WORKING WITH COLLEGE STUDENTS &
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT THEORY PRIMER[1]

This Student Development overview or "primer" is designed to provide Student Affairs staff an introduction (or refresher) to a few basic principles which contribute to the foundation of working with college students in general (not necessarily specific to UNCW). This review begins with discussion of the context of student affairs within the history of higher education, review of basic definitions associated with working with college students, discussion of the Millennial College Generation and what have been coined as their "core traits/characteristics," review of various basic principles of student development theory and key definitions, a brief history of student development theory and the four schools of theory, discussion of several additional key theories (John Dewey, Bloom's Taxonomy, Maslow's Hieracrchy and the W-Curve), and discussion of the Doctrine of In Loco Parentis. This primer provides only a cursory overview of a number of critical concepts relative to working with college students. The bibliography provides a more exhaustive list of resources intended for those who wish to further pursue a more detailed study of the various concepts and information herein.

History of Student Affairs in Higher Education

Higher education dates back to the Colonial period; however, "student affairs" was not formalized across college campuses until the 1970s. According to Dr. Adam Weinberg, Dean of the College at Colgate University (2005), "Before the 1970s, 'student affairs' consisted of some athletic programs and a few administrators who essentially acted as surrogate parents (in loco parentis), enforcing rules and order. In the late 1960s, however, as institutions struggled to confront race relations, sexual violence, drug and alcohol abuse, and other controversial issues, they hired professional administrators to deal with those concerns. By the 1990s, that trend led to an explosion of student-affairs offices and departments, charged with managing programs, residential units, cultural centers, campus safety, career services, and virtually all other nonacademic aspects of campus life" (http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i02/02b01301.htm).

During the *evolution* of student affairs between the 1960s and 1990s, college students evolved from clients to consumers. According to Dr. Roger Geiger (2005), a professor of higher education at Pennsylvania State University, prior to the 1960s the college student's role was that of a client, seeking the expertise and knowledge of the faculty. But during the 1960s and 1970s, the situation began to change perceptibility when student activists and certain administrators made significant changes to their college's curriculum, attendance policies, and examination expectations. Furthermore, as the marketplace began to have a significantly greater impact on higher education, there was enhanced competition for the *ablest* students, or "arms race" for students, which greatly promoted student consumerism. According to Dr. Geiger (2002), "The competition for students, for good or ill, has bred consumerism-- a reversal over the attitude from students as clients, fortunate to attend a particular university, to students as customers who must be pleased with a variety of amenities-- from upscale dormitories to mall-like shopping facilities that have little to do with actual education" (http://www.ed.psu.edu/news/studentconsumers.asp).

---

[1] Walker, M. (2008).

Dr. Carol Cartwright, past president of Kent State University, is a strong advocate of student affairs and institutional collaboration to foster student success. According to Dr. Cartwright (1998), an institution-wide focus on student success has become essential on today's college/university campuses. Student affairs issues are among the most fundamental and far-reaching realities facing higher education. While ten years ago many student affairs officers often operated in a vacuum, administrators are now working collaboratively across divisions to enhance the student life and academic experience of undergraduate and graduate students.

Contemporary issues and challenges in today's academy, including but not limited to safety, crisis response, threat assessment and emergency preparedness and response, and management of student mental health concerns, have contributed to the expansion of traditional student affairs responsibilities (housing, social and educational programming, diversity education). These issues have made student affairs work more complex, and necessitated additional leadership within the campus hierarchy by student affairs professionals.

Overall, faced with different demographics, new expectations and increased competition, colleges and universities are rethinking who they serve, and how. These changes are making the perspectives of student affairs professionals critical to a university's service initiatives and strategic planning, in general.

Definitions
Before discussing student development, various key definitions should be revisited. It is important not to confuse these terms when speaking about college students and not to interchange these concepts.

Higher Education: There are approximately 4,000 two- and four-year institutions of higher learning in the United States. These institutions provide post-secondary education to students after high school, and offer degrees such as Associates (two-year), Bachelors (four-year), Masters (post-Bachelors two years), Doctorate (post-Masters) and professional degrees (law and medicine).

Student Affairs: Student Affairs is the area within colleges and universities concerned with the development of students outside the classroom. Other administrative and functional areas within a university may include academic affairs, registrar, enrollment management/admissions, business affairs, CFO/treasurer/fiscal affairs, development (fund raising), alumni affairs, athletics, facilities/physical plant, marketing and public relations, and food service. Student Affairs is also a common reference to the profession of *helpers* of college students (known as "Student Affairs Professionals" or the "field of Student Affairs."

Student Services: Similar to Student Affairs, student services describes the myriad service areas on a college campus whose purpose is providing academic and support services to students, faculty and staff. Student services are predominantly delivered by the Student Affairs division,, and on most campuses include areas such as dean of students, career services, student health, counseling center, student activities and leadership development, student judicial services, substance abuse prevention, housing, disability support services, international student services, multicultural student services/diversity initiatives and customer service. Other non-Student

Affairs departments, including academic service areas, business affairs and information technology, also provide services to students outside of Student Affairs on many campuses (for example, a School of Business may offer a Student Services department for their students).

Student Development: Unlike Student Affairs and student services (nouns), student development (verb) is less an active entity as it is a conceptual and theoretical foundation used to understand and work with college students. It is the application of student development theories and principles which guide our work with college students, and which helps us properly aid them in their *change, growth* and *development.*

Student Development Theory: Body of human development theories focused on how individuals who are enrolled in college coursework develop. Merges physical, biological, physiological, psychological, social and environmental factors.

Millennial College Students
While working to understand and educate today's college students, it is important to understand the current generational culture to which today's college students belong. Those of us who are *Baby Boomers* (born 1946-1963; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baby_boomer) or from *Generation X* (1964-1981; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generation_X) are likely to perceive and interpret things differently from each other, and differently from today's college students (dubbed by Howe and Strauss as the *Millennial College Generation or Echo Boomers or Generation Y*, (born 1982-1993; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generation_Y) and the next, yet to be named generation (*Internet Generation?,* mid to late 1990s; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/IGeneration).

Through their research, Howe and Strauss (2000) found that seven key characteristics define today's 18-22 year old college students (as well as 23-25 year old graduate students). These traits include:
1. Special - many from smaller families with fewer siblings to compete with, so received greater attention and increased security from mom and dad (known as "helicopter parents" due to their constant hovering around their children).
2. Sheltered - more than previous generations, parents kept them closer to home with a focus on safety and connection to family, but also involved with many organized activities and sports.
3. Confident - increased parental involvement and coaching/external adult involvement gave them lots of support and self-confidence.
4. Team-oriented - grew up among most diverse American population ever, and learned to be civil and less "me-oriented" than previous generations. Learned early on to "play nice and share".
5. Conventional - more resourceful, dynamic, and environmentally conscious than previous generations.
6. Pressured - overscheduled, over-mentored, and driven to succeed among peers, in part due to increased pressure to attend college (or in many cases exceptional colleges) in order to succeed in life.
7. High achieving - future-oriented, planners, focus on long-term success.

According to Howe and Strauss, the Millennial generation always has had MTV, cell phones and more than one color television per household. They don't remember the Reagan assassination attempt, but their defining moments include Columbine, September 11th and the VTech tragedy.

It should be noted that the term "helicopter parents" is now part of today's college/university lingo. Helicopter parents are defined as parents of Millennial students who are "overly" and often too involved in their student's life on campus. Establishing clear expectations with parents of new students regarding the parent's versus the student's roles during the college experience (starting as early as orientation) helps provide healthy parameters for parental involvement, and non-involvement.

Introduction to Student Development Theory
According to DiCaprio (1974, in Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998), the field of student development theory and research justifies the profession of *Student Affairs* and legitimizes relevance of student affairs professionals in the college setting. It also provides qualitative and quantitative data from which to base our work with students, and helps us understand where students are within a human development continuum (where they are and where they are going, developmentally).

Through student development theory we come to understand how to address the "whole person," and complement academic progress (what students learn "in class") with co-curricular initiatives (what they learn and how they develop "out of class" and the knowledge and skills they develop to prepare for life after college and their chosen professions), and account for the development and needs of special populations (e.g., minority groups, international students, athletes, Lesbian Gay Bi-sexual Transgendered Allies or "LGBTA" students, et al.). Finally, student development theory provides description, explanation, prediction and control.

Basic assumptions and concepts related to Student Development:
- The individual student must addressed holistically ("considered as a whole"). Understanding *holistic learning* is essential, including taking an overall, inclusive approach concerning physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual factors that affect health (for more on holistic learning, go to http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/files/holistic.html).
- Each student is a unique person and must be treated as such (taking into consideration physical, social, biological and cultural distinctions).
- *Behavior* is a function of the person and the environment ($b f = p \times e$) (Lewin, 1937). The total campus environment of the student is educational and must be used to help the student achieve full development. The major responsibility for a student's personal and social development rests with the student and his/her personal resources (U. Texas Dallas-http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/ugraddean/theory.html).
- *Optimal student development* requires an environment which provides a proper balance of *challenge and support* (Sanford, 1967).
- *Developmental tasks* are skills and competencies that are mastered and acquired by an individual as he/she gains increasing mastery over their environment.
- *Crisis* often results from disequilibrium (when one does not have the skills to manage a situation). In context, today's traditional-aged college students often lack the coping

skills to manage their environment independent of assistance from their primary care giver (parents/guardians).

- *Hierarchical stages* are a series of developmental stages that one must ascend in a certain order; mastery of each stage must occur before progressing to the next.
- *Equilibrium/disequilibrium* is associated with a person beginning to question beliefs and competencies as the result of a crisis. Perhaps she or he is not equipped with the skills to deal with the situation. When this disequilibrium occurs, the student must strive to develop the skills necessary to progress to the next developmental stage and again establish equilibrium (translated as a resting stop before the next crisis).
- *Sequential stages* are a series of stages that are in a certain order, but not necessary for one to master in any particular order before progressing to the next.
- *Differentiation/Integration* is much like the Chinese philosophy of *yin and yang*. Differentiation occurs when one comes to see parts and concepts once seen as similar as separate and independent. Integration is realizing the relationship that exists between the parts that make up complex wholes (in Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998).

Key Definitions to understand before studying student development theory:
Change – Any condition that is altered from a previous condition, be it positive, negative, healthy or unhealthy.
Growth – The adding of something to a pre-existing status; the expansion of personality traits and maturity, or physical maturation (children growing taller).
Development – A process. The process of increasing the complexity of an organism. The integration of subsystems into the whole without their losing separate identities. Development is *always* positive and healthy.

History of Student Development Theory
During the late nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century, American higher education was facing rapid growth, extensive change, and impersonalization. Colleges shifted from the small, close-knit English residential college approach to a large, increasingly diverse, residence hall approach. Psychological theorists such as Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung began to write about humans from a perspective different from theologians and philosophers. As the field of psychology developed, theorists such as B.F. Skinner and Carl Rogers influenced the student affairs profession. A student services paradigm influenced by social and behavioral sciences was used as a model to help troubled students with remedial services and to provide other services and programs to supplement academics. The focus was on services (see University of Minnesota and Duluth… http://www.d.umn.edu/fye/freshmen/transiton/development/w_curve.htm).

Toward the middle of the twentieth century the combination of student activism and developing psychological and sociological theories changed the thinking about student development. Though there are many models of student development, the basic premise is the same. Student development reflects theories of human growth and environmental influences as applied to in-class and out-of-class personal learning opportunities. The essence of *intentional student development* is the interaction between the student and the educational environment, so that all aspects of the student's life are attended to. Also, that the environmental resources both challenge the student and give the support needed to meet these challenges, and so more advanced levels of development result.

Student development is both a theory base and a philosophy about the purposes of higher education. It is a directional movement toward greater complexity and competence. SDT is integrative in nature; it requires mutuality, equality, cooperation and collaboration among all parties (students, faculty, staff, administration). SDT models should stimulate and support students as they progress through their own unique developmental process, and the more the development can be individualized the better. This is why it is so important to work with students both in groups and individually. Programs based on student development models are designed to stimulate self- understanding, to strengthen skills, and/or to increase knowledge. These types of programs reflect specific educational interventions.

The basic educational value is enhanced when one uses theory to inform practice by designing and providing environments that help students both learn and mature. The well-rounded development of the whole person is valued as a primary goal.

The Four Schools of Theory
Student Development in College (Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998), provides an excellent overview of basic student development theory, focusing on the **Four Major Schools of Student Development Theory**. The following are a brief explanation of each school of theory, followed by a more in-depth explanation of each**:**

1. Psychosocial Theories
Psychosocial theories examine individuals' personal and interpersonal lives (Evans, 1996; in Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998), and are defined as, "A sequence of developmental tasks or stages confronted by adults when their biology and psychology converge" (Erikson, 1950, 1968; in Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998) and "qualitatively change their thinking, feeling, behaving, valuing, and relating to others and self" (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; in Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). They also examine the *content* of development, the important issues students face as their lives progress, such as defining themselves and their relationships with others, and what students "want to be when they grow up."

2. Cognitive and Moral Development Theories
Cognitive and moral development theories examine the development of how students grow cognitively and intellectually, including how they interpret the world around them. These theories examine the way people think but not what they think (Evans, 1996; in Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998).

3. Typology Theories
Typology Theories examine individual differences in how (students) view and relate to the world (Evans, 1996; in Forney, Evans & Guido-DiBrito, 1998).

4. Person-Environment Theories
Person-environment Theories examine the relationship between the environment and student (as Dewey (1916) notes, all activity, action and education occur only through means of the surrounding environment. The environment helps us achieve our educational goals with students). Related to environmental theory, Sandeen (1991) indicates there are *Six Sources of*

Influence by Colleges and Universities. Students Affairs Professionals should take into consideration these influences as managers, administrators, helpers and teachers in the academy: 1. Clarity and consistency of objectives; 2. Institutional size; 3. Curriculum, teaching and evaluation; 4. Residence hall arrangements; 5. Faculty and administration; 6. Friends, groups, student culture

Erik Erikson's (1959) Life Span Model
According to Erikson (1959), considered by most as the forefather of psychosocial development (and whom Chickering modeled his vectors after), there are **eight stages of development** which comprise the human life span. Erikson's model provides a chronological overview of the primary facets of human development.

1. **Infancy** (birth-2)…Basic trust versus mistrust between mother and child.

2. **Toddlerhood** (2-4)…Autonomy versus shame and doubt (potty training).

3. **Early School Age** (5-7)…Initiative versus guilt (masturbation).

4. **Middle School Age** (8-12)…Industry versus inferiority (school work).

5. **Late Adolescence** (18-22)…Individual identity versus role diffusion (adolescence). Traditional college-aged students are in this phase.

6. **Early Adulthood** (23-34)…Intimacy versus Isolation (marriage).

7. **Middle Adulthood** (35-60)…Generativity versus stagnation (parenting).

8. **Late Adulthood** (61-)…Integrity versus despair (dealing with death).

Erikson (1959) maintained that there are **five elements of identity resolution** that most young adults experience and experiment with during their maturation, including:

1. Experimentation with varied roles

2. Experiencing choice

3. Meaningful achievement

4. Freedom from excessive anxiety

5. Time for reflection and instrospection

Chickering's Seven Vectors (1969)
Arthur Chickering (1969) introduced **vectors** as series of developmental tasks both having direction and magnitude. According to Chickering, one may work through more than one vector concurrently, but each stage is the central focus at any given time. Unlike stage theories,

Chickering's theory implies fluid motion of development, and no two individuals will work through the vectors exactly the same as his or her peers. Unlike Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, Chickering's Vectors are not hierarchical in nature. The vectors are:
1. Developing competence
2. Managing emotions
3. Moving through autonomy toward independence
4. Developing mature interpersonal relationships
5. Establishing identity
6. Developing purpose
7. Developing integrity

Chickering's Vectors are well known and often referred to and utilized by student affairs professionals on both micro and macro levels. Consider for example working individually with a student who is distraught over the death of a close friend from home (vector two), or a student struggling to establish her identity as a young adult (vector five) or a student grappling with a moral or ethical dilemma (vector seven). Now consider creating a residential education program designed to help students learn self-assessment skills and gauge career direction relative to choosing a major (vectors one and six), or designing a new Community Standards Model for first year students (vectors two and seven).

As student affairs professionals become familiar with developmental psychology, they become more adept at working with college students, understanding their moods and modes, and may intentionally interact with students and design experiences to promote growth in certain areas. For example, the developmental task of "establishing identity" is perhaps one of the more challenging realms for traditional aged college students. As college students determine "who they are" and "what they want to be when they grow up," they often cope with tremendous peer and environmental influences that dictate certain outcomes. Students learning new knowledge and skills may struggle with "developing competence," while students who habitually consult with their parents before making every decision may be challenged with "moving through autonomy toward independence." These are the developmental issues that Chickering was attempting to help traditional-aged (18-22) college students resolve.

Perhaps the best way to view Psychosocial and Identity Development Theories is as a sequence of developmental tasks and stages confronted by adults when their biology and psychology converge, and which qualitatively change their thinking, feeling, behaving, valuing, and relating to others and oneself (http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/SAStudentDev.doc).

While psychosocial development focuses on the personal and human development of students in relation to their age, peers and environment, cognitive development (or "cognitive structural theories") focuses on their intellectual growth. Cognitive-Structural Theories illuminate changes in *how* people think, not *what* they think (Evans, 1996). Derived from Piagetian psychology (Piaget, 1952), these theories stress the importance of heredity and environment in intellectual development and reveals the various ways and individual develops cognitively (http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/SAStudentDev.doc).

According to Evans, Forney and Guido-DiBrito (1998), three popular theorists in this category are Kohlberg, Perry, and Gilligan. Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development lays a foundation for this category. His theory, developed in the 1950s, has relied on many aspects of Piaget's (1932) child development theory.

Kohlberg's model employs a hierarchical, sequential progression as follows:
I. Pre-conventional Level
Stage 1: Punishment and obedience orientation—the individual acts to avoid punishment.
Stage 2: The instrumental—relativist orientation-decisions are based on equal exchange.

II. Conventional Level
Stage 3: The interpersonal concordance orientation—good behavior is identified as that which pleases others.
Stage 4: The "law and order" orientation—actions are based on upholding the system and obeying the rules.

III. Post-conventional, or Principled Level
Stage 5: The social contract, or legalistic, orientation—individuals are bound by the social contracts into which they have entered.
Stage 6: The universal ethical principle orientation—Self-chosen ethical principles, including justice, equality, and respect for human dignity, guide behavior. Principles take precedence over laws.

Given Kohlberg's research was based on men only, Carol Gilligan's work in the 1980s lead to important updates to the genre of moral development theories. Where Kohlberg focused on "justice and rights," it failed to account for what Gilligan referred to as "a different voice," that of the concern that women have with care and responsibility for others (http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/SAStudentDev.doc). Gilligan's model of moral development consists of three levels and two transition periods.

Orientation to Individual Survival—decisions center on self and one's own desires and needs. From *Selfishness to Responsibility*—desire to take care of oneself remains but is in conflict with a growing sense that the right thing to do is to take care of others.
Goodness as Self-Sacrifice—Acceptance by others becomes the primary criteria…one's own desires are relegated to a secondary position. From *Goodness to Truth*—the concept of responsibility is reconsidered in an effort to include taking care of oneself as well as others.
The Morality of Non-Violence—…comes to understand that the prohibition against hurting includes not hurting herself as well as not hurting others. This principle of non-violence becomes her main guiding force (http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/SAStudentDev.doc).

According to Forney, Evans and Guido-DiBrito (1998), Perry's Theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development concerns itself with the structures that shape how people view their experiences. He described his system as beginning with simplistic forms in which the individual interprets the world in "unqualified polar terms of absolute right-wrong, good-bad) (http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/SAStudentDev.doc). Perry's Theory of Intellectual & Ethical Development "is clearly a stage model, although he prefers the term ***position*** because

it implies no assumptions about duration [of each position]"
(http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/ SAStudentDev.doc).

The stages include:

Dualism Modified (positions 1-3): In the early position, students order their worlds in dualistic, dichotomous, and absolute categories. Dualistic students see the world as a place of absolutes such as right or wrong, true or false. Knowledge is seen as existing absolutely. **Dualistic students** tend to think of their role in terms of "right" answers and the role of the professor as providing those answers. These students will present judgments and evaluations as if they were self-evident, without the need for substantiation.

Relativism Discovered (Multiplism) (positions 4-6): Recognition of multiplicity in the world leads to understanding that knowledge is contextual and relative. Analytical thinking skills emerge during these positions. **Multiplistic students** recognize that there are multiple perspectives to problems; however, they are unable to evaluate each perspective adequately. A typical multiplistic response might be, "We're all entitled to our own opinions," or "We're all good people." Argumentation ends, or is avoided, with the multiplistic attitude.

Commitments in Relativism Developed (Positions 7-9): In these positions, commitments are made to ideas, to values, to behaviors, to other people. **Relativistic students** see knowledge as relative to particular frames of reference. They show a capacity for detachment; they look for the "big picture," think about their own thinking, and evaluate their own ideas as well as those of others. Frequently, by seeing alternative perspectives, they have difficulty making a decision. Authorities are seen as people who can and should be questioned" (Battaglini, D. J. & Schenkat, R. J., 1987; retrieved 10-17-05 from http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-925/perry.htm).

Perry's model (1970, 1981), holds much explanatory power in suggesting how students make sense out of the information, theories, experiences, and opinions that confront them in college classrooms. The three descriptions below summarize many of the differences in student thinking described by Perry.

Typology Theories
According to Forney, Evans and Guido-DiBrito (1998), typology theories reflect individual stylistic differences in how students approach their worlds. Unlike psychosocial and cognitive-structural theories, they do not consist of stages that students progress through, but are more used to measure how one's personal attributes and learning style relative to others, gauge choice of major and potential career interests, and where one draws the most energy from (in terms of comfort level around decision making, peers and predicaments).
Theories commonly referred to as Typology Models include:

The **Myers-Briggs model** (the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator or "MBTI"), which is solidly based on Carl Jung's theory of psychological types.

"**Holland's theory of Vocational Choice**, which examines both people's interests and the characteristics of the work environment. According to Holland, vocation is an expression of personality…" (Komives, Woodard & Assoc, 1996, p. 181; in (http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/SAStudentDev.doc).   **A few other theories of note…**

Astin's Theory of Involvement indicates that the more students are involved on campus, the more they persist in terms of academic success and satisfaction with the campus climate, and occupies something of a middle ground between psychological and sociological explanations of student change (see http://home.okstate.edu/homepages.nsf/toc/first_generation6 for more information on Campus Involvement Theory).

Tinto's Theory of Student Development theorizes that students enter a college or university with varying patterns of personal, family, and academic characteristics and skills, including initial dispositions and intentions with respect to college attendance and personal growth. These intentions and commitments are subsequently modified and reformulated on a continuing basis through a longitudinal series of interactions between the individual and the structures and members of the academic and social systems of the institution (see http://www.integrativepsychology.org/articles/vol2_article2.htm for information on Identity Theory and Persistence).

Pascarella's General Model for Assessing Change is a general causal model that includes more explicit consideration of both an institution's structural characteristics and its general environment. Pascarella suggests that growth is a function of the direct and indirect effects of five major sets of variables (http://students.berkeley.edu/committees/bc/SAStudentDev.doc).

John Dewey
Philosopher and educator John Dewey (1916), one of the pre-eminent thinkers on philosophy of education (author of *Democracy in Education*), brought national attention to the importance of education in society. Key concepts espoused by Dewey include:

- The importance of establishing conditions that stimulate visible and tangible ways of acting…making the individual a "sharer" or partner in the associated activity so that he feels its success as his success, its failure as his failure.
- Social environments form the mental and emotional disposition of behavior in individuals by engaging them in activities that arouse and strengthen certain impulses, and that have certain purposes and entail certain consequences.
- The unconscious influence of the environment is so subtle and pervasive that it affects every fiber of character and mind…We never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment. Whether we permit change, allow the environments to do the work, or whether we design environments for a purpose makes a great difference.
- All of us have many habits of whose import we are quite unaware, since they were formed without our knowing what we were about. Consequently, they possess us, rather than we them. They move us; they control us. Unless we become aware of what they accomplish, and pass judgment upon the worth of the result, we do not control them (speaks to the importance of introspection and teaching self-reflection in students).
- On the conditions of growth…In directing the activities of the young, society determines its own future in determining that of the young. Since the young at a given time will at

some later date comprise the society of that period, the latter's nature will largely turn upon the direction children's activities were given at an earlier period. This cumulative movement of action toward a later result is what is meant by *growth*…[however], the primary condition of growth is immaturity. [For more information on Dewey, go to http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-dewey.htm and http://www.iep.utm.edu/d/dewey.htm]

Benjamin Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning (1964) remains an often-used developmental model for advising students and supervising staff. According to Bloom, the three domains of learning are cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

1. *Cognitive* domain involves knowledge and the development of intellectual skills.
2. *Affective* domain includes the manner in which we deal with things emotionally.
3. *Psychomotor* domain includes physical movement, coordination, and the use of motor skills.

Modern educators have transposed Bloom's Taxonomy into the Knowledge, Attitudes and Skills model for designing programs and services for college students, and for supervising staff in the college environment (http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/bloom.html).

A common reference to Bloom's Taxonomy is the "Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes" model, which coincides with the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains, respectively. The addition of a fourth domain- communication- forms a "CASK Model" which may be used for training and developing student affairs staff using the performance realms of Communication, Attitude, Skills and Knowledge as primary competency areas (Walker, 1998).

Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1954)

Maslow published his first conceptualization of the Hierarchy of Needs theory over 50 years ago (Maslow, 1943) and it has since become one of the most popular and often cited theories of human motivation (http://www.ship.edu/~cgboeree/maslow.html). College campuses intentionally and subconsciously still use this model while addressing the needs of their students (meeting basic needs such as housing (residence halls with essential and additional amenities), food (nutritional and diverse meal plans), and parking/transportation (bodily comforts). These needs, in addition to providing a sense of safety, must be met first, before optimal education may occur.

Levels:
1. **Physiological**: hunger, thirst, bodily comforts, etc.;
2. **Safety/Security**: out of danger;
3. **Belongingness and Love**: affiliate with others, be accepted; and
4. **Esteem**: to achieve, be competent, gain approval and recognition.
5. **Cognitive**: to know, to understand, and explore;
6. **Aesthetic**: symmetry, order, and beauty;
7. **Self-Actualization**: to find self-fulfillment and realize one's potential; and
8. **Transcendence**: to help others find self-fulfillment and realize their potential.

The "W-Curve"
New theories of working with college students are being designed all the time. Many of these new theories are based on newly conducted research and established by professionals who have spent their lives devoted to helping college students succeed. For example, according to Zeller and Mosier (1993), most new first-year students experience a predictable pattern of five stages after they arrive on campus. This "W-Curve" includes the initial period of excitement upon arrival to school (Honeymoon period), a period of discomfort with one's new environment, often laden with crises (Culture Shock period), followed by a period of adaptation and adjustment (Initial Adjustment period), followed by a period of loneliness often accompanied with academic challenges and missing one's home environment (Mental Isolation period) and followed finally by a more stable adjustment and comfort with one's total campus environment (Acceptance & Integration period). Awareness of these typical stages that most new first-year students experience may help those in the profession or working with and assisting college students. A description and graph of the W-Curve is provided by the University of Minnesota at Duluth http://www.d.umn.edu/fye/freshmen/transiton/development/w_curve.htm

The Doctrine of In Loco Parentis
From the establishment of Harvard in 1636 through the early 20th century, college faculty (at first primarily men) were entrusted comprehensively with the care and discipline of their students. This doctrine of Common Law was the ruling construct for dealing with students *In Loco Parentis* (ILP). ILP was reinforced in 1913 when a judge ruled that college officials can summarily dictate the off campus behavior of their students and punish them in a manner they saw fit, without judicial process (*Gott v. Berea College*) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Gott_v._Berea_College). ILP was again upheld in 1928 (*Anthony v. Syracuse*), when a co-ed at Syracuse was removed from campus based on rumors that she was not upholding the reputation of a "Syracuse girl."

Gott v. Berea illustrates the judicial deference then given to higher education officials, which provided them untrammeled authority over students' lives: "College authorities stand in loco parentis concerning the physical and moral welfare and mental training of the pupils, as we are unable to see why, to that end, they may not make any rule or regulation for the government or betterment of their pupils that a parent could for the same purpose. Whether the rules or regulations are wise or their aims worthy is a matter left solely to the discretion of the authorities or parents, as the case may be, and, in the exercise of that discretion, the courts are not disposed to interfere, unless the rules and aims are unlawful or against public policy [*Gott v. Berea*, 161 S.W. 204, 206 (ky. 1913)]."

Decades preceding the 1960s ended ILP, perhaps originally affected by the GI Bill's graying of college campuses in the 1940's *Dixon v. Alabama* (http://www.securityoncampus.org/lawyers/dixon.html) struck a major definitive blow to ILP in 1961, and affirmed that institutions of education MUST provide due process before taking disciplinary action against students.

According to Duderstadt (2000), college presidents and their families often play a "pastoral role" relative to their students, and can even be perceived as the "mom and pop" of the extended university family. Duderstadt, former president of the University of Michigan, said, "Students

looked to us for parental support, even as they emphasized their rejection of *in loco parentis* (Duderstadt, 2000, xi).

In total, perhaps the main overarching contributors toward the end of ILP on how college officials handled their students included:

- The GI Bill
- Emergence of non-traditional aged students on campus (some completing community college or working before entering four-year schools), and the lowering of the age of majority from 21 to 18 (26th Amendment, 1971)
- The Family Education Rights & Privacy Act (aka Buckley Amendment of 1974)
- *Bradshaw v. Rawlings* (1979) (in which a judge ruled that a college cannot be held liable for a student's injuries associated with a car accident and underage consumption of alcohol at a class picnic)

Bibliography and Associating Readings

Belt, M. (October 3, 2005). "Grounding helicopter parents: Some schools taking measures to reduce hovering affect." *The Lawrence Journal World*. Lawrence, Kansas. http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2005/oct/03/grounding_helicopter_parents/?city_local=

Blaum, P. (2002). "College Students Have Evolved from Clients to Consumers. http://www.ed.psu.edu/news/studentconsumers.asp

Carroll, F. (January 27, 2005). "No escape from 'helicopter parents': Constant hovering can kick up a cloud of troubles." *Albany Times Union*. http://seattlepi.nwsource.com /lifestyle/209473_copterparents.html

Cartwright, C. (1998). "A Presidential Perspective on Student Affairs." http://www.naspa.org/membership/mem/nr/article.cfm?id=19

Chickering, A. W. (1990). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duderstadt, J. (2000). *A University for the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor, MI: UM Press.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S. & Guido-DiBrito, F (1998). *Student Development in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pope, J. (August 28, 2005). "Colleges try to deal with hovering parents." *USA Today*. http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-08-28-hovering-parents_x.htm

Sandeen, A. (1991). *The Professional Student Affairs Administrator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schweitzer, S. (August 20, 2005). "Case of the hovering parents." *Boston Globe*. http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2005/08/20/case_of_the_hovering _parents

Smith, P. (2004). *Quiet Crisis: How Higher Education is Failing America*. Bolton, MA: Anker Pub.

Strange, C. C. & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by Design*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

University of Texas at Dallas (2005). Basic assumptions of the student development movement, retrieved August 1, 2005, http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/ugraddean/ theory.html

Wienberg, A. (2005). "An Alternative to the Campus as Club Med." http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i02/02b01301.htm

Yin, R. K. (Ed.; 2005). *Introducing the World of Education*. London: SAGE.

http://www.ericdigests.org/1998-1/conduct.htm- From Discipline to Development: Rethinking Student Conduct in Higher Education.

http://www.faculty.fplc.edu/redfield/library/Pdf/case-bradshaw.rawlings.pdf- *Bradshaw v. Rawlings*

http://www.asjaonline.org/attachments/articles/29/Shin%20v.%20MIT.pdf- Update on *Shin v. MIT case, from ASJA*

http://insidehighered.com/news/2006/03/13/counseling- Summary on *GW v. Nott.*

http://www-tech.mit.edu/V122/N16/16lawsuit.16n.html- Commentary on *Shin v. MIT*

http://web.mit.edu/aram/www/writing/nliable.html- MIT Case after *Gott v. Berea*

http://www.utdallas.edu/dept/ugraddean/theory.html- U. Tex. Dallas

http://www.d.umn.edu/fye/freshmen/transiton/development/- Student Development Theory

http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-dewey.htm- John Dewey

http://www.iep.utm.edu/d/dewey.htm- John Dewey

http://www.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft0112/opinion/thistime.html- "Millennials Floating" by Alicia Mosier

http://www.next-wave.org/oct00/mill.htm- "A Generation in Ascent" by Eric Stanford

http://www.answers.com/topic/strauss-and-howe- More on Howe and Strauss