Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association

2003 Edition

Contents

INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
School of Education
W.W. Wright Education Building, Suite 4228
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
(812) 856-8362/ 856-8364

2003 Journal Editors

Victoria S. Pasternak, Tara L. Sherwin

Review Board

Denise Easley, Brian Estrada, Erin Erwin,
Kelly Kish, Valerie Kolko, Shaila Mulholland,
Jennifer Sokas, Ontario Wooden

IUSPA Officers 2001-2002

President:	Jeremy Podany
Vice President:	Chris Heasley
Secretary:	Shaila Mulholland
Treasurer:	Sarah Young
Dir./Programming:	Chad Harris
Dir./Relations:	Dan Richter
Professional Dev.:	Denise Easley
Dir./Outreach:	Jennifer Komrosky
GPSO Rep:	Shannon Byrne
Advisor:	Jillian Kinzie

IUSPA Officers 2002-2003

President:	Michael Fazio
Vice President:	Rebecca Stone
Secretary:	Kristin Mehl
Treasurer:	Michelle Bernstein
Dir./Programming:	Alta Thornton
Dir./Relations:	Jackie Jones
Professional Dev.:	Michael Umbay
Dir./Outreach:	Camille Jones Jennifer Sokas
GPSO Rep:	Jennifer Crompton
Advisor:	Kate Boyle

The Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association is published annually by the Indiana University Student Personnel Association with support from the Higher Education & Student Affairs (HESA) Program. The Journal is produced expressly to provide an opportunity for HESA master's students to publish articles pertinent to the field of student affairs. The primary source of funding for the Journal are alumni donations and student and departmental support. The important role that each of these contributors has played in the production of this edition is gratefully acknowledged and appreciated.

Journal Editors

1967:	Ann Paloney & Michael J. Wiener
1968	Marily Liechty
1969:	Dallas Bauman
1971:	George C. Dehne
1972:	Jane A. Lundahl
1973:	Helen Mamarchev & Winnifred Weeks
1974:	Elizabeth Brannon, Robert Ciesliki, Barbara Moudy, David Stacy & Dann Lobsinger
1975:	Dann Lobsinger & Deborah Ann Alter
1976:	Dianne Burnside & Richard Scott
1977:	Susan Hopp, Frank Araiolo & Vince Carunchia
1978:	Elizabeth A. Zavodny, Marc Kaplan & Jim Scroth
1979:	Jim Scroth
1980:	L. E. Wegryn
1981:	B. J. Bischoff & Brian Pisaro
1982:	Rodney P. Kirsch & Janet J. Wright
1983:	Nedra Hartzell & Daniel Salter
1984:	Susan Buffington & Diane Ledger
1985:	Margaret O'Brien & David Stewart
1986:	Lora Burnett & James Vander Putten
1987:	James J. Holmen & James J. Hurley
1988:	David J. Strauss & J. J. Thorp
1989:	J. J. Thorp & Patricia Harned
1990:	Patricia Harned & Diane Robinson
1991:	Diane Robinson & Anne E. Spitler
1992:	Anne Spitler & Lisa K. Mitchell
1993:	Lisa K. Mitchell & Allison Block
1994:	Allison Block & Melody M. Snyder
1995:	Melody M. Snyder, Lisa P. Lourden, Kelli Kputska Smith & John Bean
1996:	John Bean & Kelli Kaputska Smith
1997:	Suzanne J. Mendoza, Jennifer Forbes & Alan Rose
1998:	Jennifer Forbes & Ryan A. Forsythe
1999:	Naraiah S. Broadus & Christopher R. Turner
2000:	Brent Ericson & Jason Pontius
2001:	Valerie A. Sarma & Kelly A. Kish
2002:	Drew Griffin & Victoria S. Pasternak
2003:	Victoria S. Pasternak & Tara L. Sherwin

2003 Awards and Honors

Congratulations to these members of the Indiana University family on the follow ing recognitions:

Susan Sgambelluri	Kate Hevner Mueller Award
Barbara Varchol	Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumni
Dana Burnett	Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Award
Kate Boyle	August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award
Megan Moore Gardner	Holmstedt Fellowship
Richard Muthiah	Holmstedt Fellowship
Megan Palmer	Holmstedt Fellowship
Daisy Rodriguez	Holmstedt Fellowship

Faculty Advisors

Elizabeth Greenleaf	1960-1977	Don Hossler	1989-1990
Wanda Deutsch	1970-1971	George Kuh	1990-1996
David Decoster	1972-1976	Bruce Jacobs	1996-1997
George Kuh	1977-1982	Teresa Hall	1997-1998
John Schuh	1983-1987	Ada Simmons	1998-2000
Don Hossler	1987-1988	Jillian Kinzie	2000-2002
Frances Stage	1988-1989	Kate Boyle	2002-2003

Call for Nominations

Nominations of individuals for the 2004 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf and Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Awards are now being accepted. The Greenleaf Award is presented annually to the graduate of the master's degree program in Higher Education and Student Affairs who exemplifies "the sincere commitment, professional leadership and personal warmth" of Betty Greenleaf, for whom the award is named. Previous Greenleaf Award recipients include Louis Stamatakos, Phyllis Mable, James Lyons, Paula Rooney, Joanne Trow, Carol Cummins-Collier, Thomas Miller, Frank Ardaiolo, Deborah Hunter, Vernon Wall, William Bryan, Terry Williams, Marilyn McEwen, Gregory Blimling, Lawrence Miltenberger, and Jamie Washington.

The Robert H. Shaffer Award is presented to the graduate of the Indiana University Higher Education doctoral program who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession. Previous Shaffer Award recipients include L. "Sandy" McLean, Thomas Hennessy, Jimmy Lewis Ross, Robert Ackerman, Don G. Creamer, Nell Bailey, Alice Manicur, Rodger Summers, Caryl Smith, and Donald Mikesell.

Nominations for both awards close February 1, 2004. The awards will be presented at the 2003 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g., vita) to Mary Howard-Hamilton, W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 4228, 201 N. Rose Avenue, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you.

Editors' Comments

Victoria S. Pasternak, Tara L. Sherwin

We are pleased to present the 2003 edition of the Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association. The national and international tumult of the past year has left its mark on colleges and universities across the United States. Students and administrators alike have felt the effects of our world's inability to respect and honor the differences among human beings. However, as we compiled the final edited versions of this year's Journal submissions, we noticed the celebration of diversity represented in all of them. We feel proud of our authors' desire to study and bring awareness to issues of diversity, especially in a time when higher education struggles to keep these issues at the forefront of campus awareness.

"Fraternity Men and Homosexuality" examines the attitudes and behaviors of fraternity members toward homosexual students. "A History of Jews in Higher Education in the United States" provides a thorough overview of Jewish students' experiences in higher education, both academic and social, since the inception of the first American university. "Self-Efficacy and Student Leaders" is a quantitative study that looks at the influence of various factors, with a special emphasis on gender, of students' beliefs in their leadership capabilities. "Here Today, Gone Tomorrow" analyzes the presence of both Black students and affirmative action policies in historical and current times. A qualitative study, "Assessing International Student Perceptions of the Classroom Environment at a United States Business School" describes the experiences of international students in the American classroom and suggests ways to enhance those experiences. Finally, "White Students' Attitudes and Behaviors Toward People of Color" provides insight to the reasons behind White students' thoughts and actions toward people of color, noting in particular how gender differences affect those thoughts and actions. Clearly, this year's authors all felt a strong need to address issues of diversity and underrepresented students, and we applaud their dedication and success in doing so.

The 2003 Journal could not have been completed without the help of Kate Boyle. Her constant advice and unfailing support, in addition to her hard work in obtaining the grant money that helped fund this year's edition, are appreciated more than she knows. We wish her the best of luck this summer as she defends her dissertation and earns the well-deserved title of "Doctor!" We would also like to thank Chris Heasley for his innovative cover design, as well as the many HESA alumni and friends who continue to help us provide this wonderful service to our readers.

Finally, we would like to thank the extraordinary Masters and Doctoral students who served on this year's Journal Review Board. Without their hard work and dedicated efforts, the Journal could not have continued its tradition of exceptional content and quality. Again, we would like to thank our peers for their professionalism and sincerity throughout the entire review process. We hope that you enjoy this edition of the Journal, and that you continue to support and contribute to the Journal, the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, and Indiana University.

Vicky Pasternak graduated with a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in 2003. While at Indiana, Vicky held an assistantship as a Graduate Supervisor in the Wright Quad and worked in the Office of Student Ethics. Vicky received her B.A. in Communications in 1998 from Marquette University.

Tara Sherwin is a current Master's student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University. She works as the Graduate Assistant for the Student Alumni Association and has served as the Graduate Intern for IU's Office of Orientation Programs. Tara received her B.A. in English from Texas Christian University in May of 2002.

State of the Program

Kate Boyle
Master's Program Coordinator

Spring has arrived here in Bloomington and I'm pleased to offer you the 2003 edition of the *IUSPA Journal*! I have had a wonderful first year as the coordinator of the Higher Education & Student Affairs master's program. We welcomed forty first-year students from across the nation. This is the largest class in recent memories and they have certainly brought many talents to us and will be wonderful additions to the field of Student Affairs. The second-year cohort members are looking forward to graduation and many of them are already successful in their job search efforts and have announced where they are off to in the coming year!

Our faculty continue to provide active leadership in research, teaching and service. Trudy Banta provides excellent leadership within the IUPUI program. She has published the book *Building a Scholarship of Assessment* which has contributions from George Kuh, Vic Borden and others at IUPUI. Trudy was announced as the 2003 winner of the Sidney S. Suslow Award given by the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) for "scholarly contributions to the field of institutional research. Deborah Carter, who continues to be an essential part of the HESA program, has recently received tenure and has been promoted to Associate Professor. Nancy Chism, also one of our key faculty for the IUPUI program, has had three recent publications regarding faculty development and learning environments. Don Hossler has been working with current and former IU doctoral students on a project funded by the Lumina Foundation to examine how the College Decision-Making Process has changed over the past fifty years.

Mary Howard-Hamilton has been named Chair of the HESA Program and has provided wonderful leadership for the master's and doctoral programs. George Kuh continues to expand the CSEQ and the NSSE through the grants received from The Pew Charitable Trust. George was the 2002 recipient of the Sidney S. Suslow Award given by AIR. Doug Priest, previously the Associate Vice Chancellor for Budgetary Administration and Planning, has joined the faculty full-time. Doug recently collaborated with Don Hossler, Ed St. John and another author on a book regarding budgeting systems in public universities. Ed St. John has written several pieces recently on social class and college costs. Ed received the 2002 Leadership Award from the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE). Each of our faculty contribute to the field of Higher Education and Student Affairs through publications and acknowledgements, but also so much through their day-to-day interactions with the doctoral and master's students in the HESA program.

Interest in the master's program in Higher Education & Student Affairs remains high as we continue to attract new students to the program. We had approximately 95 students on campus during our two Outreach recruitment sessions in February. We expect a full class of talented students to join us in the fall. This year, we extended our Outreach program and began a doctoral student Outreach that had 20 students attend. We also continued to participate in a number of graduate preparation fairs.

The IUSPA Journal is one of the hallmarks of our program. As we pursue knowledge in higher education and student affairs, the student authors challenge themselves to submit articles that are reviewed and edited by their peers. The editorial team also has a wonderful opportunity to improve their skills in reviewing, critiquing and editing the submitted works. However, this opportunity continues only via your generous contributions. Please designate donations to the annual fund drive to go towards the *Journal* so that we can continue to produce this exceptional opportunity for our students and for you to receive as alumni. On behalf of the faculty, students, and staff of the program, thank you for your support and contributions to the HESA program. Through your continued efforts to refer talented students to the program and to financial support our program you provide the necessary elements to sustain our strong Higher Education & Student Affairs program at Indiana University!

Fraternity Men and Homosexuality: An Attitudinal and Environmental Assessment

Kerry Fleming, Jason Jones, Kevin McCord, & Eric Marc Ratner

Through a self-administered survey, this study examined the levels of homophobia within Greek chapters at a public Research I institution in the Midwest. Additionally, various environmental factors within each chapter were assessed in order to determine which factors within the fraternal living environment might influence attitudes toward homosexuality. Confrontation of negative messages and quality GLB-related programming were found to be significant deterrents of homophobia. This research suggests the necessity of more diversity education within Greek chapters that teaches members how to effectively confront negative messages within their chapter houses.

Over the past few years, issues of gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) students have joined racial, religious, and ethnic concerns at the forefront of diversity research. Although studies regarding attitudes and perceptions toward GLB students on college campuses are easy to find, little research has explored the influence of the fraternal living environment on members' attitudes toward homosexuality (Case, 1996). Unfortunately, what little research does exist regarding GLB issues within the fraternity environment shows substantial levels of discrimination against prospective members perceived as possibly gay, even to the extent of dismissing them from membership (Case, 1996).

Peer groups, in the form of Greek organizations, serve as some of the strongest socializing agents on college campuses, exerting great influence over the social and academic behavior of their members (Kuh, 1982). Consequently, these negative attitudes have forced numerous others to remain in the closet for fear of threats and harassment from fellow members. Not only does this hostile environment ignite issues of equal access, but it also stagnates the essential processes of student development, thereby undermining a principal goal of the college experience (Highlen, Bean, & Sampson, 2000). The purpose of this research, therefore, is three-fold: to collectively assess fraternity members' attitudes toward homosexuality, to explore the nature of the fraternity living environment, and to draw relationships between the two.

Literature Review

Greek Values and Group-Think

The relevant literature acknowledges the importance of student culture, in the form of fraternities and sororities in the undergraduate population. Greek letter organizations represent thriving sub-cultures on their respective campuses, providing undergraduates with a wealth of values and norms for

other members to inherit through membership (Love, Boschini, Jacobs, Hardy, and Kuh, 1993). In a study of American fraternities, Rayburn (1993) lists fraternal values such as, "academe, brotherhood, culture, diversity, loyalty, individuality, tradition, religion, and leadership" (p. 25). Interestingly, Rayburn (1993) cites "culture" and "diversity" as being of least importance to the fraternity members surveyed.

Fraternities lack the necessary support for diversity within their chapters for many reasons (Johnson, 1970). Members who endure shared experiences tend to lose their individuality and begin to develop a collective attitude or group-think mentality that is socially acceptable for their surrounding fraternity environment (Nuwer, 1999). Since these values exclude an appreciation for diversity in their membership, gay students are left behind.

Campus Climates

In a review of twenty-four studies on campus diversity, Berrill (1992) noted that 80 percent of GLB college students had been verbally harassed; 44 percent had been threatened with violence; 33 percent had been chased or followed; and 17 percent had been physically assaulted. In another study of GLB students, data show that 31 percent of GLB students left school for at least one semester, and 33 percent either dropped out or transferred because of harassment issues (Sherrill & Hardesty, 1994). These statistics demonstrate the hostility of the campus climate for students struggling with issues of sexual orientation and gender identity. Such environments can have a drastic effect on the identity development of homosexuals. For example, the "Identity Pride" stage in Cass's (1979) model of homosexual identity formation states that GLB students must address an oppressively heterosexist living environment to progress to the next developmental level. However, in order to avoid a hostile experience, they will be prone to act like a heterosexual if it appears to be the overriding norm within their peer group (Blumenfeld, 1992).

This is certainly the case within the Greek environment (Case, 1996; Blumenfeld, 1992; Hughes, 1991). Case (1996) distributed a 32-question self-administered survey to GLB fraternity/sorority undergraduates and alumni across the country, the results of which demonstrated that Greek chapters often discriminate against prospective pledges if they suspect them to be gay or lesbian. In Case's (1996) study, negative attitudes toward homosexuality were naturally linked to the unwelcoming climate within Greek chapter houses, but perceptions of surrounding chapters in the community were also cited as a major issue.

Additional Influences

Homophobia is not only a product of a campus living environment; attitudes towards homosexuality can and are often learned before a student

joins a fraternity or sorority (Case, 1996). Other factors that can affect an individual's attitude toward homosexuality include previous relationships with homosexuals and education on homosexual issues.

Many gay students feel invisible to their family and peers and are unable to maintain close, positive, and honest relationships with their peers. Galupo and St. John (2001) found that friendships between homosexual and heterosexual students proved to be rewarding experiences for both parties in the friendship. While sharing the general benefits of friendship, the relationships were found to be mutually supporting of each other, regardless of sexual orientation, while also promoting both cognitive and social-emotional development (Galupo & St. John, 2001). Establishing cross-sexual orientation (e.g. friendships between heterosexuals and homosexuals) relationships in high school allows for understanding and familiarity between both groups (Lee, 2002).

Another factor that influences this understanding between sexualities is the quantity and content of sex education for young people. A lack of sufficient sex education can result in young adults, particularly men, forcefully asserting their own views of sexuality and social acceptance, often in the form of violence (Van de Ven, Bornholt, & Bailey, 1996). Effective sexual orientation education allows for individuals to learn respecting diversity among their peers by recognizing how mere phrases can hurt or injure another individual (Plummer, 2001). Additionally, education that teaches individuals to view sexuality on a continuum is likely to dissuade feelings of homophobia (Griffin, 1998; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953).

Higher education literature thoroughly explores the benefits of student involvement in Greek life, and it also examines the reasons why Greek communities systematically discourage diversity. However, developing a better understanding of the attitudes of fraternity men toward homosexuality, as well as establishing relationships between those attitudes and various environmental influences of Greek life will enable student affairs professionals to concentrate their problem-solving efforts into more efficient solutions for changing the fraternal culture.

Methodology

Participants

The researchers surveyed fraternity members at a large, Midwestern, Research I, state-supported institution. The sample came from eighteen of the nineteen traditional fraternal chapters that have on-campus residences at the study university. One fraternity was eliminated from the sample pool because the chapter's status with the university was under review. Of all the fraternities contacted, a total of six agreed to allow the researchers to administer the survey to interested members. A total of 181 surveys were

distributed and collected from members who agreed to participate. The study sample included 46 freshmen (25.4%), 65 sophomores (35.9%), 44 juniors (24.3%), and 25 seniors (13.8%). The mean age of the participants was 19.69 years. Sixty-three (34.8%) of the participants self-identified themselves as holding a leadership position within their chapter.

Instrument

Researchers have grappled with the difficulties of accurately and quantitatively measuring attitudes toward homosexuality. Between 1971 and 1978, at least 31 reports of attitudinal studies of homosexuality were published (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). Hudson and Ricketts (1980) point out that many instruments have blurred the distinction between "intellectual attitudes toward homosexuality...[and] affective responses toward homosexuality" (p. 358). The former focuses on legality and morality, while the latter measures irrational feelings of discomfort, fear, and anger toward homosexuals. Weinberg (1972) defined homophobia in terms of fear of being in close proximity with homosexuals, and Hudson and Ricketts (1980) chose this definition as a model to create their Index of Homophobia (IAH).

The researchers included additional questions at the end of Hudson and Ricketts' (1980) Index. The researchers' survey, in turn, consists of the following sections: fraternity members' attitudes towards sexual orientation, adapted from the Index of Homophobia (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980), consisting of 24 questions on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree); a comparison of the individuals' perceptions of themselves and their respective chapter houses regarding homosexuality, consisting of three pairs of questions on a five-point Likert scale also from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree); and questions regarding social and physical environments within the house related to how negative messages about homosexuals are encountered and addressed within the chapter. These eighteen questions regarding social and physical environments were on a four-point Likert-type scale from 1 (never) to 4 (often). The survey closed with additional questions about policies and programming regarding sexual orientation in and out of the fraternity and a section pertaining to the participant's demographics.

Procedure

The researchers administered surveys to groups of fraternity members within their respective chapter houses over a three-week period. Fraternity presidents of the selected chapter houses were contacted for permission to conduct the survey. The surveys were administered at weekly chapter business meetings for each fraternity. At least one researcher was present to administer the survey and answer participants' questions.

Data Analysis

According to Hudson and Ricketts (1980), a mean score of 0-25 is regarded as high grade non-homophobic, a mean score between 25 and 50 is regarded as low grade non-homophobic, between 50 and 75 is regarded as low grade homophobic, and high grade homophobic refers to mean scores above 75. In other words, the higher the score, the higher the level of homophobia. Scores were calculated in accordance with the methods used by Hudson and Ricketts (1980).

Questions from Section B were split into three pairs (1 and 2), (3 and 4), and (5 and 6). The first question of each pair reflects how a participant would personally respond to homosexuality within the chapter house, while the second question asks for a participant's opinion about how the house as a whole would feel. Comparisons for the mean responses in Section B were used to see if the difference between the two questions in each pair was significant.

The researchers then drew means comparisons and correlations between various sections of data. Means comparisons (T-tests) and correlations were drawn between scores on the IAH and various demographic and environmental factors. A stronger relationship of IAH scores to input factors, rather than environmental influences within the house, might weaken the notion that fraternity house living breeds high levels of homophobia.

Limitations

Limitations seemed to fall within two areas: (1) the environment in which the surveys were administered and (2) external influences. Each of the researchers visited the fraternity houses after a chapter meeting to administer the survey. While this was the best way to administer the survey to as many chapter members as possible in one sitting, the researchers noticed that chapter members were engaged in conversation and commentary with other members. This may have constituted a hostile environment, due to the confidential nature of the subject.

Additionally, while administering the surveys, the researchers identified a possible external influence. Since fraternity chapter presidents were contacted prior to the chapter meetings, there was ample time for any chapter presidents concerned about the reputation of their house to possibly influence their members to report socially desirable responses on the survey.

Results

Overall IAH Scores

A mean IAH score of 52.92 was found for the 181 participants. Individual scores ranged the full spectrum of the IAH from 0.00 to 100. Mean scores for specific chapters ranged from 44.21 to 58.67. The difference between these two extremes was found to be significant ($p<.05$).

Section B

The overall analysis of Section B found participants rating their respective chapter as less tolerant of homosexuals than they rated themselves. The mean response from all of the participants for the "I" or "Individual" questions in Section B (questions 1, 3, and 5) were 2.15, 2.04, and 2.84, respectively (see Table 1).

A greater mean score in Section B indicates higher perceived levels of discomfort with homosexuality. The mean responses to the "My house" questions in Section B, on the other hand, were all greater than the scores individuals gave themselves on matching questions. Questions 2, 4 and 6 simply replaced the word "I" from questions 1, 3, and 5 with the words "my house." The mean scores for the "My house" questions (2, 4, and 6) were 2.62, 3.52, and 3.18, respectively. A paired samples comparison of the means in Section B, in turn, produced a significant difference ($p<.05$) between all paired questions (questions 1 and 2; 3 and 4; and 5 and 6, see Table 2 as it relates to corresponding data in Table 1). A greater mean score in Section B, therefore, indicates that the respondent tended to disagree more with the questions pertaining to the perceived attitudes of his respective chapter house.

Table 1
Mean Scores from Responses to Section B

			Chapters									
	All n=180		A n=15		B n=37		C n=25		D n=39		E n=42	
Question	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1	2.15	0.86	1.67	0.72	2.41	0.99	2.35	0.80	2.10	0.75	2.02	0.81
2	2.62	0.95	1.93	0.70	2.76	1.14	3.00	0.69	2.74	0.79	2.40	0.77
3	2.04	1.13	2.33	1.11	3.43	1.09	3.46	1.21	2.87	0.89	2.81	1.09
4	3.25	1.03	2.33	1.05	3.54	1.17	3.69	0.79	3.05	0.83	3.10	0.79
5	2.84	1.11	2.67[b]	0.98	3.19	1.22	3.08	1.15	2.67	0.95	2.50	1.02
6	3.18	1.12	3.27[a]	1.22	3.43	1.21	3.19	1.13	3.15[a]	1.01	2.90	0.98

Note. Question 1: If a brother "came out" I would be supportive of that individual.

Question 2: If a brother "came out" my house would be supportive of that individual.

Question 3: If a gay brother were to bring a male date to house functions, I would be supportive.

Question 4: If a gay brother were to bring a male date to house functions, my house would be supportive.

Question 5: I would be comfortable if other fraternities knew that my chapter has a gay member(s).

Question 6: My house would be comfortable if other fraternities knew that my chapter has a gay member(s).

[a]Notice that these means are greater than the means for questions 4 for these particular chapters (A and D). This is a deviation from the pattern found throughout all chapters. This suggests that the individuals' perception of the other members in his chapter is that they are less comfortable with other fraternities knowing they have a gay member.

[b]Notice that this mean is greater than the mean for question 3 for this chapter (A). This, too, is a deviationfrom the pattern found throughout all chapters. This suggests that Chapter A is most concerned with others' perception of the fraternity and its membership.

Section C

Section C of the survey instrument was designed to discover how negative messages are communicated and confronted. Jokes and verbal harassment occur more often than non-verbal forms of negative messages. Jokes, especially, occur more frequently across chapters with individual chapter means no lower than 2.83.

Section C investigated who, if anyone, confronts situations in which negative messages about gays are seen and/or heard. When the means from the confrontation subcategory of Section C are compared with IAH scores, t-tests show that more confrontation of situations involving negative messages about gays from members, officers, and individuals in the chapter relates to less homophobia. Respondents who reported a score of 3 or greater (either sometimes or always confronts a situation) in this subcategory of Section C were compared with respondents who indicated less than 3 (either never or rarely confronts a situation). The mean IAH scores of these groups were found to be significantly different ($p<.05$) and show that lower IAH scores (i.e., lower levels of homophobia) relate to increased levels of confrontation in a chapter.

Non-discrimination Policies

Another comparison was made between IAH scores and participants' responses to the questions in Section D pertaining to perceptions of a non-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation. The validity of a participant's response to the question "Does your fraternity have a non-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation?" could not be verified (chapters do not necessarily disclose this information). Comparison of IAH scores between those who answered yes and those who answered no to this question demonstrated that those who believed that their chapter did not have a non-discrimination policy had lower IAH scores (M=50.38). Those who did know a policy existed had an IAH score of 54.83. This difference, however, was not found to be significant ($p<.05$). Furthermore, when the entire study group was analyzed, the majority of respondents (n=97) indicated that they did not know of the existence of such a policy.

Programming that Addresses GLB Issues

Two questions in Section D inquired as to the respondents' participation in or attendance at educational programs held (1) by the fraternity and (2) not held by the respondents' fraternity. Respondents who attended programming sponsored by their chapter had a mean IAH score of 53.75. The mean IAH score for the respondents who indicated that they attended programming held outside their fraternity was 46.38. This is more than seven points below the overall mean IAH score (52.92), and it is significantly different

(p<.05) from the mean IAH score of respondents who did not attend programming held outside their fraternity (M=54.17).

Demographic Issues

In general, participants in this study were in the early years of their college careers, with a mean participant age of 19.69 years (SD=1.22). The average time spent residing in their respective chapter houses was 1.41 years (SD=0.49). Since age does not necessarily correspond with years spent in college, a T-test comparing mean IAH scores of underclassmen (freshmen and sophomores) and upperclassmen (juniors and seniors) was performed to investigate a possible significant difference in IAH scores. Those respondents who identified themselves as upperclassmen (n=69) had a mean IAH score of 50.89. The remaining 111 respondents who identified themselves as underclassmen had a mean IAH score of 54.06. This difference in means was not significant (p<.05).

The researchers also explored the possibility that previous, personal contact/experience with gay men may influence a respondents level of homophobia. A participants positive response to the question "Did you personally know any gay men in high school?" did, in fact, produce a significant relationship (p<.05) with IAH scores. A significant majority (n=128) of the participants indicated that they knew gay men in high school. These respondents' mean IAH score was 50.60, more than 2 points below the overall IAH mean of 52.92. In contrast, the participants who indicated having no personal experience with gay men in high school had a mean IAH of 58.30. Individual previous interaction with gay men, however, did not seem to affect chapter-wide IAH scores.

The survey instrument's final question asked the participants to place themselves along a seven-point continuum (Kinsey, et al., 1953) that ranks the respondents' level of sexuality as it pertains to their thoughts, feelings, and relationship experiences. The scale ranges from 1 (completely heterosexual) to 7 (completely homosexual). The overall mean score for this

Table 2
Mean Differences of Paired Questions from Section B

Pair	Questions	M	SD	t-test statistic	Significance (2-tailed)
1	If a brother "came out" I/my house would be supportive of that individual*	-0.47	0.88	-7.19	.000
2	If a gay brother brought a male date to house functions, I/my house would be supportive*	-0.21	0.92	-3.07	.002
3	I/My house would be comfortable if other fraternities knew that my chapter has a gay member(s)*	-0.33	0.82	-5.38	.000

Note. A significant difference in the means of each paired questions was found. This is interpreted as indicating that an individual respondents' perception of his house being more homophobic than he is himself permeates throughout the question pairs in Section B.

*p<.05

question was 1.16 with a standard deviation of 0.72. Almost all of the respondents (n=164), in fact, rated themselves as completely heterosexual. Some respondents (n=10) ranked themselves as 2 (mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experience). One respondent ranked himself as completely homosexual, and the remaining respondents (n=7) placed themselves somewhere between 3 (mostly heterosexual with substantial homosexual experience) and 6 (mostly homosexual with substantial heterosexual experience).

When choosing to compare the difference in IAH score means of the respondents who ranked themselves as completely heterosexual versus the ten respondents who ranked themselves as mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experience, the researchers found that those who ranked themselves as mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experience had significantly (p<.05) lower IAH scores (M=43.13). Those who ranked themselves as completely heterosexual had a mean IAH score of 53.79.

Discussion

The intent of this study was to gauge levels of homophobia within fraternities at the campus of study, as well as to discover connections between these homophobia levels and environmental factors within each house. The research presented some interesting conclusions, as well as some useful implications for practitioners striving to create effective programming to reduce levels of homophobia within their campus Greek systems.

The study's findings regarding levels of homophobia within the participating fraternities indicate that a variation between individual fraternal living environments does occur. The variances between chapters were related to environmental factors affecting individual's level of homophobia. In some cases these factors also had an affect on the homophobia level of the entire chapter lending towards the notion of group think within fraternal living environments. Due to the number of variables involved, it is difficult to draw relationships between individual factors and chapter-wide homophobia.

An analysis of Section B of the study indicates that an individual respondent perceives himself as less homophobic than his fellow chapter members. This trend was reported across all six of the participating fraternities, and it confirms that "continuous interaction within an isolated group produces the understandings and attitudes that form the basis of student culture" (Hughes, 1962, p. 70). This study allowed the researchers to interpret such implications when compared to Rayburn's (1993) assertion that individual values tend to converge upon entering the Greek environment. Additional research regarding the accuracy with which individuals report their own attitudes toward homosexuals could be used to educate Greek

members about the actual levels of homophobia within the chapter house.

Other conclusions drawn from Section C indicate some practical implications for addressing social norming as it relates to change. Jokes and verbal harassment seem to be the most prevalent manifestations of homophobia within chapters. The frequency with which those messages were confronted, however, more significantly impacted IAH scores than their existence. The data seem to suggest that members' willingness to confront issues of homophobia within the house might work toward reducing chapter-wide homophobia. This connection between confrontation and IAH scores showed a strong relationship between environmental factors and a collective level of homophobia. Future research might attempt to establish which types of confrontations are most effective when dealing with homophobic jokes and verbal harassment.

Another way to decrease the underlying culture of homophobia might be to provide effective educational programming that includes issues of the GLB community. Attendance at outside programming demonstrated a significant connection to lower levels of individual homophobia. However, exposure to in-house programming did not show any significant impact upon chapter members' IAH scores. Future research should consider further practical implications regarding the components of effective diversity programming.

The data suggest that the existence or a perception of the existence of a GLB-inclusive non-discrimination policy is not enough to reduce levels of homophobia for individuals within a chapter. It is the opinion of the researchers that it is not only important that fraternities have a non-discrimination policy that includes GLB issues, but that it is also important for those policies to be explained and discussed in detail with all chapter members. Future research comparing fraternities that do have policies with those who do not may provide more in-depth connections between policies and homophobia.

Most demographic factors studied, such as the setting individuals surveyed grew up in, religion, strength of religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, and academic major, showed no significant influence on participants' IAH scores. Therefore, because these background factors did not prove to be significant factors influencing overall IAH scores, the researchers could only conclude that chapter house environments had (at least) a more-than-incidental effect on individual and house-wide attitudes towards homosexuals.

Contact with gay men in high school did show a significant impact on individual levels of homophobia. However, the social norming phenomenon of the fraternity environment seemed to eradicate its effect on the chapter-wide environment. Malaney (1990) asserts that contact with diverse individuals quells feelings of prejudice. Fraternities, therefore, should consider the diversity of the members they recruit and the value of the impact of interaction with gay men on the level of their chapter's homophobia. This study showed that a majority of the participants had positive experiences with gay men in high school, and in turn, had lower levels of homophobia. It can be assumed that positive interactions with gay men in college would provide the same decrease in levels of homophobia.

The final factor to be considered is the respondents' placement of themselves on Kinsey, et al. (1953) sexuality scale. Although only eight percent of respondents reported having thoughts, feelings, and experiences that were not completely heterosexual, the survey data, seems to show that the ability to place one's sexuality on a continuum is significantly linked with low levels of homophobia. Respondents that reported being mostly heterosexual with minimal homosexual experiences would still likely regard themselves as being heterosexual. However, as Kinsey, et al. (1953) and Griffin (1998) suggest, individuals who were able to see the wide range of possible sexual thoughts, feelings, and behavior were less likely to be judgmental of those who display different styles of behavior.

These conclusions suggest some guidelines for student affairs practitioners who wish to apply this research to educational programming within the fraternity environment. The revelation that "Not everyone is as homophobic as I think they are" might supply hesitant individuals with enough courage to delve more deeply into the issues of homophobia. Educational programming should also address the prevalence of jokes and verbal harassment in informal settings, as well as how to effectively confront such negative messages. Members should be educated as to the existence of GLB-inclusive policies and both how to get them and how to successfully apply them to daily life within the fraternity. Finally, any education that addresses issues of homophobia should utilize the Kinsey, et al. (1953) continuum model of sexuality. Accenting this exploration with a panel presentation of gay individuals might provide fraternity members with a variety of perspectives on GLB issues. This might help members to establish links between the continuum model of sexuality and a representation of people in general, thereby blurring the line between what is and what is not socially acceptable.

This research has shown various linkages between environments and attitudes, but, as Love (1997) points out, strategies for changing a culture of homophobia must be tailored to the needs of individual environments. It is the hope of the researchers that this study will inspire others in the student affairs community to explore this area further in order to improve climates of homophobia within the collegiate Greek system.

References

Berrill, K. (1992). Antigay violence and victimization in the United States: An overview. In G.M. Herek & K.T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men* (pp. 19-45). Newbury Park. California: Sage.

Blumenfeld, W.J. (1992). *Homophobia: How we all pay the price.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Case, D.N. (1996). A glimpse of the invisible membership: A national survey of lesbigay Greek members. *Perspectives, 23*(3), 12-20.

Cass, V.C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality, 4,* 219-235.

Galupo, M.P. & St. John, S. (2001). Benefits of cross-sexual orientation friendships among adolescent females. *Journal of Adolescence,24*(1), 83-93.

Griffin, G. (1998). Understanding heterosexism: The subtle continuum of homophobia. *Women & Language, 21*(1), 33-40.

Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B.W. (1992). Racial identity development: Understanding racial dynamics in college classrooms and on campus. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53,* 21-37.

Highlen, P.S., Bean, M.C., & Sampson, M.G. (2000, August 8). Preliminary development of the Gay and Lesbian Oppressive Situations Inventory-Frequency and Effect. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington D.C.

Hudson, W.W., & Ricketts, W.A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality, 5*(4), 357-372.

Hughes, M.J. (1991). Addressing gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues in fraternities and sororities. In N.J. Evans & V.A. Wall (Eds.), Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus (pp. 97-116). Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Johnson, E. (1970). Sophomore fraternity members compared with independents on the biographical scales of CSQ. *The Journal of College Student Personnel, 11,* 284-286.

Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., Martin, C.E., & Gebhard, P. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female.* Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.

Kuh, G.D. (1982). *Enhancing the quality of Greek life.* Bloomington, IN: Center for the Study of the College Fraternity.

Lee, C. (2002). The impact of belonging to a high school gay/straight alliance. *High School Journal, 85*(3), 13-27.

Love, P.G. (1997). Contradiction and paradox: Attempting to change the culture of sexual orientation at a small Catholic college. *The Review of Higher Education, 20*(4), 381-398.

Love, P.G., Boschini, V.J., Jacobs, B.A., Hardy, C.M., & Kuh, G.D. (1993). Student culture. In G.D. Kuh (Ed.), *Cultural perspectives in student affairs work* (pp. 59-79). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Lucas, C.J. (1994). *American higher education: A history.* New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Malaney, G.D. (1990). Student attitudes toward fraternities and sororities. *NASPA Journal, 28*(1), 37-42.

Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Plummer, D.C. (2001). The quest for modern manhood: Masculine stereotypes, peer culture and the social significance of homophobia. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*(1), 15-23.

Rayburn, W.L. (1993). *Organizational induction rituals and their impact on individual values.* Bloomington, IN: Center for the Study of the College Fraternity.

Sherrill, J., & Hardesty, C.A. (1994). *The gay, lesbian, and bisexual student's guide to colleges, universities, and graduate school.* New York: New York University Press.

Van de Ven, P., Bornholt, L., & Bailey, M. (1996). Measuring cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of homophobic reaction. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 23*(2), 155-179.

Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kerry Fleming graduated from the HESA program in 2003. She received her B.A. in public relations and history from the University of Nebraska-Kearney in 2000. At IUB, Kerry served as a Graduate Assistant for Greek Affairs for the Student Activities Office and as a Judicial Officer for the Office of Student Ethics and Anti-Harassment Programs.

Jason Jones graduated from the HESA program in 2003. He received his B.A. in Spanish and biology from Indiana University in 2001. At IUB, Jason worked as a graduate intern at the Association for College Unions International.

Kevin McCord graduated from the HESA program in 2003. He received his B.S. in marketing and management from the University of Missouri in 1998. At IUB, Kevin served as a Graduate Assistant for Greek Affairs and a Resident Chapter Advisor for Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity.

Eric Marc Ratner will graduate from the HESA program in 2004. He received his B.A. in Human Development from the University of California-San Diego in 2001. At IUB, Eric served as a Graduate Supervisor in Briscoe Residence Center, and is currently an adjunct instructor in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

A History of Jews in American Higher Education

Valerie B. Kolko

Throughout the history of American higher education, Jews have been both marginalized and unaccepted in collegiate life. Their history of discrimination in the United States led to the founding of religious and secular institutions in which Jewish American culture could be explored and celebrated. The following paper provides a historical account of the persecution of Jews and their subsequent responses in the context of American higher education and offers implications for student affairs practitioners.

From the inception of higher education in America with the founding of Harvard College in 1636, Jews were cast as outsiders beyond the realm of normal college life. Participation and eligibility in extracurricular activities was limited for centuries by the dominant Protestant paradigm; for example, institionalized anti-Semitism across the country denied Jews the opportunity to join historically Christian fraternities (Horowitz, 1987), and similar sentiments drastically affected the admission of Jews to medical schools in the United States (Halperin, 2001). At the turn of the twentieth century, quota requirements limited Jews' matriculation in college and forced them to compete against one another for the few spots elite colleges had reserved for such students. At that time, Jewish American leaders formulated plans to establish their own universities to change the face of the urban educational landscape in cities across the east (Gurock, 1988; Meyer, 1976).

However, despite a lasting and permeating sense of exclusion from college life, the discrimination of Jews was one of many practices of nonmeritocratic prejudice existing in American colleges and universities that continues today. Jews were disqualified as eligible candidates for admission, based not on their abilities to succeed academically, but merely because of what was perceived as their religious conflicts with an institution's Christian values. Until the founding of such institutions as the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary in New York City (affiliated with Yeshiva University), Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, and Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts, the higher education of Jews and their full integration into American society as participants in a democratic educational system was severely hindered by lasting social injustices and ignorance dating at least back to 1722 at Harvard University (Morison, 1936). Rising ethnic consciousnesses have followed research interests in Judaism by spawning, for instance, Black, women's, and queer studies, all connected to the civil rights movement (Greenspahn, 2000). This paper will outline the history of Jews in institutions of higher education in America. It will describe the establishment of distinctly Jewish institutions as a response to an emerging

Jewish American identity in light of discrimination by higher education's mainstream. The author, a practicing Jew who attended a Jewish-sponsored university, explores the contribution of such institutions to the development of students' spiritual development and of student affairs practitioners' role in enhancing student learning for Jewish students.

Harvard and Yale: The Early Years

Despite the unwelcoming atmosphere to Jews that Puritan settlers created, their Hebrew texts, the Old Testament, and rabbinical literature were highly valuable to higher education for not only their educational purposes but also for their representation of learnedness and elevation of character. Rosovsky (1986) found that such figures in Puritan history as Cotton Mather, Michael Wigglesworth, and William Bradford all practiced Hebrew at Harvard College to promote scholarship and religious adherence. The first Jewish instructor of Hebrew, however, was converted to Christianity (one of the first to do so in the new world) in March 1722 after his methods of teaching were found "so tedious as to be discouraging" (Morison, 1936, pp. 57-58). It is unclear as to whether his pedagogy was disliked because of his style or because of the religious beliefs that may have been connected to his lessons.

The proliferation of college campuses across the country proved less welcoming to Jews in the mid-nineteenth century, intensifying the growing elitism of American life (Horowitz, 1987). Yale College's Congregationalist affiliation helped perpetuate a highly Christianized climate fearful and wary of Judaism, but which nevertheless accepted and taught the Hebrew language. Yale forbade the organization of any non-Christian religious society (Oren, 1985). The first Jews at Yale graduated in 1777 and were actually three half-Jewish brothers who did not practice the religion. According to Yale historian Dan Oren (1985), the first "bona fide Jewish student" (p. 6) was Moses Simons, who graduated from the institution in 1809. Little is known about his education there. Seventeen years later, a Jew named Judah P. Benjamin attended Yale College, only to drop out and later become a United States senator, and eventually Secretary of State to President Jefferson Davis of the Confederacy (Canby, 1936; Horowitz, 1987).

Jews and some Catholics remained on the fringe of New Haven life through the end of the eighteenth century, although Blacks and Native Americans remained most removed from society. Tolerance for all four ethnic groups remained low; these students were essentially invisible on small-town campuses and in schools in the American west. Even within the marginalized Jewish communities at both Cambridge and New Haven, discrimination existed between the first immigration wave of Spanish and Portuguese Jews (*Sephardim*, who preferred to distinguish themselves as

"Hebrews") and the second migration, which consisted more of German Jews (*Ashkenazim*) who identified as German ethnics before associating as Jewish (Oren, 1985; Rosovsky, 1986). This German affiliation allowed the Jews to gain quicker acceptance with society at large. The first known Jew to teach at Yale came from New Haven's *Ashkenazi* community, a local immigrant hired directly by the students to tutor them in the new sciences brought to America from Europe (Oren, 1985).

The rise of the "Jewish problem" (the increasing numbers of Jews at universities previously only attended by the Protestant elite) in New England institutions began in the late nineteenth century when a reformed practice of Judaism emerged that conflicted with mandatory chapel attendance for all enrolled students. Oren (1985) describes one Yale undergraduate (Lewis Ehrich, B.A. 1869) who attended services on the fast day of Yom Kippur (he was excused from Sunday prayers to be allowed to attend Saturday services at a local synagogue) and followed suit with dinner at a neighborhood pub. This newly developing Jewish identity confused and offended the strict obedient religious nature of the student population. Further, what few scholarly interests Ehrich had - perhaps due to immigrant expectations of college as a door to success - during the intellectual drain of college life at that time marked him as an outsider (Oren, 1985), giving Jews a reputation for being bookish and snobby that would remain for some time (Horowitz, 1987). The first ideations of the creation of a Jewish interest fraternity were discussed at Yale in 1866. At that institution, Jewish men, for the time being became an accepted part of the campus community, only later to be called into question after the awarding of a coveted literary prize to the first Jewish student in 1878 (Oren, 1985).

Soon after, Harvard's president Charles William Eliot abolished compulsory chapel attendance in 1886 to continue the introduction of non-sectarianism into his school. His open-mindedness allowed non-Protestants to start their own organizations; the Menorah Society (an early national Jewish student organization) was established in 1906 (Rosovsky, 1986). Nevertheless, Eliot's successor A. Lawrence Lowell feared the deterioration of the quality of the institution from the increasing percentages of Jewish students in Harvard's colleges. Not just limited to Harvard, the "Jewish Problem" existed for schools such as Tufts, Bowdoin, Columbia, and even Yale, as discussed in 1918 at a meeting of the Association of New England Deans (Rosovsky, 1986). Newly instituted admissions requirements such as character and psychological tests, in addition to curricular reform, discriminated against Jews as lower-class immigrants who were kept out of many Eastern colleges through quotas concealed behind facades of alumni interviews and preference to students from outside the East (Steinberg, 1974). Harvard began to require passport-sized photographs from applicants, a practice thought to be

American Conditions and Jewish Cultural Continuity.

Because Eastern European culture was neither integrated nor unchanging in the new world, "American conditions selectively reinforced certain characteristics and cultural tendencies and discouraged others" (Gorelick, 1981, p. 16). Certainly, living and working conditions in the United States did not favor Jewish orthodoxy. Even Jewish employers would steal precious moments away from Sabbath preparation on late Friday evenings to discourage piety and practice. In the early twentieth century, culture came to be divided by class (Gorelick, 1981). The employers overworked their laborers in dangerous sweatshops and reaped the benefits, while the workers organized unions, went on strike, and rioted, fighting not only for fair labor laws, but also desperately trying to cling to religious practices and beliefs residual from before their immigration (Takaki, 1993).

The German Jews, often businessmen removed from traditional Jewish culture still practiced by American Jews, sought social, economic, and cultural assimilation into the North American business class. They found orthodoxy alienating and embarrassing. At times these Jews led small congregations of their own despite the lack of ordination by a formal rabbinical body (Hebrew Union College, 2002). When Rabbi Isaac Wise came to America in 1946 from Bohemia, he encountered a leaderless frontier of an emerging form of Judaism, in which Wise saw the need for an educational institution for the benefit of all Jews. Zion College, "an institution for the training of rabbis and teachers in which not only the religious but also secular branches should be taught" (Philipson, 1925, p. 5), opened in 1855 for a short time in Cincinnati, but Wise was not daunted.

Recognizing the need for "American leaders for American congregations" (Philipson, 1925, p. 6), representatives of Cincinnati congregations, under the leadership of Rabbi Wise, formed in 1873 what is now the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC). At the Cleveland 1874 convention, Hebrew Union College was named as the union's own institution of higher education in which rabbis could be prepared and ordained (Philipson, 1925). In line with the social and political revolutions of the era, rabbis prepared in this Progressive institution would learn to infuse religion with emphases on social justice, environmentalism, and reformation into their teachings, which are values still evident in Reform Judaism today. With an American Jewish population exceeding 150,000, the Hebrew Union College became the first permanent Jewish institution of higher learning in the new world (Meyer, 1976).

Orthodox Jews were concerned with this break from cultural tradition. New York Rabbi Moses Meyer Matlin, an immigrant from Kovno, observed how some Jews in his area blithely ignored dietary laws and his attempts to monitor them; Eastern European religious life in America would not be

revived. In response, his son and some classmates, under the rabbi's tutelage and assistance from other rabbis who desired a return to European-style learning, formalized a study of Torah under the incorporated name of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS), which would later become the American counterpart to European yeshivas as the only institution in the United States for the preparation of orthodox rabbis (Gurock, 1988). In 1903, the school's chances for survival, which had been endangered since its founding, were dramatically improved as the newly-formed Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada took RIETS under its wing to ensure the perpetuation of its constituency (Gurock, 1988).

Both Hebrew Union College and RIETS thus served as catalysts for religious educational change in America. Under the auspices of newly created rabbinical assemblies, their student populations would thrive. The Jewish sons of immigrants in the new world attended Jewish institutions of higher learning not only as a result of discrimination encountered in mainstream colleges, but also of the need for maintaining a Jewish culture and tradition in light of the American experience (Gurock, 1988). Despite their founding purposes, however, these two institutions functioned as segregational tools, distinctly separating secular Jews from the more observant ones. Those students not interested in rabbinical ordination would continue to attempt assimilation in secular colleges.

Higher education in America was transformed in part by the social crisis of Jews that helped make educational reform possible. The new capitalist economy, the creation of new social classes, the clash of cultures, and the new social and organizational forms all triggered these educational (and occupational) changes (Steinberg, 1989). However, despite the burgeoning promise of educational opportunity for Jews in eastern cities where they had established schools of their own, they encountered discrimination, prejudice, and exclusion at Ivy League institutions, colleges and universities across the Midwest, and even schools in their own home cities.

The "Jewish Problem": Discrimination in Academe and College Life

The College of the City of New York attracted local Jewish boys as the first tuition-free municipal college, providing the first step towards a public, secular education for the sons of immigrants. Otherwise unable to attend college, Russian Jews found in City College the keys to upward mobility through Progressive learning. At the same time, the sons of New York City's elite families enrolled in a parallel curriculum at the same academy, thus creating a dual system of education in one school based implicitly on social origins (Gorelick, 1981). Perceptions of American democracy manifested in two curriculum tracks designed to keep the upper echelon of Jewish businessmen wealthy while the merchants would learn only enough how to

bargain. Within the Free Academy of City College, the classical course and English course helped to perpetuate and maintain classism within higher education. Jews self-segregated into these two programs, increasing Jewish enrollment at City College overall and giving that institution a reputation for being a "Jewish school" (Steinberg, 1974). By 1916, Jewish college students were "ubiquitous on college campuses in the city - 44 percent of the enrollment at Hunter College and 73 percent at City College" (Takaki, 1993).

A number of other Eastern colleges also showed rapid increases in their Jewish enrollment. Because Jews were generally assimilated within the American culture, they had not clearly formed a separate element or ethnic group. During this period of growing elitism and intolerance, they remained impoverished, blending in with other immigrants in urban slums and ghettos. Aspirations of parents to see their children succeed in America's alleged meritocratic economy, however, led students to attend public schools in large numbers. Horowitz (1987) found that many were "encouraged to learn and excel, [taking] the next step and [entering] college" (p. 76). Sons of Jewish immigrants chose institutions close at hand like Columbia, New York University, Harvard, and the University of Pennsylvania (Horowitz, 1987). As these schools grew to become universities, their curricula, organization, and pedagogies changed, often violently affecting Jews and their comfort on campus. Horowitz (1987) found that in light of their exclusion from social and even co-curricular organizations such as literary societies, Jews used education as a means of social and economic uplift when their efforts to participate in the traditional "college life" were deterred. Epithets and expressions of resentment further pushed Jews from campus activities and deterred them from applying to college at all (Takaki, 1993).

Jewish academic success came not from any particular aptitude or genius, wrote Steinberg (1974), but rather merely from their willingness to undergo sacrifices, persevering beyond discrimination and social injustices to make the most of their academic career. The perception of a "Jewish invasion" of elite Eastern colleges came from the fact that Jews sent their children to college a generation or two before other immigrants such as Italians, Armenians, and Slavs. Nearly anyone with a penchant for education and the determination to succeed, Steinberg (1974) continued, could have availed themselves of the newly created opportunities for outsiders. Nevertheless, through curricular reform and the explosion of interest in student activities, Jews were made aware - and caught in the center - of a battleground between the old class and the rising bourgeoisie. Without the economic resources to join forces with the leisure class, Jews were forcibly excluded from groups of privileged background (Horowitz, 1987; Steinberg, 1974).

Finding no welcome from their classmates, Jews faced a profusion of

anti-Semitism on campuses across the country; college life essentially confirmed and intensified the growing elitism of late-nineteenth-century American life. Most students learned to live the high life by buying exorbitantly and rarely paying the bills. This indulgence, wrote Canby (1936), "was scurrilous but not insolent, bawdy but not obscene." The overwhelmingly white and Protestant men who participated in college life gained contact with young men from other regions, but they did not become tolerant of those from other ethnic groups (Horowitz, 1987). Jews remained wary of their origins, keeping a low profile and focusing on their schooling rather than on their wallets.

Nevertheless, exclusion from the mainstream did not necessarily shape their choices within college life. Like other serious students who had preceded them, most had not come to college to play games and pranks. Most Jews imagined that Ivy League schools would provide the opportunity to advance in society. It was assumed that academic success would lead to law school or medical school, although as Halperin (2001) found, Jews would encounter anti-Semitism even more often in admissions policies for the top schools of medicine in the United States, along with discrimination against Blacks, Catholics, and women. Jewish quotas limited enrollment at the medical schools of Yale, Dartmouth, and the Universities of Michigan and Pennsylvania (Halperin, 2001). Nevertheless, the Jewish respect for scholarship set them further apart from other students.

The clubbish atmosphere established in institutions of higher education by an environment of friendships, social development, fraternity houses, good sportsmanship, [and] athletic teams (Rudolph, 1962) alienated Jews. What had begun as a caste system separating the sons of Jewish businessmen and the sons of Jewish merchants evolved into a hierarchy of elitism on the college campus dominated by the wealthy Protestant men who set patterns of discrimination that seeped into all aspects of college life. Literary magazines, debating societies, and musical clubs refused membership to Jews in fear that their numbers were simply too great for their campus (Horowitz, 1987). They were certainly excluded from historically Christian fraternities and thus began to form their own in response.

Despite the expectations of collegians' parents who hoped for their children's assured economic well-being through public education and college studies, college and university life did not necessarily give Jews the social experience they might need to advance in the new world. Schools were supposed to be hospitable to their students. These "outsiders" wanted to succeed in their undergraduate academics so that they would have hopeful futures as doctors, lawyers, or in other professions (Horowitz, 1987). They had no time for extracurricular foolishness, and thus largely ignored the college life altogether. Those that were interested in Greek life formed their

own fraternities and sororities. Jews seemed to threaten the holy balance of "getting by" in one's classes, "destroying the unity of the college" by raising the expectations for schoolwork by the professors (Horowitz, 1987, p. 79). Jewish students were the scapegoat of college men (and later women) who decreased the value of their "gentleman's C" (Steinberg, 1974), a grade considered honorable and praiseworthy by those students who spent more time in pubs and on the athletic fields than in the library. Steinberg (1989) wrote that given the "taboo on scholarship" by non-Jews, "Jewish academic success aroused considerable resentment" (p. 230).

For most Jews, training in *yeshiva* (Jewish school) and in family had instilled a devotion to learning surpassing that of Gentiles. Their persistence resulted in the winning of college honors far greater than their ratio to the student body (Horowitz, 1987). The growing numbers of Jews seemed to threaten the Protestant world, rising to an intense pitch because they had become attuned to the new possibilities of learning. Jews entered a situation of expanding educational opportunity, and with the goals and changing curriculum of higher education closely aligned with Jewish interests and talents, Jewish students were bound to succeed. Steinberg (1974) questioned whether the Jews would have distinguished themselves so academically if coursework had retained its emphasis on Latin, Greek, and other classical subjects.

Collegiate culture thus drew careful battle lines between the Jews and the rest of the community. On one side were the students who looked to the extracurriculum of athletics, journalism, fraternities, and other clubs for the real education. The other side held Jewish students inculcated with aspirations of upward mobility who knew that academic success would open the door for professional opportunities in the future. For those who chose secular educations over strictly Jewish institutions like those established in New York and Cincinnati, Jewish identity, regardless of saliency, proved to be a real barrier to success; quotas limited Jewish enrollment regardless of observance (Gorelick, 1981; Horowitz, 1987; Steinberg 1974). Such issues would be addressed in the establishment of the first Jewish-sponsored, non-sectarian university in the United States in 1948.

Brandeis University: A Host at Last

The former site of Middlesex University in Waltham, Massachusetts was a likely setting for the founding of a Jewish-sponsored institution of higher education. Founded in 1926 and primarily a veterinary and medical school, in its evolution the university had quickly evolved to become a refuge for Jews discriminated against elsewhere (Sachar, 1995). Despite his upbringing in the Protestant elite, Dr. John Hall Smith, the school's founder and foremost advocate, later grounded Middlesex's accreditation problems in its

high graduation rate of Jewish doctors. When he died in 1944, the school struggled to remain open, abandoning many Jewish students' hopes for success in the medical field (Goldstein, 1951).

Long before inquiries into Middlesex's standards, however, Rabbi Israel Goldstein of New York had assessed the need for a Jewish-sponsored institution of higher learning in America that did not have integral ties to a rabbinical school such as Yeshiva University/RIETS (Goldstein, 1951). It was evident to Goldstein that a secular school based on broad Jewish values, open to both Jews and Gentiles, should be organized by the collective Jewish community to answer the problems Jews were having when quotas and practice rigorously limited their participation in college life. With the endorsement of physicist Albert Einstein and the financial backing of Julius Silver of the Polaroid Corporation, the Jewish communities of Boston and New York approved the founding of Brandeis University in 1948, named for the Jewish Supreme Court Justice from Louisville whose services to the Jewish people would serve as "an inspiration to American youth" (Goldstein, 1951, p. 79).

The curriculum was a prescribed program for a degree in liberal arts, but with direction and guidance a student could follow pre-medical pursuits; the medical and veterinary schools had been eliminated at the time of Middlesex's demise (Brandeis University, 1954). The campus had to be immediately renovated and expanded upon to accommodate increasing enrollments due to the G.I. Bill of Rights and residential students. The school's first president, Abram L. Sachar, was charged with shaping an institutional culture commensurate to the founding mission and goals. Despite the example of other emerging experimental schools at that time such as Bennington, Antioch, Reed, and Sarah Lawrence, Brandeis University would remain a testament to the core curriculum of natural sciences, humanities, and the social sciences (Sachar, 1995). Early faculty members included composers Irving Fine and Leonard Bernstein, former First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, socialist Herbert Marcuse, journalist Max Lerner, and civil rights activist Jacob "Jerry" Cohen. In its formative years, Brandeis quickly established itself as a haven for students of all backgrounds with real interest in furthering their knowledge led by world-renowned scholars (Brandeis University, 1954).

Brandeis' commitment to non-sectarianism under the sponsorship of the Jewish community was manifest in all forms of student life. Although the majority of students have always been Jewish, the 1952 student body became outraged over the rumor of the building of a single chapel to be used for Jewish purposes only. In response, President Sachar announced plans for a three-chapel complex in which Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism would each find a home (Sachar, 1995). The following year, Brandeis gained accreditation and opened its first graduate school, and conferred honorary

degrees to scholars and politicians of various religions.

Today, the delicate balance between non-sectarianism and Jewish sponsorship presents many opportunities for multicultural and diversity programming with stress on Jewish pride and outreach. The context and climate of college campuses today creates an atmosphere ripe for religious exploration and involvement, providing a sense of community involvement and ties to a spiritual outlet (Levine and Cureton, 1998). The following section illustrates the role of the university in enhancing student learning through religion. Specifically, student affairs practitioners can use religion and spirituality to inform practice with students whose Jewish beliefs are a salient part of their identity.

Jewish Students in the American University: Implications for Student Affairs Practitioners

American colleges and universities have reported an increase in the number of students from religious minorities (Schlosser & Sedlacek, 2001). As a result, institutions of higher education must be sensitive to the needs and issues of their students (Temkins & Evans, 1998). Over 65 years ago, the Student Personnel Point of View (American Council on Education, 1937) indicated that moral and religious values are a significant component of a student's being. As the face of American Judaism evolves, student personnel must become actively aware of the institutional role in using religion to holistically develop students as integrated citizens of the university community and provide a framework for spiritual development (Temkin & Evans, 1998).

Research continues to demonstrate that religion plays an important role in the lives of college students and has a significant effect on moral and ethical development (Butler, 1989; Dillon, 1996). Religious involvement thus appears to provide rich opportunities for student development as a whole. However, as Temkin and Evans (1998) noted, "cooperation between student affairs staff and campus-based religious personnel...is virtually nonexistent" (p. 65). Collaboration between these two groups can foster relationships that contribute to a Jewish student's sense of belonging and meaning on a campus whose population is predominantly of another religion (Schlosser & Sedlacek, 1998; Temkin & Evans, 1998). For example, Jewish organizations can inform housing and dining personnel of traditions that may affect the life of students in the residence halls. Students may then be permitted to light Sabbath candles in their rooms under staff supervision as part of a religious observance or know what ingredients go into recipes at the dining halls.

Diamant and Cooper (1991) expand on this theme by emphasizing that a student may choose to matriculate at a college merely because of its ability to cater to the student's needs as a practicing Jew. Most colleges and

universities in metropolitan or suburban areas with high concentrations of Jews offer an academic track in Jewish Studies. Even if a student chooses not to major in such a field, one may take the opportunity to use such offerings to explore the academic and historical nature of Judaism and perhaps meet other Jewish classmates. Diamant and Cooper write that "Jewish academics are less important than Jewish social life for many students, who want information about the presence of other Jews on campus and the availability of Jewish social, cultural, and religious programs" (p. 160). As a result, many students tend to choose Jewish-affiliated universities or at least urban institutions, where Jewish communities tend to be larger and Jewish culture is stronger (Gose, 1999).

For student affairs professionals, this means that not all Jewish students are interested in a curricular examination of Judaism, but that they may merely need to connect with a group of students whose interests match theirs on different levels. Hillel, the International Foundation for Jewish Campus Life, offers on its website a comprehensive search of nearly 500 colleges and universities across the globe and offers contact information to prospective students (Hillel, 2003). Its professionals are a mixture of student affairs personnel, Jewish scholars, social workers, and grant-writers who advise students and offer weekly religious services, student offices, common areas and recreation facilities, kosher kitchens, and a number of student clubs (Jacobson, 2001). Temkin and Evans (1998) stipulate that in order to facilitate holistic growth, religious advisors must work with other campus student services to "enrich the quality and extent of programs for students" (p. 68). An environmental approach to working with religious minorities can make the campus climate more welcoming.

Conclusion

Today's practices on campus are informed by injustices throughout the history of American higher education. Student affairs professionals can use research and scholarly works to help Jewish students find a sense of belonging on a campus in which their religious values and traditions are not visibly accepted. Partnerships across functional areas are necessary to integrate the campus as a total living environment for students with Jewish lifestyles. As students find themselves more interested in exploring Jewish identity, the campus should provide the necessary resources for them - both academic and extracurricular - to begin to investigate how the university setting can enhance their moral and spiritual development.

A historical survey of Jewish students in American colleges and universities finds them caught between wanting to merely be an included part of the campus atmosphere and seeking an educational haven for Jewish thought and study. On mainstream campuses, integration into the student body actually began with an immersion into study and learning, which

paradoxically separated Jewish students from the rest of the population (Horowitz, 1987). As they gradually became accepted by others, Jews sought to embrace their individuality through the development of Jewish student groups and organizations (Steinberg, 1974). Organizations such as Hillel and Jewish-interest Greek organizations offer a network for students to find a community and place where they can find support for the values they uphold (Diamant & Cooper, 1991). Today, students have reached their goal of assimilation without sacrificing their religious practices.

On predominantly Jewish campuses, students have the experience of being in a religious majority whose traditions are explicitly supported by administration, academic departments, and fellow students. Students at Yeshiva University, Hebrew Union College, and the Conservative movement's Jewish Theological Seminary embrace the opportunity to publicly practice lifelong traditions and worship along with the rest of the student body. These unique institutions afford students a learning environment nearly free from anti-Semitism or persecution that historically prevented Jews from partaking in activities that campus life has had to offer.

Despite the difficulties, Jewish students have had throughout the history of American higher education, their contributions to individual campuses and to the face of American colleges and to universities in general are manifold. Consequently, Jewish students themselves have exploited the values of university learning to uplift and support American Judaism as a whole. Although the early colonial colleges offered few chances for a Jewish student to matriculate and learn, the various opportunities for Jewish students today allow them not only to choose a campus, but also to have the support of college or university administrators in addition to fellow students. Student affairs practitioners can better assist their Jewish students by partnering with other campus resources and offices to create an inviting and inclusive community.

References

American Council on Education (1937). *Student Personnel Point of View.* Washington, DC: Author.

Brandeis University (1954). *Brandeis University freshman handbook.* Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Publications.

Butler, J. (Ed.) (1989). *New directions for student services: Religion on campus* (No. 46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Canby, H.S. (1936). *Alma mater: The gothic age of the American college.* New York: Arno Press.

Diamant, A., & Cooper, H. (1991). *Living a Jewish life: Jewish traditions, customs, and values for today's families.* New York: Harper Collins.

Dillon, M. (1996). The persistence of religious identity among college Catholics. *Journal for the Specific Study of Religion,35*, 65-70.

Goldstein, I. (1951). *Brandeis University: Chapter of its founding.* New York: Bloch Publishing Company.

Gorelick, S. (1981). *City College and the Jewish poor.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Gose, B. (1999). Princeton tries to explain drop in Jewish enrollment. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(36), A47-48.

Greenspahn, F.E. (2000). The beginnings of Judaic studies in American universities. *Modern Judaism, 20*(2), 209-225.

Gurock, J.S. (1988). *The men and women of Yeshiva: Higher education, orthodoxy, and American Judaism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Halperin, E.C. (2001). The Jewish problem in U.S. medical education: 1920-1955. *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences, 56*(2), 140-167.

Hebrew Union College (2002). *About Hebrew Union College: History.* Retrieved March 18, 2002 from http://www.huc.edu/about/history.shtml

Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life (2003). *Guide to Jewish student life on campus.* Retrieved February 17, 2003 from http://www.hillel.org/hillel/

Horowitz, H.L. (1987). *Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the present.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Jacobson, J. (2001). The new Hillel: It's not just about praying anymore. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*(33), A49-50.

Levine, A., & Cureton, J.S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Meyer, M.A. (1976). In the days of Isaac Mayer Wise. In S.E. Karff (Ed.), *Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion at One Hundred Years* (pp. 7-49). Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.

Morison, S.E. (1936). *Three centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Oren, D.A. (1985). *Joining the club: A history of Jews and Yale.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Philipson, D. (1925). History of the Hebrew Union College. In D. Philipson (Ed.), *Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume, 1875-1925*(pp. 1-70). Cincinnati: Author.

Rosovsky, N. (1986). *The Jewish experience at Harvard and Radcliffe.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university.* New York: Knopf.

Sachar, A. L. (1995). *Brandeis University: A host at last.* Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press.

Schlosser, L.Z., & Sedlacek, W.E. (2001). *Religious holidays on campus: Policies, problems, and recommendations.* College Park, MD: University of Maryland Counseling Center.

Steinberg, S. (1974). *The academic melting pot: Catholics and Jews in American higher education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Steinberg, S. (1989). *The ethnic myth: Race, ethnicity, and class in America* (2nd ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Temkin, L., & Evans, N.J. (1998). Religion on campus: Suggestions for cooperation between student affairs and campus-based religious organizations. *NASPA Journal, 35*(5), 61-69.

Valerie B. Kolko graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in 2003 with an M.S. in Student Affairs Administration. She attended Brandeis University as an undergraduate and received a B.A. in American Studies in 2001. While at IU she worked as a Graduate Supervisor in the McNutt Residence Center.

Self-Efficacy and Student Leaders: The Effects of Gender, Previous Leadership Experiences, and Institutional Environment

Kristen J. Bardou, Shannon M. Byrne, Victoria S. Pasternak, Nikki C. Perez, and Amanda L. Rainey

This study assesses the self-efficacy of 188 undergraduate student leaders at a large, public, Research-I institution in the Midwest. Specifically, this study examines the impact of prior leadership experiences, gender, and perceptions of institutional support on student leaders' self-efficacy. Findings suggest that men and women differ in leadership self-efficacy and perception of their environment. Support and organizational type appear to impact self-efficacy, but past leadership experiences do not.

Introduction

On college and university campuses, students play an essential role in the development and implementation of policies, events, and campus climate (Astin, 1984; Kuh 1993a, 1993b, 2000; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Strange, 1996). Student leaders emerge and direct their peers in these efforts (Depp, 1993). In order to effectively promote development and growth in these student leaders, a student affairs practitioner must be educated about student leadership. Typically, student leadership theories focus on personality traits, innate abilities, established positions of authority, and leadership styles (Rost, 1991). In contrast to focusing on how students lead, this study considers leadership self-efficacy, a different and distinct approach in examining student leadership.

Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as the "belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (p. 3). Self-efficacy is highly domain specific (Pressley & McCormick, 1995) in that it can be unique and separate for specific tasks or situations (Bandura, 1997). Leadership self-efficacy ultimately determines how leaders behave, think, and become motivated to be involved with particular roles (Bandura, 1993, 1995, 1997). As a leader develops greater levels of self-efficacy, motivation to complete the specific task also increases (Pintrich & Schunk, 1995; Stage, 1996). Therefore, increased self-efficacy strengthens motivation which in turn influences a student's behavior to complete the given task. Though the main factors in the development of self-efficacy are based on personal experiences and continued participation in a particular activity (Bandura, 1993, 1995, 1997; Pajares, 1996; Stage, 1996), other factors such as gender (Depp, 1993; Mayo & Christenfeld, 1999) and institutional environment (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1996; Kuh, 2000) can also have strong effects.

This study assesses the impact of prior student leadership experiences, gender, and perceived institutional support on student leaders' self-efficacy. As a result of this study, student affairs practitioners can gain a greater understanding of the factors contributing to and the effects of self-efficacy on student leaders. In turn, student affairs practitioners can have more effective developmental interactions with the student leaders they advise, supervise, and mentor.

Literature Review

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy develops as an individual processes information from four sources: mastery experiences, vicarious learning, social persuasion, and intense psychological states (Bandura, 1986, 1995, 1997). Mastery experience occurs when an individual gains confidence in their ability for a specific task through increased participation in that task (Bandura, 1986, 1995, 1997; Depp, 1993). Individuals also develop self-efficacy beliefs through vicarious learning which occurs when students observe others performing a given task and then interpret those results as if they themselves had participated in the task (Bandura, 1986, 1995, 1997; Pajares, 1996; Stage, 1996). Further, self-efficacy beliefs are developed through social persuasion as the opinions of others cause the individual to reassess their beliefs regarding their capabilities in a particular situation (Bandura, 1997). Finally, psychological states, when emotional reactions such as anxiety or stress arise, affect the development of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996; Stage, 1996).

Ultimately, self-efficacy is important because it assesses the role of one's self-beliefs as it plays into the context of behavior (Stage, 1996). Specifically for college students, self-efficacy affects involvement by determining whether or not a student will aspire to become involved in an organization and take a leadership position (Stage, 1996). Further, perceptions of self-efficacy influence the amount of effort put forth on a specific task (Stage, 1996). Therefore, leadership self-efficacy has a strong impact on the actual leadership behaviors of student leaders (Depp, 1993; Stage, 1996).

Student Leadership

In order to describe student leadership, one must first define leadership. Rost (1991) posits that leadership is a characteristic of individuals and how they act in influencing others. Adding to this, Prince and Associates (1985) define leadership as "the process of influencing human behavior so as to accomplish the goals prescribed by the organizationally appointed leader" (p. 7). Further, the Higher Education Research Institute (1993) asserts that leadership is not just the behavior of a single individual, but rather is characterized by a collaborative relationship between the individual and those he or she is leading.

Though defining leadership as a characteristic is a difficult task, distinguishing someone as a leader proves to be just as challenging. Although anyone can be a leader (Higher Education Research Institute, 1993; Kouzes & Posner, 1995), positional leadership (leadership through an elected and/or appointed position) has been shown to be a predictor of actual leadership ability (Kezar & Moriarty, 2000). Student leaders who demonstrate leadership through the positional theory model are those most frequently referred to by their peers and campus administrators as leaders (Wielkiewicz, 2000).

As students learn and grow in their leadership abilities, their effectiveness as a leader increases (Depp, 1993; Endress, 2000; Posner & Rosenbergerg, 1997). Kouzes and Posner (1995) identified five practices of effective leaders: Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging the Heart. First, "Challenging the Process" can be characterized by seeking out opportunities to improve one's organization and one's self through experimentation and risk-taking. Next, leaders that "Inspire a Shared Vision" enlist others to embrace common goals. Third, "Enabling Others to Act" involves empowering others and encouraging collaboration. Kouzes and Posner's "Modeling the Way" involves setting an example for others through role modeling. Finally, "Encouraging the Heart" is characterized by motivating others through recognition of individual and group accomplishments (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Several researchers (Endress, 2000; Mayo & Christenfeld, 1999; Posner & Rosenberger, 1997) also focused on the aforementioned five leadership practices by conducting their own research using the operational definition of effective leadership established by Kouzes and Posner (1995). These studies using Kouzes and Posner's model lend credibility to the process of determining leaders' effectiveness by their successful use of the five leadership practices.

Leadership Self-Efficacy

Leadership self-efficacy is an important factor in becoming an effective leader (Stage, 1996). Self-efficacy has the capability to increase or decrease motivation (Bandura, 1993; Pintrich & Schunk, 1995; Stage, 1996). Specifically for student leaders, motivation serves as an important contributor to a leader's success, as students who are motivated "display interest in activities, persist at tasks, and typically use effective task[s] and cognitive skills" (Pintrich & Schunk, 1995, p. v). Ultimately, high self-efficacy promotes not only a vested interest in activities in which they are involved, but it also fosters a strong level of commitment to those activities (Bandura, 1993, 1997). As students become more motivated to work on a specific task, their self-efficacy for that task increases (Bandura, 1993, 1997; Stage, 1996).

Thus, a positive relationship exists between leadership self-efficacy and willingness to take on a leadership role (Endress, 2000; Posner & Rosenberger, 1997).

Leadership self-efficacy remains important as the student leader aspires to recognized leadership roles (Endress, 2000; Mayo & Christenfeld, 1999; Posner & Rosenberger, 1997). Kuh and Lund (1994) found that mere participation in campus leadership positions significantly impacts the level of leadership self-efficacy for student leaders. In addition, rating one's self as an effective leader seems to imply confidence in one's personal ability to be a good leader, thereby demonstrating high leadership self-efficacy (Depp, 1993; Endress, 2000). Despite a focus on high levels of self-efficacy, self-perceptions of performance level do not inherently represent actual performance of a given task (Mayo & Christenfeld, 1999), implying that high self-efficacy does not necessarily lead to better leadership. However, Mayo and Christenfeld (1999) also noted that long periods of low self-efficacy could negatively affect the actual performance of the task in the future. Therefore, low self-efficacy can lead to less effective leadership while high self-efficacy promotes more effective leadership (Depp, 1993; Endress, 2000; Mayo & Christenfeld, 1999).

Gender and Leadership Self-Efficacy

As previously stated, individuals develop self-efficacy through four specific processes (Bandura, 1986, 1995, 1997). These basic forms of self-efficacy development, however, do not consider input factors such as gender that may affect the way in which individuals develop their self-efficacy. Fixed traits such as gender have strong effects on many levels of student development, including self-efficacy (Astin, 1993; Depp, 1993; Leonard and Sigal, 1989; Mayo & Christenfeld, 1999).

A study by Mayo and Christenfeld (1999) found that women tend to have lower self-efficacy than men in their ability to perform specific leadership tasks. Depp's (1993) study found women to be more active in the community, but to have lower levels of self-efficacy. Further, this study found that men were less likely to be active in organizations, but actually held more leadership roles and had higher levels of leadership self-efficacy than women. According to Astin (1993) and Leonard and Sigal (1989), female students are reluctant to lead campus-wide student organizations and might not achieve their full potential as student leaders. Female student leaders struggle with being taken seriously, having to work harder than men to gain respect, being intimidated by male competitiveness, and fearing the loss of approval if they assert themselves (Leonard & Sigal, 1989). Further, women, in comparison to men, use leadership styles focusing on interpersonal interactions, encouragement of reciprocity and collective thoughts, empowerment of

others to act, and de-emphasis of hierarchical relationships within an organization (Astin & Leland, 1991). In addition, women tend to seek out high levels of involvement in their organizations but do not necessarily aspire to leadership roles as often as their male counterparts (Depp, 1993). When women do seek formal leadership roles, they are more likely to seek out stereotypical "female roles" in an organization, such as "secretary" rather than other positions of leadership (Depp, 1993). In summary, men and women have varied levels of leadership self-efficacy and leadership styles.

Environmental Factors on Self-Efficacy and Leadership

Failing to address the campus environment ignores an essential aspect of a student leader's self-efficacy (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Lewin (1936) posits that all aspects of the environment must be explored in order to gain a full perspective of a person's behavior. By gaining a clearer understanding of students' environment and their interaction with that environment, campus administrators can better understand their students' needs (Lewin, 1936). Additionally, Sanford (1966) theorizes that a student receiving appropriate levels of challenge and support from the university (via advising, programming, allocation of space, etc.) will be more likely to achieve their goals thereby developing higher levels of self-efficacy.

Student leaders who receive positive reinforcement from their environment develop heightened levels of self-efficacy and increased motivation, demonstrating that the university environment plays a significant role in a student leader's motivation, involvement, and self-efficacy (Schunk, 1996). Through deliberate attention to the design of the environment, student affairs professionals can help ensure that the student-environment interaction is not only healthy, but also conducive to student development and heightened leadership self-efficacy (Kuh, 2000; Strange, 1996). Thus, the university can provide accessible resources and support that enable students to achieve goals, improve their leadership skills, and develop heightened levels of self-efficacy (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1996; Kuh, 2000).

Hypothesis and research questions

As previously stated, the researchers seek to assess the self-efficacy of student leaders. Specifically, researchers designed this study to evaluate the following: the effect of gender on leadership self-efficacy, the effect of previous leadership experiences on leadership self-efficacy, and the effect of the campus environment on leadership self-efficacy.

Based upon the literature review, the researchers hypothesize that women will have lower leadership self-efficacy than men. Further, a positive relationship between the number of previous leadership experiences and leadership self-efficacy was anticipated. In addition, the researchers believe that there will be a positive relationship between positive perceptions of

university and advisor support with leadership self-efficacy.

Methods

Sample

Researchers invited 532 student leaders to participate in this study. The respondents consisted of 188 undergraduates at a large, public, Research-I institution in the Midwest. Respondents were one hundred women and 88 men, ranging from 18 to 30 years old. Student leaders were identified and asked to participate based upon their status with the Student Activities Office as a contact person for any registered student organization or as any elected/appointed officer of a campus student organization.

Instrument

Participants were given an online modified version of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) (Kouzes & Posner, 1998) that assesses leadership self-efficacy on an 11-point scale (Endress, 2000). Endress (2000) modified the existing SLPI to assess leadership self-efficacy and include an additional six questions that addressed participants' abilities to "Influence Others," the sixth practice of effective leadership. Statements were changed to address how well individuals thought they could or could not perform the particular task rather than the frequency with which they completed the task as in the original SLPI (Kouzes & Posner, 1998). This instrument was specifically chosen by the researchers because it directly measures the self-efficacy of student leaders. Furthermore, it has internal reliabilities between .88 and .95 (Endress, 2000).

Section II of the survey was developed by the researchers to gather information regarding the participants' perceptions of the organizational purpose, size, and amount of support their organization received from the university. Participants were asked to estimate the size of their respective organization and to identify on a 5-point Likert scale how well each of the following characteristics represents their organization: Academic and Professional, Activism, Arts and Theatre, Cultural, Governance, Greek, Honorary, Political, Programming and Support, Recreational and Club Sport, Religious, and Service. Questions also collected information about prior leadership experiences, previous leadership training, other leadership experiences, gender, age, and perceptions of support from their environment.

Procedure

This study utilized a web-based survey which asked participants to respond within five days. Student email contact information was collected from the Student Activities Office and organizational websites. Participants received a scripted, personalized email complete with their name and the name of their organization. Participants were tracked via their university

username and those failing to complete the initial survey later received a second invitation. The modified SLPI was scored to determine self-efficacy for each of the six leadership practices

One of the dependent variables in this experiment was self-efficacy. For each participant, a score was calculated for each area of effective leadership behavior. Individual scores were then grouped according to gender, previous leadership experiences, type of organization, and perceived environmental support. Independent T-tests analyses were used to assess the relationship between self-efficacy and the following factors: gender, leadership training, and organizational type. Correlations were then calculated to examine the relationship between perceived environmental support and self-efficacy. Finally, the relationship between gender and the perception of support and organizational type was analyzed using correlations and T-tests.

Limitations

Three major limitations were inherent within the study. First, the sample was dependent on self-reported information by students to the Student Activities Office which was outdated or inaccurate in several cases. Another limitation was that the study only considered student leaders who held positional leadership roles but excluded Resident Assistants and Orientation Assistants. Finally, the use of an online survey posed a challenge for access to technology and proper participant notification. However, the researchers had only limited concerns about this issue because the survey was distributed on a campus where access to technology is widespread and expected from all students.

Results

The findings suggest that student leaders generally tend to have high self-efficacy for leadership practices. Student leaders felt most confident in their ability to motivate others via Encouraging the Heart (M = 8.42) and reported lowest self-efficacy in Challenging the Process (M = 8.02). Most respondents had previously been involved in other organizations and participated in leadership training. Although all participants were confident in their abilities, men and women differed in leadership self-efficacy and in their perceptions of the environment. Further, support and organizational type seem to have some impact on self-efficacy, while past leadership experiences do not. The following section will report the findings of gender's impact on self-efficacy and perception of the environment, the impact of past leadership involvement and environmental variables on self-efficacy, along with how gender affects those variables.

Gender

It was hypothesized men would have higher levels of self-efficacy than

women. Contrary to previous research, women in this study tended to report equal or higher levels of self-efficacy (see Table 1). However, a t-test analysis indicated men and women differed significantly in self-efficacy for Modeling the Way. Women tend to have significantly higher levels of self-efficacy in this area with $t = 2.10$ ($p < .05$). This may be attributed to changes in leadership style and increasing participation of women in higher education. Further, men's scores seemed to vary more than women as noted by the differences in standard deviation (see Table 1).

Researchers also found that men and women varied in their perceptions of the environment on their self-efficacy. Using a five-point scale, participants were asked to rate how much they agreed with a statement concerning their perception of the campus environment in relation to their organization. On average, participants felt that their advisor supported the organization ($M = 4.21$) and encouraged leadership development ($M = 4.07$). However, men and women perceived these differently. As shown in Table 1, t-tests indicate that women feel more supported by their advisor than men ($t = 2.36$, $p < .05$) and were more likely to feel that their advisor encourages leadership development ($t = 2.18$, $p < .05$). Women tended to rate individual support higher than that from the general university as indicated by support variable means. They may place a higher value on the direct relationship with an advisor and feel more concrete support because of the closer relationship.

Table 1

Self-efficacy and Environmental Factors by Gender

	Female ($N = 100$)		Male ($N = 88$)		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Self-efficacy[a]					
Challenging the Process	8.13	1.08	7.90	1.22	1.38
Inspiring a Shared Vision	8.42	1.08	8.13	1.37	1.64
Enabling Others to Act	8.50	1.11	8.18	1.13	1.95
Modeling the Way	8.53	1.00	8.16	1.35	2.10*
Encouraging the Heart	8.55	1.02	8.28	1.14	1.65
Influencing Others	8.55	1.07	8.48	1.13	0.46
Environmental Variables[b]					
Advisor Support	4.38	1.01	4.02	1.06	2.36*
Advisor encourages leadership	4.25	1.18	3.88	1.17	2.18*
Redo leadership experience	4.32	1.20	4.31	1.05	0.08
Univ. support	4.09	1.06	3.81	1.20	1.72
Univ. promotion	3.47	1.40	3.17	1.32	1.50
Univ. provides resources	3.64	1.40	3.32	1.38	1.59
Organization well known	3.64	1.23	3.48	1.30	0.88
Univ. encourages leadership	4.01	0.99	3.82	1.00	1.33
Satisfied with Univ. leadership experience	4.21	0.94	4.05	1.02	1.16

* $p < .05$
[a] Responses based on an 11-point scale
[b] Responses based on a 5-point scale

Past Leadership Experience

Researchers determined past leadership experiences by number of high school organizations participated in during senior year in high school, number of leadership positions held in high school, and participation in leadership training. Because self-efficacy develops with practice (Bandura, 1986, 1995, 1997; Depp, 1993) it was hypothesized that past leadership experience would encourage higher levels of self-efficacy. The mean number of high school organizations individuals participated in was 3.39 ($N = 181$). The mean number of leadership positions held was 2.44 ($N = 183$). Due to the high frequency of leadership training among the participants, comparisons could not be made between those who received training and those who did not. Thus, levels of self-efficacy could not be attributed to leadership training.

Environmental Factors

The majority of participants responded that they would be the leader of their organization again (80.9 %) and a majority further replied that they were generally satisfied with their leadership experience (78.2 %). Correlation analyses indicated that there are positive relationships between the feeling that one's advisor encourages leadership development and leadership self-efficacy. Specifically, the more an individual agrees that his or her advisor encourages leadership development, the more capable that individual feels he or she can Inspire a Shared Vision ($r = .35$), Enable Others to Act ($r = .33$), and Model the Way ($r = .36$). A perception of support by an advisor seems to have a stronger impact than general university support. Further, satisfaction is also moderately correlated with leadership self-efficacy. The more an individual wants to repeat his or her leadership experience, the more likely that individual feels like he or she can Inspire a Shared Vision ($r = .43$), Model the Way ($r = .47$), Encourage the Heart ($r = .42$), and Influence Others ($r = .39$). The more likely an individual is satisfied with their leadership experience, the more likely that individual feels like he or she can Inspire a Shared Vision ($r = .41$), Encourage Others to Act ($r = .36$), Model the Way ($r = .38$), and Influence Others ($r = .35$). Students who are willing to repeat an experience may draw confidence from their previous or current experience, which affects their self-efficacy. Further, confidence in one's ability may be drawn from the satisfaction with relationships with others in the organizations or the organization's constituents. Many of the correlations seem to coincide with practices that involve including and incorporating others.

Gender also impacts the perceptions of environment. Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the impact of the perception of environmental support variables on self-efficacy for men and women as groups (See Table 2). Positive perceptions of support variables tended to correlate

Table 2

Correlations by Gender

	Challenging the Process		Inspiring a Shared Vision		Enabling Others to Act		Modeling the Way	
	Female (N=100)	Male (N=88)	Female (N=100)	Male (N=88)	Female (N=100)	Male (N=88)	Female (N=100)	Male (N=88)
Advisor support	.22*	.33**	.23*	.39**	.28**	.26*	.30**	.35**
Advisor encourages Leadership	.21*	.29**	.33**	.34**	.36**	.27*	.37**	.32**
Redo	.24*	.40**	.38**	.51**	.21*	.43**	.38**	.58**
Univ. support	.22*	.28**	.20*	.23*	.19	.27*	.23*	.31**
Univ. promotion	.24*	.05	.21*	.07	.20*	.00	.25*	.10
Univ. provides resources	-.02	.03	.03	-.05	.18	-.04	.04	.03
Organization well known	.22*	.08	.18	.20	.07	-.02	.23*	.16
Univ. encourages leadership	.27**	.27*	.19	.21*	.25*	.16	.27**	.20
Satisfied with univ. leadership experience	.16	.43	.28**	.51**	.24*	.42**	.25*	.47**
Size	.15	.10	.11	.17	-.04	.05	.07	.11
HS leadership (N_F=97; N_M=84)	.08	.15	.13	.16	.00	-.03	.18	.06
HS leadership positions (N_F=98; N_M=85)	-.01	.20	-.03	.24*	-.01	.21	.03	.25*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

with higher self-efficacy more for men than for women. Looking specifically at advisor support, the more men perceive that their advisor supports them, the more confidence they have in Challenging the Process (r = .33), Inspiring a Shared Vision (r =.39), Encouraging the Heart (r = .33) and Influencing Others (r = .37). Therefore, although women perceive support from their advisor more than men, it might be hypothesized that advisor support may have a greater impact on men.

Researchers investigated relationships between organizational type and level of leadership self-efficacy. Those in activist organizations tended to have higher leadership self-efficacy in Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, and Modeling the Way. Cultural organization participants tended to feel more confident in their ability to Encourage the Heart compared to those in other organizations. Those in professional organizations tended to have a higher leadership self-efficacy in Enabling Others to Act, Encouraging the Heart, and Influencing Others. Individuals involved in programming and support organizations demonstrated more confidence in Enabling Others. Members of service-related organizations tended to demonstrate higher levels of leadership self-efficacy in Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way, and Influencing Others (See Table 3). The different levels of self-efficacy among organizational

types may be a result of characteristics of the organizational type that coincide with particular leadership practices.

It is important to note that because participants could identify their organization with more than one characteristic, relationships between types of organizations may exist. Activism groups correlated with governance (r = .378), political (r = .413), and service organizations (r = .405). There was a correlation between organizations being identified as both professional and political (r = .370 as well as organizations identified as both programming and governance (r = .358). These findings are important in that some organizational types encouraged leadership self-efficacy more than others even though, to some degree, the different types represented the same organization. For example, there was a moderate positive correlation between activist and governance organizations, implying that at least some groups had components of both characteristics. At the same time, governance groups tended not to encourage self-efficacy as well as activist groups.

Discussion

In examining the results, several variables of leadership self-efficacy proved noteworthy. Specifically, results for gender, past leadership experiences, environmental support, and type of organization revealed the most

Table 3

Organizational Means and Standard Deviations

		Challenging the Process		Inspiring a Shared Vision		Enabling Others to Act		Modeling the Way	
	N	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Academic	95	8.18	1.08	8.38	1.19	8.47	1.12	8.40	1.18
Non-Acad.	93	7.86	1.20	8.19	1.26	8.22	1.12	8.31	1.20
Activist	108	8.17	1.08	8.45	1.10	8.44	1.07	8.53	1.04
Non-Act.	80	7.82	1.21	8.06	1.36	8.23	1.19	8.12	1.34
Cultural	61	8.13	1.20	8.37	1.20	8.53	1.09	8.49	1.17
Non-Cult.	127	7.97	1.12	8.24	1.24	8.26	1.13	8.29	1.20
Governance	103	8.07	1.11	8.27	1.21	8.32	1.12	8.41	1.13
Non-Gov.	85	7.97	1.20	8.30	1.26	8.39	1.14	8.28	1.26
Greek	63	8.09	1.18	8.34	1.30	8.17	1.20	8.42	1.19
Non-Greek	125	7.99	1.13	8.25	1.19	8.44	1.07	8.32	1.19
Political	60	8.12	1.23	8.40	1.31	8.34	1.24	8.39	1.39
Non-Poli.	128	7.98	1.11	8.23	1.19	8.35	1.06	8.34	1.09
Professional	88	8.19	1.04	8.46	1.04	8.54	1.02	8.47	1.17
Non-Prof.	100	7.88	1.22	8.13	1.36	8.18	1.18	8.25	1.20
Programming	126	8.04	1.07	8.31	1.10	8.52	0.99	8.47	0.98
Non-Prog.	62	7.98	1.29	8.22	1.46	7.99	1.29	8.11	1.51
Recreational	72	7.91	1.16	8.13	1.27	8.31	1.17	8.22	1.23
Non-Rec.	116	8.09	1.14	8.38	1.20	8.37	1.10	8.44	1.16
Service	127	8.12	1.03	8.46	1.06	8.51	1.03	8.51	1.05
Non-Service	61	7.82	1.34	7.92	1.46	8.01	1.24	8.03	1.38

essential findings. In general, the majority of student leaders had a positive sense of themselves in regards to leadership self-efficacy. One can assume that if student leaders are demonstrating high levels of self-efficacy, they must have a clear understanding of their role as a leader, and confidence in their own leadership abilities. Extrapolating from these findings, student affairs professionals need to understand and incorporate this strong sense of self-efficacy to challenge and support organizational leaders. As this study demonstrates, student leaders feel that they excel as leaders and perform leadership tasks to the best of their ability. Advisors can utilize this information to help student leaders continue to develop in aforementioned six areas of leadership and to challenge the students to exceed beyond their current abilities.

Gender

The relationships between gender and leadership self-efficacy provide the next point of interest from the findings. In a marked improvement from past research (1970s-1990s), women in this study demonstrated gains in leadership self-efficacy. In this study, women were found to have significantly higher levels of self-efficacy than men. One potential rationale for this improvement in women's leadership self-efficacy could reside in the growing majority of women in institutions of higher learning. Because college and universities generally have a higher percentage of women in recent years (Brimelow, 2000), leadership opportunities in college can offer women experiences that will help them build their leadership self-efficacy and skills for the future. By developing high leadership self-efficacy in college, where the climate for women is more comfortable, female leaders are better preparing themselves for future leadership roles in the non-academic environment. Therefore, student affairs practitioners can significantly influence women's leadership development through intentional mentoring throughout their college years.

In directly comparing the six leadership practices, women's self-efficacy for Modeling the Way was statistically higher than that of men. This characteristic of leadership is defined as setting an example for others through role-modeling (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). In agreement with other literature, women often describe their leadership style as being based upon relationships that have been formed between themselves and individuals in an organization (Romano, 1996). Previous research also suggests that women are more relationship-oriented, non-hierarchical and concerned with sharing power and information (Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990). This leadership practice enables women to build strong personal relationships and role-model behaviors to other members of the group.

Past Leadership Experiences

The researchers hypothesized that students with the most previous leadership experiences would demonstrate higher levels of leadership self-efficacy. Based upon the development of self-efficacy through mastery experiences (Bandura, 1986, 1995, 1997; Depp, 1993), it follows that students with the most previous experiences would have the highest self-efficacy. However, the findings do not support this notion. In this study, participants ranked their levels of leadership self-efficacy as very high across all six practices, thus indicating that all participants, regardless of the amount of previous leadership experiences, had very high levels of leadership self-efficacy. Because of the high level of involvement in previous leadership experiences of all participants, perhaps it is not the sheer number of experiences, but the inherent quality of those leadership experiences that most affect the development and level of leadership self-efficacy. Keeping this in mind, student affairs practitioners should encourage all students, regardless of their past record of leadership experiences, to take on leadership roles. Results of this research indicate that all students, both those with high and low levels of previous involvement, have high levels of leadership efficacy and thus can all be confident leaders.

Environmental Factors

In comparing leadership self-efficacy with environmental factors, women believed there was more of a support structure for them in the form of advisor encouragement and support of the organization. For student affairs professionals this information is beneficial in showing that women feel supported and encouraged as student leaders. Ultimately advisors need to continue to acknowledge their important role in mentoring student leaders of both genders throughout their leadership development process.

While students had high self-efficacy in the six leadership practices, Challenging the Process had the lowest means. Since all six leadership practices are essential for effective leadership (Endress, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Posner & Rosenberger, 1997), perhaps advisors of student organizations and university student activities departments need to focus more energy on helping student leaders develop their competency in Challenging the Process through intentional support and formal training exercises in this area. Based upon this research, student affairs practitioners should note the inherent importance of being an active advisor in supporting student organizations and encouraging leadership for students.

Student affairs practitioners might find it significant to examine the different types of student organizations and the different levels of leadership efficacy that each supports. Leaders of activist organizations are the only participants to indicate a statistically higher level of self-efficacy for Chal-

lenging the Process. As a whole, all participants ranked Challenging the Process as the aspect of leadership in which they have the lowest self-efficacy. Student affairs practitioners should analyze the ways in which activist organizations enhance this aspect of leadership so that they can then encourage student leaders of other types of organizations to use similar methods to improve their own abilities in Challenging the Process. Additionally, it seems that leaders of all types of student organizations feel high levels of self-efficacy for different aspects of the six leadership practices. Future research should evaluate the ways in which organizational type affects leadership self-efficacy and effective leadership behaviors.

References

Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(7), 297-308.

Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Astin, H.S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliff, NJ: Cambridge Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*, 117-148.

Bandura, A. (1995). (Ed). *Self-efficacy in changing societies.* NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* NY: Freeman.

Bloland, P.A., Stamatakos, L.C., & Rogers, R.R. (1996). Redirecting the role of student affairs to focus on student learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 217-226.

Brimelow, P. (2000, October 2). The missing men. *Forbes, 166*(9).

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

Depp, M.J. (1993). Leadership self-efficacy and community involvement. (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International.*

Endress, W.L. (2000). An exploratory study of college student self-efficacy for relational leadership: The influence of leadership education, co-curricular involvement, and on-campus employment. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International.*

Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Higher Education Research Institute. (1993). *A social change model for leadership development.* College Park, MD: National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs at the University of Maryland College Park.

Kezar, A., & Moriarty, D. (2000, January/February). Expanding our understanding of student leadership development: A student exploring gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(1), 55-69.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1998). *Student leadership practices inventory.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. (1993a). In their own words: What students learn outside the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(2), 277-304.

Kuh, G. (1993b). Ethos: Its influence on student learning. *Liberal Education, 79*(4), 22-31.

Kuh, G.D. (2000). Understanding campus environments. In M.J. Barr, M.K. Desler, & Associates. *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed.) (pp. 50-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G.D. & Lund , J.P. (1994). What students gain from participating in student government. In M.C. Terrell, & M.J.Cuyjet (Eds.) (1994). *Developing Student Government Leadership* (pp. 5-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leonard, M.M., & Sigal, B.A. (1989). Empowering women student leaders: A leadership development model. In C.S. Pearson, D.L. Shavlik, & J.G. Touchton (Eds.), *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education* (pp. 230-249). New York: Macmillan.

Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. In K.A. Carter & G.S. McClellan (2000), An overview of relevant theories and models for student affairs practice. In M.J. Barr, M.K. Desler & Associates. *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed.) (pp. 231-248). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mayo, M.W., & Christenfeld, N. (1999, April). Gender, race, and performance expectations of college students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling, 27*(2), 93-105.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66*, 543-578.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pintrich, P.R. & Schunk, D.H. (1995). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Posner, B.Z. & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 231-237.

Posner, B.Z., & Rosenberger, J. (1997, Fall). Effective orientation advisors are also leaders. *NASPA Journal, 35*(1), 46-56.

Pressley, M. & McCormick, C.B. (1995) *Advanced educational psychology for educators, researchers, and policymakers.* New York: HarperCollins.

Prince, H.T. & Associates (Eds.). (1985). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). West Point, NY: United States Military Academy.

Romano, C.R. (1996, November/December). A qualitative study of women student leaders. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(6), 676-683.

Rosener, J.B. (1990, November/December), Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(6) 119-125.

Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century.* New York: Praeger.

Sanford, N. (1966). Self and society. In N.J. Evans, D.S. Forney, & F. Guido-BiBrito (1998), *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schunk, D.H. (1996, April). *Self-efficacy for learning and performance.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED394663).

Strange, C. (1996). Dynamics of campus environments. In S. Komives, D. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed.) (pp. 244-268). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stage, F.K. (1996). Setting the context: Psychological theories of learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*, 227-235.

Wielkiewicz, R.M. (2000, May/June). The leadership attitudes and beliefs scale: An instrument for evaluating college students' thinking about leadership and organizations. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(3), 337-349.

Kristen Bardou graduated from the HESA master's program in 2003. At Indiana University, Kristen worked as a Resident Leadership Specialist for Residential Programs and Services, a graduate intern at Student-Athlete Services, and a co-instructor for U459 Leadership Essentials. She received a B.A. in Religion and History from Denison University in 1999 and then spent two years at Earlham College as the Men's and Women's Assistant Cross Country and Track Coach.

Shannon Byrne graduated from Indiana University-Bloomington in May 2003 with a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs. She received a B.S. in Environmental Policy from the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay in 2001. During her time at Indiana University Shannon worked as a Graduate Supervisor in Eigenmann Residence Center and as a practicum student in the Office of Orientation Programs.

Vicky Pasternak graduated with a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in 2003. Prior to graduate school Vicky was the Assistant Director of Graduate Admission at Marquette University. While at Indiana, Vicky held an assistantship as a Graduate Supervisor in the Wright Quadrangle and worked in the Office of Student Ethics as a judicial officer. Vicky received her B.A. in Communication Studies in 1998 from Marquette University.

Nikki Perez has a B.A. in Mathematics-Secondary Education from the University of California, San Diego and received a Master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in May 2003. During her graduate study, Nikki has served as a graduate supervisor for Briscoe Residence Center and co-convened committees for the Commission on Multicultural Understanding.

Amanda Rainey graduated in May 2003 with a Master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University. While at IU, Amanda worked as a graduate supervisor for Residential Programs and Services, and also served year-long practica with the Student Activities Office in Greek Life and for the Association of College Unions International (ACUI). Prior to her time at IU, Amanda obtained her Bachelor of Science in Education for Secondary Education Social Studies from Southeast Missouri State University.

Here today, gone tomorrow? A Historical and Contemporary Analysis of Black Student Participation and Affirmative Action Policy in Higher Education

Ontario S. Wooden

This paper reviews literature on Black student participation in higher education and how affirmative action programs have impacted it. Trends in Black student participation at predominantly White institutions and historically Black colleges and universities form the historical foundation for this piece. The evolution of affirmative action in employment and higher education is introduced and explored. Further, legal cases challenging affirmative action are reviewed. The paper concludes with recommendations for higher education practice and directions for future research.

Introduction

The 1960s sparked increased involvement by the federal government in numerous social issues. Believing that Blacks needed "equality as a result," President Lyndon B. Johnson shifted the widely accepted American concept of equality of opportunity to one that meant government would guarantee opportunities through preferential policies for Blacks and later, other racial minorities and women (Rai & Critzer, 2000). One of the most famed of Johnson's policies was affirmative action. Since its inception, affirmative action policy has been altered numerous times and is defined differently by a myriad of groups. Currently, affirmative action policies have come under fire in both the employment and educational arenas. While the roots of affirmative action lie in the employment arena, the discussion of affirmative action in this paper will focus on its relationship with higher education.

First, the early enrollment trends of Black students at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) will be reviewed, followed by a discussion of the founding and subsequent enrollment of Blacks at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Second, this paper will move toward an understanding of the initial purposes of affirmative action in employment and its introduction into higher education settings. Third, the paper will transition to a discussion of the pros and cons of affirmative action, citing arguments from both camps. Fourth, legal challenges surrounding the use of affirmative action in college and university admissions will be explored. Finally, the paper will conclude with a discussion and analysis, as well as a presentation of implications relative to the future participation of Blacks in higher education.

Literature Review

History of Black Higher Education in America

With the founding of Harvard College in 1636 in Cambridge, Massa-

chusetts (Rudolph, 1990), Blacks and women were excluded from participation in higher education. Harvard's student body was comprised of White, upper class men. Not only was this the case at Harvard, it was also true at all PWIs during this time period. It was not until Alexander Lucius Twilight earned a degree from Middlebury College in 1823 that Blacks began to enter higher education (Bennett, 1993).

A few institutions of secondary and higher education for Blacks were organized in the antebellum years. Cheyney University in Pennsylvania, founded in 1837 as the Institute for Colored Youth, has the earliest founding date of an HBCU. Although for most of its early history it offered only elementary and high school level instruction (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Two other colleges for Blacks were also founded before the Civil War: Lincoln University in Pennsylvania (1854) and Wilberforce University in Ohio (1856) (Fleming, 1984; Lucas, 1994). However, the first great expansion in Black higher education came after the Civil War, during the widening opportunities of the Reconstruction era of American history (Anderson, 1999).

During the Reconstruction era (1863-1877), educational provisions were enacted into the new state constitutions with the aid of Black legislators (Spring, 2001). For the first time in Southern history, universal education was recognized as a right of all citizens. Most states set up school funds, which frequently required Blacks to pay special taxes in addition to those required of all citizens (Dyer, 1989). Of the 17 Southern states that mandated racially segregated education during the Jim Crow era, a period of strict separation of Blacks and Whites in the South, 14 simply refused to establish state-supported colleges for Black students until Congress required them to do so in the 1890 Morrill-McComas Act, which required states with dual systems of higher education (all-White and all-Black) to provide land-grant institutions for both systems (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

As a result, the number of HBCUs increased modestly. Unfortunately, the institutions that were established were colleges only in name and did not meet the requirements to teach agriculture, mechanical arts, and liberal education on a collegiate level (Rudolph, 1990). According to the Bureau of Education, in 1916 Black land-grant colleges had almost no students enrolled in college-level curricula (Anderson, 1999; Hoffman, Snyder, & Sonnenberg, 1996). By 1935, Black collegiate enrollments in the Southern states had risen to 12,600, while Black enrollment in Black private colleges nationally was almost 17,000. These enrollment numbers still represented only a small percentage of the country's Black population (Lucas, 1994).

While the improvements that stemmed from the Morrill Land Grant Act showed physical change due to improving campus conditions for Blacks, psychologically the country still viewed "separate but equal" as an acceptable idea. The Supreme Court's *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of 1896

declared that Blacks and Whites could not attend the same schools (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). This doctrine would stand unchallenged for over 40 years. As Blacks started to understand the reality of the inequities, they began to demand equality in educational arenas. Between 1945 and 1954, the "separate but equal" doctrine began to be overturned in graduate and professional schools. Equality, in a sense, was gained in public elementary and secondary school education with the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas* decision in 1954 (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Fleming, 1984; Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

In 1964, there were an estimated 15,000 Blacks enrolled in PWIs in the South, which was a fourfold increase since 1957. Despite this increase, by 1965, only 4.8% of all college students in the country were Black (Bowen & Bok, 1998). Remarkably, Lucas (1994) reports, Black undergraduates in the North had increased from 45,000 in 1954 to around 95,000 in 1967-68. From 1965 to 1970, Black enrollment at PWIs in the South more than tripled. At the same time, enrollments of Blacks at HBCUs had dropped from 82% of all college-attending Blacks to 60% between 1965 and 1970; it had further declined to 40% by 1978 (Lucas, 1994). Black student enrollment as a percentage of all undergraduate student attendance rose after the mid-sixties. By 1971, the figure was 8.4% and in 1977 it was 10.8%. Between 1967 and 1974, Black enrollment in PWIs increased 160%, compared to a 34% increase at HBCUs (Lucas, 1994).

Towards an Understanding of Affirmative Action

By the 1960s, Black students had been participating in higher education for a number of decades. However, those participation levels were not proportionate to Black representation in society at large. The introduction of affirmative action programs in higher education would increase Black student participation rates to unprecedented levels. The phrase "affirmative action," which is defined as taking positive steps to remedy a problem, first became associated with race relations in the United States when President John F. Kennedy used it in a 1961 civil rights speech (Lemann, 1997). The term had been the idea of Hobart Taylor, a popular Detroit businessman who had charged former Supreme Court Justices Arthur Goldberg and Abe Fortas with preparing a document to address discrimination in the hiring of federal contractors. This document was initially known as Executive Order 10925 (Lemann, 1997).

Governmental reform to advance racial justice was not a totally new idea. An executive order signed in 1941 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt forbid racial discrimination in federal contracting, and after World War II, the U.S. military had been ordered to end racial segregation in the armed service (Brown, 1996). In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed Executive

Order 11246, which required federal contractors to increase the number of minority employees as an affirmative step toward remedying the underrepresentation of minorities in those firms (Brown, 1996; Tatum, 1997). However, it was Kennedy's use of the phrase "affirmative action" that began to garner public attention. Interestingly enough, Tatum acknowledges, "though Executive Order 11246 required affirmative action, it did not specify exactly what affirmative action programs should look like" (p. 117). Because of this lack of specificity, it is not surprising that there remains great variety in the ways affirmative action programs operate around the country.

Brown (1996) asserts that the use of affirmative action allows members of all backgrounds and genders to have the potential to succeed if the opportunity presents itself. She contends that a diverse environment is crucial to the existence of higher education, as colleges set the standards for other institutions to follow. Brown further argues:

> Colleges and universities are the principal institutions in which America's future professional leaders and role models are educated and shaped. And lest we forget the higher education community had historically served as the nation's conscience, holding its own members and the larger community of citizens to higher standards of intellectual achievement and social justice (p. 12).

Trent (1991) defines affirmative action programs and strategies as those targeted at Blacks, Mexican Americans, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, and women. These programs are employed by colleges and universities to encourage minorities to apply and enroll. Many affirmative action programs serve only to ensure that institutions do not discriminate in a negative manner against certain groups. "Leveling the playing field," as it is called, seeks to ensure that merit determines whether some groups are included or excluded in admissions processes. However, there are still affirmative action programs that try to increase the number of individuals that represent certain groups. This approach to diversity is intended to include groups that have been historically excluded or underrepresented from various types of institutions (Thomas, 2000).

Misconceptions about Affirmative Action

Numerous misconceptions have arisen during the ongoing debate about affirmative action. Chang, Witt-Sandis, and Hakuta (1999) address four popular misconceptions. The first misconception is that "Past inequalities in access and opportunities that racial and ethnic minority groups have suffered have been sufficiently addressed and no longer require attention" (p. 13). While research by Trent (1999) has shown that intervention by national, state, and campus leaders toward addressing underrepresentation and success of minority groups in higher education has made some progress,

much remains to be done.

The second misconception is that test scores can define merit. On the contrary, Wightman (1999) contends that standardized tests are far from being infallible and comprehensive in their measures of merit. Further, she argues that a combination of ability, talent, and motivation, which are immeasurable by standardized tests, are the real factors that determine who will be successful in college. Likewise, Sedlacek (1996) offers a set of noncognitive variables that institutions may consider during admissions processes. These variables include understanding and dealing with racism, availability of support systems, successful leadership experience, community service, and knowledge acquired in a field, just to name a few. In addition to test score and academics, noncognitive variables, to a large extent, determine who will and will not succeed in college.

The third misconception is that fairness is best achieved through race-neutral policy. Levin (1999) claims that racism exists today and has always existed in the United States on individual, institutional, and societal levels. She contends, "Using the same standards to judge individuals from majority and minority groups is unfair because differences in power prevent the two groups from having equal opportunity" (p. 14). Further, Bowen and Bok (1998) found in their study of admissions data from selective schools that if Black students had been admitted in the same proportions as Whites with similar SAT scores, Blacks would have constituted only 3.9% of the entering class at the schools studied. This represents a decrease of between 50% and 70%.

The fourth, and final misconception offered by Chang, Witt-Sandis, and Hakuta (1999) is that diversity programs only benefit students of color. Milem (1999) reports numerous findings that support the idea that all students benefit from diversity programs. For example, he discusses the inclusive benefits of cross-cultural interactions, which lead to acceptance of those from other cultures, civic participation, increased retention rates, and a greater commitment to racial understanding. Milem's research also shows that individuals who experience desegregation in grades K-12 later seek desegregation in college, social settings, and careers.

Opposing Viewpoints of Affirmative Action

Affirmative action debates have endured since the inception of efforts to systematically open doors of education for members of groups that have experienced long-standing and persistent discrimination (Chang, 1999). When colleges and universities formulated race-related admissions policies in the 1960s, there were two intended objectives: (1) to create a diverse educational environment and (2) to prepare larger numbers of minority students to enter the mainstream of American life (Falsetti, 1999).

University of Georgia President Michael Adams (as cited in Shearer, 2000) argued, "Maintaining a diverse student body is a question of justice; therefore justice compels us to help this state to find a way to serve all of its citizens educationally" (p. 1). He added that having a diverse student body is important to prepare students for the increasingly multicultural world in which they will work and live (Shearer, 2000). These statements supported his decision to continue to use race as a factor in admissions. However, in *Johnson v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia* (2001), the court ruled that race could no longer be used as a factor in admissions. The race-based admissions policy is also in question at the University of Virginia. The Washington-based Center for Equal Opportunity brought admissions policies under fire at the institution in January 1999. The Center claimed that a Black student with the same SAT scores as a White student has an unfair advantage in gaining admission to the University, merely because of his or her skin color (Gopalan, 1999).

Opponents of affirmative action feel that race-based admissions policies discriminate against majority students, who subsequently feel unfairly bypassed (Heilman, 1996). These claims have led to challenges in the courts. Thus, a consequence of the litigious attitude of today's society is that many schools are turning their backs on minority students in the admissions process. For instance, officials at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst revamped their admissions process, to decrease the likelihood of legal challenges, thereby decreasing educational access for Black students. Chancellor David Scott explained that the current political climate, created by court decisions striking down race-sensitive admissions policies in many states, served as the catalyst for the University's decision. University representatives admitted that, under the new admissions plan, minority enrollment will likely plummet to as low as 13% of the University's student enrollment from its current 19% (Bennefield, 1999).

In addition, some opponents assert that affirmative action programs place Black students in rigorous academic positions, where they are unable to compete. These students eventually drop out of school, which leads many to think that affirmative action has a hindering effect on Black students (Cross, 1998). Heilman (1996) stated that affirmative action breeds a stigma of incompetence among the individuals for whom these programs were intended to benefit. Her research has shown that inferences of incompetence were found from association with affirmative action whether the individuals were students, working people, or racial minorities.

Legal Challenges to Affirmative Action in Higher Education

While affirmative action programs were initially designed to increase the number of minority persons allowed to enter educational programs, the

policies pose delicate legal questions (Kaplin & Lee, 1997). Affirmative action in higher education has taken center stage in recent years, with a plethora of court cases that address college and university admissions practices and the value of diversity. Additionally, countless headlines emphasizing the politicization of the issue and the surrounding debate have created the current climate for affirmative action (Coleman, 2002). The onslaught of legal action regarding race-based admissions policies has led to additional challenges. Cases have been filed challenging college admissions policies in many states across the country. In some instances, decisions have been made that support the notion that minority students do not deserve a seat in academic arenas based solely on their race.

The Supreme Court has decided that it will revisit its 1978 decision in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, which prohibited racial quotas, but allowed universities to consider race as one factor among many in the pursuit of diversity (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Shaw, 2000). The Medical School of the University of California at Davis had two admissions programs for its entering class of 100 students: the regular admissions program and the special admissions program (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978). Under the regular procedure, candidates whose overall undergraduate grade point averages fell below 2.5 on a scale of 4.0 were immediately rejected. About one out of six applicants was then given an interview, following which he or she was rated on a scale of 1 to 100 by each of the committee members. The student's rating was based on the interviewers' summaries, overall grade point average, science courses grade point average, Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT) scores, letters of recommendation, extracurricular activities, and other biographical data, all of which resulted in a total "benchmark score" (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke,* 1978). The admissions committee then made offers of admission on the basis of its review of the applicant's file and his or her score, considering and acting upon applications as they were received. The committee chairman was responsible for placing names on the waiting list and had discretion to include persons with "special skills" (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978).

In both 1973 and 1974, special applicants were admitted with significantly lower scores than Bakke's. After his second rejection, he filed a lawsuit in state court for mandatory admission to UC-Davis, alleging that the special admissions program operated to exclude him on the basis of race in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, a provision of the California Constitution. Additionally, he suggested that the committee had violated Article 601 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which provides that no person shall, on the ground of race or color, be

excluded from participating in any programs receiving federal financial assistance (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978).

The trial court found that the special program operated as a racial quota, because minority applicants in that program were rated only against one another, and 16 places in a class of 100 were reserved for them (Kaplin & Lee, 1997). Declaring that UC-Davis could not take race into account in making admissions decisions, the program was held in violation of the Federal and State Constitutions and Title VI. In spite of this ruling, Bakke's admission was not initially ordered, for lack of proof that he would have been admitted had the special program not existed. The California Supreme Court concluded that the special admissions program was not the least intrusive means of achieving the goals of the compelling state interests of integrating the medical profession and increasing the number of doctors willing to serve minority patients (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 1978). Without passing on the state constitutional or federal statutory grounds, the court held that UC-Davis could not satisfy its burden of demonstrating that Bakke, absent the special program, would not have been admitted, and the court ordered his admission to UC-Davis (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke,* 1978).

The 5th Circuit Court ruled in another landmark case, *Hopwood v. State of Texas* (1996), in which Cheryl Hopwood and three other students disputed their rejection by the University of Texas Law School. The students were successful as the court ruled that the institution could not use different standards for minority applicants from those it uses for White applicants. One of the strengths of the case says Terral Smith, the lawyer who filed the case, is that Hopwood is "a real victim, the sort of person affirmative action should help" (Gwynne & Cray, 1996, p. 54). Hopwood, who came from a blue-collar family, was offered a few partial scholarships, including one to Princeton, but still could not afford to go to law school. Instead, she attended California State University, married a serviceman, worked as an accountant, and was raising a child with cerebral palsy when she applied to the University of Texas law school. Her Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) scores were strong enough to qualify for the pool of minority and disadvantaged applicants. But, charged Smith, "They take the last 60 White kids and make places for minority students" (p. 54). Smith's comment supports the notion that academically talented White applicants and disadvantaged Black applicants normally receive a seat in the University of Texas law school, while applicants with other circumstances are not granted any special considerations.

The court agreed that Hopwood is "a fair example of an applicant with a unique background...her circumstances would bring a different perspective

to the law school" (Gwynne & Cray, 1996, p. 54). This statement endorses the idea that other types of "diversity" are valid for colleges and universities to consider. And later in the decision, it states, "A university may properly favor one applicant over another because of his ability to play the cello, make a downfield tackle, his relationship to alumni or his economic or social background" (Gwynne & Cray, p. 54). However, the court concluded that schools must "scrutinize applicants individually, rather than resorting to the dangerous proxy of race" (Gwynne & Cray, p. 54). Kaplin and Lee (1997), assert that the case calls into question the continuing validity of the *Bakke* line of cases. The Supreme Court's refusal to review this case raised questions about how to lawfully create admissions policies that take affirmative action into consideration.

In the most recent ruling on affirmative action and college admissions, Judge Bernard Friedman, in the University of Michigan law school case, surprised many leaders and legal experts when he contradicted another district judge, who just three months earlier had ruled that the University of Michigan's undergraduate school could lawfully continue using race as a factor in admissions. In the fall of 1997, the Center for Individual Rights filed two class-action lawsuits on behalf of White students who were denied admission to the University of Michigan's undergraduate and law school programs (Alger, 1999). Based on information garnered by a professor that demonstrates that higher standards are required for the admission of White students, the suit alleges that the University uses different standards for admitting White and minority students. However, the University claims that these standards are representative of its commitment to affirmative action (Alger, 1999).

Judge Friedman, appointed to the bench in 1988 by former President Ronald Reagan, ruled that diversity is not a compelling state interest. He added that if it was a state interest, Michigan's admissions system was not narrowly tailored. Thus, it is targeting a specific group or interest, in this case Black students. He also ruled that there was no evidence of past or present discrimination by the law school to justify the use of race as a factor in admissions. He rejected the University's argument that race was simply one of many factors used in admissions and said the law school admissions policy has created the functional equivalent of a quota system with a strong emphasis on race.

Friedman also rejected the argument that affirmative action is necessary to compensate for past discrimination and wrote that such a rationale ignores a person's individual history. There has been a "long and tragic history of race discrimination in this country," Friedman wrote, but that does not justify using race as a standard in the law school's admissions process

(Lords, 2001). However, in the meantime, many institutions are faced with the dilemma of assuring diversity on campus, while avoiding legal action for doing so.

Interpretation and Analysis

Blacks have had to deal with legal, administrative, and rhetorical attacks on affirmative action in both education and general society. As the debate over affirmative action continues, many issues still need to be addressed. These issues include the historical gaps and inequities in Black student participation in higher education. Second, diversity and its relevance to higher education outcomes must be addressed. Finally, a discussion needs to be held on a viable future for affirmative action programs.

Cross (1994) notes, "For the first two and a half centuries of the life of our country, Black people were virtually shut out from access to higher education" (p. 52). This statement indicates the lack of participation of Blacks during the founding of American institutions of higher education. The small number of Blacks that graduated from PWIs during the 1820s was definitely not in proportion with the presence of Blacks in society at large. In fact, up until 1900, less than 100 Blacks had earned degrees from PWIs, while at the same time, 500 had received degrees from HBCUs (Bennett, 1993; Lucas, 1994). These degrees from HBCUs were conferred in spite of obvious issues such as funding, poor physical plant, and underprepared teachers. During the period of "separate but equal," the development of the HBCUs was important to Black students. This importance was obvious because in 1940, 90% of all Black degree holders had received their degrees from HBCUs (Davis, 1998). To date, Black student participation has increased, but continues to lag behind that of Whites. "In view of this history, most fair-minded people would agree that there is a strong moral case for establishing a period of university admissions that confers advantage on Black people" (Cross, 1994, p. 52).

Affirmative action programs and the influx of Black students at PWIs have, without a doubt, contributed to the diversity of institutions of higher education. Thus, by 1987, Black students were more likely to matriculate at PWIs than at HBCUs (Lucas, 1994). After a decline in representation from 9.4% in 1976 to 8.8 % in 1984, Blacks increased their representation among all college students to 10.1% by 1994. In 1994, Black enrollment at all postsecondary institutions was 1,448,208 and 230,162 of these students were enrolled in HBCUs (Nettles & Perna, 1997). In 1997, Black participation in higher education had reached 1,532,800 students, 11% of all students enrolled (Snyder, 2001). Wilds (2000) recorded that in 1998, 85.6% of Black students in higher education were enrolled in PWIs.

As mentioned earlier, Milem's (1999) research has proven that all

students benefit from a diverse learning environment. Further, Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1999) describe the psychological climate for students on college campuses that involve feelings of comfort, inclusion, and a campus commitment to positive racial relationships. In an academic setting, it is an asset to have numerous different backgrounds represented, as it allows for a more complete worldview. A diverse campus environment also challenges students to view a situation or an issue, not only through their own lens, but also through the lens of others.

Milem and Hakuta (2000), present four findings of their research on diverse learning environments. Diversity enriches the educational experience, it promotes personal growth as well as healthy society, it strengthens communities and the workplace, and it enhances America's economic competitiveness. Without a doubt, the aforementioned points are definitely attained in diverse learning and work environments. These facts also contribute to the idea that Black students are needed at PWIs in order to diversify (academically and socially) the environment. However, Hurtado, et al., (1999) warn that increasing the racial/ethnic diversity on a campus without addressing the changed racial climate, can result in difficulties for all students on college campuses. This is significant because institutions must do more than just get Black students on campus; there must also be programming and support/advising systems in place to respond to their needs and interests.

Further, Darity (2000) contends that affirmative action has only been in effect for 25 years, and today it is being drastically rolled back. He continues to say that instead of pretending that racism is no longer present and certain individuals no longer suffer from it, affirmative action programs should be strengthened and policies should be implemented that directly address the racial gap in wealth. The fact that Black enrollment in higher education lags behind Black representation in the population indicates that reverse discrimination is not a solid foundation on which to place the arguments against affirmative action. However, the Supreme Court will render a decision relative to the future of affirmative action programs on college and university campuses across the country.

Should the Court rule against affirmative action programs, the participation of Blacks in higher education would be significantly impacted. The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education (JBHE) (1997) illustrates the realities of Black student enrollments after affirmative action programs were eliminated in Maryland, Texas, and California. After a scholarship program for Blacks was found to be unconstitutional, the University of Maryland allowed all students to apply for the scholarship. Surprisingly, the number of Black students receiving the scholarship remains the same as it was before the Court ruled the program unconstitutional. However, the court's decision was

also applicable in the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia, and while the numbers are not yet in for those states, it is highly unlikely that they did not negatively impact Black student access and participation. The JBHE (1997) further reports that in 1997, the number of Black applications to the University of Texas and Texas A&M dropped 26% and 13% respectively. Even worse, Black applicants to the University of Texas Law School dropped 42%, while the acceptance rate for Blacks dropped from 54% to 37%. In California, applications were down 7% at UC Berkeley and 13% at UCLA in 1997 (JBHE, 1997). These three states provide differing examples of what could happen across the country should affirmative action programs cease to exist.

Hopefully, the example that Texas provides will not hold for the rest of the country. If affirmative action programs cease to exist, Black student enrollments at academically selective colleges would probably see the largest decline. The decreases in enrollment are projected to be between 50% and 70% at selective colleges and universities (Bowen & Bok, 1998). The worst-case scenario may be a return to segregation of higher education, encompassing a reversal of demographic trends with the majority of Black students enrolled at HBCUs and White students at PWIs. Though this may seem to be a drastic prediction, it is far from impossible.

As noted earlier, in 1997, Black participation in higher education had reached 1,532,800 students, 11% of all students enrolled (Snyder, 2001). Further, Wilds (2000) recorded that in 1998, 85.6% of Black students in higher education were enrolled in PWIs. While enrollment of Black students is on the rise, only time will truly tell whether further increases will be realized.

Implications and Recommendations

The increase in Black students at PWIs has decreased the number of students enrolling in HBCUs, the institutions that were responsible for mass access to higher education for Black students. In light of the expected demise of affirmative action, and Black students possibly being relegated to HBCUs, now is the time to financially strengthen HBCUs. Renner (1998) suggests funding HBCUs at flagship standards, at the expense of those flagship institutions. He further insists that states end the practice of ordering HBCUs to find White students, instead shifting that responsibility to PWIs. HBCUs have never had policies that excluded White students from enrolling and should not be forced to enroll students that don't choose to attend these institutions. While these suggestions are far from reality, they are logical steps in the direction of equality for all students in higher education.

Academic advising units, in conjunction with academic and other

student affairs departments, should establish programs that reach out to Black high school students not performing well enough to meet college admissions standards. Student affairs professionals should also seek to engage students on a regular basis to hear their thoughts on affirmative action programs. These discussions can form the foundation for subsequent forums on introducing the benefits of diverse learning environments for all students, not just Black students. There should also be opportunities for students to engage the literature on research in this area. If all students could see the benefits of affirmative action programs, there might be greater support for the existence of these programs.

Admissions offices should increase their recruiting efforts for academically qualified Black students at predominantly Black high schools. Over time, partnerships should be established that guarantee access and funding for students who meet pre-determined thresholds. Due to the disappearance of color-specific scholarships, financial aid offices should seek to disseminate information to high school students on financing options for college. Also, Black students should be encouraged to participate in more community service and high school campus activities, as options for funding may be present for participating in these activities. Colleges and universities should seek to diversify faculty and administration. The presence of diversity in the academy at the faculty and administrative levels can have an overwhelmingly positive effect on Black student enrollment and persistence.

Finally, research in this area should address the impact that affirmative action programs have on perceptions of the existence of these programs. It may also be beneficial to study Black and White students' perceptions of affirmative action programs. Most of the discussion on these programs does not include the views of those that it most directly impacts. Researchers should also continue to seek methodologically sound means for assessing the educational benefits of diverse learning environments.

The aforementioned recommendations can be instrumental in sustaining and increasing Black student participation in higher education at both HBCUs and PWIs. The higher education community cannot continue to reduce or deny access to Black students. Working within the legal framework the Supreme Court will soon outline, the higher education community must find innovative ways to achieve access, equity, and diversity on college campuses.

References

Alger, J. (1999). *Affirmative action in higher education: A current legal overview.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Anderson, J. D. (1999). *Colleges and universities, historically Black, in the United States.* Retrieved October 16, 2000 from http://www.africana.com/tt_259.htm

Bennefield, R. M. (1999, March 18). *U Mass Confusion. Black Issues in Higher Education.* Retrieved June 26, 2001, from http://www.bert.lib.indiana.edu:2064/fulltext.asp

Bennett, L. (1993). *Before the Mayflower: A history of Black America* (6th ed.). New York: Penguin.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brown, S. E. (1996). The case for affirmative action in higher education. *About Campus, 2*(00), 10-15.

Chang, M. J. (1999, July/August). Does racial diversity really matter? The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(4), 377-395.

Chang, M. J., Witt-Sandis, D., & Hakuta, K. (1999). The dynamics of race in higher education: An examination of the evidence. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 32*(2), 12-16.

Coleman, A. L. (2002). Diversity in higher education: A continuing agenda. In D. M. Piche, W. L. Taylor, & R. A. Reed (Eds.), *Rights at risk: Equality in an age of terrorism* (pp. 71-78). Washington, DC: Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights.

Cross, T. (1994, Autumn). What if there was no affirmative action in college admissions? A further refinement of our earlier calculations. The *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 5*, 52-55.

Cross, T. (1998, Summer). The Thernstrom fallacy: Why affirmative action is not responsible for high dropout rates of African-American college students. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 20*, 91-98.

Darity, W. Jr. (2000, December 1). Give affirmative action time to act. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*(14), 14b.

Davis, J. E. (1998). Cultural capital and the role of Historically Black Colleges and Universities in educational reproduction. In K. Freeman (Ed.), *African American culture and heritage in higher education research and practice* (pp. 143-153). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Dyer, T. G. (1989). Education. In C. R. Wilson & W. Ferris (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture* (pp. 237-241). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Falsetti, S. (1999, April 8). Speaker: Race-based admissions a success. *The Badger Herald.* Retrieved June 26, 2001, from: http://www/badgerherald.com/content/1999/spring/news

Fleming, J. (1984). *Blacks in college: A comparative study of students' success in Black and White institutions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gopalan, R. (1999, October 5). Race to stay factor in admissions. *Minority Issues.* Retrieved June 26, 2001, from http://www.student.advantage.lycos.com

Gwynne, S. C., & Cray, D. (1996, April 1). Undoing diversity. *Time, 147*(14), 54.

Heilman, M. E. (1996). From "affirmative action's contradictory consequences." *Journal of Social Issues, 52*(4). 105-108.

Hoffman, C.M., Snyder, T. D., & Sonnenberg, B. (1996). *Historically Black colleges and universities, 1976-1994.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Hopwood v. State of Texas, 78 F. 3d 932 (1996).

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 26, No. 8. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Johnson v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, 263 F. 3d 1234 (2001).

The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education (1997, Autumn). The judicial and legislative assault on affirmative action in higher education in three states, (17), 71.

Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1997). *A legal guide for student affairs professionals.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lemann, N. (1997). Taking affirmative action apart. In F. J. Beckwith & T. E. Jones (Eds.), *Affirmative action: Social justice or reverse discrimination?* (pp. 34-55). Amherst, NY: Prometheus.

Levin, S. (1999). Social psychological evidence on race and racism. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in colleges and universities* (pp. 64-83). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lords, E. (2001, April 12). University of Michigan's admissions policy rejected. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 18*(4), 12-13.

Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education: A history.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Milem, J. (1999). The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in colleges and universities* (pp. 126-166). New York: Teachers College Press.

Milem, J. F., & Hakuta, K. (2000). The benefits of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. In D. J. Wilds (Ed.), *Seventeenth annual status report on minorities in higher education* (pp. 39-63). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Nettles, M. T., Perna, L. W. (1997). *The African-American data book – Volume I: Higher and adult education.* Fairfax, VA: Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute.

Rai, K. B., & Critzer, J. W. (2000). *Affirmative action and the university: Race, ethnicity, and gender in higher education employment.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265, 287, 98 S. Ct. 2733, 2746, 57 L. Ed.2d 750 (1978).

Renner, E. K. (1998, March/April). Redefining the issue of racial preference: Minority access to higher education. *Change, 30*(2), 26-33.

Roebuck, J.B., & Murty, K.S. (1993). *Historically Black colleges and universities: Their place in American higher education.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history.* Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1996). Employing noncognitive variables in admitting students of color. In I. H. Johnson, & A. J. Ottens (Eds.), *Leveling the playing field: Promoting academic success for students of color* (pp. 79-91). *New Directions for Student Services*, no. 74. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shaw, T. M. (2000, February, 25). The debate over race needs minority students' voices. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retreived June 26, 2001, from http://www.chronicle.com

Shearer, L. (2000, January 13). *Adams address UGA. Online Athens.* Retrieved June 26, 2001, from http://www.onlineathens.com/stories/011300/stu_0113000005.shtml

Snyder, T.D. (2001). *Digest of education statistics, 2000.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Spring, J. (2001). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality.* Boston: McGraw Hill.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race.* New York: Basic Books.

Thomas, M. (2000, January 9). *Current trends in the discussion on affirmative action and higher education.* Retrieved June 28, 2001, from http://www.indiana.edu/~1506/thomas.html

Trent, W. T. (1991). Student affirmative action in higher education: Addressing underrepresentation. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in higher education* (pp. 107-132). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Trent, W. T. (1999). Justice, equality of educational opportunity, and affirmative action. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in colleges and universities* (pp. 84-125). New York: Teachers College Press.

Wightman, L. (1999). Standardized testing and equal access: A tutorial. In M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in colleges and universities* (pp. 84-125). New York: Teachers College Press.

Wilds, D. J. (2000). *Seventeenth annual status report on minorities in higher education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Ontario S. Wooden is currently a Ph.D. candidate in Higher Education Administration at Indiana University Bloomington. He is also a Research Associate at the Indiana Education Policy Center. Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to: owooden@indiana.edu.

Assessing International Student Perceptions of the Classroom Environment at a U.S. Business School

Sandra Britton, Todd Chamberlain, Colin Davis, Denise Easley, Cynthia Grunden, and Julie Williams

The number of international students on college campuses has sharply increased in the last decade. Although several studies have explored the topic of international students from the perspective of faculty, little research has been conducted on the classroom experiences of the international students themselves. This qualitative study examines the business school classroom environment from the perspective of international students, specifically focusing on instructional methods, international student-faculty interactions, and the effectiveness of instructional tools.

Introduction

According to a survey by the Institute of International Education (Davis, 2002), the number of international students studying in the United States rose to 582,996 in 2001, a 6.4% increase over the previous year. Enrollment of international students increased by nearly 100,000 in the 1990s (Tomkovich & Al-Khatib, 1996). Several authors (Coleman, 1997; Tomkovich & Al-Khatib, 1996) have attributed these increases to the active recruitment of international students by colleges and universities, for both educational and utilitarian purposes. International students often represent the top-tier students of their native countries and bring diverse perspectives to the classroom; they also bring in greater tuition revenues since they typically pay closer to the full cost of their education than domestic students (Tomkovich & Al-Khatib, 1996).

Despite the growing number of international students in the United States, studies exploring their unique needs and perceptions of the classroom environment are lacking. Although there is a useful body of literature on faculty perceptions of international students (Ladd & Ruby, 1999; Trice, 2000, 2001; Young, 1998), little exists to indicate how well these students feel their educational needs are being met and what pedagogical techniques they consider most effective.

Because business and management continue to be the most popular fields of study for international students (Davis, 2000, 2002), this study focuses on students in these majors, specifically those for whom English is not their primary language. Students who must overcome this language barrier face a variety of challenges, making an examination of their needs all the more critical. The purpose of this study is to explore international student perceptions of the classroom environment, with a special emphasis on the

professor's instructional style and techniques. Specifically, what instructional methods do international students perceive as most conducive to their learning? What aspects of the classroom environment created by the instructor are perceived as welcoming and supportive to learning by international students? Furthermore, what additional resources (overheads, PowerPoint, handouts, etc.) do international students find effective in enhancing their learning?

Literature Review

The researchers reviewed three dimensions of the classroom environment: faculty perceptions of international students as learners, how international students view various instructional and communication styles, and how international students believe faculty perceive them as learners. These areas were selected because the researchers believe that they best embody the most salient parts of the classroom experience for international students.

Faculty Perception of International Students as Learners

Although student expectations of faculty vary, several studies indicate the role of faculty to be an important part of the educational environment for international students. Trice (2001) found that faculty's ability to interact with international students is a key dimension contributing to the satisfaction of international students. Trice's (2001) study found that faculty's perception of non-English speaking international students consists of various elements: (1) international students face unique academic issues, (2) international students face adjustment to a new culture, (3) international students are greatly affected by the language barrier, and (4) international students face problems such as integration with American students as well as financial difficulties. Faculty members also underestimate international students' desire to integrate with American students as they often believe that international students tend to self-segregate (Trice, 2001).

Faculty perception of international students can influence the way in which they instruct a course and respond to individual student's needs. Several studies indicate that many faculty members feel they should not have to alter their instructional style to meet special needs of international students. Omar (1985) asserts that such faculty attitudes may cause international students to feel faculty are not concerned about serving their needs, although some faculty do try to adjust to international students' special circumstances (Trice, 2000). Nonetheless, a commonly shared faculty perspective is that international students should be expected to achieve the same level of classroom performance as their domestic student counterparts (Ladd & Ruby, 1999). Further, when considering whose responsibility it is to ensure intercultural adaptation in the classroom, faculty participants often take a middle of the road approach, arguing that it is "everyone's" responsibility (Young, 1998).

Faculty Instructional Style and Classroom Communication

Trice (2000) found that faculty who had spent some time overseas were more likely to modify their instructional style for international students. Adaptations mentioned by these faculty included "using less jargon, incorporating more visual aids into lectures and being cognizant of whether international students comprehended class discussions" (p. 22).

Multiple researchers (Ladd & Ruby, 1999; Matthews, 1994; Yuen & Lee, 1994) have concluded that faculty should adopt a flexible instructional style that accommodates the diverse learning styles of both domestic and international students. Without flexibility, a faculty member's instructional style can become a barrier to student learning. Johannesen (1983) notes that this may require "some measure of adaptation in language choice, supporting materials, organization and message transmission to reflect the specific nature of the audience" (p. 5).

Young (1998) also identified several adaptations that faculty use as "day to day operational strategies" for assisting international students (p. 13). Examples mentioned in the study include using a student's native language in class for reference or greeting, inviting international students to discuss papers and asking them about ways to help them learn the material, as well as allowing dictionaries in class, time extensions for tests, extensions of deadlines for essays, or taking alternative tests. However, Young (1998) stated there is no formal evidence that such adaptations by faculty members actually assist international students in learning.

Becoming familiar with a student's native culture and educational system can allow faculty to better assist students discover their learning style and ways to more effectively navigate classroom dynamics. Depending on a student's native culture, participation in classroom discussion may be difficult and intimidating (Lu, 2001). For example, students from Southeast Asian countries may feel impolite or that they are wasting the instructor's time if they interrupt the class with a question (Tanaka, 2002). Furthermore, in their qualitative study of Turkish and U.S. graduate students at a U.S. university, Cagiltay and Bichelmeyer (2000) found that culture has an effect on the way students perceive power relationships in the classroom.

Even when faculty and international students actively attempt to work together, communication between international students and professors may still be hindered at times by the linguistic challenges of international students. For example, Biesenbach-Lucas and Weasenforth (2000) examined e-mail messages of twenty-eight American and international students to an American professor's electronic office hour consultations and found that the international students' messages lacked negotiation skills. The authors

suggest that this deficiency relates to cultural differences and less-developed English language skills. This lack of negotiating skills may make it difficult for faculty to interpret students' needs and appropriately respond, putting these students at a disadvantage for completing coursework successfully (Biesenbach-Lucas & Weasenforth, 2000).

How Students Believe Faculty Perceive Them as Learners

One deficiency in the literature regarding international students was a lack of studies exploring how students believe faculty perceive them as learners and how this affects their educational experience. Ladd and Rudy (1999) and Tomkovich and Al-Khatib (1996) found that many international students place a high value on understanding their American professors and developing warm interpersonal relationships with them. However, in some cultures students view the instructor as an unquestioned figure whose authority on instructional matters is final, making relational expectations between faculty and students low (Ladd & Ruby, 1999).

Further research on the international student perspective is necessary in order to understand how to optimize the faculty-student relationship. The intention of this study is to contribute knowledge to the research base that could be used to enhance pedagogical methods and develop instructional resources for faculty instructing international students. Toward this goal, the purpose of this study is to explore international student perspectives on the classroom learning environment, specifically investigating their beliefs of how faculty perceive them as learners and their assessment of the effectiveness of various instructional styles and tools.

Methodology

Participants

The sample comprised nineteen undergraduate international business students at a highly competitive and prestigious business school at Central University, a large, public, research university in the Midwest. According to the business school's Academic Counselor for International Students, there are 382 international students within the business school, comprising 9.7% of the total number of students in the business school. University-wide, there are 3,284 international students, comprising 8% of the total student population according to Central University's International Services website. Participants in this study were from Austria, Burma, India, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, and Yugoslavia and have spent varying amounts of time studying English and living in the U.S. The gender balance was 42% men and 58% women.

The sample was limited to business students to help ensure consistency of prior classroom experience by participants. Noting Selvadurai's (1992) finding that use and comprehension of the English language is one of the most significant obstacles in the classroom for international students, the researchers chose to focus this study on students for whom English is not their primary language. The researchers' intent was not to select a sample that represented the full breadth of international student experience, but rather to determine the themes common to one group of international students within the context of the Central University business school.

Procedure

Students were contacted through e-mail and classroom solicitation and provided a description of the study's purpose, information on the format of the interviews, and how the researchers intended to use the information participants provided to ensure informed consent (Kvale, 1996; Manning, 1992; Merriam, 1997).

Previous research indicates that international students may interpret their educational experiences differently than domestic students (Davis, 2000, 2002), leading the researchers to select a constructivist approach. A constructivist approach emphasizes the importance of recognizing and understanding the unique perspectives and perceptions of each participant (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Manning, 1992; Merriam, 1997). The researchers developed a written interview protocol comprised of open-ended questions (Kvale, 1996; Lofland & Lofland, 1992; Manning, 1992) drawn from previous literature in the areas of "instructor related" and "course related" experiences. Students were also asked to respond to four questions using a Likert-type scale. The total time of each interview did not exceed forty-five minutes.

Data Analysis

Written notes from the interviews were entered into a database with cells representing each item on the interview-recording instrument. Responses from all participants were summarized on one worksheet, with each comment identified by participant number. Each researcher analyzed the full data set to identify common themes. After individual analysis, the researchers discussed all the themes that were identified and narrowed them down to five.

Limitations

Although the researchers strived to account for numerous perspectives within the planning of the study, a few limitations do exist. First, the wording of one question was confusing to participants, requiring the researchers to only use the results from the question as supplementary data. Concerning demographics, the sample was primarily Asian and of senior class level, possibly limiting the applicability of the findings to other groups. Comparative data on domestic business students would have added an additional dimen-

sion to the findings. In addition, a limitation of all interview-based research is that researcher bias may steer the conversation, therefore biasing the results (Kvale, 1996; Lofland & Lofland, 1992; Merriam, 1998).

Results

In analyzing the interview data, five general themes emerged from comments made by participants. These themes include: the caring or approachable nature of faculty; the use or lack of inclusive examples and illustrations used by instructors; the preference for visual instructional tools; the view of group projects as both challenging and valuable; and students' assertiveness in the classroom.

Caring Faculty

The warmth and friendliness associated with an instructor was most often the determinant of whether a professor was ultimately viewed as "approachable." Most students described their instructors as "open to students" or "easy to approach." Jnatri, a student from India, described professors as "welcoming, really pleasant, and friendly to speak to." Examples of the means through which faculty members presented themselves as approachable included their availability to students through office hours, after class, and via email. How instructors utilized associate instructors (AIs) in the course and in responding to student questions also informed how approachable the faculty member appeared to students. For example, Amah from Indonesia shared an instance of a professor whom he found particularly inaccessible because the professor insisted that students direct all of their questions regarding the course to the AI. Describing his instructor, Amah stated, "he is indifferent, and I am not certain that he even likes students."

In regards to grading, most participants brought up "fairness" of the instructor. With one exception, "fairness" was defined as allowing students to re-write an assignment or correct grammatical mistakes. Erlyinda, an Indonesian student, described such a professor when he stated, "He allows international students and other hardworking students a chance to do assignments over...[he] recognizes effort in students." Similarly, Batuta, another Indonesian student, mentioned the notion of "fairness" describing one of his favorite classes. Batuta stated, "[The professor] allows us second chances to rewrite and looks at our effort."

Inclusiveness of Examples and Illustrations used By Instructors

Participants frequently mentioned the use of descriptive examples and illustrations as particularly helpful to their learning. For instance, Amsia, a student from Indonesia, explained that professors were easy to understand if they "tell jokes and provide illustrations, such as real life situations." Participants, however, stressed the importance of examples being relevant to their

individual experience and cultural background. Relevancy allows them to easily make meaning of and connection with the example. Teungku from Indonesia explained, "It is sometimes difficult to understand examples that are based on American TV shows not familiar to international students." Vrishni from India provided an example of this issue. He stated, "In my Business Culture class the professor used examples of the O.J. Simpson trial and I was at a loss but all the Americans were comfortable with it." Eight students similarly noted that culturally-based content, including jokes, slang, and television and movie references, sometimes placed them at a disadvantage in their ability to grasp the material. Several students said they wished professors would teach from an international perspective and use more examples from other countries. Hei, from South Korea, said he particularly appreciated faculty who have worked or taught overseas and used examples from those experiences.

Visual Instructional Tools

Commenting on various instructional tools, all but one participant mentioned the visual aspect of instructional tools as being beneficial for their learning. Particularly, all but four participants indicated that PowerPoint slideshows were most helpful, with handouts and videos also frequently noted as aiding their learning. Participants stated that these types of tools helped to organize the instructor's main points of discussion and helped them highlight key concepts. PowerPoint slideshows were viewed as most helpful to students, especially when handouts of the slides were shared with students at the beginning of the lecture so that students could add their individual notes during the class discussion. Jnatri, from India, summarized this sentiment when he explained, "PowerPoint and handouts combined [together] highlight the most important points the students need to learn."

The caveat to these favorable views on instructional tools was found regarding the use of overheads and videos. Some students expressed frustrations with faculty who remove the overheads too quickly and that simply include too much information on overheads making the points impossible to copy down. In these cases the students expressed their preference for take-home handouts that could be used for future reference and for study purposes. Finally, a few students noted their dissatisfaction with the use of videos because the rapid dialogue sometimes makes it difficult for them to keep up with the English.

Group Projects: Challenging, but Valuable

The topic of group and team projects, common to the business curriculum, surfaced in almost all of the interview conversations regarding assignments. Consistent within comments was the belief that group projects were both challenging and valuable. Immad, a student from Pakistan, explained,

"Although group projects can be hard, I learn the most from them." In fact, 47% of participants agreed, making positive comments about their experiences and how it greatly benefited their learning. Aiko, a student from Japan, explained, "I like having lots of group projects because they teach you to work as a team." Other benefits of participating in group projects identified included: group members helping each other review and reevaluate course content; the sharing of new information and perspectives; learning how to work as a team; learning how to deal with other people and help one another; having a support network; and learning new cultural perspectives. Bao, a student from Taiwan, further explained the benefits when he stated, "With group projects [I] can share information and get new perspectives."

Nine of the participants also cited specific challenges they associated with working on group projects, such as difficulties communicating with native English speakers. Bon-hwa, a student from South Korea, explained, "It is difficult to communicate in groups because of different background[s] and language[s]. Team projects make me nervous." Some challenges expressed by participants seemed typical of any student working in a group project. Participants remarked about the difficulty in coordinating several students' schedules and group members' unwillingness to put in the necessary time to complete the project, challenges potentially inherent to all group work. However, other challenges seemed specifically related to international student experiences with group work. For instance, participants mentioned the feeling of being excluded, as if one's comments are not being heard or are being ignored, and dealing with American students who procrastinate and don't understand that an international student cannot perform as efficiently at the last minute because of his/her language skill differences. Aiko, a student from Japan, explained, "Team projects are difficult because the team will wait until the last minute and because I don't speak or write English well I need more time." Despite these challenges participants also expressed benefits they gain from working in groups with American students. These benefits include pressure to think creatively in English and an opportunity to work as a team and forge relationships with their American peers. One participant referred to the collective rewards and risks of group work when he stated, "If you go down, all of us go down."

Assertiveness in the Classroom

Statements about varying degrees of assertiveness within the classroom were common. Moreover, they seemed to derive from two areas with cultural undertones: the American educational environment and the student response to that environment. In reference to the American educational environment, students articulated differences from the educational environments of their native countries. Students regularly mentioned the less formal

U.S. educational environment and the higher emphasis placed on student participation in class, characteristics contrary to the guiding methods and protocols used in some of their native countries. For example, Immad from Pakistan explained, "Professors should explain the expected classroom behavior to international students so we know that it is okay to go to the restroom during class or to address the professors by their first names." Important to this point is that these actions would be viewed as unacceptable or disrespectful in some other cultures.

When describing differences in their native educational systems, ten participants either described an expectation that students would be passive in the classroom, or said they had a much more formal, distant relationship with instructors in their home countries. "Many times [American] professors are concerned because we do not raise our hands in class and often wonder if we understand what's going on; we do, it's just that in our own country we are not allowed to ask questions in class, so we do not do it here," said Lian from Taiwan. Aiko, a Japanese student, further explained that she was uncomfortable speaking in the large lecture classes because Japanese culture promotes self-consciousness and the need to not make mistakes.

Responding to the American educational environment, students shared stories of their hesitancy to approach and ask questions of faculty members or to address them by their given name, even though they had been encouraged to do so by faculty members. Sabir explained that because of his native Pakistani culture, he "would need to be approached (by a professor) to open up." Although participants said professors at this institution were generally very approachable and available for questions, they still generally felt more comfortable asking professors their questions after class or during office hours than in the classroom. Others said it was easier to ask assistant instructors in the smaller discussion sections, or peers in their classes.

Further commenting on their classroom participation, several participants expressed discomfort with professors who posed questions directly to specific students in the class. For instance, one student mentioned that she told her professor outside of class that calling on her made her uncomfortable. Other participants criticized the large lecture format of many business school courses, using the following descriptors, "It's not encouraging to participate," "I feel nervous to speak," and "I have to sit at the front to feel like I am there." Unrelated to cultural or language differences, some participants shared that their lack of classroom participation was simply due to general shyness. One Indian student, Jnatri, stated simply, "I'm not the kind of guy who would lift his hand up in class." Paradoxically, although participants described feelings of discomfort and difficulty participating as much as domestic students, they expressed preference for the higher level of interaction in U.S. classrooms. As Markus, a student from Austria stated, "I

like the interaction in U.S. classrooms. Professors in the U.S. try to help out students."

Despite the challenges expressed, participants, especially those who had been studying in the U.S. for a significant amount of time, seemed well adjusted. The majority of participants spoke very positively about their experience. As Erlyinda, an Indonesian student expressed, "I feel very comfortable here." In addition to being positive about their experience, many participants needed to reflect back to their first semesters studying in the United States to describe struggles, suggesting their current level of adjustment to be high.

Discussion

The primary goal of this study was to explore international student perceptions of the classroom environment, with a special emphasis on professor instructional style and techniques. Although a sizable body of literature regarding faculty perception of international students exists (Ladd & Ruby, 1999; Trice, 2000, 2001; Young, 1998), the international students' perception of faculty instructional style, use of instructional tools, and how faculty perceive them as learners were notable omissions in previous researchers' treatment of this topic. As the number of international students in U.S. universities continues to increase (Davis, 2000, 2002), understanding how best to help these students learn is of vital importance to universities interested in attracting and serving these students. Although Young (1998) found that faculty members do try to accommodate the perceived special needs of international students through use of instructional tools, there was no existing evidence that such accommodations are effective. This study addressed these gaps in the research by investigating international students' feelings and perceptions regarding faculty instructional style and the effectiveness of instructional tools.

The researchers' use of constructivist inquiry in the form of open-ended interview questions allowed the nineteen participants to express their feelings and perceptions of the classroom environment. The analysis of the results of these interviews revealed the previously mentioned emergent themes. Both the existing body of literature and the findings of this study support the following recommendations for institutions and faculty desiring to better serve international students.

Faculty's Role in the Enhancement of International Students' Learning Experience

The findings of this study confirmed Trice's (2000) research on the faculty role as significant to the international student learning experience. The results revealed that faculty attitude, teaching style, and appreciation of the native cultures of international students are critical elements within the

learning environment. Faculty-initiated efforts to establish relationships may be necessary with international students from certain ethnic or regional backgrounds as such students may be accustomed to more formal classroom relationships than those found in the U.S. Consistent and repeated outreach to these students may be needed to assist them in overcoming their unfamiliarity with U.S. classroom norms. Faculty who make the additional effort to build rapport with international students will be rewarded by appreciative students who feel that they matter as learners (Omar, 1985; Trice, 2001). As a result of these findings institutions should consider developing comprehensive orientation programs to help faculty become familiar with the needs of international students, their learning styles and expectations, a need Ladd and Ruby (1999) previously advocated.

Group Projects

Group work was a consistent theme throughout the inquiry as well. Similar to previous domestic business student research (Diessner, 1993), participants acknowledged that group work is particularly challenging for them, but that it provides recognizable benefits. Respondents cited language differences and limited previous exposure to group work as primary reasons for this challenge. To help minimize these challenges faculty should purposefully design assignments and group membership in ways that encourage and support the full participation and contributions of international students. Components of the assignment could include international or comparative perspectives.

In order to ensure that each group member feels valued, it may also be necessary for faculty to facilitate mutual understanding between international students and domestic students in group projects by clarifying basic principles that foster positive group dynamics. Participants in this study stated that they often feel outnumbered in groups, making it important for faculty members to encourage groups to be inclusive of all members. Finally, while it is important to remember that heterogeneous groups generally maximize the broadening of student horizons, there may also be times when homogenous groups can allow for more thoughtful conversations, such as projects that require the discussion of sensitive topics. Until student-peer rapport is established, faculty must be cognizant of these challenges when assigning group work and try to structure them such as to mitigate these differences (Diessner, 1993; Nowak & Miller, 1996).

Classroom Participation

Trice's (2001), research on faculty perceptions of non-English speaking international students found that many may face unique academic issues, such as challenges in adjusting to a new culture, language barriers, and finding ways to participate within a new environment. Tanaka (2002) and

Lu's (2001) research on students of Southeastern Asian countries found that these students rarely participate in class because in their native classrooms it is considered impolite or a waste of an instructor's time to ask questions and to clarify points. Participants from regions with similar faculty-student interaction models also found it difficult to participate and ask many questions in the American classroom setting even when they recognized that the U.S. classroom environment is more open, participatory, and one in which a more equal relationship with professors is encouraged. Another factor that could contribute to international student passivity in the classroom is self-consciousness about their English language skills. Uncertainty about words, difficulty in phrasing questions and the fear of possible ridicule from classmates should they make mistakes are all factors that may also contribute to the reduced participation of some international students.

Faculty members should continue to encourage international students to ask questions and participate in the classroom setting. As previously mentioned, the hesitancy to be more assertive may be cultural and the efforts of faculty members to include international students are appreciated (Ladd & Ruby, 1999). Despite consistent hesitancy to openly participate in the classroom, participants stated that faculty's attempt to encourage their participation increases their comfort in the classroom.

Faculty Instructional Style

Participants indicated that the use of examples and illustrations increased their ability to understand class material, but it was important that the examples be relevant and reflective of both American and international student experiences. The use of examples and illustrations from U.S. popular culture was sometimes a hindrance to international student learning and excluded them from fully sharing in the common understanding and enjoyment of the class. This finding lends credibility to research (Ladd & Rudy, 1999; Matthews, 1994; Yuen & Lee, 1994) that indicates that without flexibility, a faculty member's instructional style can become a barrier, rather than a bridge, to student learning. Given that international students may not be familiar with U.S. popular culture references, faculty members should attempt to use alternative examples in conjunction with pop culture references, or use multiple global examples that reflect the culture of other countries. When U.S. pop culture illustrations are used, professors should explain the context. This background information, while essential for international students, might also enhance the understanding of domestic students who may have misperceptions or a limited understanding of the topic being discussed. The use of American slang, idioms, or other complex vocabulary should also be limited and the pace of presentation should be moderate with all points clearly organized. A final enhancement to the international student

learning environment is achieved through the use of an international students' native language in classroom for reference, greeting purposes, or when inviting international students to discuss papers.

Visual Instructional Aids

The use of almost all visual instructional tools in the classroom was regarded positively, with particular preference for Power Point presentations and handouts. The only exception is that the use of videos are only helpful if the videos are short and pertained directly to the course content in a straightforward manner. The study revealed that when faculty combined these tools it not only enhances the student's ability to understand and keep up with the class conversation, but also serves to compensate for the language barriers by providing a clear framework into which individual notes can be recorded. This helps international students organize the material and focus on salient concepts. To facilitate international student learning, faculty members should endeavor to use these types of instructional tools.

Conclusion

In general, the findings of this study support previous research and give a stronger voice to the experiences of international students. Participants indicated that they perceive the American classroom and educational system as supportive, democratic, and progressive. While students did not always actively respond to faculty invitations to participate or meet with them individually, they appreciated the faculty who made deliberate efforts to engage them in and out of the classroom. Students recognized the benefits that they gained from group work and, accordingly, faculty should continue to structure learning in similar interactive formats, while remaining aware that group work sometimes needs guidance to assure that all members are able to participate in a fulfilling way.

Researchers interested in pursuing an even stronger understanding of international students' perceptions of the classroom environment may want to investigate the role of peers. Participants in this study did occasionally note that peers are an important part of the classroom experience, but the researchers did not focus questioning or analysis on this issue. Another important issue not addressed by the researchers is the effect of the international students' cultures' gender norms on their perceptions of the classroom environment. Researchers did discern some gender differences in terms of assertiveness in the classroom, but were unable to reliably connect these differences to the students' native cultures.

As American higher education broadens into an increasingly global system, efforts by institutions to be more inclusive of international students will be increasingly imperative. While this increased diversity may result

from a variety of changing factors (Coleman, 1997; Tomkovich & Al-Khatib, 1996) the implications for faculty members are evident: clear and organized communications, globally-based illustrations, and a willingness to reach out to international students are essential elements for maximum student participation and success.

References

Biesenbach-Lucas, S., & Weasenforth, C. (2000, March). *Could we talk? Pragmatic variations in student professor negotiations.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Cagiltay, K., & Bichelmeyer, B. (2000). *Differences in learning styles in different cultures: A qualitative study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Coleman, S. (1997). International students in the classroom: A resource and an opportunity. *International Education, 26,* 52-61.

Davis, T.M. (Ed.) (2000). *Open doors 1998/1999: Report on international educational exchange.* New York, NY: Institute on International Education.

Davis, T.M. (Ed.) (2002). *Open doors 2000/2001: Report on international educational exchange.* New York, NY: Institute on International Education.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1998). *The landscape of qualitative research: Issues and theories.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Diessner, R. (1993). Double grouping: New strategies for collaborative learning. *The Teaching Professor, 5*(1).

Johannesen, R.L. (1983). *Ethics in human communication* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: And introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ladd, P., & Ruby Jr., R. (1999). Learning styles and adjustment issues of international students. *Journal of Education for Business, 74*(6), 363-371.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L.H. (1992). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Lu, M.M. (2001). *International students and the university support services: Utilization and perceived effectiveness.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, New York.

Manning, K. (1992). The ethnographic interview. In F.K. Stage (Ed.), *Diverse methods for research and assessment* (pp. 91-103). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Matthews, D. (1994). An investigation of students' learning styles in various disciplines in colleges and universities. *Journal of Humanistic Development, 33*(2), 65-74.

Merriam, S.B. (1997, September). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.

Nowak, L.I., & Miller, S.W. (1996, May/June). Team testing increases performance. *Journal of Education for Business, 71*(5), 253-56.

Omar, A.A. (1985). Problems of international students as perceived by international students and faculty in a public university. *Dissertation Abstract International, 47*(1), 101. (UMI No. 8604564)

Selvadurai, R. (1992). Problems faced by international students in American colleges and universities. *Community Review, 12,* 27-32.

Tanaka, J. (2002). *Academic difficulties among East Asian international graduate students and faculty in a public university.* Dissertation Abstract International, 47(1), 101. (UMI NO. 8604564)

Tomkovich, C., & Al-Khatib, J. (1996, January-February). An assessment of the service quality provided to foreign students at U.S. business schools. *Journal of Education for Business, 61*(3), 130-135.

Trice, A.G. (2000, May). *Navigating in a global learning community: Academic departments' responses to graduate international students.* Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Cincinnati, OH.

Trice, A.G. (2001). *Faculty perceptions of graduate international students: The benefits and challenges.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, VA.

Young, C. (1998, November). *Intercultural adaptation in the classroom: The ethics of grading and assessing students with minimal proficiency in speaking English.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, New York, NY.

Yuen, C., & Lee, S.N. (1994). Applicability of the learning style inventory in an Asian context and its predictive value. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54,* 541-549.

Sandra Britton graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs(HESA) master's program at Indiana University Bloomington in 2003. She received her undergraduate degree in General Studies from Indiana University Bloomington. During her time at Indiana University Bloomington, she served as the Student Events Coordinator and Orientation Assistant at the Leo R. Dowling International Center.

Todd Chamberlain is a first-year doctoral student in the HESA doctoral program. He earned his B.S. in Journalism from the University of Oregon in 1993 and his M.Ed. from Azusa Pacific University in 1997. He worked in student affairs administration at Eastern University in Philadelphia for five years before moving to Indiana University Bloomington, where he has an assistantship at the National Survey of Student Engagement.

Colin Davis graduated from the HESA master's program in 2003. He received a B.A. in business administration from the University of Technology, Jamaica. Colin worked in university administration from 1996 to 2001 in Jamaica. He did a year-long practicum experience at the Indiana University Bloomington teaching resource center.

Denise Easley graduated from the HESA master's program in 2003. She received a B.A. in Psychology from University of California Los Angeles in 2000. While at Indiana University Bloomington, Denise served as a Graduate Assistant in the Arts and Sciences Placement Office.

Cynthia Grunden graduated from the HESA master's program in 2003. She received a B.S. in Secondary Education from Indiana University Bloomington in 2001. At Indiana University, Cynthia served as a counselor at the Office of Student Financial Assistance, staff member at Orientation, and tutor at Athletics.

Julie Williams is a doctoral student in the HESA program. She received a B.A. in Business Administration from Alma College in Michigan in 1995, and earned a M.Ed. from Loyola University Chicago in Student Personnel in 1997. Julie is a member of the first cohort of the Post-Master's Certificate in Institutional Research program and is a Graduate Assistant in the Information Management and Institutional Research at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis.

White Students' Attitudes and Behaviors Toward People of Color

Stephanie Bondi, Christropher Heasley, Valerie B. Kolko and Sarah Young

The increase in diversity initiatives on college campuses seems to exclude the needs of White students in learning about multiculturalism. This study addresses White students' attitudes and behaviors toward people of color in a large, public, Doctoral-Extensive university in the Midwest. Results indicate strong differences in both attitude and behavior between men and women as well as between people who have had varying levels of social contact with minorities. Implications for theory and practice are presented.

Introduction

Across the United States, multicultural attitudes are being encouraged in colleges and universities in response to an abundance of negative racial and ethnic incidents. Although educators and researchers hold the general view that prejudicial attitudes are in a state of decline (Federico & Sidanius, 2002; Sniderman & Piazza, 1993; Tuch & Hughes, 1996; Wilkinson, 2000), college campuses continue to experience an increase of negative race-related events (Carter, 1990; Fisher and Hartmann, 1995; Sue & Sue, 1990). American institutions of higher education have been called upon to educate students about racism through workshops and facilitated training activities in order to promote tolerance and acceptance, as well as diminish the effects of prejudice (Patterson, 1995). Education allows people to comprehend complex ideological principles that bear on their racial attitudes (Sniderman & Piazza, 1993).

While campus initiatives related to racism address several issues, they often only reflect minorities' perspectives of unjust attitudes and behaviors toward themselves (Carter, 1990). Coordinators of diversity initiatives should also consider the White experience of racial consciousness and privileged racial status (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Historically, antiracism training has not allowed Whites to examine the meaning of their Whiteness, nor has it enabled the contextualization of belonging to a majority culture. It is therefore important for educators and counselors to consider "how racist attitudes might be related to variations in White racial identity, a within-group psychological variable" (Carter, 1990, p. 46). As Whites begin to understand how they are indeed part of a racial culture group, administrators can develop proactive strategies targeted to an individual's psychological understanding of racism issues and prejudice.

Few existing studies assess attitudes and behaviors that Whites have towards people of color. Such limited literature finds that White college students continue to hold negative attitudes toward their Black counterparts (Carter, White, & Sedlacek, 1987; Claney & Parker, 1989; Minatoya &

Sedlacek, 1980; Minatoya & Sedlacek, 1984), and nearly all suggest that counseling, as well as educational and developmental practices, can help in understanding the nature of such attitudes. Dennis (1981) suggested a systematic study be conducted to determine the reasons Whites perpetuate their supremacy by denying Blacks equal opportunity. Dennis advocated that such a study would help provide an understanding of the ways that "myths, legends, and fantasies become embedded in the psyche as 'ideological imperatives'" (p. 84). This leads to the research imperative to discover differences in how Whites acquire, retain, and perpetuate prejudicial attitudes. The current study investigates fixed personal qualities (gender and previous social contact) and their respective differences in White students' attitudes and behaviors toward people of color.

Literature Review

Numerous studies (Carter, 1990; Carter, White, & Sedlacek, 1987; Claney & Parker, 1989; Dovidio, Kawakami, & Gaertner, 2002; Federico & Sidanius, 2002; Fisher & Hartmann, 1995; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994; Shirakawa, 1999) have attempted to understand racism in terms of an individual's attitudinal, affective, and situational experiences. Carter (1990) wrote that Whites express ambivalent attitudes and behaviors toward Blacks that vary according to the individual's background, his or her previous contact with Blacks, and other "ideas" about Blacks that stem only from indirect knowledge (Dennis, 1981). In order to understand the differences among Whites as they develop racial attitudes, a brief literature review is necessary to describe previous findings. The White Racial Identity Development Model (Helms, 1990) provides a framework for understanding how Whites acquire and develop racist and nonracist feelings, which can be further understood by examining the differences in which men and women experience racial identity. Whites' prior social contact with people of color can also help to explain present attitudes and behaviors.

White Racial Identity Development

The most frequently cited work of its kind, Helms' White identity development model (1990) describes the development of a White racial consciousness in two phases, abandonment of racism and developing a nonracist White identity. McEwen (1996) found racism to be a central theme in White identity development, and as such, various studies have been conducted to understand the prejudicial attitudes and behaviors that are associated with each level of development. As individuals change from being racist to nonracist, they begin to acknowledge racism as a problem and become aware of their own Whiteness as a racial state of being (Helms, 1990). Other psychologists have explored similar models of racial identity development (Hardiman, 1982; Ponterotto, 1988).

Prior to the emergence of Helms' influential model (1990), numerous other studies also explored White identity development. For example, Claney and Parker (1989) conducted an inquiry to explore levels of White racial consciousness and perceived comfort with Black individuals in different situations. The authors found that Whites who see Blacks from a narrow perspective tend to develop stereotypic ideas and formulate racist thoughts. Claney and Parker also cited the need for experiential exercises in order to allow individuals to move through the stages of racial consciousness.

Following Claney and Parker's (1989) study, Carter (1990) became the first researcher to use Helms' model of racial identity (1990) to explore the specific relationship between White racial identity attitudes and racism. Carter found White attitudes to be predictive of racism and supported existing literature that claimed that Whites in general hold prejudiced attitudes (Carter, White, & Sedlacek, 1987). Additionally, the analyses showed gender differences in levels of White racial identity attitudes. Women tended to have less prejudiced attitudes towards people of color than men of the same age. Across both genders, however, Reintegration (characterized by the assertion of White superiority and the expression of Black inferiority) was the most significant predictor of racist attitudes. Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) expanded upon Carter's (1990) study by including a larger sample and by using age and gender as exogenous variables. They also confirmed Claney and Parker's (1989) findings that a relationship exists between Reintegration and racist attitudes. A further look at certain individual characteristics, such as gender and previous interracial contact, and related theories concerning such characteristics' association with racist attitudes and behaviors is warranted to understand the differences in how White individuals perceive and behave toward people of color.

Gender

Gilligan's (1977) theory of women's moral development marked a departure from previous models, which did not identify developmental differences between men and women. The author asserted that women's experiences are qualitatively different from those of men. Gilligan's theory recognizes that women's feelings and emotions influence the ways in which they make decisions, express themselves, and relate to others. Closely connecting an individual's personal experience and thought, Gilligan identified care and responsibility as the central theme behind women's moral decision-making. Women view the self as both relational and interdependent with others. In contrast, Kohlberg (1969) described a "justice orientation" that Gilligan related more to men than to women. In this model, men develop through a hierarchy that values autonomy and justice. As the relationship characterized between the self and society's rules develops from

preconventional to postconventional, individuals are able to base decisions on universally generalizable principles. Gilligan argued, however, that women's growth is in fact grounded in themes of relationships and interconnectedness.

Both Carter (1990) and Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) found significant gender differences in the White racial identity development of college men and women. Across all ages, women were found to be at a higher level of identity development and thus less likely to hold racist beliefs. Carter (1990) suggested that these differences may be attributable to White women's involvement with the advocacy and support of human and civil rights, and may be able to connect their experiences of sex discrimination with ideas of racial discrimination. A 1992 study by Qualls, Cox, and Schehr also found that college women were less prejudiced than men. Johnson and Marini's (1998) extensive study found that gender alone accounted for a portion of the variance in racial attitudes among a sample of mixed-gender White and Black high school seniors. Such research reinforces Gilligan's work in that women experience changes in racial attitude toward others earlier and more intensely than do men.

Social Contact

White college students' attitudes and behaviors toward people of color may also be considered in light of their previous contact with this population. Research (Oliver & Mendelberg, 2000) emphasizes the role of social environments as a determinant of Whites' racial attitudes. Allport (1954) was the first sociologist to examine theories of intergroup contact, and found that prolonged exposure to people of different ethnic or racial groups resulted in increased social comfort and fewer acts of prejudice. This researcher described three types of contact that can be used in understanding interpersonal contact and its effect on racism. The first kind, casual contact, does not necessarily reduce prejudice, and is rather likely to enforce existing stereotypic negative beliefs. Next, acquaintance contact brings knowledge to the individual and provides a more accurate, stable understanding of minority groups. The final kind of contact is labeled residential, in which prejudice is lessened for Whites who live with Blacks as a result of increased communication (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999). However, for some Whites, contact with minorities in residential settings is intimidating, and they may therefore identify this kind of close interaction as a threat. Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1999) used Allport's theory to describe how interracial contact "can serve to lessen or to increase prejudice, depending on the nature and the quality of the contact" (p. 33).

Wittig and Grant-Thompson (1998) examined Allport's contact theory (1954) as it relates to the reduction of racism and prejudicial attitudes and behaviors by Whites. The researchers sought to examine the ways in which

different levels of social contact enhanced comfort in talking about racial issues, strengthened the belief in the equal worth of all groups, and increased openness to making friends across racial boundaries. They found that under experimental settings that replicated Allport's ideal conditions, authoritative support (in this case, by teachers), individualized contact, equal status of participants, and cooperative interdependence in working toward a common goal all served to help reduce attitudes and behaviors of prejudice. They also suggested that school and neighborhood levels of interracial climate be examined to assess their affect on classroom programs designed to target racism.

Most studies report positive effects of increased contact between groups (Pettigrew, 1998). A longitudinal study by Smith (1994) found that meeting Allport's conditions (1954) lessened prejudice by both Black and White neighbors. Oliver and Mendelberg (2000) also found that racist predisposition decreased with increased exposure in a social context to people of other races (in this study, the context was an individual's zip code). In a similar study, Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi (2002), found that neighborhood contact affects the attitudes of Whites toward Blacks, but only if those Blacks are of the same or higher social status. This investigation supported Allport's (1954) research, which concluded that for prejudice to be reduced, individuals must have equal social standing.

Gaps in existing literature lead to both the need and purpose for the current study. The lack of research on majority groups in educational environments, specifically White students in college, implies the need to examine individual differences as they manifest in Whites' racial attitudes and behaviors.

Method

Participants

Data for this study were collected from a convenience sample of 421 students enrolled in introductory psychology and sociology lecture classes at a residential Doctoral/Research—Extensive institution located in the Midwest. Thirty-four of the original 421 students (8.1%) respondents reported their racial or ethnic identification as other than White. The low number of these individuals in the original sample caused the removal of their responses from the study. The remaining respondents, who reported their race or ethnicity as White, constituted a sample size of 387 (91.9%). The mean age group of the respondents was 18-20 (84.0%). Nearly two-thirds of the participants identified as female (65.4%). Seventy-seven percent of participants reported having a mostly White group of friends in high school. The percentage of those who reported attending a mostly White high school was 65%. Eighty-seven percent reported living in a mostly White neighborhood.

Instrumentation and Procedure

A questionnaire was administered to students at the end of the class period. The instrument included 13 demographic questions in addition to questions derived from five published instruments. The instruments that served as guides for the questionnaire used in this study include the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ; Pace & Kuh, 1998), Cultural Attitudes and Climate Questionnaire (CACQ; Helm, Sedlacek, & Prieto, 1998), Situational Attitude Scale (SAS; Sedlacek & Brooks, 1972), Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey (MAKSS; D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991), and Whites/Blacks Attitude Towards Blacks/Whites Scale (ATB/W; Helms, 1990).

The instrument used in this study consisted of 13 demographic questions, 50 closed-ended questions, and two open-ended questions. Of the demographic questions, gender and previous contact with people of other races were identified as the exogenous variables for the current study. The participant responses to the racial composition of their environments (high school, high school neighborhood, and group of friends) were collected on a five-point Likert-like scale: (1) mostly White, (2) many Whites, (3) equal number of Whites and people of color, (4) many people of color, and (5) mostly people of color. During data analysis, these categories were then collapsed into two groups: those reporting a mostly White environment (P= 65), and those reporting any other racial composition (P=35).

The 50 closed-ended questions were identified as either attitude-related (13 of the 50 questions) or behavior-related. Several behavioral questions addressed a single type of cross-racial interaction with one of the four following groups: Asian American, African American, Latino/a, and White. These were repeated four times throughout the survey, each time considering an interaction with each group. Few participants chose to respond to the two open-ended survey questions; these answers were therefore not analyzed for use in this report.

An independent T-test was used to identify differences in responses by gender and racial composition of environments (high school, high school neighborhood, and group of friends). Answers to the closed-ended questions were recorded on the following five-point Likert-like scale: (1) strongly disagree or rarely/never, (2) disagree or once in a while, (3) neither agree/disagree or sometimes, (4) agree or fairly often, and (5) strongly agree or frequently. For the purpose of analysis, these categories were collapsed into three categories, which were (1) disagree, (2) neither agree nor disagree, and (3) agree.

Limitations

Difficulties with the initial sample size caused the authors to reconsider

the research question itself. In visiting introductory psychology and sociology classes, the researchers did not foresee the high percentage of women and first-year students. The current sample is skewed toward these populations. Existing studies have used both imbalanced samples by gender (Shirakawa, 1999), as well as approximately even samples (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Using gender as a study variable, this should not have greatly affected the data. Research does acknowledge that younger people generally score lower on racial identity scales (Carter, 1990; Helms, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), which should be considered when evaluating this study.

It should also be noted that all of the researchers who administered the questionnaires were White. Past experiments have investigated the impact of researcher race on respondents' answers (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, and Williams, 1995; Ferguson, Rhodes, Lee, & Sriram, 2001) and concluded that the race of the researcher indeed affects responses. Claney and Parker's (1989) study hypothesized that responses would appear less negative if one of the researchers had been Black; Fazio et al.'s (1995) study found that subjects with a Black experimenter present responded with fewer prejudicial responses to a racial prejudice questionnaire. However, because White students completed all the surveys used for this study, the authors expect that race was not a significant factor.

Results

Gender

Table 1 contains significant findings regarding gender differences in racial attitudes and behaviors. These results are represented on a scale from one to three (1 = strongly disagree/disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3= agree/strongly agree for the attitude questions and 1= rarely/once in a while, 2 = sometimes, and 3 = fairly often/almost always for the behavioral questions). All results mentioned are at the $p < .01$ or $p < .05$ significance level.

Differences by gender emerged as themes of racial hostility, discrimination, and policy effects were addressed. The male and female respondents differed on a number of attitudes related to racial discrimination. Females were more likely than males to agree that ignorance is the cause of racial discrimination ($t = 2.88$). They were also more likely to affirm that racial discrimination is a learned behavior ($t = 2.95$). There is a significant difference ($t = 2.25$) between male and female responses to the statement that people do not racially discriminate when choosing friends. Similarly, males ($M = 1.78$) were significantly more likely to agree than females ($M = 1.46$) that people who feel they are discriminated against are just being oversensitive.

Both males and females agreed that racial hostility is still felt by many

Table 1

Responses by Gender	Female			Male			
Disagree or Agree	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*t*
Enough efforts are being made to promote racial diversity.	1.91	.841	250	2.30	.769	132	4.36**
People who feel they are racially discriminated against are just being oversensitive.	1.46	.666	249	1.78	.745	132	4.26**
Because of affirmative action, people of color often receive preferential treatment when it comes to getting into college.	2.21	.732	248	2.49	.637	131	3.74**
Minority students encounter racial discrimination from non-minority students.	2.51	.707	250	2.25	.758	131	3.28**
Racial discrimination is learned behavior.	2.78	.467	250	2.61	.650	132	2.95**
Ignorance is the cause of racial discrimination.	2.69	.638	250	2.48	.726	132	2.88**
People are not likely to express their racial hostility.	1.73	.682	247	1.93	.809	130	2.51*
People do not racially discriminate when choosing friends.	1.62	.763	250	1.81	.814	131	2.25*
Racial hostility is still felt by many people.	2.78	.518	248	2.65	.619	131	2.23*
How often do I:							
Confront others who use racist language or tell racist jokes in my presence	1.78	.854	249	1.55	.775	132	2.62**
Minimize various characteristics of my racial/ethnic culture to fit in with the group I am with at the time	1.18	.452	247	1.41	.655	131	4.08**
Use racist language or tell racist jokes	1.11	.348	250	1.57	.764	132	8.08**
Feel self-conscious slow dancing with someone who is African American in a public place	1.16	.486	250	1.38	.671	132	3.72**
Become uncomfortable around people who are Latino/a	1.10	.355	250	1.28	.612	129	3.52**
Become uncomfortable around people who are Asian American	1.06	.263	249	1.17	.437	132	3.29**
Feel uncomfortable when walking through a neighborhood that is mostly White	1.08	.354	250	1.20	.532	131	2.50*
Feel self-conscious slow dancing with someone who is White in a public place	1.07	.316	249	1.17	.486	131	2.47*

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Responses to the agree/disagree questions are reported on a 3-point scale where 1 = disagree, 2 = neither agree nor disagree, and 3 = agree. Remaining questions were reported on a 3 -point scale where 1 = rarely/once in a while, 2 = sometimes, and 3 = often/frequently.

people, although females were more likely to agree with this statement ($t = 2.23$). Another difference was that females were more likely to agree that minority students encounter racism ($t = 3.28$). Significant differences were also noted on attitudes toward policy. Specifically, males were more likely to agree that because of affirmative action, minority students often receive preferential treatment ($t = 3.74$). Similarly, men were more likely to believe that enough efforts are being made to promote racial diversity ($t = 4.36$).

There were also significant differences by gender regarding behaviors. Males were more likely than females to minimize their racial characteristics to fit in ($t = 4.09$). Furthermore, males also reported that they were more likely to use racist language or tell racist jokes than female respondents ($t = 8.08$). Women were more likely to confront others who use racist language or tell racist jokes ($t = 2.62$). Overall, female participants reported feeling more comfortable than male respondents when interacting with all three racially different groups listed within the study.

Previous Contact with People of Color

The researchers assumed that various racial compositions offered different kinds of social contact with people of other races for the participant. Significant results for responses of students who reported mostly White environments versus all other environments can be found in Table 2. There were no significant differences found between students who had mostly White peer groups in high school and students who had multiracial peer groups in the responses to the attitudinal questions.

Analysis of the behavioral questions based on racial composition of the participant's group of friends in high school found that participants who reported that they had mostly White peer groups in high school were less likely to be uncomfortable being the only White person in a crowd (t = -5.20), and less likely to minimize their racial characteristics to fit in (t = -1.99). They are less likely to interact on a social level (t = -6.18), to hang out with (t = -7.60), or to have serious discussions with someone of another race or ethnicity (t = -6.51). Additionally, they are less likely to compare their cultural perspective with that of someone from another culture (t = -2.54), less likely to attend racial or ethnic programs (t = -3.46), and less likely to seek information regarding racial or ethnic issues (t = -3.52). They are less likely to confront others about using racist language or telling racial jokes (t = -2.57) and less likely to be comfortable with an African American roommate (t = -4.49).

Table 2

Responses by Racial Composition of Group of Friends	Mostly White			All Others			
	M	*SD*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*N*	*t*
I am comfortable being in a situation where I am the only person of my racial/ethnic group	2.23	0.830	295	2.72	0.564	89	-5.20**
It would not bother me if my roommate were African American	2.65	0.683	295	2.91	0.391	88	-4.49**
Interact on a social level with students who are racially or ethnically different from my own background	2.24	0.805	295	2.79	0.410	90	-6.18**
Have serious discussions with students who are of a different race or ethnic background from my own	1.88	0.835	295	2.51	0.691	90	-6.51**
Hang out with someone who is of a different race or ethnic background from my own	2.09	0.827	294	2.79	0.439	89	-7.60**
Compare my own cultural perspective with that of a person from another culture	1.78	0.819	294	2.02	0.783	89	-2.54*
Confront others who use racist language or tell racist jokes in my presence	1.64	0.816	295	1.90	0.862	90	-2.57*
Attend programs that are about issues facing a race or ethnicity that is different from my own	1.19	0.474	295	1.44	0.638	90	-3.46**
Seek out information about issues facing a race or ethnicity that is different from my own	1.22	0.484	294	1.51	0.727	88	-3.52**
Minimize various characteristics of my racial/ethnic culture to fit in with the group I am with at the time	1.23	0.527	295	1.37	0.593	87	-1.99**

Note. **p < .01, *p < .05. *N* approximated 295 for Mostly White, *N* approximated 90 for All Others.

Those who attended a mostly White high school reported that they were more likely to believe that people do not discriminate when choosing friends (t = 2.73). When asked about their behaviors, those who attended a mostly White high school reported that they were less likely to attend a racial/ethnic program (t = -2.85), less likely to interact on a social level (t = -2.13), and were less likely to hang out with someone who is racially or ethnically different (t = -4.19). Students whose neighborhood composition was mostly White were less likely to engage in educating themselves about or immersing themselves in multicultural situations.

Discussion

The findings, divided into the categories of gender and previous contact with people of color, provide knowledge about the attitudes and behaviors of White students towards people of color. Student affairs professionals can derive theoretical and practical implications from the findings.

Gender

In addressing the differences of participant responses by gender, a number of themes surface including racial hostility, discrimination, and feelings of comfort with people of color. These variables show significant inconsistency between female and male responses.

Several conclusions can be made based on the differences of responses by gender. Men harbor more negative racial attitudes than women, and are more likely to desensitize the effects and causes of discrimination. They favored opinions that sought to discredit reports of discriminatory behaviors towards people of color. Conversely, females are more likely to recognize prejudices. They affirm the realization that racial prejudices are still prevalent and practiced by most people. This finding appears to support both Carter's (1990) and Pope-Davis and Ottavi's (1994) research in which women across all cultural backgrounds and ages were found to have fewer negative racial attitudes.

Another gender difference can be noted in males' responses regarding their level of social ease with people of color. Men report being more uncomfortable than women in social interactions with people of color. These feelings support research (Wilkinson, 2000) that finds men more likely to use and display behaviors of racism than females. Their negative attitudes toward people of color manifest in behaviors that may include using racially insensitive language, stereotyping, and giving demeaning stares. Considering these results, men may be at lower levels and progress slower through

statuses of White racial identity development.

Findings from other researchers suggest that men are, at all ages, lower than women of comparable age on Helms' (1990) White racial identity development scale (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994; Wilkinson, 2000). Females have less tolerance for racist and discriminatory attitudes and behavior and are therefore more likely to confront these inappropriate actions. Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) use a historical perspective to analyze the attitudes of women regarding racial integration. Specifically, they state that because women have actively worked toward civil rights, they are more compassionate about eliminating all kinds of discrimination. Women's sense of interconnectedness (Gilligan, 1977) also seems to influence their racial attitudes and behaviors. Within this activist framework it can be assumed that women would be more in favor of policies, such as affirmative action, that seek to end government and *de facto* practices that discriminate. The current research suggests that White women in college have a higher level of identity development than men and therefore communicate less prejudice through attitudinal and behavioral expressions.

Previous Contact with People of Color

More statistical differences were found between the responses of participants from mostly White environments and participants from mixed-race environments. Increased acquaintance contact (described as "high school friends" on the instrument) and residential contact ("neighborhood you lived in during high school") resulted in lower levels of prejudice. These results align with the conclusions of Allport (1954) and Pettigrew (1998), who found that greater exposure of Whites to multicultural environments resulted in fewer negative attitudes and behaviors toward people of color.

Most differences between those who reported experiencing a mostly White environment while growing up and those from mixed environments arose in behavioral, rather than in attitudinal, questions. Results indicate that participants with mostly White high school friends were less likely to hang out with and have social contact or discussions about race with students of color. This finding is significant given the number of studies which report that cross-racial contact has meaningful positive effects for Whites (Hampton, 1996; Minatoya & Sedlacek, 1980; Patterson, 1995; Pettigrew, 1998; Wittig & Grant-Thompson, 1998). Without such social interactions, students whose environment was mostly White in high school would gain only a limited awareness of their White racial identity. They may not understand the extent of differences among people of different races, nor recognize the need for learning diverse and multicultural perspectives by attending programs, seeking out information, or comparing cultures.

The results of this study support existing literature outlining the differences related to gender and previous interracial contact as they manifest in White students' attitudes and behaviors toward people of color. Women have fewer racist attitudes towards people of color and do not behave negatively toward them. Finally, White students who have experienced greater contact with people of color due to the racial makeup of their previous environments are more likely to behave desirably toward those of another race by not conveying negative attitudes or behaviors toward people of color.

Implications

The current study has practical implications for student affairs professionals, university administrators, and college faculty. Individual characteristics, specifically gender and previous interracial contact should be considered when developing diversity initiatives. Theoretical frameworks such as those described here would support campus programs to promote tolerance. For example, findings suggest that men harbor more negative racial attitudes than women and tend to practice more prejudiced behaviors toward people of color. Educators should thus be proactive in creating learning environments that acknowledge gender differences in attitude and behavior toward people of color.

Certain academic disciplines (e.g., sciences, law, and business) and various student organizations (e.g., fraternities, conservative political organizations) that are reflective of male predominance can create environments ripe for discrimination and racism. Care should be taken to assess environmental characteristics that may foster prejudicial relations and create an atmosphere in which both genders can thrive. The contributions of multicultural and diverse individuals in work or academic settings can enhance the identity development of Whites who have had little previous contact with people of color and therefore reduce expressions of prejudice.

Sufficient training should be implemented for all university personnel who interact with students within their learning environments. The results from this study illustrate that individuals with mostly White high school friends and neighbors tend to hold more racial prejudices. Therefore, student affairs practitioners should understand the diversity needs of White individuals whose backgrounds and previous environments offered limited interactions with people of color. Personnel can use identity development inventories (e.g., Helms, 1990) to assess students' current stage of development and design programs that challenge and support them to consider their White racial consciousness as a factor in their interactions with people of color.

Changing White students' racist attitudes and behaviors can begin with positive collaboration among and across race and gender. This can promote both cognitive and psychosocial growth, as well as enhance identity development. When considering the development of future diversity and multicultural

awareness programs, educators must reflect on and consider the ways in which White students perceive their environmental conditions and the ways in which they interact with students of color. Student affairs practitioners should consider using multicultural perspectives in creating well-rounded curricula that address the interactions of people of color and Whites.

References

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Carter, R.T. (1990). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*(1), 46-50.

Carter, R.T., White, T.J., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1987). White student attitudes toward Blacks: Implications for Black student recruitment and retention. *Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences, 33*(3), 165-175.

Claney, D., & Parker, W.M. (1989). Assessing White racial consciousness and perceived comfort with Black individuals. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 67*(8), 449-451.

D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 143-150.

Dennis, R.M. (1981). Socialization and racism: The White Experience. In B.P. Bowser & R.G. Hunt (Eds.), *Impacts of racism on White Americans* (pp. 71-85). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dovidio, J.F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S.L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(1), 62-69.

Fazio, R.H., Jackson, J.R., Dunton, B.C., & Williams, C.J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(6), 1013-1027.

Federico, C.M., & Sidanius, J. (2002). Sophistication and the antecedents of Whites' racial policy attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 66*, 145-176.

Ferguson, D.P., Rhodes, G., Lee, K., & Sriram, N. (2001). 'They all look alike to me': Prejudice and cross-race face recognition. *British Journal of Psychology, 92*(4), 567-578.

Fisher, B. J., & Hartmann, D. J. (1995). The impact of race on the social experience of college students at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Black Studies, 26*(2), 117-133.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*, 481-517.

Hampton, J. (1996). Attitudes of white college students toward African Americans with disabilities in social situations (Report No. UD031702). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED407466)

Hardiman, R. (1982). *White identity development: A process-oriented model for describing the racial consciousness of White Americans*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Helm, E.G., Sedlacek, W.E., & Prieto, D.O. (1998). The relationship between attitudes toward diversity and overall satisfaction of university students by race. *Journal of College Counseling, 1*(2), 111-120.

Helms, J.E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 26, No. 8. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Ihlanfeldt, K.R., & Scafidi, B.P. (2002). The neighbourhood contact hypothesis: Evidence from the Multicity Study of Urban Inequality. *Urban Studies, 39*(4), 619-641.

Johnson, M.K., & Marini, M.M. (1998). Bridging the racial divide in the United States: The effect of gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*(3), 247-259.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive development approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin, (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

McEwen, M.K. (1996). New perspectives on identity development. In S.R. Komives, D.B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 188-217). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Minatoya, L.Y., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1980). Background and attitude toward interracial contact: A profile of Black and White university students. *Integrated Education, 18*, 43-45.

Minatoya, L., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1984). Assessing attitudes of White university students toward Blacks in a changing context. *Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, 12*(2), 69-79.

Oliver, J.E., & Mendelberg, T. (2000). Reconsidering the environmental determinants of White racial attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science, 44*(3), 574-589.

Pace, C.R., & Kuh, G.D. (1998). *College Student Experiences Questionnaire* (4th ed.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning.

Patterson, B.T. (1995). Racial attitude development and inter-ethnic experiences of White university students. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Ponterotto, J. G. (1988). Racial consciousness development among White counselor trainees: A stage model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling, 16*(4), 146-156.

Pope-Davis, D.B., & Ottavi, T.M. (1994). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: A replication and extension. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*(3), 293-297.

Qualls, R.C., Cox, M.B., & Schehr, T.L. (1992). Racial attitudes on campus: Are there gender differences? *Journal of College Student Development, 33*(6), 524-530.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. (1972). *Situational attitude scale*. Chicago, IL: Natresources, Inc.

Shirakawa, F. (1999). *The relationship between racial prejudice to gender, racial identity, and parental bonding*. Unpublished master's thesis. Humboldt State University, Arcata, California.

Smith, C.B. (1994). Back and to the future: The intergroup hypothesis revisited. *Sociological Inquiry, 64*(4), 438-455.

Sniderman, P.M., & Piazza, T. (1993). *The scar of race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sue, D.W., & Sue., D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Tuch, S.A., & Hughes, M. (1996). Whites' racial policy attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly, 77*(4), 723-745.

Wilkinson, D. (2000). Responding to discrimination: Influences of respondent gender, target race, and target gender. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 32*(2), 27-45.

Wittig, M.A., & Grant-Thompson, S. (1998). The utility of Allport's conditions of intergroup contact for predicting perceptions of improved racial attitudes and beliefs. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(4), 795-812.

Stephanie Bondi completed the Higher Education and Student Affairs program in 2003 at Indiana University Bloomington and received an M.S. in Student Affairs Administration. She obtained her B.S. in Accounting from Butler University in 1997. While studying at Indiana University, she served as a Program Advisor for the Indiana Memorial Union Board and as a Judicial Officer for the Office of Student Ethics.

Chris Heasley graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in 2003 with a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration. He received a B. F.A. in Graphic Design from the University of Texas at Arlington in 1999. During his graduate career at IU, Chris worked as a House Director with Delta Chi Fraternity and as a Graduate Supervisor in Ashton Residence Center.

Valerie Kolko graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University Bloomington in 2003 with an M.S in Student Affairs Administration. She received a B.A. in American Studies from Brandeis University in 2001. During her graduate study at IU Valerie worked as a Graduate Supervisor in McNutt Residence Center.

Sarah Young will receive an M.S. in Student Affairs Administration from Indiana University in 2004. She received a B.A. in Political Science from Indiana University and a B.A. in Psychology from Purdue University in 2001. While attending IU Sarah worked as a Research Assistant at the Indiana Center for Evaluation and as the Assistant Director in the Office of Summer Freshman Programs.

Indiana University
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Gift Form

As members of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, we thank you for your contribution to the organization! Your continued support is crucial to the financial health of the Journal. We hope you consider sending a gift this year as you enjoy the 2003 edition of this high-quality student publication.

Please accept my gift of $_____

For: _____ IU Student Personnel Association (32-E009-15-7)
_____ Other_____ (38-E009-02-2)

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Please make checks payable to the Indiana University Foundation, the designated fundraising agent of Indiana University.

****Please be sure to note on your donation that the gift should be directed to the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (32-E009-15-7). All docations marked "Education" will be directed to the School of Education general account.*

I/we wish to make my/our gift by (please check one):

_____ Mastercard _____ Visa _____ Check Enclosed

Card #_____ Exp. Date _____

Signature _____

The Indiana University Fund supports new and ongoing projects and special initiatives by providing funds for immediate use throughout the University. A portion of funds and/or income therefrom may be used to defray costs of raising and/or administering the funds.

Mail To: IU Foundation/School of Education
PO Box 2298
Bloomington, IN 47402-2298