GROWTH

Dear Readers:

Welcome to a new issue of *Growth: The Journal for the Association for Christians in Student Development.* We are excited to introduce our largest and most diverse issue ever. We trust that the articles and book reviews will be relevant and will enhance our professional understanding and improve our work in Student Development. You may notice numerous updates to the layout and design of the journal as well, most notably our new cover. We hope you enjoy these changes and hope that the contents will continue to serve you and those you work with.

Included in this issue you will find six feature articles addressing topics such as student leadership, the integration of faith and learning, leadership philosophy, the history of the Association for Christians in Student Development, working with transgender students, and understanding the experiences of gay and lesbian students at faith-based colleges and universities. This issue is further enhanced by a compilation of six book reviews of recent works which are relevant to our practice. We trust that you will enjoy and benefit from this review of available resources.

We are happy to welcome David Chizum to the Growth Editorial team. David has joined us in the role of Graduate Assistant for Publications, and has been a wonderful addition to the team. We have also identified several new peer reviewers. If you would have interest in serving as peer reviewer please contact us.

We especially want to encourage you, the reader, to consider submitting manuscripts for the next issue of *Growth,* to be published in the Fall of 2012. Publication guidelines are included on the inside of the back cover. We are particularly interested in manuscripts presenting original or basic research and encourage anyone who has recently completed a graduate thesis or dissertation to submit an article.

Thank you for your valued partnership in Christian higher education.

Sincerely,

Skip Trudeau, Co-Editor
Tim Herrmann, Co-Editor

GROWTH

The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development

Assessing Reasons for Involvement in Student Leadership Activities

By Dirk Barram, Scott Wade, and Christopher Koch

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors that either prompt or prevent undergraduate student participation in leadership development activities. A survey including 35 items was created. The survey was rated by experts for construct validity. Based on expert ratings, 17 items were retained. Internal reliability of the items was .87. Both a factor analysis and a qualitative analysis of the items indicated a single factor for student involvement centered on personal development. An analysis of demographic variables indicated that students planning to attend graduate school were more favorable toward involvement in student leadership activities. Implications for improving participation in student leadership activities are discussed.

Keywords: student activities, leadership development, participation

Assessing Reasons for Involvement in Student Leadership Activities

Student leadership activities are generally considered to be positive experiences that enhance one's educational experience (Astin, 1999). Although there is considerable research on leadership, relatively little is known about what prompts student engagement in leadership activities. The purpose of this study was to develop an instrument to examine the reasons why students choose to participate in student leadership activities and to obtain initial data regarding participation in those activities.

For the purpose of this study, student leadership activities were defined as those institutionally organized activities that are specifically designed to move a student toward a greater understanding of his or her leadership potential. It is important to note that this study did not examine the value that participation in student leadership activities affords college students. Existing research shows that participation in leadership activities enhances academic and life skills development as well as civic responsibility among students (Astin & Sax, 1998; Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). However, Astin (1999) suggests that the degree to which students benefit from leadership activities is directly related to their investment in those activities. Therefore, it is important to understand the reasons why students either engage in or avoid leadership activities.

Researchers have suggested at least two reasons why students might choose to avoid leadership activities, both of which are based on the idea of disengagement. First, students may perceive college as a means to an end. Labaree (1997) argued that students frequently look at college as a way to earn the credentials they need to obtain a job or move on to graduate school while putting forth minimal effort. Furthermore, Flacks and Thomas (1998) suggested that this type of disengagement inhibits students from seeing the connection between their academic work and potential opportunities in the future. Second, students may simply go through the motions of being in school. Marchese (1998) discussed the concept of student disengagement from the perspective that students view college and university as representing a system they have learned and navigated previously in high school. As a result, students follow the rules of being a student without being fully invested in the process. Consequently,

GROW✝H

these negative student attitudes may prevent students from seeing the value and benefits of student leadership activities and deter them from participating in these activities.

Instead of being fully engaged in course and campus activities, students in the current culture appear to look for the immediate relevance of activities. Frymier and Shulman (1999) reported that before taking the time to read, write, think, or act, students want to know an answer to the age-old question, "what's in it for me?". Therefore, the perceived relevance of an activity, both in and out of the classroom, impacts one's willingness to participate in the activity. Although the relevance can be made explicit, modeling also influences perceived relevance. For instance, Astin (1999) found that faculty who exhibit a focus on social change, volunteerism, and service learning positively influence their students' focus on social involvement (also Lips, 2000). Therefore, a survey was developed in the present study to examine student engagement, relevance, and positive role modeling of leadership activities.

Method
Participants
A random sample of 700 undergraduates was sent a leadership-related survey through campus mail. There was a five-dollar incentive for completing the survey. The survey was completed by 166 students (23.71% response rate). Of those completing the survey, approximately 74 percent were female. The sample was relatively evenly distributed across levels of class standing with 24 percent freshmen, 19 percent sophomores, 30 percent juniors, and 27 percent seniors.

Instrument
A survey was designed to examine reasons for student involvement in leadership activities. The survey consisted of 35 items using a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (items are available online at http://www.georgefox.edu/academics/assessment/leadership.html). Survey items were constructed by an expert with six years of experience in Student Life. After the items were created, the survey was given to two additional experts in Student Life with four and 15 years of experience working directly with undergraduates in leadership-related activities. These experts were asked to rate how important they felt each item was to student involvement in leadership activities using a four-point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree). The experts rated 17 of the items as either agree or strongly agree. The remaining 18 items had at least one negative rating. Therefore, only the 17 positively rated items were retained. Thirteen of the 17 items received identical ratings by the experts.

Reliability of the survey was also determined. Cronbach's alpha (.87) was calculated based on the 156 respondents in the current study (10 were excluded due to incomplete surveys). Thus, the survey demonstrated strong internal reliability.

Procedure
Students received the survey through campus mail. They were asked to complete the survey and return it to the researchers. Upon returning the completed survey, respondents received their five-dollar incentive. Apart from the demographic questions included in the survey, no identifying information was recorded.

Results

Survey Construction

To further exam the psychometric properties of the survey, each item was correlated with the total score. All items were significantly correlated with the total scores with correlation coefficients ranging from .40 to .71. The correlations suggest that each item uniquely contributes to the total score. However, the items most related to leadership activity include "My own personal interest in leadership encourages me to participate in leadership development activities" (r = .71), "University employees have instilled within me the importance of participating in leadership development activities" (r = .68), "My sense of calling or purpose encourages me to participate in leadership development activities" (r = .67), and "A personal desire to develop my leadership gifts and abilities encourages me to participate in leadership development activities" (r =.67). In addition, a factor analysis was conducted to obtain a preliminary indication of whether or not reasons for participating in leadership activities are associated with a unitary factor or multiple factors. Results indicate that the items load onto a single factor. In addition to the factor analysis, the authors categorized each item as being related to the importance of leadership or the relevance of leadership with importance addressing personal development and relevance addressing the value of leadership or expectation of influencing others in the future. An examination of the items showed that all of the items retained dealt with the importance of leadership for personal development. This qualitative analysis is consistent with the factor analysis and suggests that students who view leadership activities as opportunities for personal development are more likely to participate in leadership activities.

Survey Results

Based on the rating scale, the total score for the leadership survey ranged from 17 to 68. Respondents in this study had total scores ranging from 25 to 67. The mean total score was 48.72 (SD = 6.83). Scores were normally distributed (Sk = -.07).

Total leadership scores were compared across several demographic variables to determine potential differences in leadership activity. A Bonferroni correction was used to account for multiple comparisons. No differences were found for age, year (e.g., freshman, sophomore), gender, living on or off campus, working off campus, or the percentage of college expenses funded by parents or family. Furthermore, educational levels of the mother and father were not related to the overall leadership score. Whether or not students planed on attending graduate school, however, did produce differences on total scores (t(157) = 2.90, p = .004) with students desiring to attend graduate school (M = 48.98, SD = 6.13) scoring higher than students who were not planning on attending graduate school (M = 46.72, SD = 7.64).

Discussion

A survey instrument was developed to investigate reasons why students choose to engage and not engage in student leadership development activities. Thirty-five items were written by a student life expert. The items were then rated by two additional experts. As a result of this process, 17 items were identified as being most related to leadership involvement. Internal reliability of the 17 items was .87. A factor analysis suggested a unitary factor structure for involvement in student leadership development activities. A qualitative analysis of the items further suggested that the 17 items focus on the importance of leadership to personal development. Together, these findings indicate that the survey developed and used in this study is a reliable and valid instrument for examining the reasons that motivate students to participate in leadership activities.

GROWTH

Among the demographic variables examined in this study, only the intention to attend graduate school led to a greater interest in leadership opportunities. This finding suggests that students with long-term academic (and career) goals may be more motivated to engage in activities to achieve these goals. Participation in college student leadership development activities may be one such avenue. Conversely, students who come to college with less certainty of their long-term goals may not choose to participate in student leadership development activities because those activities are perceived as having little relevance or utility. Unfortunately, the demographic questionnaire only contained items regarding advanced degrees and not specific career goals that do not require an advanced degree. If students are using student leadership activities as means to achieve a particular goal (e.g., graduate school), then students with clear career aspirations should also be more inclined to engage in student leadership activities in order to enhance their learning, skill set, and job application. Therefore, future research regarding reasons for student participation in leadership activities should also examine the degree to which students have specific academic or career goals. If these types of goals influence involvement in student leadership activities, then helping students identify their vocational goals early in their college careers may result in increased involvement in student leadership development activities and encourage students to engage in more goal-directed behaviors while in college.

Additional research with the survey developed in this study should also be conducted on other campuses, particularly at schools of different types (e.g., private vs. public) and sizes (e.g., small vs. large). Findings similar to the present study would suggest that college students, regardless of type and size of the school they are attending, generally look at student leadership activities the same utilitarian way. This could be tied to generational or cultural factors and would further suggest that leadership programs that engage students could be implemented across institutions following similar strategies. However, findings different from the present study would suggest that students at different schools view involvement in student leadership activities in differently. Such a finding would indicate that strategies for involving students in leadership activities, and perhaps the types of leadership activities made available, need to be tailored to the type and size of the institution.

Contributors

Dirk Barram, School of Business, George Fox University; Scott Wade, Student Life, George Fox University; Christopher Koch, Department of Psychology, George Fox University. Scott Wade is now at Advancement Office, Houghton College. The research was supported by a George Fox University Faculty Research Grant.

References

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 518–529.

Astin, A. W. (1999). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 123–134.

Astin, W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251–263.

Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2001) Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(1), 15–27.

Flacks, R., & Thomas, S. L. (1998). Among affluent students, a culture of disengagement. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(14), A48.

Frymier, A. B., & Shulman, S. E. (1995). What's in it for me? Increasing content relevance to enhancing students' motivation. *Communication Education, 44*(1), 40-50. doi:10.1080/03634529509378996

Jacob, P. A., & Newstead, S. E. (2000). The nature and development of student motivation. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*(2), 243–254. doi:10.1348/000709900158119

Labaree, D. F. (1997*). How to succeed in school without really learning: The credentials race in American Education.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lips, H. M. (2000). College student's visions of power and possibility as moderated by gender. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24,* 39-43. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2000.tb01020.x

Marchese, T. (1998). Disengaged students. *Change, 30*(2), 4. doi:10.1080/00091389809602599

GROWTH

Scholarship and Relationship in the Integration of Faith and Learning

By Keith Starcher

Abstract

In this paper I review some of the literature on the integration of faith and learning (IFL) and reflect on my implementation of IFL inside the classroom, outside the classroom and within my discipline (marketing). I also reflect on what the Lord is teaching me about teaching.

Keywords: faith integration, college teaching

Scholarship and Relationship in the Integration of Faith and Learning

Worldview matters. According to Gaebelein (1968), no teacher teaches out of a philosophical vacuum. Thus, my Christian faith impacts my teaching and, yes, my students' learning. In this paper I will review some of the literature on the integration of faith and learning (IFL) and reflect on my implementation of IFL inside the classroom, outside the classroom and within my discipline (marketing). It is truly a journey marked by slow, faltering steps–but it is a journey guided by my Ultimate Teacher and my Savior.

IFL: Inside the Classroom

Levels of IFL Implementation

According to Holmes (1994), learning can be viewed as both content learned and human activity (experience). For example, the New Testament verb for knowing, *epigonosko*, involves an experimental kind of knowing. That is, *epigonosko* is not just a mental acquiring of knowledge, but has the meaning of knowledge acquired by acquaintance or by encounter. This way of knowing rings true for Holmes (1994), and he has challenged me to think about the IFL from the students' perspective which includes the following:

- The integration of thinking and feeling
- The integration of faith and learning with living (service learning)
- An integrated spirituality (seeing vocation as a calling from God; work as worship)
- Integration into the Christian community

As I meditated on this, I wondered how I could become more deliberate in integrating my faith in my classroom. A perusal of IFL literature led me to an article by Korniejczuk and Kijai (1994) in which the authors presented seven levels of implementation of deliberate IFL. Their goal was to answer questions such as, "What does 'integration of faith and learning' actually mean in operational terms?" and "How do teachers help students to integrate faith and learning?" Until their study, no empirical research had been done to answer these questions. The hypothetical model of IFL implementation is briefly summarized below along with my reflection on my own involvement with each level.

Level 0: No knowledge or no interest. At Level 0, instructors do not integrate the Christian worldview into the academic discipline. I do not see myself at this level any longer, although I have struggled with IFL in my statistics courses.

Level 1: Interest. At this level, the teacher is seeking information on how to intertwine the discipline and Christian belief with the idea of practicing IFL in the future. I have been on this journey for eight years now (since I began teaching full time in the academy). There are many business topics through which I have learned to introduce IFL systematically (e.g., economics, materialism), and yet there are many more to consider (e.g., sustainability).

Level 2: Readiness. At Level 2, the professor sporadically (in an unplanned fashion) demonstrates the intersection of Christian beliefs and values with the discipline. However, this integration is not a formal part of the planned curriculum. I have seen this happen in my classroom. On more than one occasion, an unplanned classroom discussion (e.g., standard of living vs. quality of life) has led me to introduce the discussion formally into future classes. My goal is to become more intentional (and less sporadic) in implementing IFL in the classroom.

Level 3: Irregular or superficial. This level appears to be the main "barrier" to the continued expansion of IFL in my classroom. At Level 3, the teacher is aware of the Christian worldview but lacks the time (or something else) to work on systematic implementation of IFL. Being proactive in regards to sharing with your students the "backdrop" of assumptions and worldviews behind a myriad of business topics (and how these assumptions relate to Christian principles) is time consuming. I have often caught myself just trying to "cover the content" within a semester—leaving IFL for a future class preparation. This "excuse" is exacerbated when I teach in our school's adult program (accelerated learning model).

Level 4: Conventional. At Level 4, the instructor has melded his beliefs into the discipline. This is reflected in things such as the syllabi and course objectives. Some who reach Level 4 are satisfied to stay at Level 4. My goal is to reach Level 4 in all of my traditional undergraduate classes by the end of the 2011-2012 academic year–but I don't want to remain at Level 4.

Level 5: Dynamic. Here the focus of IFL moves from the teacher's perspective (what is really the integration of faith and teaching) to the students' perspective. The IFL strategies are more dynamic in Level 5, allowing for variation as the instructor reacts to student responses. For me, this challenge awaits during the 2011-2012 academic year. In other words, until I've reached Level 4 (stabilized IFL), I cannot consider modifying what I am doing in integration based upon student responses.

Level 6: Comprehensive. This is an awe-inspiring level as the professor now seeks to collaborate with colleagues to improve IFL not only in his classroom but across the campus as a whole. I look forward to the day when I can be a value-adding part of the IFL collegial activity at Indiana Wesleyan University.

Time and Effort Required for IFL

In regards to the amount of time and effort it takes to integrate one's faith in the classroom successfully, Atta-Alla (n.d.) suggests that the teacher who is interested in the IFL should pray for guidance. This reminds me of the wonderful promise in James 1:5, "If any of you lacks wisdom, he should ask God, who gives generously to all without finding fault, and it will be given to him." The instructor should also identify the course's foundational ideas, issues in the field and aspects of character and virtue needed by Christian professionals to address these issues. For me, the marketing discipline offers many "issues" that Christian professionals should

GROWTH

address (e.g., childhood obesity and the marketing of sugar-filled cereals to children, charging a price "that the market will bear," etc.). Atta-Alla further suggests that the teacher search the Scriptures for insights on these "issues" and then use Scriptures found to design devotionals to enlighten the class. In my class we have wrestled with marketing's role in developing rampant materialism in our society. We read Bible texts such as Matthew 6:25, "Do not worry about your life," and discuss our dependence on our Heavenly Father to provide our needs versus the never-ending needs and wants paraded before us in the marketplace. These suggestions from Atta-Alla seem quite daunting. However, the beauty of the IFL within the classroom is the realization that God alone can and does reveal to mortal man spiritual perspectives on any topic. According to 1 Corinthians 2:14-16, there are two types of individuals: the natural man or woman who has no discernment of spiritual things and the spiritual person who can discern things from a spiritual perspective. Romans 8:6 -7 also provide insight into the fact that there are two kinds of minds: the carnal mind and the spiritual mind. The carnal mind sees the world from a temporal point of view whereas the spiritual mind is more holistic and can see beyond this life into the life of eternity. Having students in my classroom who are spiritually minded can help (and challenge) me to be more spiritually minded–even as we study secular subjects. Also, I can rely on the Holy Spirit to guide me as I read the Scriptures, listen to sermons, and even as I read secular literature. His revelation and illumination help me to "think Christianly" about real-world marketing issues and then share those insights with my students.

Devotional moments are worth the time. I have become more systematic in my approach to providing a brief time of devotion and prayer before each class. Oswald Chamber's *My Utmost for His Highest* (1984) provides the content for some of my devotional thoughts shared in class. When I first began teaching full time, I thought that devotions were somewhat of a nuisance. After all, class time is precious with so much content to cover. However, the Lord has taught me how wrong I was. Using feedback from several of my students and advice from my peers, the Lord has guided me to offer devotional moments and then trust Him to apply what we discuss to the needs of the students that day. The fact that He is doing just that may be seen in the following email I received from a student:

> I just wanted to take this opportunity to express a word of thanks to you and to let you know how much I enjoyed being in your class last semester. Not only did you just present the curriculum, you made it come alive. Your class was always one I looked forward to going to.
> In addition, I want to thank you for investing in the lives of your students, inside and outside of the classroom. It meant a great deal to me to know that if I ever had a question or needed help with something, I could always turn to you. Also, I always appreciated the devos you presented at the beginning of each class. Those were some of my favorite moments of the day. (personal communication, January 2010)

Teaching students to "think Christianly" in a secular world. Daniel and his friends provide an example from Scripture (Daniel 1:8-16) regarding how to stay spiritually minded even while working in a secular institution. They would not let their secular surroundings keep them from integrating their faith with their work. And the result, "In every matter of wisdom and understanding about which the

king questioned them he found them ten times better than all the magicians and enchanters in his whole kingdom" (Daniel 1:17-20 NIV). What a wonderful challenge and blessing to share with my students as they enter the workforce dominated by worldly thinkers!

Learning humility as a teacher. There is a new sidewalk at my school that now runs from the near Beard Art Center to Elder Hall. That sidewalk did not exist when I arrived at Indiana Wesleyan University (IWU) in June 2007. In its place was a well-worn path pressed down by a host of sneakers and sandals from students who had long ago figured out the shortest distance between the two buildings.

A few weeks after I arrived, as if by magic, a new sidewalk appeared and the brown path disappeared. Its creation did not affect the ambulatory habits of most students since they had created this path to begin with. However, as a new faculty member, the new sidewalk was a welcome sight. I, too, could now be more efficient in my goings about campus without the slightest hint of guilt.

I've noticed that IWU is not a real stickler when it comes to rules like "don't walk on the grass" (as I've heard other schools are). To me, that is a good thing since the new sidewalk would most likely have never been created had the students been subject to such a rule. Similarly, in areas not involving sidewalks, students will see a need and respond in a way that makes sense to them; many times (not always), the college then sees the need as well and applies resources in a way that benefits both the students and the college.

This same feedback loop happens in my classroom. For example, students may suggest a change to improve their learning. Once I'm made aware of the suggested change, I could be tempted to change something in the classroom just to improve student survey scores rather than to improve student learning. Yet, am I at IWU just to teach or am I here to ensure that my students learn? If the answer is "just to teach," then I don't need to concern myself too much with the learning needs of my students. On the other hand, if my focus is to ensure that my students learn, then I must be about understanding how they learn and why they learn and consider alternate methods of teaching to enhance their learning. As today's learners take a different path from the one I'm used to or the one I would classify as "being right," I must, in humility, be willing to look beyond "what was effective" and consider "what is now effective" and even more so "what will be effective" in the classroom of the future. I must allow for the fact that all around me new learning paths are being created–some through traditional means (e.g., research); others through my own observation. By studying where my students are now walking, I see opportunities to create a new way, a better way to encourage their learning. May God help me continue to develop an attitude of humility as I learn and grow as a teacher (Starcher, 2005).

IFL: Outside the Classroom

Badley (1994) asks about the locus of IFL. Does it occur in the curriculum (that is, the classroom and the teacher) or does it occur in the students' consciousness? He challenged educators to ask whether integral learning refers primarily to the natural world (ontology), the knowledge that teachers teach and the curriculum they construct (epistemology), or the faithful understanding that students develop as they study (epistemology, psychology, Christian growth).

As I thought about this, I resonated with the third construct and realized that I had a powerful role as a person (not just a "Sage on the Stage") in helping my students develop this "faithful understanding." Research supports this idea. For example, consider the study done by Burton and Nwosu (2002) in which students listed the

GROWTH

following as most valued in regards to faith-learning integration: Professor's caring attitude and Professor's exemplary life.

Sorenson (1997) showed that the "evidence of a professor's ongoing process in a personal relationship with God is the single most important dimension that accounts for what students found helpful for their own integration of clinical psychology and faith" (p. 541). Sorenson also discovered that the quality of relationship between the instructor and the graduate psychology students influenced the students' IFL more than the content of the psychology program. How I live truly matters to my students. Similarly, my relationship with students matters as well. For example, I read about the importance of developing rapport with my students (Chickering, 1987; Ramsden, 2003). This rapport between professor and students is associated with good teaching. In one study, when alumni were asked what quality they associated with effective teachers, the most frequent response was the teachers' attitude toward and relationship with students (Carson, 1996).

Thus, beginning in the spring of 2009, I endeavored to build rapport intentionally with each of my students. On the first day of class, I asked the students to set up an individual meeting with me–a one-on-one appointment. This appointment was worth about 5% of their final grade and had to take place within 4 weeks of our first class. I shared with them a professional way of setting up the appointment via email and provided each student with a blank "Student Information Inventory" form to complete prior to coming to our one-on-one meeting. On many occasions our one-on-one conversations have moved into the arena of a student's spiritual journey, his or her wrestling with faith and vocational choice, etc.

Morton (2004) found that IFL was not confined to the classroom. It reached into all areas of a college instructor's responsibility: teaching, research, service and, in some cases, into community service. He concluded that the professors in his study attempted the integration of faith and learning based upon love for God and man, both inside and outside the classroom. Morton compares IFL to a tapestry of faith, knowledge and professional practice woven from threads provided from faith in God as found in Jesus Christ, and from the threads of human knowledge as found in various disciplines of human study. The vertical threads, provided by faith, intersect with the horizontal threads, provided by man's discovery, to create a tapestry revealing the hand of God throughout the history of mankind. He sees faith as being those threads dangling vertically which represent understood Christian concepts given by God contained in the Bible. Knowledge is represented by horizontal threads that contain the fruit of our efforts as scholars that we pass on to fellow scholars and to our students. We weave professional practice horizontally as well as we serve our students and institutions and communities outside the classroom.

I appreciate the tapestry metaphor, especially the idea that my professional practice (consulting) is a vital part of my IFL as I share business insights which I have developed from a Christian worldview with the secular marketplace.

IFL: Within my Discipline (Marketing)

I spent some time reading about faith-learning integration on Eastern University's website. They define faith-learning integration as the integration of human knowledge and practices with the divine knowledge and practices given in Scripture and articulated by careful Christian reflection (Faith Integration, n.d.). They see integration taking place at the knowledge level. They do not consider integration at the knowledge level to involve cultivation of Christian living, Scripture reading and prayer at the beginning of class. Rather, they view integration as simply using the academic discipline/

practice to illustrate spiritual truth. In this regard, Eastern University has challenged me to think beyond what I do inside and outside of the classroom and to think more intentionally about the assumptions and concerns of my discipline–marketing. I need to be thinking along these lines: "How are the fundamental assumptions of marketing (as a discipline) related to the foundational assumptions of the Christian worldview?" This approach not only requires that I have a deep understanding of the philosophies that form foundational marketing principles, but that I can hold these philosophies up to the light of Biblical doctrines that deal with God, the word of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, redemption, salvation, the church, the future, etc. By doing so, I have an opportunity to affect students' worldviews in regards to marketing. Dockery (2002) suggests that students may not have well thought-out worldviews when they enter their college experience. By being more intentional with regards to the IFL, I have the potential to help students develop a worldview that goes beyond just a personal expression of faith or theory to an "all consuming way of life" (Dockery, 2002, p. 2). Some of this intentionality has resulted in a series of articles that I have written which have proved to be helpful to Christians who serve in the secular marketplace but who want to approach marketing (and business in general) from a Christian perspective (Starcher, 2007).

Specific Examples of IFL within the Marketing Discipline

Materialism. The Bible has much to say about this world's goods (Proverbs 11:24-26, 23:4-5, 30:7-9, Ecclesiastes 5:8-20, Matthew 6:19-34, Luke 12:13-21, Luke 19:1-10, Acts 4:32-37, 1 Timothy 6:6-19). Marketing is also very concerned with this world's goods. Scripture focuses more on quality of life while marketing (from a secular point of view) focuses on standard of living (the quantity of stuff one possesses). Bringing both of these philosophical worlds into a classroom discussion on materialism can produce rich dividends in the IFL (Lam, 2004). Requiring students to think more deeply about the differences between quality of life and standard of living can produce both a deeper understanding of marketing concepts (e.g., consumer behavior) and a greater appreciation for the sometimes contrary view of Scripture (Lam, 2004).

Students must wrestle with this world's scarcity mentality (economics) versus the Christian's view of God and His abundance (Psalm 50:10 NIV, "… for every animal of the forest is mine, and the cattle on a thousand hills"). These types of discussions can help students see themselves as stewards of all that God provides rather than merely consumers of all that they can obtain. This "thinking Christianly" can even impact the attitude that a student has toward his or her education. That is, pursuing my education as a child of God who stewards God's resources rather than one who is only interested in "finding a job after I graduate."

Consumer behavior. Marketers employ means-end chain analysis as we attempt to influence consumers' buying behavior. Means-end chain analysis involves understanding consumers' terminal values and instrumental values. Instrumental values are made up primarily of personal characteristics and traits (e.g., ambitious, broadminded, capable, cheerful, logical) while terminal values are those we think are most important and desirable (e.g., family security, equality, true friendship, social recognition) (Rokeach, 1973). Marketers first seek to find those product attributes that are most relevant to the consumer. Then, through an in-depth interview process, marketers discover how consumers link those product attributes to consequences and values. The goal is to have the consumer realize a positive consequence (and support the consumers' values) via purchase of the product (and its attributes).

GROWTH

Lam (2000) asks students to think about these values in light of their own consumption behavior. She challenges students to seriously consider the relationships between their instrumental values and their terminal values. The discussion that results from this self reflection can cause students to reassess their consumer buying behavior in light of Biblical principles.

Marketing in the book of Acts. Many times students have a negative perception that marketing and persuasion are inherently un-Christian. Karns (2002) created an exercise to help students explore "...points of connection between marketing and the scriptural account of the growth of the early church" (p. 112). Elements of a strategic marketing plan–including market segmentation, positioning, and marketing mix (product, price, place, promotion)–are discussed in light of the expansion of the early church. This exercise promotes thoughtful study, discussion and reflection about the intersection between marketing principles and principles of the Christian faith.

The fall and insatiability of wants. Wheeler (1991) reminds us that the insatiability of desires began after man's fall. Prior to the fall, Adam's and Eve's needs were perfectly met in their personal relationship with God. After the fall, humanity began the hunt to fill the void caused by the absence of a right relationship with God. Unfortunately, marketers can take full advantage of this insatiability as consumers, needs and wants continually spiral upwards. I remind students of this issue on many occasions as we wrestle with subjects such as the "standard of living" versus "quality of life." How much stuff is enough? The Bible teaches, "For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also" (Matthew 6:21, NIV). God warns us, "Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal" (Matthew 6:19, NIV). Helping students learn to think and behave with a focus on "heavenly treasure" is a real challenge when the primary emphasis of marketing is to satisfy earthly wants and needs right now. However, Scripture, my personal testimony, and the evidence I discuss of many Christian lives well-lived demonstrate to the students how to "think Christianly" about wants and needs from both consumer and marketer points of view.

The definition of marketing. The first formal AMA definition of marketing was developed in 1935; it was periodically reviewed and maintained for the next 50 years (Wilkie & Moore, 2007). It was modified in 1985, 2004 and 2007 (see Appendix). The 2007 definition is as follows: "Marketing is the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large" (Marketing Definition, n.d.).

Notice the addition of "society at large" in the 2007 definition. This addition makes the point that there are marketing issues in the world which are larger than the problem of a single organization and which have "faith" implications. We could refer to things such as

- Marketing and the environment (with serious cumulative impact issues)
- Marketing and dangerous products (e.g., tobacco)
- Marketing and health care
- Marketing and wellness

Mick (2007) suggests that marketers must accept a moral responsibility for the socioecological conditions of the world. He reminds us that in the global marketplace, "...the marketing system is a complex set of multilayered, near-and-far relationships in which the choices and actions of market practitioners have long-term consequences beyond their firms, partners, and customers" (p. 291). There has been no better

time in modern marketing history where marketers who come from a Christian perspective can have a voice in the worldwide conversation on how we can better steward the resources of our planet.

I have asked students in both my Business Foundations class (when we study marketing) and in my Principles of Marketing class this question, "Who invented marketing?" Ultimately we conclude that God did. Then I ask them, "What does God like or enjoy about marketing?" This leads us into a great discussion of some of the wonderful attributes of God (e.g., creative) and how He values relationships. We then work on defining marketing from God's point of view. Students astound me with the clarity of their conclusions at the end of this discussion. They begin to "think Christianly" about marketing.

Why both Scholarship and Relationship Matter

This paper documents a portion of my journey in the integration of faith and learning. In regards to scholarship, I have a responsibility inside the classroom to be very intentional about uncovering and discussing the intersections of the assumptions and philosophies behind the marketing discipline in light of Scriptural principles. I must continue to be proactive in seeking faith integration at the "knowledge level" of my discipline. This is not an easy task, but one that provides a wonderful outcome both intellectually and spiritually. However, in addition to my scholarly pursuits, I also have an obligation (and the privilege) to live my life in such a way that the integration of faith holistically is attractive to my students. Both inside and outside of the classroom, I must see my students as individuals for whom Christ died. My love for each student must show in my desire and willingness to put in the time to get to know each one as a person. Thus, it is not a matter of "either/or" but "both/and" –scholarship and relationship matter.

What the Lord is Teaching me about Teaching

Teaching is Hard Work

I'm embarrassed to think that in the past, I made comments about how easy teachers have it. "They only work nine months a year and when they work they keep bankers' hours." Now I know better. Teaching is not just a job–it's a way of life. It's pouring yourself into your students, your discipline, and your pedagogy. After seven years of pouring, I am not yet running on empty, but I do sometimes feel drained. A quote from an unknown author says it best, "A good teacher is like a candle–consuming itself to light the way for others." I see what a challenge balancing consumption and rejuvenation can be. My rejuvenation comes from a spiritual discipline–a daily quiet time. Each day begins with reading of Scripture and devotional material ending with a short season of prayer. When students are "driving me crazy," He quiets my heart and renews my love for my students and for teaching.

Teaching can be Lonely Work

Although I relish the interaction with students both in and outside the classroom, my colleagues and I seldom seem to find the time to chat–especially about teaching. We exchange greetings, serve on committees and line up according to tenure. But the collegiality that I assumed would be ubiquitous in a college setting, especially in regards to conversations about teaching, is a rarity. Everyone is just too busy teaching to talk about teaching. Here I find the Lord's comfort as well, as He reminds me frequently that He has called me to this good work and He will enable me to love Him and others through it. I am not alone in this endeavor.

GROW✝H

Teaching has Significance

I'm amazed how my students are maturing and gaining poise as they move through their college years. I remember them as freshmen–what a difference when I see them now! How humbling it is to realize the small role that I can play in this developmental process! Education leads to change. What a privilege to help engender change in the minds and hearts of students. Building a legacy in my former business life was measured in dollars and cents. Now my hoped-for legacy will be seen in changed lives. According to Henry Brooks Adams (2010), "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops" (p. 126). What can be more significant than that? Ah, there's the deep well from which I draw living water. Although James 3:1 (NIV) warns me, "Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly," I am encouraged that what I do counts for time and for eternity.

Teaching and Continuous Improvement

You would think that after seven years teaching the same courses, I would have at least one course "wrapped" so to speak–a well-chosen text, effective in-class activities, challenging assignments and outstanding assessment tools all in place. But that is not the case. I'm still changing texts, tweaking experiential learning activities and dreaming of assessments that truly measure how well the students are realizing the course objectives. Ideas for improvement continue to flow in from all directions–from books, articles, attending the *Teaching Professor* conference, from colleagues–the list goes on and on. Perhaps the joy is truly in the journey. And I believe that God expects me to improve as a teacher and a scholar over time. For example, Hebrews 5:12-14 (NIV) states,

> In fact, though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you the elementary truths of God's word all over again. You need milk, not solid food! Anyone who lives on milk, being still an infant, is not acquainted with the teaching about righteousness. But solid food is for the mature, who by constant use have trained themselves to distinguish good from evil.

At this stage in my life, although I profess to be a lifelong learner, in so many areas I need to accept my responsibility as teacher and continue to improve in that role.

Teaching Takes Courage

Teaching is a very personal vocation. Standing in front of a class involves a level of vulnerability before which I had never experienced. I have felt the disappointment of a bombed lecture and the sting of a hurtful comment from a student evaluation of my course. During those times I wonder if I'm really cut out to be a teacher. Then I get an email like this one: "Just a note to thank you for your enthusiasm and commitment to teaching as it showed very brightly in our class. Keep up the good work" (personal communication, April 2009). The Bible shares many stories of men and women whose ever-growing faith helped them to develop courage for the task to which they were called. And so my faith, and my trust in the Lord's working through me, sustains me and gives me courage to face another semester, another class.

As the Lord helps me accomplish the above systematically and with excellence, I may reach the high water mark of Christian higher education suggested by Dockery (2000):

> The purpose of Christian institutions is to educate students so they will be prepared for the vocation to which God has called them, enabled and equipped with the competencies necessary to think

Christianly and to perform skillfully in the world, equipped to be servant leaders who impact the world as change agents based on a fully orbed Christian world and life view.

What a challenge–to help my students "think Christianly," "perform skillfully," to "impact the world… based on a fully orbed Christian world and life view." My Christian faith truly affects my teaching and, yes, my students' learning–and, with God's help, their worldview.

Contributor
Keith Starcher holds a PhD in Engineering Science from the University of South Florida, and currently serves as Associate Professor of Business at Indiana Weslyan University.

GROWTH

References

Adams, H. B. (2010). *The Education of Henry Adams*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, LLC.

Atta-Alla, M. (n.d.). *Integrating faith into classroom teaching*. Retrieved from http://www.eastern.edu/academic/ccgps/vcst/pdf/Integrating%20Faith%20into%20Classroom%20monir%20part%201.pdf

Badley, K. (1994). The Faith/learning integration movement in Christian higher education: Slogan or substance? *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, *3*(1), 13-33.

Burton, L. D., & Nwosu, C. C. (2002). *Student perceptions of the integration of faith, learning, and practice in a selected education course*. Paper presented at the Biennial Symposium of the Coalition of Christian Teacher Educators. Grand Rapids, MI. doi: ED476074

Carson, B. H. (1996). Thirty years of stories: The professor's place in student memories. *Change*, *28*(6), 10-17.

Chambers, O. (1984). *My utmost for His highest*. Uhrichsville, OH: Barbour and Company, Inc.

Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, *39*(7), 3-7.

Dockery, D. S. (2000). *Integrating faith & learning in higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.uu.edu/dockery/092000-erlc.htm.

Dockery, D. S. (2002). Introduction: shaping a Christian worldview. In D. S. Dockery & G. A. Thornbury (Eds.), *Shaping a Christian worldview* (pp.1-15). Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman.

Faith-learning integration. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.eastern.edu/academic/provost/policies_forms/Faith%20Learning%20Paper%20or%20Project%20Information%20WEB.pdf

Gaebelein, F. E. (1968). *The Patterns of God's truth: Problems of integration in Christian education*. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books.

Holmes, A. F. (1994). What about student integration? *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, *3*(1), 3-5.

Karns, G. L. (2002). Faith-learning integration exercise: Marketing principles in the book of Acts. *The Journal of Biblical Integration in Business*, Fall 2002, 111-126.

Korniejczuk, R. I., & Kijai, J. (1994). Integrating faith and learning: Development of a stage model of teacher implementation. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, *3*(1), 79-102.

Lam, M. L. (2004). *Reflections on integrating faith and marketing education*. Paper presented at the fall meeting of the Christian Business Faculty Association, San Antonio, TX.

Mick, D. G. (2007). The end(s) of marketing and the neglect of moral responsibility by the American marketing association. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *26*(2), 289-292.

Marketing definition. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.marketingpower.com/AboutAMA/Pages/DefinitionofMarketing.aspx

Morton, C. H. (2004). *A description of deliberate attempts of the integration of faith and learning by faculty members at colleges affiliated with the Southern Baptist denomination*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina). Available from Dissertation Abstracts International. (UMI No. AAT 3157171)

Rasmussen, J. B., & Rasmussen, R. H. (2009). The challenge of integrating faith-learning-living in teacher education. *The ICCTE Journal*, *1*(1). Retrieved from http://icctejournal.org/issues/v1i1/v1i1-rasmussen-rasmussen/

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York,: Free Press.

Sorenson, R. L. (1997). Doctoral students' integration of psychology and Christianity: Perspectives via attachment theory and multidimensional scaling. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *36*, 530-548.

Starcher, K. (2005). Of sidewalks and learning. *The Teaching Professor*, *1*, 5.

Starcher, K. (2006). Three years and counting. *The Teaching Professor*, *7*, 8.

Starcher, K. (2007). *Weekly insights: Volume I.* Unpublished manuscript.

Wheeler, B. (1991). *Opening the American mind: The integration of biblical truth in the curriculum of the university*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2007). What does the definition of marketing tell us about ourselves? *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *26*(2), 269-276.

Appendix
Definitions of Marketing over the Years

• "(Marketing is) the performance of business activities that direct the flow of goods and services from producers to consumers." (1935)
• "(Marketing is) the process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distribution of ideas, goods, and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objectives." (1985)
• "(Marketing is) an organizational function and a set of processes for creating, communicating, and delivering value to customers and for managing customer relationships in ways that benefit the organization and its stakeholders." (2004)
• "(Marketing is) the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large." (2007)

From: Wilkie, W. L., & Moore, E. S. (2007). What does the definition of marketing tell us about ourselves? *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *26*(2), 269-276.

GROWTH

Leading Naked: The Costly Consequences of Organizational Solipsism

By Anthony J. Marchese, Ph.D.

Introduction

In one of the most acclaimed children's stories of all time, Hans Christian Anderson (1873) reveals the personal and corporate consequences of leaders becoming so inebriated by the effects of power and position that they become oblivious to the intricacies of the world around them as they exist within a realm of adulterated self-contrivance, devoid of truth. In *The Emperor's New Clothes,* we become acquainted with an indulgent, narcissistic leader who possesses an insatiable drive to elevate himself before his people. His *raison d'être* is being the object of admiration. His disposition contributes to an impairment of the highest order. His appetites perpetuate the law of diminishing returns as he foolishly employs two "tailors" to fashion him a magnificent garment to provide yet another opportunity to garner the approval and affection of the masses. The con artists indicate that the cloth is "invisible to anyone who is too stupid and incompetent to appreciate its quality" (Anderson, 1873, p. 1). Despite the inability of the emperor to view his new garment, he acknowledges its grandeur and concedes to the wishes of the courtiers who encourage him to place himself on display as the centerpiece of a public processional. The emperor, his courtiers, and nearly all of the onlookers reinforce the emperor's psychosis by acknowledging the exquisiteness of a fabric that does not exist. This manufactured reality is contested by the ignorance of a small child who curiously inquires why the emperor is naked. Soon after, the absurdity of the situation is heard throughout the kingdom as the crowd responds, "The boy is right! The emperor is naked! It's true" (Anderson, p. 9).

Truth? How do we know?

In an era that elevates individuals in the public eye to a frightening place of incalculable importance, it is incumbent upon both leaders and followers to ensure that systems of accountability are instituted to minimize the likelihood of a maligned perception of reality infiltrating the kingdom or organization. How can leaders or followers prevent themselves from succumbing to the intoxicating effects of status either by position or association? Attempts to understand *what is* as we contemplate the world around us renders a reality that is unmistakably altered by the pigmentation of our personalities, preferences, and presuppositions. In other words, that which deviates from our self-construal of normality may be overlooked or altered in order to maintain an order within our contemplative universe.

> In their work on human cognition, Maturana and Varela explain that, at any moment, what we see is most influenced by who we have decided to be. Our eyes do not simply pick up information from an outside world and relay it to our brains. Information relayed from the outside through the eye accounts for only 20 percent of what we use to create a perception. At least 80 percent of the information that the brain works with is information already in the brain. We each create our own worlds by what we choose to notice, creating a world of distinctions that make sense to us. We then "see" the world through this self we have created. Information from the

external world is a minor influence. We connect who we are with selected amounts of new information to enact our particular version of reality. (Wheatley, 1998, p. 49)

For most of my life, I have heard individuals including parents, teachers, and pastors talk about the *truth*. Many, especially within the ecclesiastical context, often speak extremely authoritatively and passionately about the matter. All truth claims appeal to an epistemological system by which information is processed, compared to some standard which authenticates its veracity, and then transmitted through behavior that should conform to its tenets. While I am strongly compelled to embrace the existence of objective reality, I am also aware of the impossibility of gauging reality free from personal *baggage* or those subjective elements which color our perspective. For example, one's race, religion, gender, socio-economic status, education, geographical origin, and personal tragedies all shape one's worldview. It is impossible to bifurcate our baggage from our inquiry. When we make truth claims, especially within the presence of others, it is important that we consider how our worldview impacts our process of acquiring and disseminating knowledge.

Much of the impetus behind my initial desire to study Organizational Leadership at the doctoral level came from my need to make sense out of some fascinating behaviors that I observed of some leaders. My observations led to a continuing process of questioning. What qualities are essential for one to be identified by others as a promising leader? To what extent does one's personal disposition inform leadership decisions? Within the context of religion, what is the relationship of one's personality to one's overall conception of the Almighty? As a college student, I was curious about the degree to which the message of a religious leader was influenced by the disposition of the messenger. While I agree with the tenets of organic inspiration, it seems that one's personality can strongly inform one's epistemological framework for understanding the will of God. In order to more closely align ourselves with truth, we must be aware of the impossibility of considering truth free from subjective constraints, i.e., personality, human relationships, experiences, etc. We must acknowledge the presence of these factors, consider the manner in which they influence our thinking, and move forward in our inquiry. One of the most important tools that one can use to help expose the subjective elements that shape our viewpoints is the dialectical process, or human interaction. It is within the presence of community that we are able to work together to unravel the complexities of the world in which we live and form some conclusions.

Within the context of leadership, however, some individuals choose to restrict engagement with others that could potentially call to question the perspective of the leader. That is, the leader surrounds herself with people who do nothing but affirm her own viewpoints. While A is occurring in the organization, the universe within which the leader chooses to reside prefers to embrace B as reality. This alternate universe, which closely resembles that found within Anderson's *The Emperor's New Clothes,* is primarily self-referential. I have chosen to refer to this common phenomenon as Organizational Solipsism. Solipsism is a philosophical term that is used to describe a detached, self-centered worldview or, more specifically, one in which the self or one's existence operates as the only thing of which one can be certain. Miller (1996) defines solipsism as "...the belief in one reality, the solipsist himself, upon whose thoughts and perceptions all other things depend for their existence" (Miller, 1996, p. 147). More simply, the American Heritage Dictionary posits that solipsism is "the theory that the self is the only thing that can be known

GROWTH

and verified. The theory or view that the self is the only reality" (Solipsism, n.d.). Upon first exposure to this concept, one might immediately recall television portrayals of schizophrenic individuals such as John Nash in *A Beautiful Mind* or be transported back to an undergraduate psychology course in which the DSM was introduced. For our purposes, organizational solipsism is a condition with varying degrees of severity characterized by a self-generated, self-moderated, insular worldview maintained by a person in authority. Like Anderson's emperor, this condition may be externally fueled by other stakeholders within the organization who may believe that by seeking favor with the leader, their own agendas may be advanced. Furthermore, this form of solipsism can also act as a fast-spreading contagion within an organization as individuals acquiesce to the perspective of the leader and ultimately place the health of the organization in jeopardy. Anderson alludes to this in his fairy tale as he describes the inner struggles of the messenger who must make a decision about whether or not to abdicate what he clearly perceives to be the emperor's nakedness for what the ambassadors call magnificent. Anderson writes, "… and accordingly, he praised the stuff he could not see, and declared that he was delighted with both colors and patterns" (Anderson, p. 3).
The consequences are costly.

Several years ago my scholarly interests in leadership studies were piqued while working at a college wherein the president persistently offered public praise for the fact that the organization was *on the move* as a result of a spike in attendance and the expansion of the physical campus. While brick and mortar were transformed into numerous buildings, many lives were adversely affected–both students and faculty. The alternate universe in which the president resided did not acknowledge the alarmingly low faculty morale or high rate of student attrition. Divergent viewpoints offered in the spirit of sincerity and collegiality were quickly extinguished and categorized as insubordination. Decisions were made on a regular basis that diminished the value of human capital and perpetuated a crippling cynicism and blatant distrust within the culture. Students and staff members were reluctant to express concerns for fear of losing scholarships or jobs. In this story, the emperor and his courtiers sought frequent opportunities to utilize impression management with the public outside of the kingdom by emphasizing the growth of the kingdom and the remarkable satisfaction espoused by its inhabitants.

Every leader is capable of succumbing to the temptation of organizational solipsism. The unhealthy synergy of ambition, personal insecurities, mental illness for some, and the blind loyalty of followers, can lead individuals, who may have the best of intentions, down a path of untruth. History is replete with examples of leaders who achieved remarkable success but at a cost. The extermination of human populations, the loss of billions of dollars through dubious financial practices, and countless other incidents reveal emperors and courtiers inhabiting a lie. Though the allure of creating an alternate universe in which the self reigns supreme is compelling, the casualties that may be incurred along the way make it a deplorable course of action. Regardless of our skills, intelligence, or records of success, we must ALWAYS be aware that the *baggage* that we carry can have a marked impact, for better or for worse, upon those whom we serve in our organizations. Leaders, regardless of their intelligence, successful history, or ethical prowess must be cognizant of their humanness and establish practices that reinforce accountability and the pursuit of what is real.

Considerations for Leaders

Self Awareness

Since ancient times, understanding the complexity of the self has been lauded as a worthwhile and necessary aspiration. In his *Phaedrus,* Plato writes, "I must first know myself, as the Delphian inscription says. To be curious about that which is not my concern, while I am still in ignorance of my own self, would be ridiculous. . . . Am I a monster more complicated and swollen with passion than the serpent Typhon, or a creature of a gentler and simpler sort, to whom nature has given a diviner and lowlier destiny?" (Plato, trans., 2009, pp. 229-230)*.

Much harmful leadership behavior has its origin on the playground when an unkind word was spoken or a classmate refused to play. Old wounds unattended fester over time and can cause irreparable harm to others. Effective leaders understand their vulnerabilities. Remember: hurting people hurt others.

Honest Feedback

Leaders who receive consistent, truthful feedback from a diverse representation of followers are less likely to practice organizational solipsism. Dotlich and Cairo urge leaders to "find the truth-tellers in your organization and ask them to level with you" (2003, p.9). This can be facilitated via the Cross the Line Test presented in the table below.

Table 1: *Dotlich and Cairo's Cross the Line Test*

You're willing to fight for what you believe in.	You're unwilling to give up a fight no matter what.
You believe that your perspective is the correct one.	You believe that your perspective is the correct one before evaluating others' ideas.
You hold yourself accountable when your strategy or idea doesn't work.	You refuse to take responsibility when your strategy or idea doesn't work.
You adapt your strongly held viewpoint to jibe with new information or developments.	You reinterpret events to fit your point of view.
You possess a powerful ego that allows you to make an impact on others.	You possess a powerful ego that causes you to dominate others.

Formal and informal feedback mechanisms that include individuals occupying positions at various levels, intergenerational perspectives, and gender and racial diversity can provide the leader with valuable breadth and depth of what is occurring. Also, identify an individual outside of the organization who will not hesitate to hold up the mirror and provide truthful insight. Be wary of those who do not offer alternative ideas. This is a red flag.

Take a Risk

Consider spending some time with a harsh critic or two. Invite them to coffee or to lunch. Though a bit unconventional, ask them to spend some time sharing their viewpoints without fear of reprisal. Maintain a posture of humility and openness. What is this person saying? What factors contribute to their position? What of value can be taken from this exchange?

Unlike the emperor in Anderson's story, leaders who focus on serving their followers and other constituencies rather than their own aggrandizement are less prone to indulge in practices that can lead to the public nakedness experienced by the

GROWTH

emperor and the harming of other members of the organization. Leaders who commit themselves to increasing their self-awareness are more adept at identifying and confronting past injuries and personal idiosyncrasies before they negatively manifest themselves in the organization. What is truth? How is it verified? Is it selective and situational? To whom do we listen? To what extent does our understanding of reality correspond to that of others? Are we aware of how our past influences our present behaviors? Have we engaged in organizational solipsism?

Contributor

Anthony J. Marchese holds a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University and has completed advanced graduate studies in law at West Virginia University and Negotiation and Conflict Resolution at the University of Notre Dame. Marchese currently serves as Senior Manager of Educational Leadership and Development at ICF International and is a professor of Strategic Leadership at Mountain State University.

References

Anderson, H. C. (1837). The Emperor's New Clothes. *Tales from the Brothers Grim.* Retrieved from http://www.yankeeweb.com/library/storytime/grimmbros/grimmbros_17.html

Dotlich, D. L., & Cairo, P. C. (2003). *Why CEO's fail: The eleven behaviors that can derail your climb to the top and how to manage them.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, E. L. (1996). Idealism. In E. L. Miller (Ed.)., *Questions that matter* (pp. 147-148). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Plato. (2009). *Phaedrus.* (H. Yunis, Trans.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Solipsism. (n.d.). In *American Heritage online dictionary.* Retrieved from http://ahdictionary.com/word/search.html?q=solipsism

Wheatley, M. J. (1998). *A simpler way.* San Francisco: Berrett-Kohler.

Some of the Early Story: The Beginnings of the Association for Christians in Student Development

By David M. Johnstone

Abstract

A reasonable critique of American student affairs is that the profession does not utilize its heritage and history. The profession leans heavily on the praxis of its responsibilities to the detriment that it has a long history and those who worked diligently in years past have made what happens today possible. The Association for Christians in Student Development has a significant history. Some of it parallels contemporary culture, while some of it is unique. However, the current association reflects the vision of early "pioneers." This article seeks to begin filling the gap, provide a sense of how the association arose and honor those who had a vision and pursued it.

Some of the Early Story:
The Beginnings of the Association for Christians in Student Development

In 1978, a cluster of essays was released by a group of prominent student affairs administrators. They observed:

> Few administrators see the relevance or importance of historical forces and issues to the present status of student affairs administration. … History provides a perspective and without an understanding of the role our predecessors played, the circumstances in which they worked, and the contributions they made … we have a truncated knowledge of our profession. … *In our field, the present is a dominant preoccupation* [emphasis added]. The price of this preoccupation is the diminution of our predecessors but also of ourselves. (Appleton et al., 1978, p. 9)

Three decades later, the *present* still dominates the world of higher education administration. We look to the future in our strategic planning, goals and objectives, but are mostly immersed in the present. The past is sometimes acknowledged, but rarely, and it is often viewed as irrelevant. This article suggests that it is not irrelevant. The role of Jesus' followers is particularly important in the history of American higher education. Faith and higher education continuously intersect throughout history. As our focus is narrowed and the historical roots and impact of Christian student affairs are examined, we quickly recognize that the Association for Christians in Student Development (and its predecessors) has played and continues to play a major role in North America. Its formal beginning in 1980 has many facets and nuances. Those involved mentored many who are now retiring or have left the field. Many current voices in Christian student affairs are now the third generation since those early days. To fully understand Christian student affairs' role and impact, the narratives and stories regarding earlier individuals must be acknowledged and understood in order that we do not *diminish ourselves* and what we seek to accomplish with college students. The insight and experience of the past may surprise us with its relevancy and applicability. This is the reason for this article.

GROWTH

The History of Christian Student Development

Events in the 1960s helped consolidate a major shift in the world of American higher education. Colleges and universities began to move away from the prevailing educational philosophy or doctrine of *in loco parentis* which defined how universities and colleges related institutionally to their students. Historically, students had been viewed as children living outside of parents' protection; therefore, the institution took on the prerogative and responsibility to act on behalf of parents or "in the place of parents" (*in loco parentis*) (Doyle, 2004, p. 69). While institutions' relationships with their students had been evolving for decades, this evolution was accelerated during this era due to political and social unrest present in American culture. This specific administrative philosophy or doctrine (as called by some) of *in loco parentis* was defining how students lived both formally and informally in relationship with their universities and colleges. These changes away from *in loco parentis* (particularly in the co-curricular lives of students) were partly due to student affairs professionals moving away from managing student behavior as their primary focus to interacting and responding to students as maturing adults. There was an increasing recognition that student affairs personnel were needing to take a greater role in the pedagogical mission of their institution.

A similar shift was taking place among evangelical institutions and their administrators. One eventual result of this shift was the creation of the Association for Christians in Student Development (ACSD). In 1980 this organization was created by the merger of the Christian Association of Deans of Women (CADW) and the Association of Christian Deans and Advisors of Men (ACDAM). In order to understand the background of this merger, some historical details are important.

Student Affairs as Student Services Personnel (1925-1960)[1]

The history of student affairs in higher education, from its earliest time until the 19th century, was concerned with providing an education which went beyond just acquiring knowledge (Student Personnel Point of View [SPPV], 1949). With the rise of German intellectualism in the latter part of the 19th century and its primary focus on scholarly development, there was a paucity of concern for the social, moral and spiritual development of students (SPPV, 1949). Academic and intellectual growth were given the priority. In America, German intellectualism was embraced by many academics as their chosen guiding philosophy of education. In 1937, and then once again in 1949, the American Council on Education (ACE) released a document titled "*The Student Personnel Point of View* (SPPV)." It was an attempt to challenge the prevailing perspective and realign how higher education related to students on American college campuses. The report encouraged institutions to understand students as individuals rather than purely as containers for knowledge (SPPV, 1937, 1949). While document referred to "student group life" (SPPV, 1949, p. 19) as an indication of its interest in community, it was primarily concerned with encouraging institutions and academic professionals to view students in a broader way than just as recipients of intellectual data. It was a pointed challenge to view students in a holistic manner.

The SPPV (1949) recognized that a student's growth is ultimately his or her own responsibility. At the same time, it also asserted that educational institutions had an

---

[1]*In 1997, Loy and Painter, in their survey of American student affairs, conveniently divided history into periods. Each time period was loosely defined by the philosophical approach by which student affairs practitioners interacted with "students." In this article, we do not touch on the periods before 1925.*

"obligation to consider the student as a whole" (SPPV, 1937, p. 2). In many ways, the SPPV report gave impetus for the direction in which student affairs was moving. It was seminal in that it set the tone for subsequent scholarship which helped shape student affairs.

Some of the key and enduring components of the document were that students needed to be taught with their whole being (socially, intellectually, spiritually, etc.) in mind. Furthering the education of the individual student was accomplished by and was the responsibility of the entire institution. Therefore the profession of student affairs was identified as a real and legitimate part of an institution. In short, the SPPV asserted that student affairs personnel were recognized as educators committed to supporting the formal and informal educational mission of the university. The writers acknowledged that student affairs administrators differed from instructors and other formal teachers. Yet, the focus of student affairs personnel on out-of-classroom curriculum and experiences was essential for a student's educational development (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994).

SPPV mirrored what had already been happening on many campuses. Particular employees of universities and colleges were identified to address matters of student campus life (Doyle, 2004; Bloland et al., 1994). As early as 1903, men and women began gathering to better understand the lives of college students, how to administer their responsibilities and shape their experiences. These were the early student affairs professionals. As these gatherings formalized, they became critical for providing support, encouragement, consultation and learning which eventually took the focus of emerging and current national associations of student affairs professionals. These groups included the foundation of the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW) in 1916, and the National Association of Deans and Advisors of Men (NADAM) in 1919 (which later became the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, NASPA) (Gerda, 2006).

In 1955, two Christian deans of women at Providence-Barrington Bible College, Rhode Island, invited presidents of Christian peer institutions to send their deans of women to a three-day gathering for counsel and fellowship. This group met in March of 1955 on their campus in Rhode Island. They met again in 1956 at Columbia Bible College in South Carolina. During this second meeting they established the structure of a new organization, selected executive officers and chose the name "Christian Association of Deans of Women" (*History*, n.d.).

Parallel to this, in 1955, deans of men who were part of the NADAM gathered at Moody Bible College in Chicago. In 1957, they decided to formalize their meetings and created the Association of Christian Deans and Advisors of Men with the purpose of not only encouragement and fellowship, but a desire to examine topics pertinent to student affairs from a Christian perspective (Zopfi, 1991). While the specific catalysts which prompted these gender-specific gatherings and organizations are not clear, the results reflected the SPPV emphasis that student affairs professionals were educators and life-long learners.

Student Affairs as Developmental Science (1969-present)

Jumping ahead a couple of decades, the growing student affairs profession reexamined the perspective provided by the foundations of the SPPV. In 1975, the Association of College Personnel Administrators (ACPA) published *Tomorrow's Higher Education Project* (THE). The document asserted that *student development* should be the foundation of all work within student affairs. THE is viewed by some historians of higher education as one of the primary guides for the profession for the subsequent 20 years (Doyle, 2004). THE maintained that the SPPV was no longer contextually

GROW✝H

adequate for shaping how administrators responded to their students. Student development theories, as highlighted in THE, directed the attention of educators to the individual students' development as distinct from the pedagogical goals and purposes of their institution (Bloland et al., 1994; Loy & Painter, 1997).

In that same year, the Council of Student Associations in Higher Education (CSAHE) published the *Student Development Services in Post Secondary Education Report* (SDSPE) (Loy & Painter, 1997). Similar to THE, this document affirmed the need for student affairs practitioners to become proficient in developmental theories outlined in psychology and sociology. THE and the SDSPE both affirmed the boundless possibilities for students and affirmed that human developmental theories must function as the bedrock of student affairs practice (Doyle, 2004). It is important to note that student affairs as a profession was entrenching itself solidly within the sphere of the behavioral sciences.

The SDSPE introduced student affairs to the competencies generally called for in developmental theories. The document viewed those in student affairs as facilitators assisting students in their own learning processes. Student affairs personnel stood in contrast to the faculty emphasis which sought to provide content; student affairs personnel were to focus on the process of learning (Cooper, 1975). Student affairs, now viewed as *student development*, emphasized the individual's process of maturation. The SDSPE articulated that most student life priorities should be assessed in light of the positive development of human relationships–both individual and corporate. The language of the document was replete with phrases referring to the "unlimited potential" of students (Cooper, 1975, p. 525), the importance of "process" (Cooper, 1975, p. 527), and a focus on "self direction" (Cooper, 1975, pp. 525, 527) and "self-development" (Cooper, 1975, p. 528). This language appears to have been a natural progression of the alignment of many student development professionals viewing their work through the paradigms presented in the behavioral sciences.

One of the unfortunate effects of this philosophical emphasis was that some student development practitioners began to view themselves as having a greater role in the education of a student than their faculty colleagues (Doyle, 2004). They saw themselves as being more attuned to students and their pedagogical needs. However, many developmental theories were still unproven; their credibility had not been established. Not surprisingly, confusion and tension arose between student affairs practitioners and faculty members even though both were equally committed to the educational enterprise of their students.

The field of student affairs was not uniform throughout the nation or even within individual institutions. There had been a significant shift from the 1949 perspective of a student affairs officer being an administrator to the 1975 vision of an educator seeking the development of students. *Student development* was a nascent field, unproven in its claims of being able to guide and craft how student affairs practitioners cared for college students. However, it was seized by many in student affairs as being a significant paradigm by which to view their work. These varying and sometimes competing perspectives were part of the context in which ACSD was formed.

The Beginning of ACSD

At the beginning of the 1970s, the United States Congress passed legislation called the *Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972* (USDOL, 1972). This particular amendment asserted that no persons within the USA could be excluded on the basis of their gender from programs or activities benefitting from federal funds. It primarily held implications for educational institutions, their sports, activities and associated organizations. While it took a few years, the federal government finally implemented

laws in 1975 that gave the amendment some authority. As a result, many institutions and organizations began the task of scrutinizing their practices to ensure that they were in compliance with the federal mandates.

In early 1977, Gene Hovee, the president of the Association of Christian Deans and Advisors of Men, wrote to the leadership of the Christian Association of Deans of Women. He posed the exploratory and unofficial question of whether, in light of the federal regulations tied to the Title IX Amendments relating to gender-exclusive organizations, there would be interest or benefit in the two organizations merging. The two organizations already had very cordial and respectful relationships due to many members being colleagues at the same institutions. CADW shared locations for annual meetings and maintained strong organizational relationships with ACDAM, yet both were separate organizational entities defined by gender.

The responses from the CADW executives were polite but uninterested. Legally, they did not see the merger as necessary. Further, they raised other concerns about a possible merger. One executive suggested that the general CADW constituency would not be in favor of such a move (Watts, 1977). Another viewed a merger as having significant disadvantages for their own organization, particularly because women at Christian colleges found many opportunities for leadership within the CADW and were well represented by the organization. Comparable organizational roles were not available at their own institution and could possibly be lost in a merger (Hoglund, 1977). The president of CADW responded with the opinion that merging would not be a good response to the requirements of the Title IX legislation; she went on to explain that she was currently seeking counsel from their secular counterpart, the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (Lauffer, 1977). While they were consistent in their hesitation toward the idea of a merger, the leaders of CADW were willing to continue discussing this possibility at a future date.

A year later in June 1978, while Hovee presided over the annual business meeting of the ACDAM, the organization's relationship with the CADW arose once again out of Title IX concerns. Six men were appointed by the association to study the matter of their relationship with the CADW (ACDAM, 1978). In anticipating that a formal organizational relationship might occur in the future, the ACDAM leadership began eliminating gender-specific language from their literature and business documents and changed their terminology of constitution and by-laws to more gender-neutral language (ACDAM, 1978). Interestingly, in spite of a growing desire for cooperation, the CADW voted in a parallel meeting to remain autonomous (ACDAM, 1978).

In June of 1979, the ACDAM voted to change its name to the gender-neutral *Christian Association for Student Affairs* (CASA). In November of that year, the leadership of CASA was joined by the executive leadership of CADW (CADW/CASA, 1979). Discussion about the possible merger continued with the suggestion that a sample constitution and by-laws be created for each organizational executive to consider.

Miriam Uphouse, president of CADW, wrote to all of the organization's members in February 1980. She proceeded to outline the history and reasons behind the conversations with CASA about a possible merger. Reflecting utilitarian perspectives, she outlined the advantages and realities of a decision to proceed in this direction. She indicated that a merger would demonstrate better stewardship of the money and time devoted to the organization's purposes. With the larger and diversified demographic that a new organization would provide, they could anticipate broader and more robust counsel, wisdom and resources. She also pointed out the obvious fact that most of the members of both CADW and CASA interacted with colleagues and students of both genders; therefore, meeting together would not be such an unusual step.

She observed that regional groups of both national organizations were currently meeting in such a manner with no concerns. Last of all, she noted that while CASA was not yet open to female membership, when it had eliminated gender-specific terminology from their literature some months earlier, women had immediately begun to apply for membership with the organization (Uphouse, 1980a).

After making these points, Uphouse and CADW polled their membership, asking what they desired with regards to a merger with CASA. By April, after polling 105 members, they received 73 responses; all but three were in favor of a merger (Uphouse, 1980b). At CASA and CADW's annual June meeting, both groups passed motions to dissolve their organizations and form a new one together (CADW, 1980; CADW & CASA, 1980). On June 5, 1980, the Association of Christians in Student Development[2] (ACSD) was birthed. In response to the original concerns about numbers, power and representation, two presidents were proposed (one from each of the past organizations) for the initial "transition" year. Thus Don Boender (formerly of CASA) and Miriam Uphouse (formerly of CADW) served as joint presidents of ACSD for the first year (ACSD, 1980).

The new organization did not yet have a final draft of their constitution. Over the next months, ACSD executives continued to craft its new constitution and organizational goals (Boender, 1980a; Irvine, 1980; Zopfi, 1980a). In October of 1980, the leadership stated that both professional and spiritual growth should be priorities for the new ACSD. As part of the spiritual emphasis, integration of biblical principles into student affairs was critical. On a practical side, the executives stated that the organization was to provide placement services, publications and other tools. They also gave preeminence to communication, fellowship and encouragement as defining the organization's goals (Boender, 1980b; Irvine, 1980b; Jaggers, 1980; Uphouse, 1980c). Implied, but not stated overtly, was the role of a student affairs professional as an educator. These priorities of providing resources and placement services became major components of the new association's mission and character.[3]

Conclusion: History Interpreted

In the meeting which brought together CASA and CADW, there was discussion regarding the name of the new organization. As indicated by the association's name including the word "development," there was support and familiarity with the student development language of the day (Loy & Trudeau, 2000). There has been some suggestion that this alignment with student development theory was done "without examining the philosophical underpinning or its compatibility with the Christian faith" (Loy, n.d.). However, over time, the organization has not locked itself into one philosophical perspective. Since those early days of the organization, there have been writers from within and without who have broadened and challenged both the understanding of student affairs, higher education and the role of Christians in these spheres.

Over the past decade, there has been an increasing awareness among members of ACSD about their roles in shaping the out-of-classroom experiences of students on college campuses. Members are increasingly affirming that they are more than campus activity providers and caregivers; they have a role to play in the educational

---

[2]*The minutes demonstrate that the use of "of" was included in the original title; yet within four months, it was the Association "for" Christians in Student Development.*

[3]*Note that there was no mention of educational role within these priorities; this omission was missing from early correspondence and other archived documents.*

development of the student. In an attempt to infuse Christ into their work, members have sought to balance both a missional (in regards to institutional pedagogical mission) and a developmental (as in processing learning experiences) role within the lives of their students.

In looking at student affairs in America, one historian made the observation that the profession has not fully utilized its history and heritage (Gerda, 2006). Others suggest that history is underappreciated and neglected in student affairs (Appleton, Briggs & Rhatigan, 1978). They caution readers that "we cannot afford to continue a legacy of indifference" (Appleton et al., 1978). This is one of the reasons why recording this narrative is important. Those working in higher education with students should have some understanding about their professional heritage and community in order to make wise decisions for the future.

ACSD has been true to its history and original intentions (ACSD, 2006) and has increasingly clarified its pedagogical role within higher education. Early concerns by the CADW about adequate representation and leadership for women seem to be resolved – at least at the leadership level.

The association has sought to engage the world of higher education by encouraging members to participate in organizations and conferences beyond the evangelical sphere and pursue substantive relations with counterparts at secular institutions. It is actively working at greater and more profound engagement with issues of cultural diversity and trying to discern its role in what has become an international conversation. Most of all, it has been a place where members wrestle intellectually and seek to infuse their commitment to Christ into all that they do as educators and practitioners. While these efforts are not exclusive to ACSD, the organization has the potential for speaking creatively into concerns and challenges faced by student affairs. A constant challenge to the organization has been to understand personal and organizational identities in light of the philosophies and history that have shaped American higher education and student affairs. Understanding the context and heritage of an organization such as the ACSD is one of the initial steps in understanding the field's identity and (sometimes prophetic) role within higher education and even the Kingdom of God.

Contributor
David M. Johnstone serves as Associate Dean of Students at George Fox University. He holds a Masters of Arts from Providence Theological Seminary.

GROWTH

References

American Council on Education. (1937). *The student personnel point of view*. Retrieved from http://www.bgsu.edu/colleges/library/cac/sahp/word/THE%20STUDENT%20PERSONNEL.pdf

American Council on Education. (1949). *The student personnel point of view.* Retrieved from http://www.naspa.org/pubs/files/StudAff_1949.pdf

Appleton, J., Briggs, C. M., & Rhatigan, J. J. (1978). *Pieces of eight: The rites, roles and styles of the dean by eight who have been there*. Portland, OR: NASPA.

Association for Christians in Student Development. (1980). Executive committee meeting minutes. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Association for Christians in Student Development. (2006). Constitution and by-laws. *ACSD 2006 membership directory*. Retrieved from http://www.letu.edu/people/debbiemoughon/documents/directory.pdf

Association for Christians in Student Development. (n.d.). Mission statement. Retrieved from http://www.acsdhome.org/mission.html

Association of Christians in Student Development (1980). Transitional meeting to establish ACSD. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Association of Christians Deans and Advisors of Men (1978). Business meeting minutes. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Bloland, P., Stamatakos, L., & Rogers, R. (1994). *Reform in student affairs: A critique of student developmen*t. Greensboro, NC: ERIC Counseling and Student Services Clearinghouse.

Boender, D. (1980). [Letter to Miriam Uphouse]. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Boender, D. (1980). Purpose and general goals of organization. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Christian Association for Deans of Women. (1980). Minutes. Archives of the ACSD, Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Christian Association for Deans of Women & Christian Association of Student Affairs. (1979). Combined meeting of CADW/CASA executives. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Christian Association for Deans of Women & Christian Association of Student Affairs. (1980). Business meeting of the executive committee. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Cooper, A. (1975). Student development services in post secondary education report (SDSPE). *Journal of College Student Personne*l, *16*(6), 524-528.

Doyle, J. (2004). Where have we come from and where are we going? A review of past student affairs philosophies and an analysis of the current student learning philosophy. *College Student Affairs Journal, 24*(1), 66-83.

Gerda, J. (2006). Gathering together: A view of the earliest student affairs professional organizations. *NASPA Journal*, *46*(4), 147-163.

Guthrie, D. (1997). Christian higher education and Christian student affairs. In D. S. Guthrie (Ed.), *Student affairs reconsidered: A Christian view of the profession and its contexts* (pp. 65-77). Lanham: University Press of America.

History of the Christian Association of Deans of Women. Unpublished manuscript. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Hoglund, B. (1977). [Letter to Gene Hovee]. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Irvine, R. (1980). [Letter to Miriam Uphouse]. Archives of the ACSD Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Irvine, R. (1980). *Purpose and general goals of organization.* Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Jaggers, C. (1980). *Purpose and general goals of organization.* Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Lauffer, S. (1977). [Letter to Gene Hovee]. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Loy, B. (n.d.). *A rough draft of a history of the Association for Christians in Student Development.* (Unpublished manuscript.) Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Loy, B., & Painter, W. (1997). Student affairs in historical perspective. In D. S. Guthrie (Ed.), *Student affairs reconsidered: A Christian view of the profession and its contexts* (pp. 15-37). Lanham: University Press of America.

Loy, B., & Trudeau, S. (2000). ACSD: Past, present, future. *Koinonia*, 4-8.

Star, M. (1980). *Purpose and general goals of organization.* Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs (1996). *Journal of College Student Development*, *37*(2), 118-122.

US Department of Labor (1972). Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972 (Title 20 U.S.C. Sections 1681-1688). Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/oasam/regs/statutes/titleIX.htm

Uphouse, M. (1980). [Letter to CADW members]. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Uphouse, M. (1980). [Letter to CADW members]. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Uphouse, M. (1980). *Purpose and general goals of organization.* Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Watts, V. (1977). [Letter to Gene Hovee]. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Williams, M., Coomes, M., & Dannells, M. (2006). Chronology of foundational documents of the student affairs profession. Retrieved December 4, 2008 from http://www.bgsu.edu/colleges/library/cac/sahp/word/Chronology%20of%20Found%20Docs11.28.pdf

Zopfi, K. (1980). [Letter to Donald Boender]. Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Zopfi, K. (1980). *Purpose and general goals of organization.* Archives of the ACSD. Upland, IN: Taylor University.

Zopfi, K. (1991). The history of ACSD. *Koinonia*, 6.

GROWTH

What About the "T's"?: Addressing the Needs of a Transgender Student at a CCCU Member Institution

By Scott Barrett, Philip Byers, David Downey & Eric Gingerich

Abstract

As the discussion of the LGBT community continues to evolve and inform decisions at higher education institutions, evidence suggests the "T"–transgender–discussion at CCCU institutions has remained stagnant and largely unrecognized. In June 2011 ACSD's New Professionals Collaborative asked professionals to present a case study on how a CCCU institution would house a transgender student who had already been admitted into the institution. The authors found the literature on the subject to be sparse, and within the Christian context it is nearly nonexistent. The few precedents and best practices on housing a transgender student do not appear to align with the values of a CCCU institution. There are, however, a few viable housing options to explore, and while an exhaustive list was not created, several of the most likely are examined and discussed. Understanding that a transgender student's situation is unique and recognizing a lack of knowledge, precedent, and expertise on the subject, the recommendation is to have a conversation with the student about institutional fit. If an agreement to live by the institution's values is reached, the authors assert housing the student with his/her biological sex most aligns with the institution's values. Ultimately, the most compelling conclusion and discussion is that CCCU institutions must urgently lay a philosophical and theological foundation on the transgender issue.

What About the "T's"?: Addressing the Needs of a Transgender Student at a CCCU Member Institution

In June 2011 at the annual ACSD conference, members who qualified as "new professionals" were invited to participate in a case study challenge addressing current issues in higher education as identified by New Professionals' Collaborative leadership. The following study emerged from that competition and examines approaches toward housing a transgendered student at a CCCU member institution.

Institutional Description

For our purposes, the university will be referred to as Mid-States University (MSU). MSU is meant to be a median of the 111 member institutions that make up the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Mid-States has a total enrollment of approximately 2,800 students both graduate and undergraduate. It is located in the Midwest and has a residential campus with an on-campus housing rate of approximately 85 percent. Although not affiliated with any particular denomination, Mid-States is a conservative school with core curriculum requirements in Bible and expected weekly chapel attendance.

Problem Statement

The student in question was accepted to Mid-States as Stephanie but has since informed the housing department of *hir* (gender-neutral pronoun used by the transgender community) situation (O'Neil, McWhirter & Cerezo, 2008). Stephanie is

currently in transition from hir birth gender and biological sex, a male legally named Steve. According to MSU's policy, first-semester students are required to live on-campus. The housing department is tasked with deciding how to house the student.

Literature Review
Public and Non-Sectarian Private Institutions
One of the foremost scholars exploring this issue in non-sectarian institutions is Brett Genny Beemyn. At the front end of the housing process, Beemyn, Curtis, Davis, and Tubbs (2005) recommend amending institutional intake forms and clarifying admissions and marketing language. In their view, intake forms that force students into a "binary" gender paradigm of male or female should be replaced by those with blanks for self-identification. Additionally, clearly publicizing and clarifying policies online can help students understand the context into which they are entering before they apply or matriculate.

Beemyn, Curtis, Davis, and Tubbs (2005) offer general housing principles. According to these researchers, co-educational facilities (whether designated by floor, suite, or room) are preferable to single-gender spaces where students may not "pass" as easily (p. 53). They recommend that these areas be comprised largely of upperclassmen who are often more developmentally mature. However, these practitioners recommend an approach that is equally as varied as the experiences of transgendered students, one informed by a written policy but implemented on a "case by case" basis (p. 52).

Elsewhere, Beemyn, Domingue, Pettitt, and Smith (2005) recommend that institutions have "advocates" in any "single-gendered" locations (like residence halls) in which students are more likely to face obstacles (p. 21). Beemyn et al. (2005) caution against LGBT "themed" housing as a solution, as these facilities often focus on sexual identity to the exclusion of heterosexual transgendered students.

Beemyn, Domingue, Pettitt, and Smith (2005) recommend steps at "beginning," "intermediate," and "advanced" levels for residence halls. These steps include publicizing names of residence life practitioners with knowledge of and sympathy for transgendered issues ("beginning"), conducting mandatory training for all residence life staff and developing "inclusive" policies ("intermediate"), and establishing gender-neutral bathrooms and private showers ("advanced"). They would also allow students to be housed by their "gender identity/expression" or to apply for single rooms (p. 90).

Catholic and Evangelical Institutions
Literature examining the policies of Christian institutions is less common. In his examination of approaches toward LGBTQ students at an all-men's Catholic institution, Yoakam (2006) commits no direct attention to transgendered students, and very little attention is given to housing issues. Besides mentioning self-selection of other LGBTQ roommates, the only housing approach Yoakam identifies is the existence at select Catholic institutions (like Loyola College of Maryland) of "Stonewall" houses, institution-sponsored residential units where LGBTQ students and their "allies" live together.

There is almost no extant literature examining best practice at Evangelical institutions. Wolff and Hines (2010) recently published research describing experiences of what they refer to as "sexual minority youth (SMY)" at 20 randomly selected CCCU member and affiliate institutions. Wolff and Hines (2010) explicitly address the challenge in ascertaining best practice at Evangelical institutions when they claim,

GROWTH

Transgendered students–the T in GLBT–are not included in some of this paper as many schools do not even acknowledge that transgendered students are on their campuses. Thus, many of the policies that bar GLB students do not currently bar transgendered students, though the campus climate may be equally condemnatory for them. (p. 441)

Wolff and Hines criticize policies that would bar SMY from admission, and they condemn policies that would target sexual minorities separately from other sexual behavior occurring outside of marriage.

Connections Between Homosexuality and Transgenderism

Since the literature regarding transgender issues at Christian colleges was so sparse, this case study also investigated how Christian institutions dealt with homosexual students on campus, a distinct but similar phenomenon. One prominent Christian researcher on the issue makes an important distinction between temptation and behavior (Yarhouse, 2010). Similarly, many Christian colleges focus their policies on "behavior" and "promotion" rather than struggling or being tempted by same-sex attraction (Hoover, 2006, p. 1). Finally, some Christian institutions tackle the issue by emphasizing the importance of shared values and raising the question of institutional fit.

In the spring of 2001, a CCCU ad hoc task force on human sexuality compiled a resource document to inform CCCU colleges of the growing need to address homosexuality in constructive ways. Because the transgender community is often associated with the gay community in policy issues, this resource helped inform the specific response in this case study.

The CCCU (2001) task force agreed that "the historic stance of the Church, grounded in the unambiguous teaching of Scripture, cannot be explained away," thus positioning the CCCU with the viewpoint that homosexual behavior is not biblical (p. 6). Additionally, the CCCU task force (2001) explained that dealing with sexual minorities on Christian campuses is extremely nuanced and "there is no 'one size fits all' formula for dealing with this difficult issue on our campuses" (p. 2). The task force did encourage each CCCU institution to determine its own stance "explicitly and deliberately" because the identity of Christian institutions will be tested (p. 8). The encouragement for each faith-based institution to be specific in its stance, while not assuming their positioning is correct for everyone, is a concept that can be applied to the transgender issue, and it greatly informed this response. Although the task force found Scripture to be clear on the issue of homosexuality, it also recognized that experiences of students and institutions are varied.

Examining the Options

There is a wide variety of options to consider in housing a transgender student; however, each of these solutions comes with both strengths and weaknesses. The following section will identify strengths and weaknesses within each response and who is affected by these options.

Encourage Student to Find Off-Campus Housing

One short-term response to the issue of housing a transgender student is to encourage the student to find housing off-campus. Certainly there are times for exceptions to rules, and this issue seems like a very reasonable instance to make such an exception. However, encouraging the student to find off-campus housing fails to connect the student to the greater university community. MSU does not house students

on-campus to make a profit or to increase accessibility to classrooms. Rather, MSU sees the added benefit of living in community with peers as a means of promoting holistic learning. In this case, Stephanie would miss out on an experience central to student growth at a CCCU institution. However, this option is the least disruptive to the rest of the student body.

Discuss Whether MSU is a Good Institutional Fit

The idea of being part of a community while not having a desire to comply with community standards raises the important question of fit. Is the typical faith-based institution the best fit for a student who is acting on, and placing their identity in, transgenderism? There must be an important discussion with the admitted student about whether or not this particular institution is the best fit. As seen through the experiences at University of the Cumberlands, behavior and promotion of issues that go against university values are different than temptation and struggles (Hoover, 2006). If Stephanie acts or promotes behavior different from MSU's values, perhaps this particular institution is not the best fit. Stephanie is free to pursue hir academic growth somewhere else. This option once again has a minimal impact on the student body at MSU, but it also raises a question of equality. Is it fair to have this conversation with some students but not all? What are the criteria for having this type of conversation? This type of conversation also has the potential to alienate those involved and insult the LGBTQ community.

House the Student with Hir Preferred Gender

Housing the student on campus raises additional issues and concerns, most importantly with which gender to house the student. The first option is to house Stephanie with hir preferred gender. This would be difficult to justify according to MSU's values given that the institution would be identifying Stephanie opposite hir biological gender. In addition, this approach would be difficult on several fronts for the students who lived with Stephanie. An outcry from other constituents, particularly parents of current students and conservative alumni, would be likely. This option, however, would possibly resonate with the LGBTQ community as an allied response to Stephanie.

House the Student with Hir Biological Gender

The second option for gendered housing is to place Stephanie on a male residence floor. This option would align more with the CCCU (2001) stance that, as creations, human beings are sacred (including their sex), and therefore, their biological sex should be respected as a foundational component of God's design. However, one must also recognize the extreme difficulty this option could cause for Stephanie. Stephanie could be subject to ridicule, embarrassment, and other hurtful abuses. Also, depending on Stephanie's choices, housing hir on a male residence floor could have a large impact on those housed with Stephanie. This would once again raise many concerns with other constituents, including the parents of those housed with Stephanie.

Create a Gender-Neutral Space for the Student

Lastly, MSU has the option to create a gender-neutral, or LGBTQ allied, floor or apartment. This is a path that most public and some select private schools have chosen. To the LGBTQ community, this option would be an allied response and show great care toward Stephanie's needs. However, there is no precedent for this option within the CCCU, and this tactic does not seem to align with CCCU member institutions' or MSU's values. Thus, this is an unviable option.

Additional Details to Consider

Other very important housing issues include the following: (a) placing Stephanie in

GROWTH

housing that has communal bathrooms or private bathrooms (suite-style bathrooms reserved for four or fewer students), (b) placing a roommate with Stephanie, (c) allowing hir to have hir own room, or (d) placing hir in a single room if available. Lastly, if the university owns apartments either on- or off-campus, Stephanie could be afforded the option to live in an apartment by hirself or with upperclassmen students who desire to live in community with Stephanie. Each of these options once again has the potential to either alienate or include Stephanie in the MSU community and also to either expose or insulate the student body from Stephanie and the issue of transgenderism.

Recommendation

The Dean of Students should first consider the values and mission of the school, then the viability for Stephanie's holistic success on-campus, and finally ensure proper reasoning and response to impacted constituencies including current students, faculty and staff, parents, alumni and donor bases, and the LGBTQ community.

Upon review of these factors, we recommend that Mid-States hold tightly to the values of the Christian community which are the foundation of the institution. First and foremost, this requires MSU to work with Stephanie to determine hir degree of willingness or desire to uphold the shared values of the university community. This conversation would clarify that behavior and promotion of lifestyles in conflict with a traditional Christian sexual ethic are not included in those shared values. If Stephanie could not agree to this, the recommended decision is to release Stephanie to pursue another academic institution that is more aligned with hir values.

If, however, Stephanie willingly embraced MSU's community expectations, our recommendation would include housing Stephanie on a male residence floor where the bathrooms are suite style and private to only the two rooms they adjoin (meaning the bathroom is shared by no more than four students). According to our sense of the spirit of established CCCU policy (per the 2001 statement on sexuality) and our overall estimation of the pros and cons to the various options, we assert that this decision would be most beneficial for Stephanie and the various constituencies. In addition, we would suggest that Stephanie live in one of these rooms as a single resident.

Conclusion

The case study detailed approaches to the issue of transgenderism at CCCU member institutions from a practical and logistical angle. However, it is the conviction of these researchers that the matter which institutions must address first is more philosophical and theological in nature: what, exactly, do Christian colleges and universities think about transgenderism?

As the literature and best practice reveal, historically, many Christian institutions have dealt with issues of sexuality by distinguishing between "behavior" and "promotion." Similarly, Yarhouse (2010) challenges his readers to differentiate between orientation and identity. In his approach, one may be oriented to same-sex attraction but not necessarily assume the homosexual identity.

While the behavior / promotion approach may be helpful concerning sexual minorities, it offers little guidance for Christian institutions seeking to care for transgendered students. The distinction between orientation and identity which some have adopted to make sense of same-sex attraction breaks down with transgendered students because transgenderism seems to concern identity inherently. Whereas one can imagine how students experiencing same-sex attraction could learn to reframe their language about sexuality from statements of identity ("I am gay") to statements

of orientation ("I feel attracted"), the basic assertion of the transgendered person is one of identity ("Despite my biological gender, I am…"). There seems to be a clear difference in kind between questions about homosexuality and questions about transgenderism.

The authors of this study do not presume to have the theological or scientific expertise to make a pronouncement on this broader question. What we do assert, however, is that the entire Christian community is in desperate need of honest conversation regarding transgenderism. No longer can Christians ignore the "T" in LGBTQ. Pragmatically, such a head-in-the-sand approach exposes Christian institutions to the danger of being caught off-guard by an issue like the housing question detailed above. Yet worse still, disregarding this important question neglects the needs of a real segment of the population. Sustained and sophisticated theological reflection on this question is an absolute necessity if the Christian community is to be what it purports to be.

Contributors

Scott T. Barrett holds a M. A. in Educational Ministries (Grand Rapids Theological Seminary, '10) and B. A. in Elementary Education (Taylor University, '07). He serves as Resident Director at Biola University.

Philip D. Byers has a M. A. in Higher Education & Student Development (Taylor University, '10), B. A. in History (Taylor University, '08), and serves as Resident Director at Bethel University.

David M. Downey holds a M. A. in Higher Education & Student Development (Taylor University, '10), a B. S. in Social Studies Education (Taylor University, '08), and is Coordinator of the Upper Class Experience and Resident Director at Messiah College.

Eric M. Gingerich has a M. A. in Higher Education & Student Development (Taylor University, '10) and B. S. in Chemistry (Indiana Wesleyan University, '07). He serves as Resident Director at John Brown University.

GROWTH

References

Beemyn, B. (2003). Serving the needs of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*.

Beemyn, B., Curtis, B., Davis, M., & Tubbs, N. J. (2005). Transgender issues on college campuses. R. Sanlo (Ed.), *Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Research, Policy, and Personal Perspectives: New Directions for Student Services*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beemyn, B., Domingue, A., Pettitt, J., & Smith, T. (2005). Suggested steps to make campuses more trans-inclusive. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education, 3*(1), 89-94.

Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. (2001). *Report of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Human Sexuality*. Retrieved from http://www.cccu.org/news/cccu_task_force_on_human_sexuality_releases_draft_of_report

Hoover, E. (2006). Gay and Christian. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/GayChristian/26504/

O'Neil, M. E., McWhirter, E. H., & Cerezo, A. (2008). Transgender identities and gender variance in vocational psychology: Recommendations for practice, social advocacy, and research. *Journal of Career Development, 34*(3), 286-308.

Wolff, J. R., & Hines, H. L. (2010). Purposeful exclusion of sexual minority youth in Christian higher education: The implications of discrimination. *Christian Higher Education, 9*(5), 439-460.

Yarhouse, M. A. (2010). *Homosexuality and the Christian.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing Group.

Yoakam, J. R. (2006). Resources for gay and bisexual students in a Catholic college. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 14*(3), 311-321.

Experiences of Gay and Lesbian Students Attending Faith-Based Colleges: Considerations for Improving Practice

By Joel M. Wentz and Roger D. Wessel

Abstract

The intent of this 2010 qualitative, phenomenological study was to understand the experiences of undergraduates who identified as gay/lesbian in faith-based colleges. Some of the issues students encountered were identity denial, perceptions of homosexuality on campus, exposure to off-campus cultures, concealing sexual identity, establishing a peer support network, and reconciling faith and sexual identity. Participants discussed support from faculty/staff, counseling services, school policies, male residence hall culture, and perceptions of administrators. Considerations for improving practice include making informed enrollment decisions, supporting sexual identity formation during college, reconciling faith and sexual identity, encouraging supportive networks, and developing policies regarding campus sexual behavior.

Experiences of Gay and Lesbian Students Attending Faith-Based Colleges: Considerations for Improving Practice

The collegiate experience takes place during a formative period of identity development for many young adults. In addition to developing a career, college students also mature academically, emotionally, spiritually, and sexually (American Council on Education, 1937). The intent of this study was to discover how an explicitly Christian, undergraduate college environment influenced the collegiate experiences of gay and lesbian students.

In many faith-based colleges and universities, homosexual behaviors are prohibited (Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, 2001), creating unique concerns regarding the experiences of gay and lesbian students in these universities. To better serve these students, faculty and staff at faith-based institutions would benefit from a more-informed understanding of the collegiate experiences of their gay and lesbian students and how these experiences influence overall identity development.

Literature Review

The theoretical framework for this study rests in the literature of two separate fields of study: (1) literature regarding college student development and (2) gay and lesbian identity formation. Arthur Chickering's (1969) foundational work on education and identity addressed how identity development takes place in relation to the college experience. He theorized a seven-stage psychosocial model which Chickering and Reisser (1993) later revisited. After a student moves through the first vector, developing competence, he/she must then learn to manage emotions, as emotions that are not properly managed can delay the developmental process. In the third vector, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, students experience an emotional separation from parents, which typically results in reliance on peers. In the fourth vector, developing mature interpersonal relationships, students build on established interdependence and develop a capacity for intimacy. The quality of relationships deepens while students begin to recognize and tolerate

GROW✝H

differences. In the fifth vector, establishing identity, growth in many various aspects of holistic identity takes place. This sense of identity draws upon the foundation of the previous vectors. After establishing a sense of identity, students decide who they want to become and how to get there, thus developing purpose. This vector addresses personal interests and the priorities that students place on family, friends, and accomplishments. Finally, students address core beliefs and values in the seventh vector, developing integrity, affirming values while recognizing the existence of alternative viewpoints.

Concerning gay and lesbian identity formation, the theoretical models which contributed to the foundation of this study were organized into stage and non-sequential models. One foundational stage model of homosexual identity formation was developed by Cass (1979) in which gay and lesbian adults progress through six stages before achieving a fully realized sexual identity. When an individual first perceives that his/her behavior may be identified as homosexual, he/she enters the first stage: identity confusion. Depending on personal beliefs, he/she will consider the possibility of a homosexual identity and either accept or reject this possibility. If the individual accepts the potentiality of a homosexual identity, he/she moves into stage two: identity comparison. This stage is primarily defined by feelings of alienation, as the individual compares him/herself to others of heterosexual orientation. If the individual considers making contact with other homosexuals to lessen the feelings of alienation, he/she enters the third stage: identity tolerance. This stage is defined by tolerance because the individual sees his/her contacts with homosexuals as necessary rather than desirable. It might be common for an individual in this stage to maintain both a heterosexual and homosexual identity, depending on the environment.

Increased contact with the homosexual culture leads to the fourth stage: identity acceptance (Cass, 1979). As a network of gay and lesbian friendships is created, the individual begins to define how he/she may fit into society as a homosexual. Extremely selective disclosure may be made at this point to community members outside of this network. As the individual accepts that homosexuals are a generally negatively valued group in society, he/she progresses into the fifth stage: identity pride, during which frequent attempts are made to validate homosexual status. If these attempts result in positive dialogues and contacts, the sixth and final stage is entered: identity synthesis. During this stage, the individual realizes not all heterosexuals have contributed to marginalizing the homosexual group and that there are other aspects of one's identity other than sexuality. Homosexuality is no longer hidden, and every aspect of identity is synthesized into a seamless whole. As peace and stability are found in this stage, identity formation is considered complete. Cass (1984) later revisited this developmental model in an effort to determine its validity. Based on this assessment, it was found that research participants tended to blur the original distinctions between stages one and two, as well as those between stages five and six, which suggested that individuals who develop a homosexual identity may actually progress through four stages, rather than six. This finding also supported the validity of four-stage models developed by other researchers, such as Troiden (1989) and Fassinger (1998). However, Cass (1984) ultimately concluded that six identity formation stages could still be clearly distinguished from one another. She also asserted that, in comparison to other models of homosexual identity formation, her original model was the only one which included every one of these individual stages, stating that "these alternative models may offer a too narrow conception of the developmental process" (p. 164).

D'Augelli (1994) developed a nonsequential model of homosexual identity development, in which he presented three variables and six interactive processes which play important roles in identity development throughout a gay or lesbian individual's entire lifetime. The first variable, personal subjectivities and actions, is defined by specific meanings an individual attaches to perceptions and actions related to his/her sexual orientation. The second variable, interactive intimacies, refers to the effects of messages received through interactions with friends, family, peers, and other intimate members of one's community concerning sexual orientation. The third variable, sociohistorical connections, refers to the setting in which the individual lives (e.g., cultures, laws, policies, or organizations which impact sexual orientation). D'Augelli also identified six processes that homosexuals may interact with at any point during the identity formation process: exiting heterosexual identity, developing a personal lesbian/gay/bisexual identity status, developing a lesbian/gay/bisexual social identity, becoming a lesbian/gay/bisexual offspring, developing a lesbian/gay/bisexual intimacy status, and entering a lesbian/gay/bisexual community. A homosexual may enter or exit any process depending on his/her current context and environment.

Method

The purpose of this study was to better understand the collegiate experiences of undergraduates who identified as gay or lesbian while enrolled in private, faith-based colleges and universities and to identify what factors are present which may have positive or negative influences on the collegiate experiences of gay and lesbian students at these institutions. A secondary purpose was to better understand how these institutions could improve their practice in meeting the developmental needs of these students. This information was studied to better equip faculty and staff members in faith-based institutions for working with students who identify as gay or lesbian. This study addressed the following research questions. What are the experiences of gay and lesbian students in faith-based institutions of higher education? How can faculty and staff at faith-based institutions improve the collegiate experiences of these students?

Design of the Study

Students who participated in this study self-identified as gay or lesbian and were enrolled in one of four private, faith-based institutions of higher education. Each participant attended an institution that was affiliated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), an international association of intentionally faith-based institutions of higher education whose mission is to "advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education" (CCCU, 2009, para. 2). The CCCU had 110 members in North America in 2010, as well as affiliates in 24 countries.

Qualitative, phenomenological methodology was followed in this study since the focus concerned the experiences of a group of people, rather than a single individual (Creswell, 1998) and the experiences of this group revolved around a similar concept, or phenomenon. Flowers and Moore (2003) argued that "a qualitative research design is suitable when . . . [educators] are interested in collecting in-depth data reflective of . . . students' college experiences" (para. 1). Data were collected through single, personal interviews with students who attended private, highly residential, faith-based institutions.

Data Collection

Purposive sampling was used to identify potential informants (Patton, 1990). One of the researchers had personal contacts on faith-based campuses around the

GROWTH

country, and some of these contacts identified as gay or lesbian. An email was sent to each of these individuals, requesting their participation as a research subject. In addition to purposive sampling, snowball sampling was utilized so that the researcher could "find an insider, a member of the group studied, who is willing to be an informant and act as a guide" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 77). In this way, many of these initial personal contacts quickly resulted in personal contacts with other gay and lesbian students. The first eight students who agreed to participate in this study were selected for interviews. Experiences were gathered from students at four different faith-based institutions, representing geographically diverse locations in the United States, including institutions in eastern, western, and midwestern states.

Personal interviews were conducted in a mutually agreed-upon environment. A semi-structured interview protocol was created to facilitate flexible interviews that adjusted to the flow of conversation (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). The structure for this protocol was organized into two major areas so that information would answer the research questions. Students were encouraged to share stories and personal experiences through the interview process. Before any interviews were conducted, a panel of experts (i.e., educators and faculty members skilled in both the topic and qualitative research methodology) reviewed the proposed interview guide. A revised draft of the interview guide was prepared based on the suggestions of this panel. Then, a pilot test was conducted with three members of the target population who were not involved in the study. Final revisions were made based on the suggestions of those involved in the pilot test. Interviews were conducted during the spring semester of 2010; they were recorded and transcribed. All information provided by the participants was kept confidential through pseudonyms.

Data Analysis

The qualitative research technique of "memoing," as defined by Glaser and Strauss (1967), was used to draw emerging connections and themes during the data collection process. Analysis was conducted based on steps identified by Moustakas (1994) and Strauss and Corbin (1990). During the first step, horizontalization, statements from the interviews that addressed how individuals experienced the topic were identified (Moustakas, 1994). Second, statements identified from multiple interviews during the first step were organized into clusters. This step required the researcher to revisit the data and identify themes, or common experiences, among the participants. In a process known as *axial coding*, the researcher then examined these clusters to identify major categories which explained the experienced phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This step required the researchers to visit the data multiple times. Finally, a narrative was constructed, in relation to the original research questions, around these categories.

Findings

Demographics

All eight participants were traditional-age, Caucasian college students enrolled in faith-based colleges and universities associated with the CCCU. Of these eight students, five were male and three were female with participants ranging from sophomores to seniors. Each participant came from a predominantly Christian background, and none identified as gay or lesbian before attending college. The circumstances surrounding each participant's sexual identity and the college he/she chose to attend were unique to each individual.

• Aaron grew up in the Catholic Church and became a Christian in junior high school. He came out (i.e., publicly announced his sexual orientation) to his immediate family members and, at the time of this study, no longer identified as Christian.

• David came from a conservative, Christian family and had not come out to any immediate family members at the time of this study. David identified as a Christian. Both of David's brothers also attended faith-based universities.

• Both of Elizabeth's parents were pastors. She identified her family background as moderate and open-minded. She chose to attend a faith-based institution in an effort to maintain her Christian faith. At the time of this study, she came out to her immediate family, and she identified herself as an atheist.

• Jessica was raised in a conservative, fundamental Christian background and came out to both her parents during college. Jessica was in a same-sex relationship before attending college, but she never expected to actually identify as a lesbian. She did not identify as a Christian.

• Josh was raised to believe homosexuality was sinful and attended a faith-based institution in an attempt to avoid identifying as gay. Josh came out to his entire immediate family during college, and he identified as a Christian.

• Katie attended a faith-based university as a "naïve attempt to not become a lesbian." She had one sister and came out to all of her immediate family members. She identified herself as a Christian.

• A prominent factor in Mike's decision to attend a faith-based university was because of his initial belief that homosexuality was a sin. His father was a pastor and his mother ran a Christian pregnancy crisis shelter. Mike came out to each of his immediate family members while he was in college.

• Zach decided to attend a faith-based university because he did not want to be gay. He was very involved in church and youth group throughout high school but did not identify as a Christian at the time of this study. He came out to his mother but not many extended family members.

Collegiate Experience of Gay and Lesbians on Faith-Based Campuses

Five main findings emerged: identity denial, perceptions of homosexuals on campus, exposure to off-campus cultures, concealing sexual identity, establishing an on-campus peer support network, and reconciling faith and sexual identity.

Identity denial. Every student indicated a period of time during which he/she denied the possibility of accepting a gay or lesbian identity. Although each one admitted to experiencing varying levels of same-sex attraction prior to attending college, none actually acknowledged a gay or lesbian identity before attending

GROWTH

college. The impact of this period of denial was different for each person. Two of the eight students indicated that this denial played an active role in their decision process regarding which college to attend. Josh felt that attending a Christian university would help him avoid establishing a gay identity.

> So when looking at my university, I saw what their policies were, and for me I felt that it would be best if I was trying to change something, which at the time I felt like being gay was something that needed to change . . . it provided the restrictions that I felt would be needed for that change to occur.

While deliberating over which school to attend, Katie felt that attending a faith-based institution would cut her off from any opportunities to explore her sexuality, which would ultimately help her maintain a straight identity. "I had a list of bad things that could happen at college . . . what if they figure out I like girls? . . . I wanted to avoid that if at all possible."

During their pre-college years, the other six students were not as actively worried that same-sex attraction, much less adopting a gay or lesbian identity, would ever become a major concern as a college student. The assumption among these individuals was that either their feelings of same-sex attraction would simply go away or that they could progress through their undergraduate experience without ever engaging in homosexual behavior. In regards to choosing a faith-based university which took an open stance against homosexual behavior, Jessica also did not expect her sexuality to cause any problems. "At the time I was very religious . . . I didn't really ever expect to be 'out' or be comfortable with being a lesbian." Ultimately, for these individuals this period of denial eventually resulted in accepting a gay or lesbian identity. Aaron acknowledged,

> I came to this school with the knowledge . . . that it's wrong and it's a sin, and I just didn't accept it. Through the course of being at this school, I learned a lot of things . . . I realized that all this is who I am, and I ended up accepting myself.

Perceptions of homosexuality on campus. Each student expressed that extremely negative perceptions of homosexuality were perpetuated within the general campus culture. These perceptions seemed to be largely unchallenged by the student body, and in some settings, they were actually affirmed. Three of the students specifically mentioned homophobia as a significant attitude within their university culture. Aaron said, "You hear people say 'faggot' or making fun of gays . . . homophobia on this campus is pretty ridiculous. It's all subtle, under-the-carpet, not directly in your face." Further negative perceptions were evident in chapel services. Jessica expressed frustration that chapel services were not utilized as a time to engage in healthy dialogue about sexuality. Zach referenced a specific chapel service in which the prevailing message was, "You can be gay, as long as you're trying to be straight." Elizabeth spoke about a meeting she held with her college's chapel directors. "We talked about how, when it came to the content of chapels, gay issues were very rarely mentioned. If they ever were, it was in a negative sense."

Four of the students reported the attitudes of people in class settings as further evidence of these negative perceptions. Three students specifically identified professors as a source of anti-gay sentiment in the classroom. According to Josh,

"I've heard stories of faculty members outright saying . . . 'It would be better if our government just killed all the homosexuals,' and nothing's been done about that." When Elizabeth chose to turn in a writing assignment about gay slang in the early 20th century, her instructor strongly objected to the topic. She also indicated that during a conference after the assignment was finished, he commented on the "questionable morality of me studying gay people." Jessica identified one specific classroom occurrence that exemplified the attitude of her peers toward homosexuality.

> This one girl was just passionate, trying to hold back tears, being like, "there was this guy in my church, and he was living the homosexual life and he came out to his parents, and unfortunately he had a lot of bad experiences and they cut him off financially, and he was in high school so he didn't have anywhere to go, and the church shunned him, but, you know, he prayed about it, and he saw that it was a sin, and he was able to change, so don't tell me that it's not a choice" . . . and I just wanted to turn around and be like, "Really? Because I have cried and prayed over this a bajillion times, and I have tried everything not to be, and I still am, so don't tell me that it is a choice."

Exposure to off-campus cultures. In regards to sexual identity, many students indicated a period of exposure to others outside their campus culture as a significant event within their collegiate experience. In some cases this was a period of exposure to a LGBTQ community or a realization that significantly different cultures existed outside of the university. In either case, students indicated that this exposure resulted in feeling accepted by a community of peers, which was extremely valuable. Overall, five of the eight students spoke of this as a turning point in their college experience.

For David, studying abroad for one semester provided him with a valuable perspective. "So that time away, away from the Christian University . . . provided me the opportunity to really become who I was inside and gave me the time to discover that." Similarly, both Mike and Aaron spent one semester in urban environments, which was formative for each of them. Mike expressed a newfound level of confidence in his own sexuality after this experience, stating, "I sort of came back to Christian University with the mindset of 'I'm not going to take this anymore.'"

Concealing sexual identity. After accepting a gay or lesbian identity, each student experienced significant pressure to conceal his/her sexuality. One student indicated a fear of losing her on-campus job if any of her supervisors found out she identified as a lesbian. Other concerns expressed by students included being fined, sent to mandatory counseling sessions, or being suspended from the institution. For Zach, this constant pressure resulted in him leading a double life: "There is the Zach that everyone at Christian College sees, and then there is the gay Zach, and I won't let anything intersect." Josh spoke about the experience of having his boyfriend visit him in this environment.

> When he would come on-campus, it was understood between the two of us . . . to stay separated from him, to walk by my side and not have much physical contact, no hand-holding or anything like that, and to not really show affection.

GROWTH

For Katie, this dynamic was especially uncomfortable when she became friends with other students who were employed by the university.

> I had a friend last year . . . and he'd ask me things about my life, and I'd always have to say, "I'm sorry, I'll talk to you about it next year. I can't talk to you right now," and I hated it because I can't afford to tell the wrong person. I'd lose my job, I'd get fined, I'd get sent to counseling, there's a whole list of things that would happen if the wrong person told the wrong person.

The tension experienced during the pre-college stage of identity denial seemed insignificant compared to the tension created by the pressure to conceal their sexuality after accepting a gay or lesbian identity. Students actively worked to ensure they never accidentally said or did something which would reveal their homosexual identity. This required keeping silent when derogatory comments were made about homosexuality and emotionally distancing oneself from professors and students who perpetuated those attitudes. The result was a pervasive feeling of anxiety, constantly wondering if someone would find out. According to Elizabeth, "It's a challenge here if you wish to live a life that's open and honest and full of integrity in keeping with your sexual orientation."

Establishing an on-campus peer support network. After accepting a gay or lesbian identity, building a peer support network became extremely important for students. Seven of the participants spoke directly about the positive results of having a social network of friends that accepted and encouraged him/her. Elizabeth admitted, "I found all the reasonable kids at the Christian college and quickly befriended them." One student even cited this network as the main reason he did not transfer to another school. Students also spoke about how the coming-out process actually strengthened many of the friendships they had already established with other students. Jessica explained, "I think that most of my friends went from being a friend to a very good, close friend through that. Just through their support . . . those people really know me and know what I went through."

Not every aspect of this process was positive, however. Students also indicated that friendships were lost and relationships damaged as a result of establishing a gay or lesbian identity. Both Katie and Mike took steps to intentionally distance themselves from other students who they knew would not accept their sexuality. Students did admit, though, that it was more important to be honest and open with a smaller group of close friends than to hide their sexuality in order to maintain a larger friend group. Opening up about one's sexual identity was seen as a method of discovering individuals that were not seen as true friends.

Reconciling faith and sexual identity. Each student specifically spoke about attempting to reconcile their Christian faith with their gay or lesbian identity. The outcome of this process ranged from active rejection to continued acceptance. Several students also indicated that these issues influenced their relationships with peers and family members. Three students spoke about how they were in the process of attempting to maintain their faith. David described how appreciative he was of his supportive friends and family members, "especially in regards to my faith because I'm still trying to hold on to my Christian faith and not sacrifice that for this." Josh also indicated that he was appreciative of his supportive family members, although

> Every time I see them faith always has to be brought up. It gets
> a little tiring after a while, because I told my dad, you know, "If I
> wasn't still trying to figure that out and what it looks like for me,
> I wouldn't be sitting here with you right now."

For both Mike and Zach, the Christian faith was something they explored in an attempt to ignore their feelings of same-sex attraction. Mike explained, "I was that guy that just prayed every day since junior high for God to heal me, and just assumed that it would happen." Similarly, Zach described his previous experience with the Christian faith. "I was all about faith then. It's what I threw myself into to ignore the stuff I didn't want to deal with, and I was like, 'Oh, it'll go away, and God will make it go away.'" At the time of this study, neither Mike nor Zach identified as Christian. Elizabeth came to identify as an atheist during her collegiate experience.

Positive and Negative Influences on the Collegiate Experience

Five main findings emerged: individual support from faculty and staff, counseling services, school handbook and policies, male residence hall cultures, and perceptions of administrators.

Individual support from faculty and staff. All of the participants indicated support from faculty and staff members as an extremely positive aspect of his/her university. Zach even explained that the main reason he had not left his institution was because his instructors did not treat him any differently after they found out he was gay. Students further appreciated the fact that faculty and staff members would support them, despite the possibility of being reprimanded by the university. In some cases, students indicated that professors actually risked their own job security by being supportive of their sexual identity. Mike explained,

> I've actually had faculty and staff give me secret notes that are
> like . . . "I'm sorry that we have to have all these conversations in
> secret, but I just want you to know that I don't think it's a sin" . . .
> and then they'll be like, "Please rip up this note after you read it."

Six of the eight students spoke about individual relationships they formed with faculty or staff members. These individual relationships were exceedingly positive, and in some cases, were integral in the student's identity development process. Aaron spoke of how one teacher "helped give me the courage to begin to accept myself and come out." One professor helped Jessica come out to her Christian family: "That Bible professor I told . . . he got me resources on biblical translation stuff that I could show to my mom, and he was really helpful." Elizabeth had the opportunity to take an independent study with a faculty member who was supportive. The purpose of the study was to examine gender roles and sexuality in literature.

> He had to title it "Readings in English" so we could get it past the
> faculty, but it was a fabulous experience. Every week we would
> talk about various queer theories, what it is like for me at that
> institution, gay identity, all that kind of stuff. He saved my life, I
> think. If not for him, I would have gone nuts.

Counseling services. Four individuals attended the counseling center at their respective universities. Despite any fears or preconceptions the students had, each experience was positive. None of them felt any pressure to change or ignore their sexuality, and for two female students, the experience of going to counseling was

GROWTH

actually formative in helping them establish a healthy sexual identity as a lesbian. Mike indicated, "my therapist has been really there for me. He doesn't think that homosexuality is a sin and . . . that a healthy identity as a homosexual is to embrace that part of yourself."

The only negative association with counseling services was expressed when students felt worried that they would be sent to mandatory counseling sessions if their sexual orientation was reported to school administrators. When asked about this, Katie responded, "I think that's demoralizing to someone, to be like, 'You're clearly disturbed and not fit. We need you to go and talk to somebody and make sure that you really know what you're talking about.'"

School handbook and policies. An overwhelmingly negative aspect of each student's college experience was the tension caused by the school handbook and policies. Each student attended an institution where homosexual behavior was specifically mentioned and prohibited in the university's lifestyle guidelines. One specific source of tension was the distinction these policies made between acknowledging a homosexual identity and actually participating in homosexual behavior, such as same-sex hand-holding, kissing, and dating. As a college student attempting to define his own sexuality, Aaron indicated, "It's really frustrating because, for one, I can be gay as long as I'm not practicing, which doesn't make any sense to me." According to Katie, "You're allowed to be gay, as long as you don't do anything gay."

A second significant source of tension was a perceived extra-emphasis that was placed upon the institutional policies regarding homosexuality. Behaviors that other students engaged in, such as drinking and heterosexual behavior, were not dealt with as harshly. As a result, a double standard was perceived, and gay and lesbian students felt singled out, frustrated, and bitter. Six of the students spoke about how their respective institutions specifically included same-sex hand-holding within the definition of prohibited sexual behavior. Aaron said, "I can't hold hands with another guy, yet I see straight couples making out everywhere . . . it's just really frustrating . . . unfair." Elizabeth spoke about her experience in the residence hall as a further example of this double standard:

> A lot of stuff got overlooked in a way that gay stuff never does. Girls had their boyfriends sneak up to their rooms all the time. There was a lot of drinking going on . . . folks did what they wanted, and a lot of that flew under the radar.

Zach recalled a time in which a group of under age students were caught drinking on-campus, a behavior that was in violation of the living guidelines. "All the school ever did was slap them on the wrist . . . nothing ever came of it. And I'm like, 'That's illegal. That's against the law,' but me being gay isn't, and I was more severely punished."

In regards to forming student organizations, David spoke about the Gay-Straight Alliance chapter on his campus. Every student who was seen attending this group was threatened with punishment if participation continued. As a result, the group decided to meet in secret.

These rules and policies were seen as encouragement of the negative perceptions of homosexuality displayed on-campus. Mike explained,

When you create a handbook that's all about loving your neighbor, and all this stuff that Christian universities stand for, and then you have an entire section of the handbook devoted to, basically, putting down homosexuality and encouraging homophobia, of course the student body is going to, in many ways, perpetuate the cycle of homophobia and hatred, because the handbook does.

Male residence hall culture. Of the five male students who were interviewed, four lived in all-male residence hall environments. The culture of the all-male residence halls was both foreign and intimidating to male students experiencing same-sex attraction. The behaviors which other males found humorous and entertaining were seen as offensive and immature by the gay individuals. David spoke about his own experience.

I can't even describe how much I can't stand the whole dorm lifestyle and attitude . . . it was just the whole assumption, like, "Yeah, we're all guys, let's wrestle naked, let's all take showers together" . . . I hated the immature attitude.

For Mike, the experience in the residence hall was partially negative because he did not feel safe coming out to the RA on his floor or even to his full-time hall director. He concluded that the male residence hall culture contributed significantly toward the negative attitudes displayed toward same-sex attraction on-campus.

The actual people who are in the residence halls themselves, the students, literally have no inkling that there might be a gay person around them, so they just spout off every horrible thing you can say about gay people . . . the resulting homophobia that occurs is literally jarring.

Perceptions of administrators. Unlike the relationships and positive interactions students experienced with faculty and staff members, interactions with and perceptions of administrators were exceedingly negative. Administrators were perceived as people who were largely ignorant and out of touch with current issues regarding homosexuality. For Josh, his supervisor was informed by administration that Josh recently entered a same-sex relationship. As a result, Josh was called into his office for a meeting.

He asked me point-blank if I was in a relationship, and I . . . said "yes." . . . He pretty much gave me the ultimatum of continuing my schooling until graduation and ending my relationship or continuing my relationship and ending my time in school.

Zach reported a similar experience that occurred after another student told university administrators that Zach was gay.

The school pulled me from summer tour . . . There was a meeting where they wanted to put me in counseling, and they said, "The only way you can stay is if you're in counseling." So by the end of it all I told them it wasn't true . . . "I'll just say what you want me to say, and we'll pretend that this never happened."

GROWTH

In general, students felt administrators were completely unapproachable regarding sexuality. Elizabeth was the only student who spoke in defense of campus administrators.

> I know the president, the vice president, so it's not quite as easy as just, "They're a bunch of old, white homophobes who don't know what they're doing" . . . but at the same time, they're really products of their culture . . . which really conflated biblical prohibitions against homosexuality, [and] pop-psychology that suggested it's a series of disorders.

Discussion

Five considerations for improving practice emerged from the findings: students making informed enrollment decisions, sexual identity formation during the collegiate experience, reconciling faith and sexual identity, encouraging supportive networks for gay and lesbian students, and policy development regarding sexual behaviors on-campus.

Students Making Informed Enrollment Decisions

Young adults who experience feelings of same-sex attraction, although they may not identify as gay/lesbian, should carefully approach enrollment decisions when considering attending faith-based colleges or universities as feelings of same-sex attraction will likely have a negative impact on their collegiate experience at these institutions. Sexual attractions to individuals of the same sex may not simply disappear while progressing through higher education. Rather, the possibility exists that one's same-sex attractions will intensify while enrolled in college, and policies restricting homosexual behavior on faith-based campuses may become a significant source of tension and frustration. Likewise, colleges and universities must be candid with prospective students and families regarding institutional policies concerning homosexual behaviors. Additionally, staff members who interact with students in enrollment decisions cannot assume these students fully understand their own sexuality upon entering college.

Prospective college students, whether or not they eventually identify as gay or lesbian, should be aware of the pressure they might feel to conceal same-sex attractions or behaviors while enrolled at faith-based institutions. This pressure is often the result of institutional values, and it creates obstacles regarding the ability of gay/lesbian students to openly develop and establish their sexual identities. Chickering (1969, 1993) identified growth in competency, emotional management, interdependence, and mature interpersonal relationships as necessary to achieve identity development. Similarly, the final stages of many sequential models of homosexual identity development were consistently characterized by an individual's ability to synthesize his/her sexuality into a larger, holistic identity (Cass, 1979; Fassinger, 1998; Troiden, 1989). However, the pressure these students feel to conceal their sexuality while enrolled in faith-based institutions may place undue focus on the sexual aspect of each one's identity, resulting in a hindered ability to holistically develop.

It is equally important for enrollment professionals at faith-based universities to recognize that many incoming students possess a limited understanding of their own sexuality. If prospective students acknowledge that a gay/lesbian identity is even a remote possibility, this consideration should weigh heavily in discussions regarding whether or not a faith-based university is the best fit for them.

Sexual Identity Formation during the Collegiate Experience

Students who experience same-sex attraction often make formative decisions regarding sexual orientation and overall identity during their college years. It is important for these students to be able to safely discuss these decisions with other individuals within the context of the campus subculture.

Although each individual in this study identified as gay or lesbian at the time of his/her interview, none of them thought this was a possibility prior to entering college. This pattern suggests that many students may enroll in a faith-based university without originally intending to sexually identify as gay or lesbian. For these students, adopting a non-heterosexual identity is an unforeseen, and possibly unwelcome, change that occurs during the college experience. This finding is supported by Cass (1979) and Troiden (1989) who both posited a stage of identity confusion in their respective models of homosexual identity formation. This stage was marked by an individual's ability to notice his/her own sexual attractions as different from the societal norm, and Cass specifically noted that an individual may completely reject the possibility of ever establishing a homosexual identity while rooted in this stage.

Gay and lesbian students identified exposure to off-campus cultures as an occurrence which helped their overall identity development. This included exposure to various international cultures, diverse regional cultures within the United States, and gay and lesbian cultures. This exposure provided an avenue for students to incorporate multiple perspectives into their own viewpoints, thereby moving from dualistic into relativistic thinking (Perry, 1981). Additionally, exposure to off-campus cultures provided students with a larger perspective regarding how their sexual identity could fit into the broader society outside of the culture of the faith-based institution they attended. This pattern is supported by sequential and non-sequential models of homosexual identity formation. Troiden (1989) identified the identity assumption stage where a gay/lesbian individual determines how to process the social stigma associated with a gay/lesbian identity. Cass (1979) identified one's ability to evaluate how he/she will adapt into society as a sexual minority as a precursor to the stage of identity acceptance. These messages were significantly impacted by exposure to other cultures. Without these off-campus experiences, gay and lesbian students are at a significant disadvantage when seeking to develop their sexual identity.

College students who experience feelings of same-sex attraction should search for exposure to cultures outside their institution. This may be found through opportunities such as urban immersion experiences, study abroad programs, service-learning trips, and intentional interaction with local gay and lesbian communities. Such experiences will provide students with a broader perspective regarding their own sexuality, which will be invaluable as important decisions are made regarding identity formation. Faculty and staff members at faith-based colleges and universities should be aware that students who experience same-sex attraction make formative decisions regarding their identity development during the time they are enrolled at these schools. Students should also be encouraged to process and discuss these decisions within the campus culture, rather than feel pressured to maintain secrecy regarding issues surrounding their sexuality and only seek guidance outside of the campus environment.

Reconciling Faith and Sexual Identity

Many students who identify as gay or lesbian while enrolled at faith-based institutions progress through a period where they seek to reconcile their sexuality

GROWTH

with the Christian faith. This process may result in a continued engagement of Christian faith, abandonment of faith, or adoption of a new faith. Overall, spirituality is a primary concern for many gay and lesbian college students (Love, Bock, Jannarone, & Richardson, 2005). Every individual interviewed for this study came from a predominantly Christian background, and, as a result, questions of faith became impossible to ignore as he/she began to acknowledge a gay or lesbian identity. However, these students did not feel safe openly engaging these questions within their institutional setting. Negative perceptions of homosexuality were observed in residence halls, classrooms, and chapel services, and, therefore, students felt insecure openly addressing these questions.

Though these negative perceptions were tangibly experienced within specific aspects of the collegiate experience, such as the behaviors of heterosexual students in male residence hall settings and institutional policies forbidding same-sex behavior, the disparity exists at a much deeper level. These negative attitudes permeated the campuses, indicating the existence of a broader, systemic cultural conflict between the Christian organizations that sponsor these institutions and the gay/lesbian culture. The CCCU Task Force on Human Sexuality publicly acknowledged that the Christian Church has repeatedly confirmed the inherent sinfulness of homosexual actions throughout its history (Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, 2001). Gay and lesbian students find themselves in conflict with this cultural background when they choose to attend faith-based colleges and universities.

It is not the purpose of this study to address the core cultural conflicts between Evangelical Christianity and the gay/lesbian culture. However, students who have questions regarding their own sexuality will continue to attend faith-based institutions, and programmatic efforts on the part of the university would be helpful to these students as they navigate these questions. These efforts should be approached as intentional learning opportunities that engage all students in discussions regarding how sexuality impacts faith and spirituality. In an effort to avoid harming students who are forming their sexual identity, it is essential that safe spaces be created within these institutions where multiple viewpoints may be acknowledged. It may not be possible to condone or affirm these viewpoints, but they should be acknowledged and tolerated. Chapel services may provide an ideal environment to openly engage the topic of human sexuality, especially as it relates to biblical text and the Christian faith. Scholars and ministers who represent multiple perspectives regarding sexuality should be brought to campuses to discuss these viewpoints with students, either through panel discussions or a series of lectures. Gender-specific programming could be implemented in residence halls to give both male and female students insight into how young adults of their same gender process the experience of growing up as a Christian with feelings of same-sex attraction. Educational initiatives could be embedded in course content. Any of these programmatic efforts would benefit gay and lesbian students as they seek to reconcile their faith and sexuality. Heterosexual students would also benefit from these efforts by being exposed to the reality of the struggles these students face as they progress through their collegiate experiences.

Encouraging Supportive Networks for Gay and Lesbian Students

Gay and lesbian students seek support from faculty, staff, counselors, and other students while making healthy sexual identity decisions. Administrators should be aware of this dialogue and support these interactions and relationships as they provide channels for students to progress through healthy sexual identity formation within the context of the Christian university culture.

College students progressively move through autonomy toward interdependence (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). This is often experienced as students become separated from their parents and develop an increased emotional reliance on others. Every student who participated in this study came from a religious background, and many of these backgrounds held negative perceptions of homosexuality. The possibility of harming relationships with family members by identifying as gay or lesbian heightened the importance these students placed on supportive relationships with peers. Coleman and Remafedi (1989) argued that individuals who establish a gay/lesbian identity during adolescence develop an increased desire for intimacy in peer relationships. As a result, the positive relationships gay and lesbian students formed with fellow students became vital in helping them navigate the college experience.

Similarly, positive relationships with faculty, staff, and counselors became significant factors in sustaining the collegiate experience for many of the individuals interviewed. Especially for first-year students, frequent contact with faculty members lessened feelings of anonymity (Scanlon, Rowling, & Weber, 2007). For gay and lesbian students, the need for accessible faculty members was heightened as they progressed through sexual identity formation (Mooney, 1992). Supportive professors and staff provided much-needed validation to gay and lesbian students who felt rejection from the mainstream culture of the university. Students were also relieved to find that counselors did not expect them to simply ignore or repress their sexual attractions. These supportive professionals helped gay and lesbian individuals feel valued in a cultural setting that often condemns homosexual behavior.

A primary responsibility of faculty members at faith-based universities is to support the development of their students. Some of these students may happen to identify as gay or lesbian, but this support is no less important for them than it is for heterosexual individuals. In fact, inaccessibility of faculty members contributes significantly to students' feelings of isolation and anonymity, regardless of sexual identity (Pitkethly & Prosser, 2001). Despite finding individual faculty members who were supportive of their sexuality, gay and lesbian students also identified other professors who made derogatory comments or encouraged homophobic discussions.

Administrators and staff members at faith-based institutions are in a difficult position regarding gay and lesbian issues. These administrators, particularly high-level administrators such as presidents, vice presidents, and deans, embody the values of their institutions and it would not be wise to compromise these values. Frequently in CCCU-affiliated universities, active support of gay and lesbian students is in direct conflict with institutional values, and, therefore, the ability of administrators to support gay and lesbian students is understandably limited. However, students with questions regarding their own sexuality will continue to attend faith-based universities, and administrators have a responsibility to serve these students who pay the same tuition and fees as heterosexual individuals. Supporting the development of all students remains their responsibility, while maintaining and upholding institutional values is their charge. Administrators should seek to facilitate supportive networks for gay and lesbian students in whatever capacity they are able.

Considering the difficult position of administrators concerning this topic, three specific suggestions are offered regarding how these individuals could support gay and lesbian students. First, administrators should actively seek to learn about the

GROWTH

individual experiences of gay and lesbian students on their campuses. By seeking to learn more about the struggles of these students, administrators could have context for understanding their experiences and communicate a more personal message to these individuals. These efforts should be carefully considered within the prevailing values of the institution. Second, counseling should be encouraged to support students as they mature and develop. Students with questions regarding their own sexuality should be encouraged to take advantage of the counseling services provided by their university but requiring these counseling sessions as a perceived form of punishment sends the wrong message to young adults who are likely in an already sensitive developmental phase. Third, administrators should be honest and transparent with students regarding the difficulties they (i.e., administrators) face on this topic. Most current gay and lesbian students are simply unaware of the true challenges administrators face when dealing with issues of sexuality. As a result, gay and lesbian students assume that administrators have no desire to help or support them. However, these same administrators may actually have a strong desire to help, but they simply are restricted in their ability to do so because of their responsibility to uphold the values of the sponsoring institutions. Overall, increased communication between both administrators and gay and lesbian students may yield positive results.

Policy Development Regarding Sexual Behaviors on Campus

University policy regarding homosexual behavior on faith-based campuses contributes significantly to the negative experiences of gay and lesbian students who are enrolled in these institutions. Such policies cultivate feelings of fear, anger, and bitterness in students who experience same-sex attraction as well as aggravating the confusion these students feel while they process their sexual tendencies and identity.

To protect the confidentiality of the institutions represented in this study, specific examples of institutional policies regarding homosexual behavior were not included. However, for a comprehensive explanation of the stance of the CCCU regarding human sexuality, readers should review the report released by the CCCU task force on human sexuality (2001) as well as other CCCU documents on this topic. They clearly articulate the position of this organization, and, therefore, its affiliates on sexuality and sexual behavior.

Policies regarding homosexual behavior on faith-based campuses created two specific sources of tension for the gay and lesbian students in this study. First, policies were structured in a way that created a distinction between adopting a gay/lesbian orientation and actually acting upon that orientation by outwardly displaying homosexual behaviors. This distinction, between orientation and behaviors, was confusing to undergraduates. Second, gay and lesbian students perceived an imbalance concerning how policies were enforced regarding their sexuality compared to the inappropriate sexual behaviors, as defined by university policy, of heterosexual students.

Students who experience same-sex attraction experience a hypersensitive dilemma when they agree to adhere to college and university living guidelines that expressly forbid homosexual behavior. The distinction these guidelines create between sexual orientation and sexual behavior adds unnecessary confusion to students who are likely already confused about their own sexuality. It is simply too difficult for students, particularly as freshmen and sophomores in college, to conceptualize having homosexual orientation versus prohibiting homosexual behaviors while they are also processing their own feelings of same-sex attraction,

attempting to reconcile their faith and sexuality, and navigating their first experiences as independent college students. Furthermore, students who experience same-sex attraction initially feel unable to process these feelings with many of their peers because of the negative attitudes that permeate the culture of the campus. These factors put students who feel same-sex attraction at significant risk when compared to heterosexual students. In addition to the increased confusion, these policies also cultivate feelings of bitterness in gay and lesbian students as they are able to observe heterosexual students expressing their sexuality without fear of repercussions.

Conflicts concerning policies and living guidelines on faith-based campuses may be further evidence of a deeper cultural rift. Specifically, a significant disparity exists regarding how administrators demonstrate tolerance compared to how gay and lesbian students view tolerance. Under the current paradigm, policies are structured in a way which draws sharp contrasts between homosexual orientation and homosexual behaviors, tolerating homosexual orientation while punishing homosexual behaviors. Evidently for administrators, who embody the values of the institution, this is an appropriate position that is supportive of student development. However, according to gay and lesbian students in this study, this stance is intolerant and confusing. As administrators at faith-based universities seek to develop and update policies regarding sexual behavior, this conflict must be carefully considered and articulated.

Regarding students who feel same-sex attraction or who identify as gay or lesbian and wish to attend faith-based universities, it is important to not underestimate the impact institutional policies will have on the undergraduate experience. Students should be fully aware of the cultural context of faith-based universities and that there is little tolerance for homosexual behaviors on these campuses.

In a broader sense, the sponsoring institutions of faith-based universities, including the CCCU and various denominational churches, should recognize the importance of continually revising and updating policies regarding sexual behaviors. The complexity of this topic as well as the awareness of deep cultural conflicts that exist within it demands continued learning and dialogue. The CCCU should encourage this dialogue through sponsored forums, presentations, and professional conferences. These sponsored events could incorporate research regarding college student developmental theory, theological discussions on homosexuality, and best practices for addressing gay and lesbian behaviors on faith-based campuses. Sponsoring institutions should also recognize the possibility that two major cultures are merging on faith-based campuses, Christian and gay/ lesbian culture. Sadly, these cultures often cannot coexist within this specific context of higher education. Individuals within each culture may find ways to reconcile them, but this reconciliation may be impossible at an institutional level. In either case, healthy, holistic development of all students must be the primary concern and continued discussion should be a top priority.

GROWTH

Contributors

Joel M. Wentz is an Area Coordinator in the Office of Residential Education and Housing at the University of New England. He has a Master of Arts from Ball State University and baccalaureate degree from Huntington University.

Roger D. Wessel is an Associate Professor of Higher Education in the Department of Educational Studies at Ball State University. He has a Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Arts from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and baccalaureate degree from Lee University.

References

American Council on Education. (1937). *The student personnel point of view.* Washington, DC

Cass, V. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality, 4,* 219-235. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eoah&AN=6514182&site=ehost-live

Cass, V. (1984). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Sex Research, 20,* 143-167. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/ login.aspx?direct=true&db=eoah&AN=20518349&site=ehost-live

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity.* San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, E., & Remafedi, G. (1989). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual adolescents: A critical challenge to counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *68*, 36-39. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=5334110& site=ehost-live

Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. (2001). *Report: The ad hoc task force on human sexuality.* Retrieved from http://www.cccu.org/professional_development/ resource_library/report_the_ad_hoc_task_force_on_human_sexuality

Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. (2009). *About CCCU.* Retrieved from http://www.cccu.org/about

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 312-333). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds). (1998). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fassinger, R. E. (1998). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual identity and student development theory. In R. L. Sanlo (Ed.), *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators* (pp. 13-22). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Flowers, L. A., & Moore, J. L. (2003). Conducting qualitative research on-line in student affairs. *Student Affairs Online*, *4*(1). Retrieved from http://www.studentaffairs.com/ejournal/Winter_2003/research.html

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Love, P., Bock, M., Jannarone, A., & Richardson, P. (2005). Identity interaction: exploring the spiritual experiences of lesbian and gay college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *46*, 193-209. Retrieved from http://search. ebscohost.com/ login.aspx?direct=true&db=eoah&AN=6981131&site=eho st-live

Mooney, C. (1992). Homosexuals in academe: Fear of backlash clouds reactions to increased tolerance. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A17. Retrieved from http:// search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=9210260603&sit e=ehost-live

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1981). Cognitive and ethical growth: The making of meaning. In A. W. Chickering (Ed.), *The modern American college* (pp. 76-116). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pitkethly, A., & Prosser, M. (2001). The first year experience project: A model for university-wide change. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *20*, 185-198. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db =aph&AN=4645664&site=ehost-live

Scanlon, L., Rowling, L., & Weber, Z. (2007). "You don't have like an identity . . . you are just lost in a crowd:" Forming a student identity in the first-year transition to university. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *10*, 223-241. doi:10.1080/13676260600983684

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Troiden, R. R. (1989). The formation of homosexual identities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 17, 43-73. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/ login. aspx?direct=true&db=eoah&AN=6514667&site=ehost-live

GROWTH

Abelard to Apple: The Fate of American Colleges and Universities
Richard A DeMillo

Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2011.

Reviewed by Chris Abrams, Malone University

The general public does not understand the mission of higher education…what else is new? According to Richard DeMillo here's what's new:

> American Higher Education is in trouble because an alarmingly small – and shrinking – portion of the public believes that colleges and universities are worth the expense. In business terms, this means that the American public is for the first time questioning the value received for dollars invested in higher education. If American higher education had paid attention to the marketplace, both the penalties for failure and rewards for success would be easier to explain to the public and to policy makers. (2011, p. 51)

As indicated by this statement, Richard DeMillo in *Abelard to Apple: The Fate of American Colleges and Universities* urges leaders in America's higher education system, upper-level administrators, deans, department chairs, and state government officials, to "define its value" and "become architects" of its future in order that higher education may succeed in the 21st century.

DeMillo's analysis and solutions for the future of higher education are divided into five parts: Great Visions to Lure Them On, An Abundance of Choices, A Better Means of Expressing Their Goals, Abelard to Apple, and The Long View. In part one, Great Visions to Lure Them On, DeMillo attempts to help the reader understand the "mystical" professoriate. He attempts to help the reader understand course loads, research, academic freedom and tenure, just to name a few unfamiliar areas which are often misunderstood. DeMillo believes the general public does not understand faculty and thus views them as lazy and wasteful.

In part two, An Abundance of Choices, the author encourages institutions to plan for future student and academic trends, and know their competition. The higher education landscape has changed; for-profit institutions are growing, and by 2017 student demand for higher education will level off at around 25 million. What niche(s) will keep your institution relevant in the overall higher education landscape? Who will fill the new majors needed to fuel our world? What will those majors be? These are questions each institution must answer as they move forward.

In part three, A Better Means of Expressing Their Goals, DeMillo urges leaders in higher education to go back to the general public and help them understand the value of colleges and universities not only for the students who attend but also for the public through the research they produce. At the same time, he continues to implore higher education to reconsider curriculum, asking the simple question; what do students really need to know? Put another way, how does higher education and our culture define an educated person? With these questions in mind, DeMillo recommends a reexamination of majors and instructional methods asking these two critical questions: (1) what majors have become irrelevant and need to be discarded, and

(2) what teaching styles are relevant for today's student? As an illustration of where higher education has succeeded and failed, DeMillo shows how higher education capitalized on society's need for well-educated men and women in computer science, but also its inability to react when the bottom fell out of the technology industry in the early 21st century (2011, p. 159).

In part four, Abelard to Apple, DeMillo comments on the efficiency of higher education. Throughout, he looks at how business and industry have stayed competitive in ways higher education has never explored. He examines how technology can, for example, make industry more resourceful and reduce costs, but how it increases costs within higher education.

Part five is where he begins to explore the opportunities for change. DeMillo encourages the reader to look overseas for innovations in higher education, specifically within the higher education systems of China and Singapore. In chapter 19, Change My Name to Architect, he illustrates that positive change for the future of American higher education is not a one-size-fits-all proposition. Lastly, in Chapter 20, Rules for the 21st Century, he spells out what it means to "define your value" (p. 272) as an institution and to "become an architect for the blueprint for future success" (p. 275).

In reading *Abelard to Apple*, my first thought is that DeMillo's observations and suggestions don't always fit when examining smaller private liberal arts colleges with endowments below $50 million. DeMillo spends a great deal of time talking about the life of a tier-I research faculty member or budgets at Ivy League schools. I am not sure he references one institution with less than 2,000 students, and institutions acting on the basis of a faith-based mission do not appear in his analysis. This may lead some readers to conclude that DeMillo's book offers little value for a person who has spent an entire career at a small-tuition-driven institution. But DeMillo's Rules for the 21st Century are worth examining regardless of the type of institution at which one serves. For example, all institutions of higher education can benefit from better defining themselves, cutting costs, and finding a balance between faculty-centrism and student-centrism.

Along the same lines, I am waiting for the book that discusses the "typical" institution of higher education, the non-flagship state school or the under-$50-million-endowment private liberal arts institution. There are many wonderful anecdotes about the things which have taken place in the history of the "top" institutions of higher education in America, but most of higher education does not have a great deal in common with Harvard or California Berkley. The front flap of the book addresses "the middle" reputable educational institutions, but those are not considered equal to the elite institutions in this country. The majority of the anecdotes and much of the analysis focuses on institutions outside "the middle."

Overall, *Abelard to Apple* is an excellent read. DeMillo is fair in his analysis of the higher education landscape, including his own profession as a faculty member. The historical context sets the appropriate framework for the argument, and his ideas for change are relevant and worth further exploration. I recommend *Abelard to Apple* to those interested in learning more about where we, as members of the academy, have come from and what it will take to maintain our significance in an unpredictable future.

Contributor

Chris Abrams Ed.D. has a B.A. in Communications from Malone College, a M.S. in Education from Alfred University and an Ed.D. in Higher Education from the University of Arkansas. He currently serves as the Vice President for Student Development at Malone University.

GROWTH

Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses
Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa

Reviewed by Steve Conn, LeTourneau University, and Josh Wymore, Gordon College

According to *Academically Adrift,* students are not learning much in college. Sociologist authors Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa derive this conclusion from research spanning two years and 2,300 students. Their data, rooted in the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), show that first-year students demonstrated limited improvement between their first and second years. Using extensive background research culminating in a multiplicity of demographic variables, the authors intend to eliminate all confounding factors and show that colleges are the cause of limited learning. Since its release in early 2011, *Adrift* has sparked debate and discussion among readers and has served as a challenge to academics and administrators alike.

The size and scope of the research is impressive. Touching 24 four-year institutions of every mission and type, the comprehensiveness of this learning assessment transcends past projects by a wide margin. In contrast to instruments like the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the CLA attempts to measure critical thinking directly through complex case studies and essay questions that are meant to span every field and discipline. Since critical thinking is one of higher education's chief goals (an assumption stated by the authors), the CLA provides the foundation for examining collegiate learning and consequent institutional effectiveness in creating learning.

Their research found that students in general learn very little. While the top 10% of students saw a 43% improvement in their scores between their first and fourth semesters, 45% demonstrated no significant growth at all. An exploration of the subgroups finds that privileged, white students with educated families and strong scholastic preparation grew at an admirable rate while minority students with previous poor schooling were doomed to continue underperforming. Thus, while colleges posit to close the educational gap between the privileged and underprivileged, the authors criticize institutions as merely perpetuating the status quo.

The authors take a broad look at the current state of higher education to explain these poor results. Due to growing demands for scholarship and service, faculty priorities increasingly skew away from undergraduate teaching and focus more on research productivity and pursuing areas of personal interest. Their research is evaluated in a highly competitive environment, demanding more time and energy in non-teaching related responsibilities (such as grant-writing) and leaving little time to spend on honing teaching skills and improving classroom instruction (a mere 11 hours a week according to *Adrift*). Increasing demands on colleges and universities to provide expansive student services as well as transparency and accountability force administrators and faculty alike to spend more time on business and administration, accreditation, retention, recruitment, involvement, diversity, sustainability, and a laundry list of other issues. Although these efforts are indirectly tied to student learning in a variety of ways, they take time and attention away from improving direct instruction.

Students are also at fault for their lack of learning. Adopting an *Animal House*-like worldview, students increasingly view college as a social experience with minimum academic expectations. Ironically, this culture permeates a population of unprepared students. Because of increasing financial demands and calls for greater accessibility, colleges often have little choice but to enroll students who are uninterested in college level scholarship and unable to meet the demands required of them. Forty percent of faculty surveyed agreed that students lack the basic skills needed to do college work, yet the average student still spends only 12 hours a week preparing for class. Thus, studying has reached an all-time low and academic investment continues to peter out at a time when the wholehearted pursuit of learning could not be more necessary. As the global market becomes more competitive and higher education becomes more accessible, the social credentialing approach of many schools falls far short of meeting job force needs.

But are Arum and Roksa's death knells as ominous as they sound? Many researchers contest their broad-sweeping pronouncements based on insufficient data. First, the CLA, while recognized as a good tool, is not established as the preeminent measure of learning by any means. Like the SAT, the CLA provides a snapshot of a limited sector of learning. Despite this recognized fact, a fundamental assumption behind this study is that the CLA is a definitive measure of learning quality. As their own research shows, however, not all courses of study are equally equipped to increase scores on the CLA.

Students who saw the biggest gains on the CLA were those whose classes incorporated the most CLA-like task – reading, writing, and critical thinking. Because some majors spend more time in lab settings or on math homework than they dedicate to reading and writing, engineers and other technical majors fall behind traditional liberal arts majors in CLA scores. Obviously, a test's inability to measure such technical learning is not necessarily an accurate indicator of stunted growth. One could argue, though, that the purpose of a liberal arts education is to create scholars across disciplines who all possess these types of skills.

Second, the study pulled from a variety of schools whose average retention rate between first and second years is under 50%. The authors downplay this factor, stating that, at worst, this fact inflates the typical amount of learning measured as less-prepared students tend to withdraw before completing the post-test. But this institutional characteristic stands out as a blemish on the instructional power of the institutions studied. Regardless of the validity of their principles, such a sub-par research pool severely limits the applicability of their findings.

The student affairs professional may be concerned with the inferences drawn by the authors in regards to the co-curriculum. Arum and Roska seem to view activities outside of the classroom as a distraction from learning – a perspective affirmed by CLA data that shows a negative correlation between learning and extracurricular involvement. Again, their methodology falls short by conglomerating volunteering, working, and participating in clubs and fraternities/sororities into one extracurricular variable – an approach that doubtlessly eliminates the well-researched differences between various types of extracurriculars and their consequent learning gains (Kuh & Schnider, 2008). While the research presented in *Adrift* certainly indicates that students could benefit from spending more time on classwork and studying in a more focused institutional setting, educators should not let this issue reduce their commitment to investing time and energy in the larger learning environment that is life outside the classroom.

Setting aside the limitations of Arum and Roska's research methodology, their literature review clearly shows one noteworthy finding: emphasis on classroom

GROWTH

learning has decreased in both the student and faculty ranks. The commodification of higher education is grounded in other writings of late as well, challenging classroom educators to address consumerist attitudes as well as learning gaps. It is at this juncture of life and learning that the student development professional is most critical. As a moor in the midst of a college student's drift through college, student affairs personnel carry the responsibility of sages and mentors. Their task and opportunity is, above all else, to provide perspective that comes from time and wisdom and Eternal connectedness. More important than the content of a given course is the hard fought shift from performance to perseverance, away from our own accomplishments toward a focus on God's approval.

   Academically Adrift shines an uncomfortable light on the state of higher education. Its challenge to faculty and students is to return to the primary charge of a college education: teaching students how to think and learn. As student development professionals, it is our task to till the fecund co-curricular environment to cultivate these same skills outside the classroom. The undergraduate obsession with the social realm of college life further increases the need for skilled professionals to help students draw meaning from their college experiences, anchoring them to timeless truths and providing an eternal perspective through which to view their reality.

Contributor
Josh Wymore received his Master of Arts in Higher Education and Student Development from Taylor University in Upland, Indiana. He currently serves as the Director of Orientation and Student Activities at Gordon College in Wenham, Massachusetts.

Steve Conn earned his Masters Degree in Higher Education from Taylor University. He is currently the Director of Student Programs and Orientation at LeTourneau University in Longview Texas.

References
Kuh, G. D., Schneider, C. G., & Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Alone Together, Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other
Sherry Turkle
(New York, NY: Basic Books, 2011)

Reviewed by Douglas M. Wood

In 1998 futurist Ray Kurzweil published *The Age of Spiritual Machines* (1998) which predicted a future of supreme artificial intelligence shaping our world in ways we cannot imagine. Kurzweil theorized that within the next 100 years, the computing power of all computers will exceed that of human brains, with superhuman computing machines appearing around the same time. The ever-advancing scope of artificial intelligence will lead to a question of whether or not these machines will want to keep the human race around. It's likely they will no longer need us.

If all goes as Kurzweil projects, Sherry Turkle's latest book *Alone Together* won't matter all that much in the long run. But if there's one upside to Turkle's view of our present technology and its vice grip hold on today's rising Millennials, it's that who we are in relation to our machines does matter. In short, we need them.

Turkle, an MIT professor of Social Studies of Science and Technology, has a keen interest in knowing how the technologies we make shape us. In *Alone Together*, Turkle explores both the emerging robotic movement in addition to the online world and asserts that our uber-dependency comes at a debilitating cost. Her interviews with hundreds of people across ages, from children to senior citizens, reinforce the notion that, for all its benefits, technology can really stifle us.

Social Robots

We are on the verge of a robotic movement that will far exceed what our society has experienced to date. In the not-too-distant future, robots will do our housework, cook us meals, take care of our aging parents, and provide a synthetic companionship that will be too perfect and irresistible for us not to imagine as real. According to Turkle, the ease with which we will be able to relate to our future personalized assistants – a relationship with no rigorous demands or challenges – will ultimately diminish our ability to relate to real people. If that's hard to imagine, consider the story of Howard, age 15, who in an interview with Turkle expresses his disappointment with advice his father gave him about a girl at school and wished he had a programmed companion robot to turn to instead.

In short, Howard didn't follow his father's advice because it was "limited by his own life experience" and would have ended in disaster for him. Instead, Howard can envision a day when companion robots will be uploaded with a multitude of "life experiences" and know how to give the right advice tailor-made for him and his situation. The robot would be an ideal confidant and wise sage. Howard told Turkle, "People (with their limited data base), are risky. Robots are safe" (p. 51).

Envisioning our future response to such idealized technology, Turkle takes cues from how today's children interact with their programmable Tamagotchis and Furbies. These two digital pets are programmed to have feelings and needs that must be responded to by their caretakers. They are required to have ongoing feeding and care, or they will "die." Not surprisingly, children attribute life to them. "We love what

we nurture," explains Turkle, as she connects the classic children's story *The Velveteen Rabbit* to our ability to make programmable computerized robots "become real" (p. 31).

Lest we think we may outgrow affording agency to inanimate objects, Turkle cites examples from a thriving sex doll industry and details a chilling account of a senior citizen shunning the whining of her own great granddaughter to quiet the cries of a Hasbro My Real Baby doll. Turkle references the current testing of Nursebots which are designed to care for the elderly in their homes, to dispense medication, provide surveillance, check vital signs, signal for help in an emergency, etc. She suggests both the frail and their human caregivers would welcome the assistance of these helpful programmed companions.

Ultimately, our ability to make robots more human will increase as the technology advances. Turkle posits what these "social robotics may augur – the sanctioning of relationships that make us feel connected although we are alone" (p. 120).

Tethered to a Web

Feeling connected yet isolated is further explored as Turkle looks at today's embrace of smartphones. With these pocket computers, she asserts that we are tethered at all times to the Internet and virtual world of social networking sites. Our apps bring us food, directions, captured moments, entertainment, and instant solutions literally at the touch of our finger tips. Lest we think we can sever the tether, we are too uncomfortable knowing we can't be reached by a loved one or check the myriad of updates of our "friends" or our virtual selves. We are, as Turkle puts it, "always on" (p. 151).

Turkle suggests that this pulsing connection to the Internet brings us a reframing of identity development. New possibilities exist for experimentation in cyberworld. Developmental tasks no longer need to occur at age-appropriate times nor require completion. Trying on new and different identities is also no longer relegated to adolescence.

A college senior warned Turkle not to be fooled by anyone she interviewed "who tells you that his Facebook page is 'the real me'. It's like being in a play. You make a character" (p. 183). She describes a high school guy shocked to find out that some girls use "shrinking software" to thin down their appearance in posted photos. Lives lived in the virtual world become another life where it's easy to mix what a true self is from an imagined one. "Distinctions blur. Virtual places offer connection with uncertain claims to commitment" (p. 153).

Turkle emphasizes a banality of technical dependency as well. With the affirmation of multitasking and the bombarding demands on our time, we choose not to talk on these phones. The ease of a depthless text suffices. Emails are too long. We can Tweet *what's up,* thumb a semicolon and half parenthesis and let the world know we are happy, or sad, depending on how the line curves. That we would text as we walk across campus at the expense of meaningful conversation with other students seems shallow until we realize that we're all doing it. Countless undergrads have their heads down to their hand-held devices, connected, yet alone.

Turkle's research is a compelling, albeit one-sided, view of the current and coming technology and its impact on humankind. Her take on how identity development is being reshaped is of particular interest to student affairs professionals. Glaringly absent from her work is an exploration of the Divine in relation to creation. I had to remind myself that God is in control. We are made in His image and, yes, designed for relationship. Discerning how we create technology brings us face to face with the original temptation: to be like God.

Admittedly, there were times when reading the book that I wanted to quicken the Second Coming or at least join the Amish! Devoid of this biblical grounding, Turkle's commentary on current trends and forecast for the future seemed quite bleak.

Perhaps not coincidentally, I read *Alone Together* while revisiting Chap Clark's *Hurt* (2004). His research on systemic abandonment of teenagers by adults reinforces the relational void Turkle presents. The implicit challenge for Christians reading *Alone Together* is that we would utilize our technology to create and shape our relationships in ways that honor our Creator's purpose and not for a purpose we cyber-create.

Contributor
Douglas M. Wood is the Associate Dean of Students at Messiah College.

References
Clark, C. (2004). *Hurt: Inside the world of today's teenagers.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Kurzweil, R. (1998). *The age of spiritual machines: When computers exceed human intelligence.* New York, NY: Penguin Books.

GROWTH

Being Equipped: A Review of *Homosexuality and the Christian*
Mark A. Yarhouse

Yarhouse, M.A. (2010). Homosexuality and the Christian: A guide for parents, pastors, and friends. (Bloomington, MN: Bethany House Publishers).

Reviewed by Joshua Canada

"I am gay."

The phrase came as a surprise to my ears. I was not shocked at the actual words or the student identifying as homosexual. Friends have uttered these words to me, and I have relationships with folks who identify as homosexuals: sexuality was not what caught me off-guard. My surprise was rooted in the context and plainness of the words. Our meeting was not about relationships or sexuality; it was about a discipline situation. I asked Adrian* why he volunteered this information so openly – we did not know each other well; our interactions were limited to casual "hellos." He looked up and responded, "You are safe." I was at once thrilled and terrified. As a Resident Director, I thrive on the intimacy that comes with life together with students. But professionally, same-sex attraction was something I only knew in anecdote and through a patchwork of sermons and academic articles. Caring for and understanding the complexities of those who experience same-sex attraction and the developmental aspects of that attraction were foreign.

Mark Yarhouse, psychology professor at Regent University, has written a straightforward text which provides a framework for Christians to understand and approach same-sex attraction. *Homosexuality and the Christian* is not explicitly for those serving in Christian higher education; however, Yarhouse is quite familiar with the cultures of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCUs) and has been invited as a speaker and consultant to a number of faith-based institutions.

Yarhouse (2010) does not skate around his beliefs on homosexuality. He clearly states, "homosexual behavior is not appropriate for the Christ-follower" (p. 35). Yarhouse realizes that the articulation of his belief is important. He acknowledges the pressure to change the historic, orthodox Christian position on homosexual behavior, but also believes that the Christian task is living out one's belief in a way that harmonizes truth with love.

Yarhouse's analysis of Christians' perspectives on homosexuality mirrors that of the Wesleyan Quadrilateral – an epistemological method utilized by many Wesleyan traditions. One Wesleyan tradition defines the quadrilateral as such:

> Wesley believed that the living core of the Christian faith was revealed in Scripture, illumined by tradition, vivified in personal experience, and confirmed by reason. Scripture [however] is primary, revealing the Word of God – so far as it is necessary for our salvation. (Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church 2008 – 2012, 2008, p. 77)

Similarly, Yarhouse utilizes a balance of Scripture, Christian tradition, reason, and personal experience as places of epistemological authority. As with the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, the primary source of truth rests within Scripture, but the other quadrants maintain relationships with one another. After a brief presentation of

the quadrilateral, Yarhouse returns to discourse and asks the reader to consider which of the four ways of knowing is most used by them and those around them. Yarhouse contends that the answer to this question has a significant impact on what one believes about same-sex attraction, as well has how we manifest those beliefs. However, Yarhouse's argument is that all the lenses, with Scripture as primary, need to be utilized equally in order to have a robust understanding of same-sex attraction.

Perhaps most helpful in *Homosexuality and the Christian* is a presentation of how same-sex attraction manifests. Yarhouse uses the phrase "sexual minorities" to clarify that same-sex attraction is more complicated than popular images of the lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, trans-sexual, and questioning (LGBTQ) community. Sexual minorities include everyone who experiences same-sex attraction, regardless of how that affects their life and identity. Yarhouse suggests that in order to have a holistic grasp of the experience of sexual minorities, it is imperative that attraction is viewed in a three-tiered categorization.

The first of these tiers is *same sex-attraction*. This level consists of homosexual attraction. Same-sex attraction is a descriptor of one's feeling but not a determinate of one's identity. Some in this category may be happily heterosexual in identity and may primarily experience heterosexual attraction, but also find themselves having some attraction to the same sex.

Second is *homosexual orientation*. This level exhibits a heightened attraction toward those of the same sex, which is close to or more than one's attraction to the opposite sex and is enough to become a factor in identity – the former often manifests as bisexuality and the latter as homosexuality. This level does not necessarily mean one will be active in their orientation; it is again descriptive of one's feelings. Recently within the Christian community, individuals like Wesley Hill (Hill, 2010) are identifying as homosexual, yet living as celibate because of their Christian convictions; others are in heterosexual marriages but acknowledge a primary attraction to the same sex.

The third level of Yarhouse's (2010) categories is a *gay identity*. This is a prescriptive position that "people use to describe themselves, and it is a label that is imbued with meaning in our culture" (p. 42). This third level is a modern, western phenomenon. Homosexual behavior has always existed, but it is only in the modern age that it has become a factor in one's identity.

These three tiers create a distinction between manifestations of homosexuality and enable a more astute understanding of the differences of those who experience homosexual feelings. Adrian is somewhere in the third tier of gay identity. His questions about how he might stay at an institution that does not permit homosexual behavior exhibited a complex issue, and thus required my articulation of Christian truth to be done with care. I was not challenging merely a belief or feeling, but something he saw as central to his identity. This intersection of theory and practice is where understanding the three-tiered model is vital for student development professionals. My conversations with Adrian about his sexuality looked different from the ones I have had with students in different tiers of their sexual identity.

In addition to the three-tiered framework, *Homosexuality and the Christian* engages the idea of social scripts and considers the impact of the cues and instruction sexual minorities receive from those around them. All of us interact with a variety of scripts that influence our decisions and psychosocial development. Yarhouse (2010) believes that there is a salient "gay script" within our culture which promotes

GROWTH

> (1) a naturally occurring "intended by God" distinction between homosexuality, heterosexuality and bisexuality; (2) same-sex attraction as the way you know who you "really are" as a person; (3) same-sex attraction at the core of who you are as a person; (4) same-sex behavior as an extension of that core and (5) self-actualization of your sexual identity as crucial for your fulfillment. (p. 49)

Conversely, Yarhouse suggests that the Christian community has been misguided in warring with the LGBTQ community and has not adequately offered an alternative script for sexual minorities. Thus, in the desire to establish an identity, some Christian sexual minorities choose to live and act on their same-sex desires, while others – Yarhouse argues a substantial number – feel marginalized and lonely within the Christian community in which they wish to belong.

Yarhouse's research and conclusions push Christian colleges to embrace the complexity of our engagement with sexual minorities. Students come to our institutions at varying levels of Christian maturity; at some institutions they come without a Christian faith. We care for students in all three tiers of same-sex attraction. It is a challenge for us to create safe places for students who identify as gay. Moreover, finding a place for students who disagree with the institutions' stances and believe that their Christian faith and engagement in same-sex behavior is congruent is a precarious position. We must be careful not to become entangled in the politics of the homosexuality debate, while maintaining the integrity of our beliefs about same-sex attraction. Numerous students disagree with our institutions' stances on sex outside of marriage, marijuana, alcohol, off-campus co-ed living, etc. Some of these students participate in these activities despite the institutions' stances, while some choose to abstain. We engage the tension that these students bring to the community with discourse and patience. Genuine engagement also means that we honestly engage with what it means to be a community member and truly care for those who wish to be part of our institutions.

Yarhouse finds that there are groups of sexual minorities who do not want to change the institution; rather, they want to experience the benefit of living in community. It is too simple to view sexual minorities as primarily a threat. Sexual minorities seek community and mentorship just as sexual-majority students.

> Christians who are sexual minorities may often choose traditional Christian colleges and universities because they share the values that are reflected in those institutions' policies. They are not secretly hoping to be freed from these policies; rather, they want the institutions themselves to be places in which they can be more transparent about their experience and receive more support in the context of their struggles. (Yarhouse, 2010, p. 161)

Homosexual practice has been against the policy and the ethos of CCCU institutions, but within this new era, which highlights a deeper connection between sexuality and both social and personal identity, homosexuality is a complicated reality that cannot be monolithed into stereotypical images or perceptions. Some CCCU institutions and student development departments may have not honestly examined their beliefs about same-sex attraction and how they approach sexual minorities. This position prevents difficult conversations and forces institutions to be reactive toward students struggling with their sexuality identity as well as toward those who feel the need to express their sexual attractions.

The heart of student development is based in the fact that college students are actively engaged in identity development – including sexuality. At times this process is chaotic and students often flirt with – and indeed make – decisions that are detrimental to their maturation. It is imperative that student development professionals uphold their role in helping students achieve positive identities, regardless of the difficulties. This requires not only helping students make good decisions, but entering into the culture, personal realities, and decisions that have already impacted their identity and development.

Yarhouse's contribution provides a guidepost in understanding the diversity of same-sex attraction and offers insights from which Christian colleges can learn.

Christian colleges and universities cannot afford passivity. Sexuality, as well as other moral and social issues of our day, must be addressed with a clear voice and Christian imagination, which acknowledges complexity and offers the truth with love.

Contributor
Joshua Canada is Resident Director of Armington Halls at Westmont College, and holds a B.A. in Sociology and M.A. in Higher Education from Taylor University.

References
Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church 2008 - 2012. (2008). Nashville, TN: Abington Press.
Hill, W. (2010). *Washed and waiting.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

*Identifying details, including names, have been changed.

GROWTH

A Parent's Guide to the Christian College: Supporting your Child's Heart, Soul, and Mind during the College Years
Todd C. Ream, Timothy W. Herrmann, and C. Skip Trudeau
Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2011.

Reviewed by Brad A. Lau

Everyone who works in higher education has become familiar with the term "helicopter parents" and has probably even met a few of them along the way. Typically, when this term is used, it is used in a pejorative sense to indicate an unwelcome intrusion of parents into their son's or daughter's college experience. However, such a narrow view of the partnership between parents and the university limits potential benefits to the students. This is why most universities have added special sessions in pre-orientation summer programs and orientation itself to talk to parents about the university community and their child's full engagement and participation in it. Ream, Trudeau, and Herrmann have done a great service by offering an excellent resource for parents with information and "education" that is vital to their meaningful involvement in our Christ-centered universities and the lives of their students.

The book is divided into two major sections. The first discusses the various domains of college life and highlights themes about the role of worship in the life of the campus as well as the in-class and out-of-class involvement of students. The authors argue that "common worship" is at the core of the Christian college experience and provides coherence and meaning by "affirm[ing] its responsibility to form the identity of students in ways that prepare them to offer their lives in praise and worship of God" (p. 37). This holistic perspective includes working with students as they encounter others who may not think the way they do and who challenge their beliefs – an important component of true education.

In addition to the dimension of common worship, the authors discuss the classroom experience by offering perspective on the choice of a major, pursuit of a career/vocation, the value of a liberal arts education, and student engagement. Out-of-class experiences are validated as essential to a well-rounded education that "connects what happens in the classroom with what happens outside of it, an idea known as the 'seamless curriculum'" (p. 83). Research supports that living on-campus is extremely valuable and meaningful involvement and service is also encouraged.

The second section of the book focuses on the seasons of college life through (a) the lenses of the first-year experience, (b) "success" and how that is defined, (c) crisis during the college years, and (d) life after graduation. The authors rightly propose that "hospitality" is the foundation of the first-year experience since ". . . the practice of Christian hospitality begins with the assumption that our well-being is inextricably bound to the well-being of others" (p. 104). Of course, central to any discussion of the first year and beyond are learning how to live well with a roommate and mental and physical health and well-being. The notion of "challenge and support" is also introduced as are issues of safety and security. Finally, the notion of "emerging adulthood" and the transition from college to "real life" are presented as key considerations during the senior year as well as the post-college experience.

There are several points of critique that could be made regarding this excellent contribution to our work as Student Life professionals in general and to the parents of students in particular. First, throughout the book, the authors do a great job outlining the ways that a Christian college can and should meet the expectations and aspirations of Christian parents. They are less clear about what happens when our students have unbelieving parents and how and what we communicate to those families. I would suggest that this is critical as we seek to articulate the value of a Christ-centered education to the diverse families that our students represent. Along with this, I would have liked to see a stronger articulation and affirmation of the value of diversity and cultural competence in our work with students.

A second observation is that one of the significant challenges for many of our institutions is to articulate a meaningful connection between the liberal arts, a sense of vocation/calling, and an actual job after graduation. Clearly, parents may see the value of all three of these, but care deeply about the third as a primary outcome of their significant "investment." Ream, Trudeau, and Herrmann are entirely correct that "employment is but one of the ways that particular calling is fulfilled" (p. 21), but we must not minimize the importance of this to parents and students – and not just as a function of career services. Is it a concern that 20% of 26-year-olds are living with their parents and that 60% of college students plan to live in their parents' home after they graduate (pp. 175ff)? If so, is it a concern for parents about the way they parent or universities about the way they educate (or both or neither)? Ongoing dialogue about these tensions will be important as we look toward the future of Christian higher education, and I appreciated the authors' treatment of this important topic.

Third, even at Christ-centered institutions, there are faculty members who are perceived as deconstructing what they see as the simplistic, childish, and denominational beliefs of students. From time to time, students will have difficulty reconstructing a vibrant faith after considering the difficult questions that have been raised in and out of class. How we reassure parents and come alongside students during this critical period of reflection and disequilibrium remains a significant concern for some parents and a worthwhile conversation for Student Life professionals. While the book touched on this, a fuller discussion might have been helpful as we think about our work with families.

Finally, Student Life staff interact with parents intensely during summer pre-orientation programs, fall orientation, and if parents have specific concerns about their daughter or son during the course of the college experience. Parent Councils, family weekends, or other programs may also offer some time for interaction and dialogue. Nonetheless, the question remains about how Student Life can and should maintain proactive, positive, consistent, and ongoing interaction with parents throughout the college years.

Ream, Trudeau, and Herrmann suggest early in their book that "[t]he question here is not whether parents should be involved, but in what manner" (p. 21). This is a poignant reminder that it is essential for Student Life to engage parents in meaningful and productive ways as we work toward a common end and goal. Our mutual interest is to care for and educate students in a seamless way so that students will come to understand and pursue their calling through their college years and beyond to the glory and praise of God. Of course, it involves much more than this but, as the authors suggest to parents, "Ultimately, the goal is that our students – your daughters and sons – might search for truth in a way

GROWTH

that leads them to desire and discover in ways consistent with the Christian narrative of creation, fall, and redemption" (p. 68). Challenging, supporting, and encouraging students in this pursuit without "living their lives for them" (p. 110) is essential as we equip the next generation of teachers, businesspersons, engineers, artists, and leaders!

Contributor
Brad A. Lau is the Vice President for Student Life at George Fox University.

Practice and Profile: Christian Spiritual Formation for Vocation
Johan Hegeman, Margaret Edgell, & Henk Jochemsen
Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2011.

Reviewed by Kelly D. Sargent

The integration of faith and learning has been at the forefront of conversations, research, and practice of Christian education for many years. However, much of the research and writing around this topic does not address exactly how this integration takes place, specifically within the context of professional programs. The authors of *Practice and Profile: Christian Spiritual Formation for Vocation* adequately address this particular topic with thoughtful research and a thorough scope of both theory and application.

Hegeman, Edgell, and Jochemsen bring an interesting cross-section of perspectives to this research, blending their experiences in Christian higher education in the Netherlands and United States. They were drawn together through the International Association for the Promotion of Christian Higher Education to partner on this work. Hegeman currently serves as Senior Professor of Ethics and Social Sciences in the Academy of Theology at Christelijke Hogeschool Ede. Edgell is an Associate Professor of Business at Calvin College, and Jochemsen serves as Chair of Reformational Philosophy at Wageningen University.

Practice and Profile addresses the timely issue of intentionally developing college students for vocation with a moral foundation. The foundational claim of this book is that students make choices about who they want to be as people in a profession before choosing a professional profile. It is paramount, therefore, that a strong moral profile, specifically in a Christian mindset, must be infused in the curriculum, and that mentoring should be the role of the educator.

Training students for four or more years as doctors, lawyers, teachers, and the like, should equip them to perform their respective functions with competence. However, working with students to help them understand that there is a moral consideration to the way they live out their practice will enable them to not only preform their respective functions with competence, but also with transparency, honesty, and a strong ethical foundation.

The authors propose that helping students develop a moral profile is not only possible but vital, and it is the responsibility of those who work in higher education to develop and mentor students along this journey. According to the authors, moral formation is accomplished in four ways, which they have termed PISA: (a) Being Practice Minded, (b) Being Integral, (c) Being Spiritual, (d) Being Answerable.

P: Being Practice Minded

The authors begin their argument with the concept of marrying competence-based learning (CBL) with *Bildung* (a German tradition of self-cultivation) as an approach to the practice of developing a moral profile. Apart from the typical experiences that internships and extracurricular activities provide a student, CBL is an integral component of education, though they claim it is insufficient as a stand-alone technique of developing a competent and ethical professional. Here,

GROWTH

they introduce the idea of *Bildung,* which they argue will enhance CBL to create an intentional moral and personal formation within the practice of profession. It is the responsibility of the educator, supervisor, and student to embark on the journey of intentional practice together in order to truly achieve moral formation.

I: Being Integral

In the following chapter, the authors elaborate on the second condition of PISA. Being integral involves deep reflection as a key aspect of education. Many institutions of higher education, especially those with a religious focus, place value on holistic education of students. The development of the whole student – body, mind, and spirit – is an admittedly high standard to achieve. This concept, however, is not new to the Christian community. The call to higher standards, to integrate belief and action in everyday life, is so much a part of the Christian life. Relating that wholeness to professional practice, however, may not come naturally to some. The authors state, "Our central claim is that the student cannot become integral without knowing thoroughly what the intrinsic normativity of practice means for him or her" (p. 100). Mentoring and deep reflection is key in developing this understanding. Here, the authors provide a useful example of reflection tools for the practice of professional education that can guide the reader through various reflective techniques and dialogues to encourage integration.

S: Being Spiritual

The book progresses to a third aspect of the moral development process which the authors identify as being spiritual. Hegeman, Edgell, and Jochemsen assert,

> Opening the window of spirituality in PISA allows us to see how faith, worldview, and deep feelings influence the moral formation of students in Christian higher education. Not only must their instructors gain insight into experiences and questions of meaning and purpose that motivate students to be moral, above all, students need this knowledge in order to make fitting career choices. (p. 153)

The authors support their claims with practical applications for spirituality-infused curriculum and mentorship, drawing on the tested theories of faith formation from prominent scholars to support their work. I would argue that this aspect of moral development is relevant and important both inside and outside of specifically-Christian higher education settings. Identifying a specific spiritual profile to hold fast to ultimately influences students' professional practice. Encouraging students to think critically about spiritual implications and guiding a process of deep reflection regarding practice and belief will ultimately empower students for a life-long journey of moral consideration and development.

A: Being Answerable

Finally, the authors tie together their model of developing a strong moral profile with the claim that being answerable is the culmination of student formation. Faith integration in professional practice has the power to inform and influence, if a person has mastered the concept of being answerable. They sum up this idea by saying,

> The student who is answerable in PISA chooses willingly to be a responsible, accountable professional. The student's willingness implies that he or she chose a moral profile after reflecting deeply on being answerable. Clearly, this process requires guidance, which derives from an ethics of accountability. (p. 213)

Students will be faced with many situations in their professional lives that force them to be accountable to their beliefs or to turn from them in a moment. With guidance and mentoring in practice, integration, and spiritual formation, students will gain the tools and wisdom necessary to be answerable to their moral profile as responsible professionals.

Through various examples and reflection, the authors give a comprehensive approach for educational theory, vocational practice, and intentional spiritual formation. They successfully explore the formation of a strong moral profile in this well-developed book. The call for those who work in higher education to intentionally mentor and encourage college students to identify and shape a moral profile for their future vocation is an important one. This book reminds us that education is far more than developing competencies in students, but rather creating in others a desire to live and improve upon this world in a thoughtful, Christ-like manner.

Contributor

Kelly D. Sargent is Manager of Student Services for the Career Education Center at Georgetown University.

GROWTH

Publications Policy
Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development

All articles should be consistent with the Doctrinal Statement, Article III of the Constitution and By-Laws of the Association for Christians in Student Development.

Material in the following categories will be considered for publication:

1. Research articles that have relevance to the field of Christian Student Development.
2. Theoretical or applied articles that have relevance to the field of Christian Student Development.
3. Research, theoretical, or applied articles dealing with the integration of faith and learning within the field of Christian Student Development or within the broader field of Christian Higher Education as a whole.
4. Reviews of articles in other journals relevant to Christian Student Development.
5. Reviews of books relevant to Christian Student Development practice.
6. Reactions to current or past journal articles.

Submission Guidelines
Authors submitting a manuscript should:

1. Send an electronic copy (double-spaced) in either a PDF format or Word document only, to Skip Trudeau, Co-Editor of *Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development,* Taylor University, 236 West Reade Ave., Upland, IN, 46989-1001.
2. Follow the guidelines on format, style, and submission procedure provided in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed.).
3. Manuscripts should adhere to the following length parameters:
   • 10-15 pages for original research articles
   • 7-10 pages for applied research articles
   • 3-4 pages for article reviews
   • 3-4 pages for book reviews
4. Avoid submitting manuscripts which have been previously published or that are being considered for publication in other journals. If an article has been rejected by another journal, it may then be submitted to *Growth*.
5. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words on a separate sheet of paper.
6. Include the current *vita* information for each author: address, title, degree(s) and institutions where earned, and specializations.
7. Include telephone number, fax number, and electronic mail address.

All submitted manuscripts will be promptly acknowledged and processed in a timely fashion. The review process generally requires a minimum of three months.

GROWTH