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(ABSTRACT)

Most educational leaders of higher education recognize the importance of creating and sustaining a sense of community on college campuses to enhance the likelihood that students achieve their educational goals. Historical definitions of campus community often are vague in their characterizations and difficult to use to structure learning experiences. This study was concerned with creating definitions of campus community with greater specificity and utility than has been traditionally revealed through literature. Historical conceptualizations of community were reviewed and a consensually oriented process for operationally defining campus community in a particular setting was employed to arrive at a preferred definition of community.

The Hutchinson methodology for defining "fuzzy concepts" was used to arrive at a preferred definition of community. Student participants from a land-grant research university living in three distinct life style arrangements were consulted in workshops designed to achieve consensus to arrive at their operational definitions. The findings from this study should be useful especially to student affairs professionals who are concerned with structuring out-of-class college environments to strengthen the learning opportunities for students.
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CHAPTER 1

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

In contrast to the romanticized image of a college as an idyllic island of serenity, the lack of community reflected in the changing nature and complexion of college campuses concerns many modern day scholars. From the anger of the 1960s, the depression of the 1970s, the confident caution of the 1980s, to the present urgency for renewal in the 1990s, the call for advocacy of community values increases. In order to forge a decade of distinction, we need to strengthen the capacity of our communities to encourage vocabularies and behavior of mutual respect. This is perhaps the most challenging moment in higher education in four decades (Boyer, 1990). We need to look at the issues from the vantage points of people who were not in mind when our institutions were designed (Minow, 1990).

The traditional campus community was one of sharing and caring, of collaboration and mutuality, homogeneity, and constant, demanding conformity. It witnessed a sense of shared commitment among colleagues, and boasted generations of history and continuity (Gardner, 1989). These characteristics of campus community are no longer present on many campuses today.
What is campus community? It has been recognized that teaching and learning are best carried out in that social setting often called a "community of scholars." Whitehead (1925) pointed out that the major justification for a university is to preserve the connection between knowledge and the zest for life, by uniting the young and old in the imaginative consideration of learning. The definition of campus community differs from campus to campus, and often from subcommunity to subcommunity on specific campuses. Each institution seeks to make its campus a transmitter of knowledge and culture and a model community. But with the diversity that characterizes today's campus it is difficult to choose community principles all will accept. Overlapping values, norms, language, symbols of group identity, traditions, heroines/heroes and other cultural artifacts are needed in order to insure some common experiences for students, faculty and administrators (Kuh, 1990).

The report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990) entitled Campus Life: In Search of Community has identified two distinct needs in higher education today. They include the need to begin a national dialogue on community-building and the need to challenge higher education to define its role in developing ways to create and strengthen the campus community and, hopefully, society at large. This dissertation is in response to the second challenge in defining campus community operationally from the students' point of view.
The Research Question

The questions guiding this study were:

1. What is the operational definition of campus community at Virginia Tech?
2. How does the definition address issues of individual versus shared interests and diversity?

How Various Authors Define Community

To attempt to define community confronts the problem of there being only general areas of agreement. Hillery (1955) surveyed ninety-four definitions and found that community was often understood to denote a group of people in social interaction having some bonds in common. The ties most often mentioned were common life, consciousness of kind, and possession of common ends. These terms as a consensus are too general and abstract to describe campus community.

Gardner (1989), listed characteristics defining the modern community:

1. Wholeness incorporating diversity
2. Good internal communication
3. Caring, trust, and teamwork
4. Group maintenance and government
5. Participation and the sharing of leadership tasks
6. Development of young people
7. Links with the outside world. (pp. 73-81)
Peck (1987) defined community as a group of individuals who have learned how to communicate honestly with each other, whose relationships go deeper than their masks of composure, and who have developed some measure of significant commitment to rejoice together, mourn together and delight in each other, making each others' conditions their own.

Boyer (1990) believes that a larger, more integrative vision of community on our campuses is needed. He envisions the focus as being on the quality of student encounter in the classroom as well as in social encounters. He proposed six principles that provide a workable formula for decision making on the campus, which taken together define campus community. Paraphrasing his principles: A college or university should strive to be educationally *purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and a celebrative* community.

Need for the Study

College presidents, through a recent survey, indicated that strengthening "community" on campus is a major concern (Boyer, 1990). Their perceptions are not the least bit surprising when one surveys what has taken place over the last three decades in higher education in the United States. In the last thirty years enrollment in higher education has increased by almost 400 percent, while the number of colleges and universities has increased nearly 60 percent to 3,300 (The Study Group, 1984).
Meeting individual student needs is increasingly difficult, especially in large institutions where fewer opportunities exist for students to really connect to the campus community. Chickering (1969) observed that many students on large campuses are "redundant" because there are not enough positions of responsibility to spread around. Smaller schools, on the other hand, are "undermanned environments" (Barker, 1968) where "an inverse relationship exists between the number of people on the campus and the frequency and intensity of opportunities" (Hawley & Kuh, 1986, p. 13). On campuses that have numerous opportunities for student participation and leadership (Astin, 1984; Barker & Gump, 1964; Chickering, 1969), students seem to be busier, more vigorous, more versatile, and more involved (Walsh, 1978, p. 7). Greater loyalty is instilled among students who are involved in the life of the community (Clark & Trow, 1966; Heath, 1968).

This research on campus community suggests that a normative definition is linked to the opinions of those who are affected most in a campus community. These include students in three categories specifically those living in a family home who commute to the campus; students living off campus but near by; and those students living in the residence halls on campus. These students are on the cutting edge where creating a quality campus climate is vital to their education.
The Logic Of Definition

Five types of definitions are introduced by Copi (1968) as stipulative, lexical, precising, theoretical, and persuasive. How each of these five types of the defining process might apply to an operational definition of campus community will be examined in this chapter.

Stipulative definition has a bearing on this study because campus community has undergone a major metamorphosis over the last four decades. When using a stipulative definition, one is assigning a meaning to a new term. The researcher seeks to define the term in its contemporary setting, not define a new term. Campus community is not a new term. It is in a state of flux and obviously is used in different ways by different writers.

Campus community has a lexical definition in as much as it has an established usage. Copi (1968) explained that word usage is a statistical matter, and any definition of a word whose usage is subject to this kind of variation must not be a simple statement of 'the meaning' of the term, but a statistical description of the meanings of the term as determined by the uses it has in actual speech.

He pointed out the role which well-known writers with established reputations play in the definition of a term. The need for lexical statistics cannot be evaded by reference to 'correct' usage, for that too is a matter of degree, being measured by the number of 'first-rate' authors whose usages of given terms are in
agreement. Moreover, literary and academic vocabularies tend to lag behind the growth of living language. Lexical definitions are true or false, in the sense of being true to actual usage (Copi, 1968).

This point Copi made is particularly important to this study. A concept such as operational campus community could have a true definition in accordance with established usage, but the established usage could be in error by being ambiguous, or too brief, or in several other respects inadequate to meet the standards of logical definition.

In a precising definition, the matter at issue is not how new the term is, but how vague. The maker of a precising definition must remain true to established usage as far as it goes. A number of legal decisions demand a precising definition in order that certain terms will be clarified to specifically cover or specifically exclude similar terms (Copi, 1968). In this study the interested respondents are asked to help refine the definition of the term "campus community." To this extent, a precising definition is requested.

Copi states that a theoretical definition is one that attempts to formulate a theoretically adequate characterization of the object to which it applies. He explained that to propose a theoretical definition is tantamount to proposing the acceptance of a theory, and theories are notoriously debatable. Here one definition is replaced by another as our knowledge and theoretical understanding increase.

The last of the five types of definitions Copi set forth, the "persuasive" definition, is particularly relevant in those areas where
respondents are asked to state how their concept of campus community will work operationally. The definition for which this dissertation searches can have either a connotative or denotative meaning. The referential sense of meaning is called extensional or denotative meaning; that is, whenever the subject referred to denotes a general or class term to which that subject may be correctly applied, the term is being used in its denotative sense. Thus the general terms "campus" and "community" are understood to be class terms. The properties possessed by all of the objects in a term's extension are called the intension or connotative of that term (Copi, 1968).

One is required to have a criterion for deciding about any given object whether or not it falls within the extension of the term. A skyscraper has a connotive meaning of all buildings over a certain height. One can readily see how "skyscraper" connotes something like the Empire State Building, but one would not include a mobile home in that grouping. However, it is much more difficult to precisely determine what the term campus community connotes because there is no set criterion. We have nearly as many definitions as we have writers and speakers on the subject.

Rules for Definitions

Copi (1968) gives the following rules for definitions which apply primarily to lexical definitions.
1. A definition should state the essential attributes of the species.
2. A definition must not be circular.
3. A definition must be neither too broad nor too narrow.
4. A definition must not be expressed in ambiguous, obscure or figurative language.
5. A definition should not be negative where it can be affirmative. (Copi, pp. 115-118)

Lexical Definitions

With these basic rules of logic, it is instructive to look at some lexical definitions of the terms that are the subject of our search. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (1976) defines "campus" as (a) "a university, college, or school that is an educational, social or spiritual entity"; (b) a college, school or division of a university that is complete in itself in having its own faculty and physical facilities but that is linked to the university by a common president and policy-making body" (p.408).

According to *Webster's* (1976) the lexical derivation of "community" comes from the Latin word *communitat-*, *communitas* which literally means common. It means (a) "a people living in a particular place or region usually linked by common interests" and (b) "an interacting population of different kinds of individuals constituting a society or association or simply an aggregation of
mutually related individuals in a given location" and (c) any group sharing interests or pursuits [a community of scholars] (p. 498).

The Oxford English Dictionary 2nd Edition (1989) differs in its lexical analysis. The Latin word was "merely a noun of quality from communis, meaning "fellowship, community of relations or feelings," but in Latin it was like universitas, used concretely in the sense of a 'body of fellows' (p. 581).

The Encyclopedia of Education, The Dictionary of Education and The International Dictionary of Education were consulted. None of these publications addressed the term "community." The Encyclopedia of Psychology (1972) defines the term as "social groups which, through firm bonds between their members (cohesion, cohesiveness, q.v.) seek spontaneously to achieve common objectives, which frequently have emotional overtones [e.g. family, religious groups] (p. 192). This publication expanded on the definition by addressing "community feeling (syn. communal spirit)." "In Adler's individual psychology the force countering the egotistic desire for power; community feeling maintains the individual's ties with the community" (p. 192). Thus among the encyclopedias and dictionaries cited, there are a dozen terms amassed helping to clarify this fuzzy concept. The problem with a lexical definition is that it is too broad and may not state all the essential attributes of an operational definition of campus community.
Quality of Life

The quality of life on college and university campuses is a concern of students, faculty, and administrators. Nearly all issues from leadership, athletics, Greek societies, residence life to the diverse groups seeking funds from student activities budgets relate to the notion of community on campus.

Scholars say our campuses have become burdened with the "curse of departmentalization," a powerful form of false categorization from which nothing but a prejudiced view of campus community can follow. For bad science begets bad metaphysics, even in grammar school, says Whitehead (1929), then he voices his complaint that we teach algebra, from which nothing follows; geometry, from which nothing follows; and so with history, language, and literature, with nothing following. This produces the curse of closed systems or provincialism in time and space. Escaping provincialism without a valid doctrine of campus community is virtually impossible. But can higher education make community happen on campus? What is required of higher education as a technique of release from provincialism?

It is as if each segment of our campus culture has evolved its own provincialism or the inability to be "open minded" by reason of one's own preoccupation with an uncritical acceptance. This attitude distorts and prejudices community and thus destroys its prospects. An escape from provincialism may lie in the direction of campus
community. That escape comes when higher value reference points are found around which a new sense of belonging is created.

Faculty members constitute the very heart and soul of campus community for they are the integral hub around which the advancement and dissemination of knowledge moves. The ideology of personal autonomy and academic freedom ought to set the stage for community, yet on so many campuses the effect is just the opposite. There is, instead, much fragmentation and isolation.

Some scholars feel strongly that "community of scholars" is in itself a contradiction in terms. Weick (1983) makes the point that the very phrase "community of scholars" contains a contradiction. Actions that strengthen scholarship weaken the community and likewise; actions that strengthen community weakens scholarship. Colleges and universities are known for this cohesion-accuracy tradeoff between community and scholarship. If cohesion dominates validity, the institution persists, but its claims to accuracy are no stronger than any other institution of higher learning. If validity dominates cohesion, the knowledge is on the cutting edge in accuracy, but continuing to draw top students and faculty could well suffer. Universities are more willing to give up more cohesion sooner than one would find in other organizations (Weick, 1983).

The answer to the cynics might be that sensitivity to, awareness of, and respect for diversity requires a morality of both reason and respect. The principles of equality, freedom of expression, and
mutual respect that are by-products of campus community will contribute mightily to overcoming inevitable campus tensions. Diversity is an inherent value in the quality of life on campuses today. Quality of life and diversity valued equally impart the important lessons of how to live with and delight in differences, as well as similarities.

As de Tocqueville (1987) observed one hundred and fifty years ago, we must find a common ground that integrates both the public and private life, since radical individualism is a threat to our very freedom.

Terms

For the purpose of this study the following terms are cited:

**Anticipatory Socialization.** This is the process by which newcomers become familiar with the values, attitudes, norms, knowledge, and skills necessary to function acceptably in a new role or environment prior to actually entering the setting (Bragg, 1976).

**Egalitarian.** Collegial and heterarchichal institutions; information is freely shared and decision making is a collective responsibility. Distinctions based on race, gender, family background, rank, or title are unwelcome. Formal titles, such as Doctor, President, or Professor are eschewed on the assumption that they make people seem more different from one another than they really are, because someone is usually placed in a dependent,
secondary role and, in the process, is viewed as of a lower status (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, Andreas, Lyons, Strange, Krehbiel, & MacKay, 1991).

**Focus Groups.** The purpose of these discussions is to share one's point of view and to listen to the views of others, not to negotiate individual agendas. Focus groups are formed to generate information that will be of use in discovering various beliefs and perceptions adhered to by various groups (Kuh, et.al., 1991).

**Fuzzy concept.** Used in everyday life in communicating i.e., peace, love, democracy, patriotism, and civil liberties. Individuals perceive different words or phrases differently, such as self-actualization, individualizing instruction and student centered learning often leading to misunderstanding, disagreement, tension, and conflict (Coffing, Hutchinson, Thomann, & Allan, 1971).

**Holism.** That philosophy of higher education and student personnel work which maintains that education is and must be concerned with the whole person: the mental, physical, social, emotional, and spiritual development.

**Involving Colleges.** Institutions that provide environments that encourage student out-of-class learning. Certain themes emerge at involving colleges: faculty members and staff take time for students; the blending of curricular and out-of-class learning experiences is acknowledged and valued; everyone is held to high, clearly communicated standards; and institutions value undergraduate learning wherever it occurs (Kuh, et.al., 1991).
**Multiculturalism.** A state in which cultural, ethnic, racial, gender, and other differences are understood, protected, respected, and celebrated throughout all aspects of the institution including the curriculum, student life and residences, and governance (Kuh, et.al., 1991).

**Provincialism.** The loss, absence, or distortion of one's critical faculties with respect to self and environment. An attitude of mind which issues in a series of false generalizations not subject to change or criticism on the basis of new evidence. The inability to be other than subjective with an acquired incapacity for objectification posited on a preoccupation with a satisfaction with one's own values and environs.

**Research Procedures**

Some research techniques deal strictly with the opinion of experts. The drawback of this approach is related to the question of who determines who is an expert. As Sackman (1975) pointed out, one may "also use other subject groups who may be informed to a greater or lesser extent in the target area of inquiry" (pp. 9-10).

The population in this study will be composed of undergraduate students, living on and off campus, attending a large land grant university. The research technique, to be described in Chapter III, is the Hutchinson Method of Operationalizing a Fuzzy Concept (Coffing, Hutchinson, Thomann & Allan, 1971).
Limitations

The following limitations were made in carrying out this study:

1. The population of interest was limited to student residents in six residence halls, those commuting from parental homes and those living off-campus but not with parents.
2. It was not the purpose of this study to determine the merits of campus community.
3. The purpose of this study was not to detail how campus community could be implemented although operational guidelines were set forth from the results of research.
4. It was not the purpose of this study to determine which institutions are best suited for programs to implement campus community.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in carrying out this study:

1. Confusion of terminology was detrimental to sound educational practices, and it is desirable to reduce that confusion.
2. We expected participants to give full and honest replies to hypothetical situations.
3. A population of interest in the target area of inquiry was identified.
4. The Hutchinson technique was as useful as any available to obtain statements which related to the subject of this inquiry.

5. Considerable difference of opinion concerning the subject of this inquiry existed among participants.

**Summary**

Ideally, the intersection where democracy and higher education cross could be defined as campus community (Barber, 1989). Where campus community exists it confers identity upon its members. It bestows a sense of belonging and a measure of security where ideals of justice and caring for one another are nurtured (Gardner, 1989). When campus members come to perceive themselves as empowered, belonging fully in the common activities they define community, true learning is enhanced.

Building a stronger overall sense of community to improve the quality of campus life is a primary goal of any first-rate student development operation. Leaders of higher education nearly all agree that a sense of community is one of the most effective ways to improve the quality of life on campus (El-Khawas, 1989). Community is significant on a college campus as it relates to the central mission of the academy as the generation and transmission of knowledge.
CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

"Community" as a term has a long and ambiguous history, and without any further definition it fails to identify any specific kind of human relation. In the English language the term is far more obscure than in other languages. We use one word while the Germans, Italians, and the French use a number of descriptive words to cover human relations, local communities, and affective unity (Cochran, 1982).

The recent Carnegie Foundation/American Council on Education survey of campus life noted that more than two thirds of college and university presidents are concerned about the sense of community on their campuses and were interested in ways to strengthen it. Bresler (1989) observed that much of the emphasis concerning community on campus stemmed from nostalgic recollections of bygone eras when colleges were small, geographically and socially isolated, and served mainly a homogeneous population of students.

Since the 1950s, student populations have increased 400 percent while the number of colleges and universities increased only 60
percent. Large and organizationally complex institutions of higher learning have been hard pressed to meet the needs and interests of all the students and faculty (Kuh, 1990).

Many students along with some faculty, administrators, and staff have sought to know a sense of community on their respective campuses. There has been a prevailing desire among most people to be thought of as whole persons, not just social security numbers to be processed through a computer.

What is it about our contemporary campus society that causes some to want their roots down in the soil of belonging? Research has shown that the campus is a microcosm of society in general and many of society’s traits have been reflected in the academy. Nisbet (1962) shed light on this situation when he asserted that the ominous preoccupation with community apparent in modern thought and mass behavior is a manifestation of certain profound dislocations in the primary associative areas of society, dislocations that have been created to a great extent by the structure of the Western political state. He viewed the major problem as social as well as political. The problem has social impact on the statuses and social memberships which men hold, or seek to hold. The problem has been political in that it reflected the location and distribution of power.

"Community" has been a symbol for relationships where the experiences of social solidarity, a common search for truth, and mutual openness of character were the dominant themes. All or
some of these characteristics have been usually present, but any one
by itself might symbolize the relationship using the concept.
Individuals who have participated in community develop rituals,
symbols, affection, common language, mutual respect, and their
own traditions. Often they have established formalized institutions
with a structure of authority to preserve and protect the bond
(Cochran, 1982).

Nisbit (1966) touched on the intimacy of community when he
proposed that it encompassed all forms of relationships which are
characterized by a high degree of personal intimacy, emotional
depth, moral commitment, social cohesion, and continuity in time.
Community has been founded on man in his wholeness drawing
psychological strength from levels of motivation deeper than those
of mere interest, and it has achieved its completion in a
submergence of individual will impossible in unions of mere
convenience or rational agreement. Community has been a merger
of feeling and thought, of tradition and commitment, of membership
and volition. Cochran (1969) pointed out that the important items
here are intimacy, commitment, emotional depth, and man in his
wholeness. Clark (1973) summed it up when he identified the two
essential features of community: a sense of solidarity and a sense of
significance.

The experience of trust and belonging was part and parcel of
the New Testament Greek term for community, *koinonia*, often used
to describe early Christians. Community is defined as a society relative to a common good.

Boyer (1990) pointed out that the unique characteristic that has made community work on college and university campuses has been the way people relate to one another. He reflected that it should be a place where every individual feels affirmed and where every action in the community is humane. Social bonding is a human need we have from the cradle to the grave. Clark (1990) observed that social bonds are not temporary agreements entered into simply for the convenience of an individual, but are absolute requirements for human existence. Social embeddedness is the very essence of human nature.

The Traditional Campus Scene

The traditional campus community was homogeneous and experienced little change. A high degree of conformity was demanded of its members and strangers were often not welcomed. Boasting generations of tradition and continuity, maintaining its heritage was a primary pre-requisite for membership (Gardner, 1989). If we examined the concepts motivating individuals to a sense of community on campuses of the past, we would find at least four emphases that seem to characterize the traditional scene. These four are tradition, individualism, communality, and interdependence.
1. Traditions led students and faculty to conduct their lives in keeping with time-honored custom, which created a basic sense of community and connection to the past as prologue to the present and the future. The rightness or wrongness of the past was not questioned but accepted as, "this is our custom." The sense of community was built on a familistic model, with a principle of patriarchy guiding various relationships. The clue to whether an individual member of the campus community was respected or not was measured on the basis of how well he/she lived up to the expected traditional behavior associated with those of the same status on campus. A number of individuals may have found the experience living on campus as somewhat restrictive, but never the less shared in the "sense of community" the tradition-bound campus imparted (Sanders, 1975).

2. Individualism led to a gradual swing away from tradition especially for those who needed a substitute for tradition if they were to experience any sense of community. The rugged individualism seen during the turn of the century, fostered the notion that the campus community existed to help graduates get ahead in life (Sanders, 1975). The notion of "live and let live" was a strange one to build a sense of community on, but to those whose main goal was to get ahead, a sense of community could spring up among those who had the same goal. The Protestant Ethic was in full force in the America Alexis de Tocqueville described as having organizations and associations of many kinds devised to serve the
needs of individual members (Sanders, 1975). Slater (1970) pointed out the limitations of individualism. This belief that one should pursue autonomously their own destiny has placed us in a position that we must maintain an emotional detachment (for which no amount of superficial gregariousness can compensate) from our social and physical environment. It arouses a vague guilt about our competitiveness and indifference to others. After all, our earliest training in childhood does not stress competition, but cooperation, and it is only later that we are taught to reverse these priorities. Major changes in our society, then, always rap a confused responsive chord within us that is far more disturbing than anything that goes on outside. Individualism finds its roots in the attempt to deny the reality and importance of human interdependence. One of the major goals of modern technology is to free us from the necessity of relating to, submitting to, depending upon, or controlling other people. Unfortunately, the more we have succeeded in doing this the more we have felt disconnected, bored, lonely, unprotected, unnecessary, and unsafe. The age of individualism as reflected on American campuses, was the kind of community one develops in playing a game where the rules are known, and where there were both winners and losers, with few referees or umpires to assure fairness. The game, the Great American Dream, was the common basis in which thousands of college students sought to find a sense of community.
3. Communality has been one of those utopian schemes for setting up places where everyone would have a satisfactory life and be protected from many of the abuses so prevalent in society at large. These student groups founndered on the dilemma of utopianism: how to find and maintain communalism in a noncommunal world. One of the characteristics of communality is liberation. Reich (1970) described the meaning of liberation as where the individual is free to develop one's own philosophy and sense of values, one's life-style and one's own culture from a new beginning. In place of the world seen as a jungle, or the world seen as a meritocracy leading to a corporate hierarchy of rigidly drawn relations and maneuvers for position, the world is a community. In personal relations the keynote is honesty, and the absence of socially imposed duty. To carry communalism to its ultimate conclusions, interpersonal relations would be honest in that there would be true sharing of feelings, thoughts, and intentions. It would lead to the communalizing of all social relations and ideally would be an excellent approach to building a sense of community.

4. Interdependency has been traditionally a major cornerstone for building a sense of campus community. Students were the fledgling scholars who were processed through a type of guild system into full blown masters and doctors. Everyone in the academy was motivated by the pursuit of knowledge with some being more senior than others. One Oxford don put the matter this way: "the purpose of the faculty is to stay around the institution as
long as possible and the student's goal is to get out as soon as possible" (Smith, 1989). The administration is concerned with the business aspects of keeping the doors open, seeing that everyone gets paid, and the constituencies and donors are kept happy. The three major subsystems of the university have different functions to perform, and one party cannot exist long without the other. The essential exigencies of the situation surpass any stress on commonality. The campus interdependence, the very mutual reinforcement, is even today a major step toward developing a sense of community (Sanders, 1973).

Kuh (1990) noted there was no substitute for human contact. If people spend time together they develop meaningful relationships and share understandings needed to maintain a sense of community. Looking to the future it is most likely that tradition will not be the binding force for a sense of community. Likewise individualism in its extremes has pretty much run its course. The same could be said of communalism with everyone stripped to a common denominator. Sanders (1975) projected that we will know a sense of community in small groups where intimacy can prevail, and an appreciation for and accommodation with the larger community through the recognition of our interdependence can be developed.

The Contemporary Campus Scene

Most campuses today are quite different from 20 or 50 years ago. Great strides have been made in terms of student diversity and
the programs and services provided. However, a prevailing theme of alienation is being experienced by students of nontraditional backgrounds in their campus environments which is seen by many as symptomatic of a deeper underlying problem that is not being effectively addressed. The voices of these young people who feel like outsiders, strangers in a strange land (Beckham, 1988). Current literature indicates that some campus environments are more "chilly" than welcome, more alienating than involving, and more hostile than encouraging (Smith, 1989).

Bornholdt (1987) reflected on an imaginary Rip Van Winkle who retired from higher education in 1966 and returned today and resumed reading the Chronicle of Higher Education and looked through Change. He would have to wonder not at the tremendous change since 1965 but at the continuity of problems. The statistics for black students are anything but encouraging. Perhaps the most obvious change Rip would notice is the deteriorated climate for interracial unity. The presence of blacks in higher education falls far short of where men and women of good will had hoped and trusted it would be by this time. This could be also applied to virtually all nontraditional student populations. In reviewing the literature one readily sees numerous references to multiple barriers that face the diversity of students today. Women, minority students, adult learners, and disabled students are feeling the results of racism, discrimination, and stereotypic responses.
Women

"The chilly climate" was a phrase coined to describe what women are experiencing on today's campuses. Even though, in some cases, they compose the majority of students, they have not become totally integrated on today's campuses (Sandler & Hall, 1982). Treatment by faculty, attitudes on campus about gender, curricula that still fail to recognize the contributions of women, sexual harassment, acquaintance rape, absence of role models, and limited opportunities for leadership are but some of the problems women face in higher education. The very value system of higher education does not take into account approaches to learning where women are most likely to excel.

If women who are overall a majority of the college student population experience a chilly climate in higher education one imagines that students of different ethnic and racial backgrounds or older students, or the disabled perceive their campus climate and might well feel a sense of alienation. In fact, research (e.g., Bechman, 1988; Brown, 1982; Burrell 1980; Elam, 1982; Freedman, 1981; McIntyre, 1981; Mallinckrodt & Seldacek, 1987; Martin, 1985; Oliver, 1985; Ponterotto, Griege, & Heapy, 1985; Rasor, 1981; Suen, 1983; and Zuber, 1981) concluded that one major theme emerged from their research, interviews and general commentary that many campuses are alienating for their students.
Minority students

There is a large body of literature that discusses the campus environment experienced by minority students due to the focus of concern about minority enrollment and retention. Their longer history in higher education and sheer numbers indicates the experience of African-American students provides the core of this literature (Allen, 1982 &1986; Elam, 1982; Loo & Rolison, 1986; Morris, 1979; Nettles, 1986; Patterson & Sedlacek, 1984; Peterson, 1978; Ponterotto, Grieger, & Heaphy 1985).

There is a growing amount of literature being published on Latinos. Particular literary attention has been paid to Chicanos, Asian and Native Americans (Chacon, Cohen, & Stover, 1986; Hsia, 1988; Madrozo-Peterson & Rodriguez, 1978; Olivas, 1986; Oliver, 1985; Patterson, Sedlacek & Perry, 1984; Rasor, 1981; Sanders, 1987; Sue, 1981; Suen, 1983; Webster, 1984; White & Sedlacek, 1987).

There is no question that many black students enter college with poor academic preparation and that socio-economic status is often a barrier to matriculation. There is growing evidence that minority students experience an inferior quality of life and that their sense of isolation, alienation, and lack of support are the more crucial factors in attrition. Ask a black student about the racial climate on campus and he or she will likely describe it as a microcosm of society. They are subjected to outlandish insensitive statements and experience painful expressions of disrespect and downright hatred.
Repeatedly, black students experience in mostly white colleges chronicles how the institutions have almost systematically bruised self-esteem and doled out mere pittances of support services (Beckham, 1988).

There is little doubt that the environment on a campus and the issues surrounding it can be readily observed. In most cases, the environment is composed of individual acts of overt racism. In the more subtle situations it deals with questions of customs and values.

Native American students, Asian American and others whose cultural customs involve soft speech and indirect eye contact as appropriate behaviors, are subjected to consequences when trying to be a part of an environment where argument, assertiveness, and directness may not only be expected but also looked on as indicators of intellect and academic commitment (Sanders, 1987). Researchers comparing the perceptions of a university environment between Mexican-Americans and Anglo-American students found significant differences between their perceptions and comfort with such things as politeness, assertiveness, and risk taking (Garza & Nelson, 1973). Numerous studies on the learning styles of African-American, Native American, and Latino youth indicate more variety than usual forms of pedagogy would deal with on campus (Claxton & Murrell, 1987).

Ironically, in spite of numerous common campus discussions about minority students who isolate themselves, available research suggests that the number of interracial contacts among whites is
much lower than for minorities (Dinka, Mazzella, & Pilant, 1980). The problem we have may not be minority students who isolate themselves, but non-minorities who avoid contact. The increasing number of racially inspired incidents on campuses across the nation is discouraging evidence that the problem appears to reflect growing tensions in dealing with diversity (Bechman, 1984; Rooks, 1988; Weinberg, 1982).

Many universities have codes of conduct that discipline students for "offensive" speech. The 1989 study sponsored by the American Council on Education and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators found that 60 percent of the colleges and universities surveyed had written policies on bigotry, racial harassment, and intimidation. Another 11 percent reported that they were in the process of developing such policies. Prohibitions against verbal slurs, invectives, or epithets referring to an individual’s race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, and handicap, made with the purpose of injuring another are the kinds of sanctions campuses are forced to adopt.

Crosson (1988) summarizes the environment for racial and ethnic minorities on four-year campuses by concluding that while the depth of racial and discriminatory attitudes and behavior are unknown, it is clear that many predominantly white four-year colleges and universities have not lived up to their ideals as civil and tolerant social communities that respect diversity and pluralism.
The Adult Learner

"Jugglers of many roles" is the term often given to adult learners. These students who attend college part time, hold off-campus jobs, and have significant commitments to family and their civilian communities are often persistent and have clear goals about their education. Women reentering college especially women of color face significant financial problems and in the case of the latter the barriers are multiplied (Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989). Numerous challenges are placed before the institution such as class schedules, child-care, financial aid (often geared to full-time students), career advisement, and access to the full range of services and programs which are usually geared to full-time students. Those who can only spare the time to take classes and leave the campus are unable to fully learn of available services much less experience the cultures of the campus.

Many researchers have pointed out that the characteristics of the adult learner also have implications for methods of teaching as well as methods of learning. Students harbor expectations that their academic program will not only acknowledge the validity of their own experiences but will also connect those experiences to their study. Comparative studies indicate decided differences between the adult student and their younger counterparts which present challenges for teaching. The literature also describes the needs of adult students for emotional support and information (Bauer, 1981; Bodenkoop, & Johansen, 1980; Courage, 1984; Creange, 1980;

Disabled Students

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 facilitated and even encouraged the matriculation of students with physical and learning disabilities. It validated the legitimacy of concerns about access for those with disabilities (Smith, 1989). The needs of these students, especially those with physical disabilities, have raised basic questions about access and accessibility on campuses. Modification of architectural structures, steps, stairs, parking facilities, and ramps are needed. There is also a need for restructuring testing procedures and curricular requirements, computer systems, and support services for learning disabled. In addition, more programs need to be made available to this segment of the campus population. Many of the academic modifications have had a beneficial effect for others on campus. Students, faculty, and staff whose own learning or physical needs do not qualify them as disabled but who, nevertheless have very special needs, have benefitted from the new regulations.

Institutions should make sound commitments and designate funds to accomplish the reduction of barriers for the disabled. Studies show that the social isolation felt by disabled students results from the discomfort experienced by the nondisabled in their interaction with them. Professor Seymour Martin Lipset, a well-known sociologist, author of over 40 books, and himself a dyslexic,
described the isolation for such students as "punishing" (Stanford Observer, 1989, p. 6). In dealing with the issue of social isolation, the institutional emphases seem to be educating the disabled person rather than educating the majority cultures on campus to include those that are different. Evidence from surveys suggests an overwhelming amount of negative attitudes faced by the disabled, evidence of avoidance behavior, and discomfort, suggesting that the disabled raise issues of vulnerability to others (Asch, 1984; Belgrave, 1984; Demetrulias & Fenderson, 1984; Patterson, Sedlacek, & Scales, 1984; Richardson, 1976; Stilwell, Stilwell & Perril, 1983; Yuker, Block, & Young, 1966).

The quality of environment a student finds in an institution directly or indirectly influences performance and persistence. Alienation, lack of comfort, and isolation not only deprive students of access to information, support, and programs but can produce stress and lack of commitment that the arduous tasks in education require. While isolation can be harmful, cross-cultural interaction can be especially damaging if members of the majority exhibit significant measures of prejudice, intolerance, ignorance, or distain (SHEEO, 1987).

Deprivation for some affects the rest of the community as well. Nontraditional students' lack of access to information and exchange results in a lack of exchange for majority students as well. It has long been held that the reason students are required to learn other languages and about other cultures is that it broadens their understanding of society and how individuals are shaped by culture and help shape

Smith (1989) quoted the ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 5 (1989) which set forth the five major themes which have emerged from research done on successful institutions. These institutions:

1. Focus on students' success and provide the tools for success;
2. Have begun to develop programs for increased coordination with elementary and secondary grades for enhanced articulation between community colleges and four-year colleges and universities;
3. Dedicate energy and resources to creating an accepting environment that nourishes and encourages success;
4. Have access to good information that focuses on the institution and students;
5. Include leaders in the faculty and administration who provide strong direction for these efforts. (pp. iv-v)

To establish campus community today requires innovative approaches. The world we live in dictates that communities must be pluralistic and adaptive fostering individual freedom and responsibility. Hard realities necessitate that campus communities today need to be in continuous and effective dialogue with
communities outside the campus. Value systems will need to become inclusive rather than exclusive (Gardner, 1989).

Students participate in the contemporary campus often through an intensified and accelerated knowledge of interdependence as shown by the media. Their proximity to so much and so many on television increases their sense of estrangement and a longing for kinship and familiar contacts. Living in a stage of social fragmentation through the myth of individualism, the rapid advance of technology and communications is overwhelming. Reality becomes "we are alone" and "there is no safety." Is it any wonder many feel disconnected, unsupported, and unprotected? The powerful archetype of the orphan breaks through one's consciousness: the denial of pain, the refusal to acknowledge one's true condition, the inability to own one's "shadow" which is readily projected onto others. As Kolbenschlag(1988) noted that the orphan is a metaphor for our deepest, reality: those experiences of attachment and abandonment, of expectation and deprivation, of loss and failure and of loneliness.

The orphan often suffers from a profound sense of worthlessness, and at the same time a sense of being a person who is significant and precious. We find students as strangers in a strange land yearning to belong, to stamp out the loneliness that stalks them. Education has long concentrated on the cognitive that it has lost touch with the fact that people not only think, but they also act and feel. The distancing, intimadating, disappointing, degrading, and
devaluing on our campuses have perpetuated isolation and debased basic human values. If we do not know love, tenderness, compassion, caring, sharing, and relating then life is empty. It is a strange phenomenon how we spend too little time in higher education helping students develop the very traits that will ultimately give their lives meaning.

There has amassed over the last two decades a vast amount of scientific literature which overwhelmingly proves that relationships do matter. Reviewing the writings of contemporary philosophers and scientists such as Albee (1960), Branden (1980), Buber (1970), Cousins (1981), May (1969), Mead (1971), Montagu & Matson (1979), Morris (1971), Rogers (1973), Rubin (1983), and numerous others we see a common theme persists, that society devoid of love, this basic human need, is doomed. Intimacy is necessary to sustain a good and productive life, and a hearty laugh or a loving touch can heal. Positive relating brings physical, psychological and mental health.

If there is alienation on our campuses, and few would dispute that, the solution lies in that which the Greeks had several words to portray--eros, agape, and philia. We seem to have plenty of emphasis on eros (erotica), but unconditional love (agape) and brotherly love (philia) are what is needed to stem the tide of institutions of higher education becoming emotional orphanages.

Montagu and Matson (1979) write that love is the highest form of communication. They state that human communication, as the
saying goes, is a clash of symbols' and covers a multitude of signs. It is media and messages, information and persuasion, but it also meets a deeper need and serves a more lofty purpose. Communication is the ground of meeting and the foundation of community. It is, in short, the essential human connection.

In this regard, Kolbenschlag (1988) notes that many more students could find on campus a sense of community if (a) they are considered lovable, loving, and loved; (b) they are accepted as capable and competent; (c) they feel a sense of belonging and are connected; (d) they feel they can make a contribution and take part in the shaping of their world on campus; (e) they have a sense of the future; and (f) they can grow and be transformed and are convinced that (g) life has meaning.

Symbols of Campus Community

A symbol is a sign that something stands for or suggests something else by reason of relationships, an association or an act, sound, or object having cultural significance and the capacity to excite or objectify a response (Webster, 1977). On campuses across the nation as reported in the Educational Record in the fall of 1989, there are numerous physical, natural, and architectural symbols of campus community that evoke a spirit of unity among various campus groups, not just students, but faculty, staff, and administrators.
Keynon College in Gamblier, Ohio, has the MIDDLE PATH, a campus thoroughfare where faculty gather as freshmen and graduates walk to their opening convocation and commencement ceremonies.

Hope College in Holland, Michigan, prides itself on THE ANCHOR which has for nearly a century symbolized the college and its Christian heritage.

Cornell University in Ithica, New York, sponsors DRAGON DAY, an eighty-five year old festival symbolizing the rivalry between the Schools of Architecture and Engineering.

Augustana College in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, has a symbol that reminds all who view it of the ethnic heritage of the college. OLE THE VIKING is sometimes adorned with various items of clothing and is a popular site for student gatherings.

Hampshire College in Amherst, Maine, has its "DIVISION FREE" BELL which symbolizes completion of their final project before graduation. Each student gets to ring the bell once and to most that is the actual moment of graduation.

The University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana, in spite of its desire to downgrade inter-collegiate athletics on campus, the NOTRE DAME STADIUM still continues to be one of the most widely recognized symbols of campus community (Summer/Fall, 1989).

RALPHIE THE BUFFALO has been since 1934 at the University of Colorado in Boulder, the school's mascot leading the CU football team onto the field before each game.
BARABOO QUARTZITE ROCK was presented to Northwestern University at Evanston, Illinois by the class of 1902. It serves as a message board where students can express their ideas.

TOMMY TROJAN, a larger than life stone statue, was first unveiled in 1930 at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles. Each year students from rival UCLA attempt to deface TOMMY preceeding the UCLA-USC football game.

THURTENE CARNIVAL is the oldest student-run campus carnival in the nation and located at Washington University in St. Louis. The carnival provides the campus community an opportunity of raising money for charity and "giving something back" to the city of St. Louis.

These are a few examples illustrating the fact that nearly every institution of higher learning has one or more symbols of campus community. These symbols evoke a spirit of unity among diverse campus groups that include alumni, students, faculty, staff, and administrators.

Involvement as a Symbol of Campus Community

Colleges and universities take pride in these kinds of symbols, but the greatest symbol of campus community is student involvement in the institution. Lewin (1936) first devised the formula that spelled out the Person-Environment Interaction Theory [B = f (PXE)]: that is, behavior is a function of persons interacting with environment. Astin (1974, 1985) has taken this and elevated it
to new heights in his theories on student involvement in campus as a way to build loyalty, commitment, and ultimately community. The result of an over-twenty-five-years study in student development led Astin to a profound proposition that "the greater the student's involvement in college, the greater will be the amount of student learning and personal development it directs attention away from subject matter and technique and toward the motivation and behavior of the student" (1984, p. 307). Astin (1985) also emphasized the importance of involvement to academic success. Utilizing research related to learning theory, earlier studies involving the quality of effort (Pace, 1984), and his own work, Astin concludes that involvement in learning and involvement in campus life are both extremely important. Based on his findings, Astin (1984) posits that all institutional practices and policies like those having to do with nonacademic as well as academic can be evaluated in terms of the degree to which they increase or reduce student involvement.

Studies done on enrollment management echo a similar theme: the importance of students' involvement in their own learning process. Tinto (1987) in his research on student departure from college, concentrates on the role colleges and universities play in influencing the social and intellectual development of their students. He proposes a course of action and an innovative way of thinking about and dealing with the student dropout. The key to student dropout, or the successful student retention lies with the institution,
in its faculty and staff, and their ability to apply what is known about student retention to specific situations in which the institution finds itself.

Since students are primarily social in character, Tinto (1987) looks to the social and intellectual context of the institution, its formal and informal interactional environment, as playing the central role in the process of individual departure. He argues that the impact of individual attributes cannot be understood without reference to the social and intellectual context within which they find themselves. The communities of the college have the capability to transform the effect of the formal organization.

Tinto's (1987) position is that contact with faculty and staff influence students' judgments about the degree to which the college or university, as reflected in the actions of its representatives, is committed to their welfare. Wide-ranging contact generally leads to heightened commitment and, therefore, serves to enhance the likelihood of persistence. The absence of interaction results not only in lessened commitments and possibly lowered individual goals, but also in the person's isolation from the intellectual life of the institution.

Research has shown that being involved with one's peers, with faculty outside the classroom, and with the school can also facilitate success (Astin, 1985; Fox, 1985; Nettles & Johnson, 1987; Pascarella, 1980; Rooney, 1985). Interactions of this kind create a comfort level with the environment and allow academic and
emotional support. It provides far more than handbooks and catalogues are ever able to do.

The goal of involvement is often difficult because some of the values in the academy run counter to it, according to Astin's (1987) findings. Learning and a commitment to learning are best accomplished in an environment of cooperation and support. Competition has been found to be detrimental for many students (Astin, 1987; Belenky, 1986; Martin, 1985; Palmer, 1987; Sanders, 1987; Sandler, 1987; Sandler & Hall, 1982). Using the curve to grade students' performances has been found to be detrimental and universal success is impossible when it is used. This structure reinforces a competitive environment based on students' needs to succeed (Astin, 1987). Faculty implement alternate grading structures in which all students can succeed have been accused of contributing to grade inflation and often criticized for their efforts.

To date, the research has been extremely supportive of the significance of integration and involvement as important factors in persistence and success. With this insight, earlier descriptions of noninvolvement on campuses, even alienation, by nontraditional students may well explain why many of these students do not perform as well and often fail to reach their potential. The alienation felt by many students, the racial discrimination experienced by others, and those who feel as though they "don't belong," lead to questions about the values adhered to that conflict with personal values, especially in patterns of learning. Competition
is antithetical to learning for those whose cultures stress cooperation. Being the other is feeling different, is awareness of being distinct, is consciousness of being dissimilar. It means being outside the group, outside the circle, outside the set. Other-ness results in feeling excluded, closed out, precluded, even disdained and scorned. It produces a sense of isolation, of apartness, of disconnectedness, of alienation (Madrid 1988).

The condition of diversity in higher education is often the condition of alienation. If the theories on the importance of involvement are true, the conditions of alienation need to change to give all students a fair chance. The research outside higher education seems to support the theories on involvement. The literature on cultural pluralism and intergroup relations for example, suggest some important elements to be noted.

Smith (1989) listed the fundamental issues in organizing for diversity that center around a number of complex issues:

1. Diversity of faculty and staff;
2. Mission and values;
3. Educating for diversity;
4. Dealing with conflict;
5. The quality of interaction;
6. The perceived conflict between quality and diversity.

(p. iii)
The challenge of diversity is one of national importance. Smith (1989) set forth steps institutions can take to facilitate the process of responding to diversity:

1. A comprehensive institutional assessment can provide important data from which priorities can be identified.

2. Cross-institutional research can identify successful institutions, identify ways in which involvement can be promoted, and clarify often conflicting material in the literature.

3. Coordination among the educational sectors can improve articulation and movement between levels and types of institutions.

4. Developing programs and funds can increase the number of students who enter teaching at all levels.

5. Organizations that succeed in meeting this challenge can also play a significant role in educating all future teachers and citizens to function in a diverse culture.

6. Providing increased local, state, and national financial aid will make access more possible for virtually every population of students.

7. Sustained commitment and effort rather than episodic interest will be required.

8. Leadership plays a central role, not only in setting goals and providing resources but also in framing the questions and setting the tone for deliberations. (p.vii)
If there is any one thing learned from the literature about diversity it is that we cannot just "add and stir." The institutional responses to the challenge of diversity will likely do more for them in the preparation for the future than any other resource. Becoming an involving college or university seems to hold the greatest promise in creating campus community.

Involvement and Campus Cultural Pluralism

The way an institution is perceived must be clarified if it is to meet the challenge of diversity and create a campus where involvement of students is a reality. "Cultural pluralism" has come to mean a community in which diversity is valued and in which difference can coexist with a concept of community" (Astin, 1984; McBay, 1986; Terry, 1981). A pluralistic approach is one that acknowledges and stresses ethnic or group identity (Hunt, 1975).

There is a creative tension between the call for involvement and a call for pluralism. Resolving these tensions will require reflectiveness about the institutions goals and values. "Shared values" and "value of diversity" can be unified, but such an effort is complicated by the impact of where the power lies. Inequality, and past experiences also impact on unifying values.

Conflicts will emerge unavoidably, but if institutions are prepared for the challenge of diversity, they will be prepared for the inevitable conflict. If the challenge of a culturally pluralistic institution is to create a process where each student will experience
an environment that accepts his or her preferred modes of interacting, and learning as equally important (Casaneda, 1974), then the challenges of higher education cannot be underestimated. The commitment of the large bureaucratic structures where multiple choice tests, expansive lecture halls, and minimal interchange between faculty and students, is crucial in creating respect and a desire to learn among the various students within the institution.

Involvement in the institution leaves one with the impression that shared values or goals are the norm whereas pluralism leaves open the possibility of living parallel but separate lives. The challenge is to foster values in which people share but at the same time acknowledge and even nourish the differences. Diversity is the natural order of things and the values our founding fathers instilled into the fabric of our nation's creation required the resolution of issues of community versus individual rights (Madrid, 1988).

Kolbenschlag (1981) makes this point: we are the children of the Enlightenment: our world is circumscribed by our notions of ego, personal consciousness, and autonomy. This view is now changing radically. A perception of our inseparability and connectedness is emerging as the next threshold of social evolution. Indeed, the depth of our interdependence with the whole earth-cosmic system is now becoming the primary reality.

Resolving tensions brought about by this evolutionary process requires that institutional leaders reflect carefully on how the goals and values they set forth and the concepts of "shared values" and the
"value of diversity" are blended. This is a complicated task because power differentials, inequality, and past experiences impact on decision making. Being in a minority or majority position changes the way one approaches these questions (Wilkerson, 1989). Conflicts will emerge and institutions prepared for this inevitable occurrence will have thought through and have the means for resolving conflicts.

Summary of Literature Review

This review speaks to the problem as set forth by this study. To draw conclusions from such a wide array of research on involvement, pluralism, and community is challenging. The key issues most relevant to this study include the following:

1. Involvement and integration, whether it be formal or informal, social or academic, are crucial elements for student success. The literature on academic integration and intergroup relations support the critical importance of involvement.

2. In each institution, forms of involvement will be different among various groups and individual students. African-Americans and Chicanos may experience such efforts differently from Asian Americans or other international students or more recent immigrant groups. Because variations exist across institutional lines, what can work in one institution may not work in another.
3. A high degree of competition on campus may be detrimental not only to learning but also to creating opportunities for collaboration and participation in more than one subcommunity which has been found to be extremely important for pluralistic communities.

4. Involvement is far more significant the closer it is to the center of the institution's mission. It is imperative for institutions to pay close attention to the ways students are encouraged to become involved and the ways in which those students view their involvement.

5. Being a member of a nontraditional population is all too often viewed as synonymous with the feelings of alienation. This connection must be broken if involvement and integration are to be strong and integral parts of the student experience.

6. It has been shown that students do far better in environments where the values of openness, acceptance, and personal affirmation are practiced. By creating an environment of openness, one sometimes confronts the attitudes and behaviors of the majority.

7. As noted by Smith (1989) conflict is an inevitable part of the process of creating educational communities in a pluralistic culture on campus.
Feldman and Newcomb (1969) set forth the characteristics of colleges and universities that had the greatest potential for impact. Those were seen as ones with a clear sense of mission and students from diverse backgrounds. Such institutions are the most successful in creating involvement through a kind of commitment to shared purposes. Student diversity of backgrounds contributes varieties of perspectives and can be viewed as an essential element to the creation of a exceptional education community. Researchers (e.g., Astin, 1985; Pace, 1987; Pascarella, 1989; & Tinto, 1987) have found, involved students are the more satisfied students and are happier with their college experience. These are the ones who are more likely to graduate.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Qualitative research methods that seek to build understanding and discover meaning through interviewing or the dialogue approach provide students the opportunity to give an unqualified assessment of the campus environment.

The quantitative-qualitative debate has gradually given way to dialogue. Student affairs practitioners have long realized that their role in managing student activities includes collecting student opinion (Astin, 1986), assessing program effectiveness (Hansen, 1978; Kuh, 1979), and measuring campus life quality. Quantitative research methods have been the conventional paradigm.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) observed that this paradigm assumes a mechanistic world view, uniformity of time and space, analogous goals for the social and natural sciences, and the means of gaining new knowledge have relied on the scientific method.

Einsteinian and later quantum physics have led to a profound shift within the natural and social sciences in the assumptions used in their research (Kuhn, 1970). This shift impacted on student affairs research (Kuh, Whitt, & Shedd, 1987; Lucas, 1985) causing monumental changes in the ways theory, practice, and research
methodologies are viewed. The emergent paradigm makes the following assumptions: "realities are multiple, constructed, and holistic; the knower and the known are interactive, inseparable; only time- and context-bound working hypotheses are possible; all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping; and inquiry is value-bound" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37).

Methods of research of the emergent paradigm are predominantly qualitative (e.g., ethnographic, case study, naturalistic inquiry) incorporating techniques of interviewing, observation, and document analysis for data collection. The purpose of using qualitative research is understanding (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Understanding meaning as well as the manner that students understand themselves and their environment is the reason of the emergent paradigm qualitative research.

In this chapter, topics related to the execution of this research will be presented. The topics include a description of the population and sample, the instrumentation, and the method of analysis.

Population and Sampling Plan

The Hutchinson methodology indicated that six triads makes a good size working group. Thus, the sample population of 54 students came from three distinct groups. Eighteen students from six diverse residence halls, eighteen home-campus commuters, and eighteen students living off campus in the campus area. Each of the
three groups were composed of six triads. The groups featured different styles of living arrangements, such as all male, all female, coed, special purpose, graduate and foreign students, and the Corps of Cadets. Triads were selected by a mixture of class, gender, cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and academic majors.

The six halls were selected by the Director of Residence Education and the Area Coordinators. Resident Directors in each selected hall choose three students from a list of hall volunteers to participate in the workshop. Commuter students who resided in the Roanoke, Salem, Vinton area were recruited by phone to participate in that workshop. Students living off-campus in the Blacksburg area were contacted using lists of students randomly selected from the University computer.

Instrumentation: The Hutchinson Technique

Hutchinson (1971), co-originator of the Fortune-Hutchinson Evaluation Methodology, was most interested in group opinions about critical educational problems, for example, forecasting goals and behavioral objectives. In adapting the Fortune-Hutchinson Evaluation Methodology for decision-making to special problems, specifically the redefinition of the function of evaluating, a much needed procedure was developed they entitled "The Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts." This procedure has a wide spectrum of potential possibilities and applications. One application is developing educational goals into behavioral objectives.
Documentation of the technique was written in the 1970s and composed of six steps.

In this section the Hutchinson methodology of operationalizing the fuzzy concept of campus community will be presented in more detail. Although Hutchinson and his colleagues varied the number of steps each study utilized, certain components were included in all their research. The purpose was to break down the goal, identifying it's observable component parts. These parts can then be used to evaluate criteria for measuring accomplishment of the goal.

Step 1.

A hypothetical situation is constructed to be as real and as complete as possible, simulating a total environment. By the end of the first step, a number of the dimensions of the fuzzy concept are identified.

Step 2.

A second hypothetical situation is constructed that depicts as completely as possible the opposite of the initial hypothetical situation. There is a complete absence of the fuzzy concept. This situation is examined to find all the things observed that indicate the fuzzy concept is not present. Simply writing negatives of the positive items in step one is not acceptable.

Step 3.

Completeness tests are conducted by the participants. Working in triads the participants go through steps one and two making their
lists individually then each student observes the other triad members lists and item by item asks the question, "Is this an item I want on my list; Is this a dimension that I already have?" This is simply one more way of discovering additional dimensions.

Step 4.
Participants working in their triads go back to their original lists based on the first hypothetical situation and discern those things they thought about but, for one reason or another, did not write down. They examine the implications of those things in both hypothetical situations that were not considered as being a part of the fuzzy concept.

Step 5.
Focus group members are requested to imagine dimensions that are totally unrelated to the fuzzy concept and then seriously examine those dimensions to determine if they really are unrelated, or not.

Step 6
For each item on the list, participants are asked to observe the dimension directly. Something which can not be observed directly is defined as a fuzzy concept. At this point another technique is used, that of prioritization. All observable dimensions each wishes to include in final deliberation, are ranked with 1. being highest and numbered through to the end of their lists.

Hutchinson's procedures normally end with step six. In order to complete the objectives of this study, certain modifications were needed.
Step 7
From the observable dimensions compiled, each participant writes a definition of campus community then the triad writes a consensus operational definition of campus community.

Step 8
A spokesperson from each triad will write the triad's consensus definition on the board. Once all are in view, a consensus definition will be developed by the entire group.

Procedures for Arriving at the Summary Data

1. The participants' lists and the definition they individually devised from their lists and the definition arrived at through a consensus with others group members were analyzed for the key, first preference concepts.

2. Each concept was grouped with identical or similar concepts with those from other groups.

3. Qualifying or amplifying statements were removed for purposes of simplicity and manageability.

4. The definitions submitted by the individual groups were combined to form a tentative definition. All workshop participants gave input on final editing of the operational definition which combined the results of all three groups.
Analysis of the Data

Having utilized the Hutchinson Technique to determine dimensions, with all participants having prioritized their lists, each of the triads wrote operational definitions of campus community. All the participants in the larger group wrote a consensus definition based on definitions from each triad.

In closing out the workshop, all participants were asked if they would like to further participate in the final operational definition by editing the consensus results they reached combining input from each of the other two groups.

Consensus definitions written by each of the three groups were summarized and a copy of the final operational definition was sent to all participants.

Procedures for Conducting Group Workshops

The following "script" was used by the facilitator in each workshop:

Introduction

"Campus Community" is a term many educators use in describing the quality of life at an institution of higher learning. The problem we face is that the term "campus community" is a fuzzy concept. It means different things to different people. Fuzzy concepts are words or phrases used every day in communication
such as love, democracy, civil liberties, self-actualization, patriotism, and peace. Because each of us has different perceptions of the same words, some scholars have suggested that our gaps in communication are due to the use of fuzzy concepts.

Our conceptualizing skills have been clearly limited, but a possible answer to this dilemma has been developed by Dr. Tom Hutchinson (1969a, 1969b) in his technique called "Operationalizing Fuzzy Concepts." The Hutchinson technique is basically used to reduce intents or goals to statements of an observable/measurable nature. This analytical process systematically breaks down a generalization into its measurable parts. It employs both an objective structure and subjective structure. It is a contrast-probing technique and a selection process. As an elimination process it extracts the concrete from the abstract. It brings together behavioral elements into a context, such that the elements are seen as having a relationship where such a relationship might not have been previously observed (Hutchinson, 1971).

The best way to learn this technique is to actually experience the phenomena. A defining process, particularly when it involves an operational definition, concerns itself with matters of opinion.

This study, "Campus Community: Students' Search for an Operational Definition" is in answer to the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Dr. Ernest L. Boyer. He has called for a national dialogue on campus community building.
The purpose of this study is to reduce the confusion regarding the concept of campus community as viewed from the undergraduate student perspective. A review of the literature on this subject points up the need for a "clearer" definition inasmuch as theoretical definitions are highly debatable. Some form of research dealing with opinions which had in its' apparatus provisions for refining those opinions had to be found. Hutchinson's Operationalizing Fuzzy Concepts is a technique that lends itself to this research.

Before we begin our steps would you take a few minutes and write down just what campus community means to you?

Operationalizing the Fuzzy Concept of Campus Community.

Step 1.
A hypothetical situation, Building Community On Campus, is presented.

Mrs. Becky Jones, Student Center Director at a 25,000 student land-grant university, wanted to sponsor a Campus Community Workshop. She decided to find out as much about the current campus climate as she could to provide resource materials. Through her reading and random discussions with students, Becky has gotten a sense of what "campus community" is on the campus.

1. She knows the student center board is primarily made up of students.

2. Each residence hall has a governing board of students that handles everything from pizza parties to disciplining unruly student residents.
3. The university's leadership had long recognized that having students on key committees and special advisory councils was essential to a healthy campus leadership climate. Students serve on every committee of the Board of Trustees.

4. The president of the university has a PAC--President's Advisory Council--composed of student leaders from each of the colleges as well as all the deans. They meet regularly and every major presidential decision affecting students is discussed with the PAC.

5. Every college dean has a DAC--Dean's Advisory Council--composed of class leaders and key faculty to discuss those matters affecting their college.

6. The Vice-President of Student Affairs has a special committee composed of student leaders from the residence halls, the Greek system, organizations, and special interest groups.

7. The Director of Athletics also has students on the Athletic Council which deal with all sports activities.

8. Students on work-study programs are working in every department, and every college on campus.

9. The faculty members brought to the school love to teach students. Though research is important, the first priority is to be an excellent teaching and learning institution. There seems to be good student-faculty interaction and gathering informally outside of class is one of the contributing factors to good morale.

10. Many of the students in the humanities, social sciences, philosophy and religion work as volunteers in local schools, orphanages, day care centers, hospices for terminally ill patients, nursing and senior citizen's homes and other community service programs.

11. A great major morale boost was given to the campus in the early 90s when the President invited all the Chinese students in the University to her home for dinner after the massacre in Tienamen Square. This began a regular program of all the upper
administrators inviting foreign students to their homes. This expanded to faculty having foreign students stay in their homes during holidays and other times when the residence halls are closed down. This sensitivity shown to foreign students has made a large number of the students proud to be at the school.

Becky was convinced there was still a greater need to understand how quality of life on the campus could be better operationalized. After much discussion with her superiors it was agreed that the university would sponsor a retreat/workshop as an experiment to examine ways to improve the quality of life on campus. It would be composed of students, faculty, and administrators.

Now you have been selected by the Vice-President of Student Affairs as one of the student leaders to participate in this Retreat/Workshop on Campus Community to be held ten miles from campus in a rustic log cabin beside a swift flowing mountain stream in a national forest. You are there ----sitting on throw pillows in a semi-circle in front of a roaring fire in the big stone fireplace. The smell of the burning cedar fills the air as you and your fellow students hear the leader say:

"What would our campus be like if it were more successful in building community?" "What are the strengths of our campus, what is going well?" What things are standing in the way of our having a better campus community?"
You are being asked to give the observable dimensions from this scenario on making community happen. You need to record all those positive dimensions, words or phrases that could clarify the fuzzy concept of campus community. We will count off into groups of three.

Instructions to participants
1. Now write those positive dimensions (words or phrases) that best describe aspects of the fuzzy concept of campus community observed in this situation.
2. Identify all the elements of campus community that you can think of.

Step 2.
A negative hypothetical situation: You are a campus student newspaper reporter assigned to write a series of articles on campus morale. You arrive at the Dean of Student's Office to interview him, only to find they had you scheduled the following week, even though you have a letter signed by the dean confirming your appointment time and date. The secretary to the dean determines you can proceed with your assignment even though the dean is not available to talk to you. Over several days you interview a number of students in order to get the student perspective of the quality of life and morale on the campus.
The following is a sampling of comments you received:

1. "Students are not taken seriously here. We are told what to do and what we cannot do, but never asked what we would like to do."
2. "We never get to talk to our faculty members outside the classroom, except for the advisor, and he/she discusses only scheduling and the rules established by the faculty."
3. "We wanted to set up a peer-tutoring program like they have in many colleges, but the dean shot us down. He said the faculty was too busy to monitor the tutors."
4. "We never see the president of the college. He never comes to student functions, football or basketball games. He is a phantom."
5. "The faculty dominates the school and students' opinions do not count."
6. "There never seems to be any money to pay for student activities, yet everyone pays a $50.00 activities fee each semester. When we ask where our money is being spent, we get a run-around."
7. "The faculty doesn't like to teach. They give boring lectures then complain because we cut class. When we complain that they bore us to tears, they say they are not here to entertain."
8. "Faculty members who give well prepared, stimulating and provocative lectures and are well liked by students, usually get the axe after a few semesters. We figure it's because students rarely cut their classes and the older faculty members get jealous and lobby to have them fired."
9. "Our financial aid office is a big joke. I don't know any student who has been able to work through that bureaucratic maze and come out ahead. The administration just doesn't seem to care about students."
10. "The food riots in the dining hall this year were about more than just the lousy food. We don't feel we matter to the powers that be."
11. "Here diversity is simply tolerated. Students from various ethnic groups feel like second class citizens, but then so do those of us who are white Anglo-Saxon Protestants."
These random comments sort of sum up the general atmosphere and attitude you heard expressed as you reported on campus morale from the student's point of view. What things do you see in this situation that would indicate to you that the fuzzy concept of campus community is absent here? What are the negatives?

After having examined both positive and negative hypothetical situations, finding more dimensions out of one's own mind is even more challenging. Next we employ strategies to test for completeness.

**Step 3.** Tests of completeness

1. The first test of completeness: While in your triad go through the same steps as above with the positive and negative aspects of the fuzzy concept of campus community. Examine each others lists item by item. Place negatives opposite positives and positive words opposite negative ones. Where you find a different word or phrase, it should be added to your own list. Should you decide the item is inappropriate, reject it. If the other individual's item makes you think of one or more dimensions you have forgotten, each one should add them to their list, if deemed appropriate.

2. A second test of completeness: Go back and recreate in your mind these two hypothetical situations, the retreat workshop and the student interviews. Now there were items that you saw that you wrote down in your two lists. There were other things that you saw that you did not write down for one reason or another. Go back, think again and consider the implications of some of these being considered of value to your lists. Write these dimensions down on your list if on reconsideration they are, for you, a part of the concept.
Step 4.
List as many dimensions that have nothing to do with Campus Community but might have implications for the concept.

Step 5.
Review all the dimensions listed and cross through those which are fuzzy concepts themselves. Now prioritize only those dimensions which are observable.

Step 6.
From the observable dimensions on your list, each of you write your own operational definition of Campus Community.

Step 7.
Working with the other two students in your triad, write a consensus operational definition of Campus Community.

Step 8.
With all triads back in the main group, spokespersons from each triad wrote the consensus definition on the board. Now from those triads' definitions written on the board, the entire group determined a consensus operational definition of campus community.

Analysis of the Data
Analysis procedures for arriving at Concluding Data are:
1. Each participant's list as well as their tentative definition and that of their whole focus group were analyzed for the key, first preference concepts.
2. Each concept was grouped with identical or similar concepts.
3. After separating and identifying these concepts the dominant themes were analyzed to arrive at a single tentative definition of campus community.
4. Comparative analyses were done to determine if noticeable differences occur between the on campus and off-campus students.
5. The concepts were then combined to form a final definition.

Summary of Procedures and Methodology

This section of the study has provided information on how the focus groups were selected. The rationale for selection of these individuals was that they were the ones most affected by the presence or absence of campus community. A review of the literature describing the Hutchinson Technique for Operationalizing Fuzzy Concepts was given along with the basic information on how it was used to achieve the purpose of this study.

The data collection process consisted of conducting three workshops: one with students representing six residence halls; one with commuter students living at family residences; and one with off-campus students living near the institution. The analysis of the final dimensions discovered by the three groups are presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the descriptive and comparative data collected from the three Campus Community Workshops. The first workshop was held in Pritchard Hall on the campus of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia and was composed of 18 resident undergraduate students nominated by the resident life staff. The second workshop, composed of 18 commuter students from the Roanoke-Salem area met at Lewis-Gale Hospital in Salem, Virginia. The third and final workshop conducted for off-campus students living in the Blacksburg area was held in Pritchard Hall and also had 18 participants.

Sample Description

The descriptive data reported in Table 1 shows some notable findings. There is a fairly equal representation of students by gender—51% were male and 49% were female. Of the students sampled, 60% of the sample were above the age of 20 while 40% were 20 or younger. As one would surmise, a moderately high percentage, 75%, of the student participants were single. Of those who volunteered to participate in the study, 44% were seniors, 28%, juniors, 18%, sophomores and 10%, freshmen.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours on campus each week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Majors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The largest ethnic group was Caucasian at 83%, with 7% Hispanic, 5% African-American, 1% Asian-American, and 1% American Indian. Twenty nine percent of the students spent less than twenty hours a week on campus while 71% reported having spent in excess of twenty hours a week.

The Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Chemical Engineering, Education and Psychology, led in representation with four or more majors in each academic area covering 44% of the workshop participants. Other majors represented with one to three students each included: Accounting, Archeology, Art, Communications, Family and Child Development, Finance, Geology, Liberal Arts and Sciences, English, Physics, Spanish, History, Aerospace Engineering, Business, Interior Design, and Liberal Arts.

Workshop Highlights

The highlights of each workshop will be recounted by selecting dimensions and personal definitions seen as pertinent. The definitions reached by each Triad in each workshop will be quoted and steps leading up to the final group definition will be elucidated reflecting participants comments and observations. Repetitious items and dimensions not applicable to our subject will not be reported.
Group I. On-Campus Workshop

The campus residents selected by the Residence Life Staff seemed eager to participate in the workshop. Their enthusiasm for the subject was evident as the overall goals and objectives were discussed and the positive and negative hypothetical situations (See Chapter 3, pp.55-56) were related to them. As they moved into their six triads to test the completeness of their personal lists of dimensions, the discussions broadened to include observable dimensions of the Tech campus that would serve as positive dimensions of campus community. Some of the comments' students made included:

A sophomore Hispanic Communications major observed that: "The Budget Rally brought Tech students together." "Wearing t-shirts, sweatshirts, caps with Tech logos and colors promotes unity between Tech students." "It is important for all students to give input on academic and social issues-working towards reaching a common ground that suits the best interest of all." "Relations between all members of a community, (regardless of race, class, gender, sexual preference) are positively exhibited."

A freshman Chemistry major felt that "campus community is a place for students to interact, grow, and learn without segregation and confinement. The faculty and students also interact and learn from each other."
A sophomore accounting major observed the "ideal campus community is a place of hierarchical communications, an organization where services are available and success is promoted."

A junior Communications major felt that to have community on campus students should have "the chance to band through activities based on the wellness wheel (spiritual, emotional, physical, intellectual, etc.) all aspects of healthy living."

A female sophomore Biology major pointed out the importance of a "positive attitude about student involvement, student -- faculty relations within the structure of the campus community."

A junior Civil Engineering student made a number of observations based on his two and a half years at the University. He wrote: "We need to have good representation, not just a token vote. There needs to be greater tolerance and inclusion of people different than others. The faculty needs to take more interest in students and those in administrative positions need to make it easier when students need to get things done, i.e. registration, financial aid."

A freshman History major defined our subject as a "complex organizational student/faculty body in which the students and the faculty share the responsibility for meeting the needs and wants of their community while preserving diversity and individuality through dedication to the institution."

A Landscape Architecture major in his sixth year of college made some astute observations in his personal definition. "An effective campus community comes from fair and equal
representation in regard to decision making. A place where a student is regarded as an equal to faculty and administrators as far as their input to decision making is concerned. A community includes on-campus as well as off-campus through things such as committees for improvement of facilities and sporting events. A community is one where a student is a member because they are students—not because they are white, black, or oriental. The staff also plays an important role in the morale of the students, and this in turn, makes them want to belong."

A junior in Aerospace Engineering observed in his definition that, "faculty members should be seen as people, not just authority figures and that interaction between everyone in community exists regardless of background, beliefs, etc."

A female senior Chemistry major defined campus community as "a sense of belonging, a concept of personal respect and a feeling of being heard and having those ideas put into action through encouragement by other students and by the faculty and staff."

Group I. Triad Definitions

Each triad came to a consensus on a definition and each was placed before all the campus students participating in the workshop. The entire group considered each of the following definitions before reaching a group consensus definition:
Triad 1. "Campus Community is a complex organizational student/faculty body in which the students and the faculty share the responsibility for meeting the needs and wants of their community while preserving diversity and individuality through dedication to the institution."

Triad 2. "Campus Community is primarily an educational environment where students and administration communicate their individual needs and come to an agreement whereby the majority of educational and social needs are met."

Triad 3. "Campus Community is a group of individuals of different backgrounds, personalities, and values, living together under a common governing body while striving to improve the collective standard of living by fostering better student -- faculty relations, peer relations and enhancing organizational structure."

Triad 4. The students in this group were all upperclassmen and chose to bullet their definition.

"Community-Fair and Equal Representation with regard to decision."

*Student is equal, feeling personal gratification based on involvement.

*Includes worlds of off and on campus.

*Students are members-not black, white or oriental members.
*Staff cooperation/niceness.  
*Sense of belonging."

Triad 5. "Campus Community is characterized by all students, and all faculty giving input on academic and social issues working towards reaching a common ground which suits the best interests of all. i.e. relations between all members of community (regardless of race, class, gender, or sexual preference etc.) is positively exhibited. Total campus activity participation, faculty/student interaction is multidimensional with on and off campus students feeling a part of the community and those off campus can still be involved."

Triad 6. "The ideal campus community is a place of hierarchical communication, organization, a place where services are available and success is promoted."

Consensus Definition Reached by Group I

The following was unanimously chosen as this group's definition:

Campus Community is a complex educational and social environment composed of all faculty, students and staff interacting and communicating multidimensionally to improve the collective standard of living and learning in an attempt to promote the success of everyone involved.
Group II. Commuter Workshop

The group of commuter volunteers from the Roanoke-Salem area were selected from a group of fifty, twenty-five from a random list supplied by the University’s Computer Service and twenty-five randomly selected from the University Directory. These fifty commuter students were first contacted by letter with pre-addressed stamped return cards and when only five responded affirmatively, extensive phone calls follow up conversations were conducted. Finally after countless hours of trying to obtain students willing to participate, twenty-two agreed to attend and eighteen showed up to participate in the workshop conducted in the Board Room at Lewis-Gale Hospital. The difficulty enlisting these commuting students to take an evening to discuss a topic they found hard to relate to was a definite deterrent in completing this phase of the research in a more timely manner.

The commuter students were nearly all older upperclassmen. Half of them were married. All these students were holding down full or part-time jobs or looking for employment in the Roanoke-Salem area. These students were decidedly less enthusiastic about the subject than the on-campus students. One out-spoken senior asked, "Why would you want us to talk about campus community, we don't live on campus and by virtue of our residences 45 miles away having little to do with it either way? Not much affects us but academics, and we have little opportunity to have any impact on the campus in any way." They did not see where their opinions would
make much difference and saw the workshop as a waste of time. They were serious and wanted to leave almost as soon as they finished their dinner. Practically all of these commuting students viewed campus community as a phenomenon unique to the geographical campus grounds. There was a cynical attitude that prevailed, what is called in the Navy "a short-timers attitude." They gave minimum comments on the worksheets, thus there is much less to report.

An example of the responses given, a married junior Geology student when asked to write his personal definition of Campus Community based on the observable dimensions on his list (he had only two dimensions - student/faculty interactions and club sports) wrote the following: "Extracurricular activities for students. Sensitivity to individual student needs both from faculty and administration. Extraordinary student aid, i.e., adult students, out of town commuting students." He wrote no consensus definition from his triad and did not participate in the group consensus definition discussion.

Others did get into the spirit of the effort. A married senior Chemical Engineering student wrote the following as his personal definition: "The campus and the city or town helping each other out. Engineering students may help the town planning commission. The town may provide free parking for football games. The town may provide rooms or buildings for student groups. The students may provide day care for working families." Throughout all the
workshops it was emphasized that dimensions must be observable. At least this student observed those instructions.

A single senior coed Spanish major defined "the 'ideal Campus Community' would be one in which there was adequate parking for all the students that would be close to classes, in order to minimize absenteeism on bad-weather days, and 'slow-moving' days, as far as health goes. There would also be more job-search type meetings, possibly within majors, and more actual 'guidance counselors' whose jobs are strictly that-to guide! Also, no one would have to work much to pay the rising financial costs."

A senior Finance major wrote his definition based on a number of dimensions he viewed as pertinent to the discussion:

"Create small school atmosphere by encouraging subset student groups; involve students in administration of school; encourage staff as well as faculty to get involved with student organizations and activities; give students a sense of direction; involve students in those fields outside the college in which they are studying; involvement in the surrounding community."

A 23 year old male senior defined our subject as "the system of college-related and socially-related functions that allow positive student activities and a healthy environment for learning."

A married senior Business Management major observed in his definition that "it is the atmosphere on a campus based on how people interact and feel about one another. Whether it is student vs. student or faculty vs. student (It is generally a positive, happy
atmosphere or a negative cold atmosphere.) Campus Community must involve Communication between all parties who have a stake in what is going on in their community."

Group II. Commuter Triad Definitions

Triad 1. "The campus community can be defined as all those individuals that make the campus what it is. This can include the immediate campus and the nearby community (Blacksburg). The campus community makes progress toward togetherness when each member is looking to better all the others."

Triad 2. "The atmosphere on and off campus based on how people interact through communication between administrators, students, citizens (of the community) and local government."

Triad 3. "Campus Community is reaching its goal when any member of the school (Faculty, staff, student of any background) can appreciate the existence of any other member of that school and feel free participating or working beside each other."

Triad 4. "The system of college-related and socially related functions that allow positive student activities and a healthy environment for learning: better organized parking; faculty advisor training; inter-related (discipline) speakers; student influence; and less beautification with more education."
Triad 5. "A campus community is characterized by all faculty, students, administrators, and staff giving input on academic and social issues working towards reaching a common ground which suits the best interest of all."

Triad 6. "Campus Community is based on strong leadership which brings together faculty, staff and students in an attempt to stimulate a functional and unified environment for all involved."

Consensus Definition Reached by Group II

Each triad’s definition was written on the blackboards around the hospital conference room. They voted on each dimension in each triad’s definition. The commuter group reached the following consensus:

Campus Community is effective communication and meaningful participation among stakeholders through college and socially related functions to provide a healthy environment for living and learning.

Group III. Off-Campus Workshop

The off-campus students living in the Blacksburg area met in a Pritchard Hall lounge and settled down to work on reaching their definition of campus community. Generally these students seemed every bit as enthusiastic about the workshop as the on-campus students. They opted to start working while still eating dinner.
One senior Education major astutely summed up her prioritized dimensions as: "Communication, involvement, leadership opportunities, people are valued and support services available."

A third-year Business major stated her definition this way. "Campus community occurs when there is efficient communication between all students, faculty, and administration; there are definite personal interactions between each of the groups."

A fourth-year Hispanic student majoring in Architecture listed "minority consideration" as one of the positive dimensions. Others included "faculty-student interaction, representation/expression of what students want, morale support, consideration, and effective communication." His own operational definition was stated this way: "A united, cooperative student body which is represented effectively in the administration, and interacted with by the faculty and communicative levels of the campus."

A junior Family and Child Development major summed up the positive dimensions in defining our subject this way: "Representation of students through interactions with faculty, administration, and other students in an effective cooperative way."

A junior Psychology major defined campus community as "an interactive environment among students, faculty, staff and administration that provides accessible services to students, utilizes teamwork, advisory committees and student input to enhance every individual's college experience."
Group III. Off-Campus Triad Definitions

Triad 1. "Two-way open communication between all members of the campus; all members of campus valued; provide efficient, effective support services; creation of opportunities for involvement within campus and society (future-oriented); development of cognitive, effective and practical skills."

Triad 2. "An interactive, purposeful environment among valued supported students, faculty, staff, and administration that provides efficient, effective, and accessible student support services combined with the creation of opportunities for involvement with campus governance and societal outreach."

Triad 3. "A united, cooperative campus where the student body is represented effectively in the administration and is interacted with by the faculty and communication levels of the campus."

Triad 4. "Interaction among faculty, students and administrators that provides teamwork, effective communication, accessible student services and where diversity is welcomed."

Triad 5. "Communities in which the thoughts and ideas of all of those represented are constantly circulating and being recognized through communication, diversity and interaction."
Triad 6. "All constituencies within and affected by the institution, joined in common efforts, exercising participatory communication to accomplish efficient and productive living and learning in an environment that encourages growth for all."

**Consensus Definition of Group III**

Each triad placed their definition on poster boards and attached them to walls and easily visible areas of the room. Though still enthusiastic, the exuberance was not as great as the competitiveness shown by the campus residents in their workshop mainly because this group took much longer completing their exercises and was growing weary. They tried very hard to include the best dimensions from each triad's composition to complete the following definition.

**Campus Community** is all individuals comprising the university, united in cooperative efforts, interacting through effective participatory communication towards an efficient and productive learning and growing environment.

**Analysis of First Preference Concepts**

As was noted earlier, community has become an important topic for discussion within higher education, although little research has been done on students' perceptions of what dimensions define community. The needs of the Tech students appear to be for
activities, cognitive, and social pursuits that relate to Hutchins and Cole (1986) definition of behavior as that which "includes a person's thoughts, feelings, and actions. Because thinking, feeling and acting are different aspects of behavior, each has a strong effect on the others" (p.2). Here each student's list of positive dimensions as well as tentative definition and that of their triad was analyzed for the key, first preference concepts. These concepts are simply listed here for ready reference to better elucidate on the student perceptions of important aspects of our subject and their thinking, feeling and acting responses to the subject at hand.

- faculty and staff show interest in students and their involvement in community
- fair representation and interaction between students and faculty
- efficient and effective communication
- responsible freedom for students
- student involvement in university governance vital to community
- empowerment opportunities for students to serve in leadership positions
- unity, democracy and teamwork creates superior academic atmosphere
- ethnic diversity and multiculturalism welcomed and celebrated thoughtfulness, sensitivity, respect for all members of the community
- All campus members exhibit enthusiasm and positive attitudes sense of community perceived by all as important
- out-of-class social gatherings with faculty and students in student center
greater consideration given to off-campus students, i.e. lounge for meeting
cross-departmental/discipline invitations for special speakers and events
well trained faculty advisors
fair and impartial student evaluations
students treated equally regardless of their past, their age, race
fair and equal representation with regard to decision making
striving to improve the collective educational and social environment
working for common ground which best suits the interests of all
faculty/student/staff multi-dimensional interactions
on and off campus students feel a part of community
better organized parking
campus and town help each other out
students provide day care for working families in area
all campus members valued
effective student support services
two-way open communication
desire for faculty to balance teaching and research
united cooperative campus
faculty members and administrators seen as persons not just authority figures
participating in classes
socializing and interacting with classmates outside of class
participating in recreational sports
attending varsity sports events
being part of activities closely related to academic major
interacting in student organizations
living and participating in residence hall activities
living in a Greek house and participating in fraternal/sorority activities
In the Hutchinson research methodology this would normally be the last step in the process. Since the goals of this study included not only a final consensus operational definition but how that definition addressed issues of individual versus shared interests and diversity. Thus, the researcher was compelled on this study to go beyond just operationalizing the fuzzy concept of campus community.

Similar or Identical Concepts Grouped

The University of Minnesota conducted an exploratory study in 1991 on Students' Views of Community on the Twin Cities Campus. Researchers set up a questionnaire using six factors in an analysis of interrelations of some twenty items (p. 17-18). This format of six factors was used in this study to group the Virginia Tech student sample population's forty dimensions on campus community. The factors were used to classify these students' first choice dimensions. The order of the factors reflects the first place emphasis assigned by students in this study. A factor not used in the Minnesota study but included in this research was "Student Involvement in Community." One factor used in the Minnesota study, "Use of Unions/Attend Campus Events" did not seem to comply with first choice dimensions in the Virginia Tech study. The groupings and the first place dimensions they represented were as follows:
Factor 1: Academic Involvement on Campus

Unity, democracy and teamwork creates superior academic atmosphere
Participating in classes
Responsible freedom for students
Cross-departmental/discipline invitations for special speakers and events
Being part of activities closely related to academic major
Well trained faculty advisors
Desire for faculty to balance teaching and research
Fair and impartial student evaluations
Faculty/student/staff multi-dimensional interactions

Factor 2: Social and Interpersonal Activities

All campus members valued
Faculty members and administrators seen as persons not just authority figures
Ethnic diversity and multiculturalism welcomed and celebrated
Thoughtfulness, sensitivity, respect for all members of the community
Efficient and effective communication
Greater consideration given to off-campus students
Fair representation and interaction between students and faculty
Students treated equally regardless of their past, their age, race

Factor 3: Student Organizations

Interacting in student organizations
Empowerment opportunities for students to serve in leadership positions
All campus members valued
Effective student support services
Living and participating in residence hall activities
Living in a Greek house and participating in fraternal/sorority activities
Factor 4: Student Involvement in Community

On-and off-campus students feel a part of community
Faculty and staff show interest in students and their involvement in community
Student involvement in university governance vital to community
All campus members exhibit enthusiasm and positive attitudes
Sense of community perceived by all as important
Fair and equal representation with regard to decision making

Factor 5: Universal Student Experiences

Better organized parking
Campus and town help each other out
Students provide day care for working families in area
Two-way open communication
United cooperative campus
Working for common ground which best suits the interests of all

Factor 6: Sports and Campus Events

Participating in recreational sports
Attending varsity sports events
Socializing and interacting with classmates outside of class
Striving to improve the collective educational and social environment
Out-of-class social gatherings with faculty and students in student center

The first place dimensions assigned to these factors were the researcher's intuitive placement in the sense that they were determined as the most suitable representation of the items or variables which make up that factor. Had time allowed, it would
have been beneficial to involve the students in a "Q" Sort to identify not only the factors but come to consensus in placing dimensions.

Dominant Themes

These dominant themes emerging from the three workshops are discussed at length in Chapter 5 in conjunction with recommendations for the enhancement of programs leading to greater community on the campus of Virginia Tech.

Definitions developed from Workshops

As a review we include here the three definitions developed in the workshops. The definitions development by each life-style group was not the most important product emanating from the workshops. The process through which the students journeyed to achieve the definition was the major learning experience.

On-Campus Students

Campus Community is a complex educational and social environment composed of all faculty, students and staff interacting and communicating multidimensionally to improve the collective standard of living and learning in an attempt to promote the success of everyone involved.

Roanoke Commuting Students

Campus Community is effective communication and meaningful participation among stakeholders through college and socially related functions to provide a healthy environment for living and learning.
Blacksburg Off-Campus Students
Campus Community is all individuals comprising the university, united in cooperative efforts, interacting through effective participatory communication towards an efficient and productive learning and growing environment.

All student participants were mailed all three definitions (Appendix G). Each was asked to highlight those dimensions they felt should be included in the final definition and mail back their recommendations. Two commuter students, two Blacksburg students and two Campus residents took the 23 returned recommendations analyzed the responses, and formed the final definition.

Campus Community is a complex educational and social environment composed of faculty, students, staff and other stakeholders interacting and effectively communicating multidimensionally to improve the collective standard of living, learning, and growing in order to promote the well-being and success of everyone involved.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine how campus community has been traditionally defined and the way selected students, living on and off campus, prefer to have the concept operationally defined. The study included a historical review of earlier conceptions and then explored innovations in the definition identifying characteristics of community in a four-year land-grant university that may be useful. An analysis of the logical criteria used in defining campus community in other than idealistic terms was presented.

The research questions guiding the study were:
1. What is the operational definition of campus community at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech)?
2. How does the definition address issues of individual versus shared interests and diversity?

Fifty-four student participants from three distinct life styles were consulted using the Hutchinson methodology for operationally defining "fuzzy concepts." The goal was to determine elements of an operational definition of campus community at Virginia Tech. A definition based upon the opinions of the participants was presented at the completion of the study.
Critique of Research Methodology

Hutchinson (1971) developed these procedures for eliciting and refining group opinions about critical educational problems and to forecast goals and behavioral objectives. Initially a major obstacle that hindered this research was the lack of data available on the research technique, "Operationalizing Fuzzy Concepts." There was no information in the university library journals. It appears that much of the original research data was lost in a library flood and it took months of writing and calling before finally reaching Dr. Hutchinson (Appendix A). After three more weeks delay he responded with copies of materials from his own files.

Once the procedural data were obtained, a trial workshop was conducted with graduate students in a class on student personnel. Several suggestions were made by the graduate students and incorporated into the final workshops. It was a unanimous opinion of the graduate students who participated in the trial workshop that a minimum of two hours be allotted to complete the process with each group. The problem of time allotment for the completion of each step became a hindrance in conducting the workshops and completing the work.

The Director of Residence Life had agreed to assist in obtaining participants for the On-Campus Workshop. He communicated both verbally and in writing urging the staff to nominate student participants (Appendix C). There was almost no response. After questioning his staff at length, he received feedback from them that
they had tried unsuccessfully for months to get campus volunteers to participate in a two-hour workshop on campus community. Staff members found that campus residents would not volunteer to commit more than an hour and a half to participate in a workshop.

Since a sample population could not be acquired that would dedicate two hours of time to discuss the subject, it was decided that every effort would be made to accommodate to 90 minutes for each workshop. Plans were implemented to proportion time over the required steps of the research procedure.

In the first workshop some triads took longer on certain steps than others. Although some flexibility was given with time limits set for the completion of each step, many of the triads did not complete their work on certain steps which resulted in shortchanging other steps. The researcher was faced with the problem of continuing without some of the triads having completed their steps or waiting for them to complete the assignments. Because each step was built on the preceding one, this scenario meant that less time was spent on developing the final definition. An adequate solution to this problem was not forthcoming due to the imposed 90 minute format for the campus workshop.

Faced with the situation of the acceptable time limit not being sufficient for completing the assigned steps, the researcher expanded the time allotted for the two remaining workshops. In contacting numerous off-campus and commuter students to encourage their participation in the workshops, a definite trend was discovered that
90 minutes was the optimum time students were willing to volunteer their participation. Two hours was seen as too long to spend. The residence life staff had accurately gauged student opinion. Stuck with a format of 90 minutes other measures had to be taken.

Options implemented in the remaining workshops were to streamline the initial "get acquainted" time, start on time with those coming late left to catch up as best they could, and the hypothetical situations used in Steps 1 and 2 were abbreviated. Even with those measures taken, the 90 minute time span was still inadequate to the task. Neither the off-campus or the commuter groups had enough time on the latter two steps. Two hours was the minimum amount of time given to utilizing this research methodology (Appendix F).

Operational Definition of Campus Community
The final consensus definition reached by the three life-style workshops was as follows:

**Campus Community** is a complex educational and social environment composed of faculty, students, staff and other stakeholders interacting and effectively communicating multidimensionally to improve the collective standard of living, learning, and growing in order to promote the well-being and success of everyone involved.
To operationally define campus community was viewed by our student groups as a near impossibility. As one senior commuter put it, "I can define the D-Day Invasion, but to operationalize it would take, as it obviously did, hundreds of volumes." Thus, even utilizing the Hutchinson Research Technique to narrow the defining process, the participants were under the tension of trying to define the concept as they viewed it, and at the same time include how they thought it could be accomplished. As the literature review pointed out, countless scholars have tried and found this to be no easy task. Response consensus was also difficult to obtain due to the possible contaminating variables from differences in age or class, living on or off campus, different disciplines, being married or single, which could influence needs and values.

These students felt compelled to include the term "complex" as a partial disclaimer in the operationalizing of the definition. The operationalizing comes through dimensions grouped into academic involvement; sports, campus events and social activities; student organizations; student involvement in community; universal student experiences; and interpersonal relations. The students felt they could not include all these first-line observable dimensions into a definition. They were forced to summarize these dimensions in the definitions they produced and hardly any of the participants felt good about what was produced when measured operationally.

The campus environment was viewed by our participants as both educational and social. They felt it was imperative to include
the surrounding community as being stakeholders in the university. Interacting and effectively communicating were seen as synonymous by many of the students, but they conceded to those who felt interaction happens without necessarily requiring communication. Effective multidimensional communication was seen as the major ingredient of the definition. Understanding shared values and aspirations for the community can only be achieved through dialogue not monologue.

The goal of improving the collective standard of living, learning, and growing for the well-being and success of all members of the community was a noble feature felt by these students to be necessary to achieve campus community. The influence of campus diversity was seen by these student participants as a strength in accommodating a united vision of community.

The Process

The major significance of this study was not the definitions that the students came up with but the process through which they moved to get to the point of defining (Appendices F and G). A number of students commented that they had never given much thought to the concept of campus community before. Having participated in this process encouraged them to share their thoughts and ideas on a subject which had real significance for their college experience.
Group I. Dynamics

This student group started out eagerly to get at the topic. Initially students voiced keen interest in discussing campus community. They liked the idea of being able to offer their opinions and seemed appreciative of being asked to participate in the process. As each step was taken and the deliberations progressed many became more weary and anxious to get on with it. Several students asked why the process of operationalizing the concept had to be so long. Another observed, "we could have gone from step one to step six and accomplished the task much quicker and probably better." On several occasions while participants were in their triads this researcher had to explain why the process had to follow the established research procedures. On the positive side of the coin, many students commented on the fact that going through the positive and negative dimensions made them realize how important having that sense of community was to the overall welfare of the campus.

To get the needed research results it was necessary to allow each triad to complete their definition before moving to the larger group. Two of the triads experienced major disagreements on what should be included in their final definition. The other four triads had to sit and wait for these two to resolve their differences. Repeated deadlines were given to these two triads to complete their assignment. One triad had to finish their definition while the entire group was discussing the consensus definition.
written on posters and placed on the walls around the room. Everyone in the entire group had the fullest opportunity to read, discuss and question each triad's definition. The method they used for arriving at a consensus was first underlining those dimensions from each triad's offering they wished to use in the final definition and eliminating those they felt were less applicable.

One of the more difficult problems for a researcher in a democratic setting where subjects have invested a fair amount of effort to achieve results requested is the highly vocal minority whose position is not generally shared. In one of the two hold-out triads, two students carried over into the larger group their differences. Each gained several allies and argued their position forcefully. Their points were minor but even after this researcher polled the whole delegation as to their sense of priority and received a majority hand vote to move on in the developing of the consensus definition, the dissidents became more as loose cannons and sought to take on the entire group.

It is interesting that both of these students were from minority racial or ethnic backgrounds. Because they sat together initially and in counting off to make up the composition of the triads they ended up in the same one. In analyzing the dynamics of this interaction, it seemed as if these individuals were playing their parts in a cultural script. Finding themselves in a workshop where they were obviously in a minority, they sat together. Once they ended up in a triad, their own differences emerged. Once back in the larger group and finding their
differences emerged. Once back in the larger group and finding their views out of sync, they tended to take on the whole group. This interaction might have been avoidable had the researcher anticipated the friction and assigned the two individuals to different triads.

Group II. Dynamics

It was interesting to observe the commuter group and the about-face they executed. Entering the workshop with a uniformly negative attitude, it was incumbent on the researcher to spend more time in the beginning motivating this group to share their opinions about campus community. It was pointed out that little research had been done on how commuter students responded to this whole concept of campus community and that what they were doing was important and significant to this study. As the participants moved through the steps, more of them gradually caught the spirit. As one coed noted, "Since we are all here we might as well give it our best shot." There was observable enthusiasm for each triad's contribution, and participants were not content to let their chosen spokesperson argue the case for the dimensions of their definition, but argued vigorously for inclusion of their ideas in the final definition. This was most obvious with the business major who wanted "stakeholder" included in the final group definition. He actively lobbied every member of the group and countered objections with positive and logical reasons for including this word in the final product. It is interesting that the use of this term found its way into the final definition.
Group III. Dynamics

This group of students had a distinctive group personality. They were enthusiastic, but there was a reluctance on the parts of several of the older students summed up in this senior's comment: "We've seen these studies go on for four years, but nothing is ever done. We still have to put up with the same administrative b--- s---. Nobody here really cares what we think."

Several others had stopped at the local pub before arriving at the meeting place and their behavior was observed. They never interfered with the deliberations, however these individuals had seemingly greater difficulty keeping focused on the subject at hand, One was seen and overheard trying to make a date with the coed in his triad. The other nodded off to sleep several times in the consensus meeting. This observation was made to point out that getting a group of active students together after dinner on a school night for two hours to concentrate on a subject that requires a good deal of in-depth cogitating will produce some unique scenarios.

General Observations

One of the realities that emerged from this study was that in a university the size of Virginia Tech, the involvement opportunities realistically available to students must, by the very nature of the institution, be found, mainly in sub communities. These provide a milieu in which students can feel comfortable and relate to others like themselves yet participate in the total community and establish
connections with those in other sub communities. In the on-campus workshop one student commented, "How can you have a sense of community with over 25,000 people?" Another observed that, "Community can only be experienced in small groups." Each of these students observations were discussed in the workshops.

An interesting student observation emerged from The Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota's research on this subject. They developed two definitions of community and asked students to indicate which of the two described their personal image. The two definitions differed mainly in terms of their emphasis on size, closeness, and interdependence.

A small, close-knit group of people who share a common experience, history, goals, interests, and values; and

Any interdependent group of people, of whatever size, who share certain common goals, interests, and values."

It was found that three fourths of the students responding to the survey (78 percent) chose the latter definition. These respondents did not limit community to small groups and this may well suggest that programs enhancing a sense of community on large campuses need not be restricted to small group activities (p.7).

The concept of diversity on campus as discussed by two of the groups led to the recognition of the importance of student subcultures. To sum up the ideas shared in the groups, thoughts on
the mainstream of institutional life were viewed as that which establishes the characteristics and distinguishing attitudes, values, beliefs, and patterns of behavior of the campus community.

The periphery was viewed as all other communities or subordinate subcultures whose particular values, beliefs, and patterns of behavior differ substantially from those of the center. Our workshop participants discussed the degree to which membership in sub-communities influenced closer relationship to the mainstream campus culture, the more one perceived of oneself as being congruent with the institution generally. Our students voiced strong opinions that impacts on one's commitment to the institution. Participants were unanimous in their belief that student involvement in campus life through sub-communities was a way to build loyalty, commitment and ultimately community.

Further research into this concept of community in large groups and smaller sub-communities would shed greater light on this neglected area of study.

Dominent Themes from Workshops

A major theme that dealt with the second research question concerned "issues of individual versus shared interests and diversity." This strong consensus opinion came from all three representative sample population groups. More than any one single issue emanating from these campus community workshops was the desire of students to be a vital a part of the university, other than
just paying fees. Unity, democracy, and teamwork were seen as key ingredients in the creation of campus community and ultimately a superior academic atmosphere. From participating in classes, interacting with academic advisors and faculty in and outside the classroom, to being part of activities involving their own major and activities of other related departments, students wanted to be a vital part. They wanted to relate with responsible freedom to faculty and administrators, viewing them not just as authority figures, but as colleagues interacting for a common goal. When discussing social gatherings in each of the three workshops, there was a strong desire expressed on the part of students to have the faculty there to interact. It was important to these students for the president, the deans, and key faculty to show interest in them as part of a total community environment.

The concern of students for the faculty to maintain a balance between research and teaching was a major factor. Because the system primarily rewards research and publications, these undergraduates perceived that faculty members had little time for teaching, advising, and interacting.

Nearly every student in each of the workshops related unpleasant experiences of ineptness or lack of interest to ignorance of the system when being counseled by their faculty advisor. The perception of undergraduates was that faculty advisors were not trained to perform this function but handed it as an unwelcome, unwanted assignment.
Surprisingly, sports and campus events, though seen as integral to campus community, were not ranked as high with these participants as one might have imagined. Attending major sporting events and taking part in intramurals, Greek Week activities, other campus social activities, and campus events all make major contributions, yet the more personal themes seemed to dominate in the positive dimensions these student participants were concerned about.

Not surprising was the importance these students attributed to general socializing and interacting with classmates outside the classroom. This was viewed as the training ground for maturing interpersonal communications. Participating in residence life, whether in dormitories or Greek houses, was seen as a significantly strong influence on the experience of community. Those living off-campus voiced concerns about feeling left out, and not considered a part of these campus activities.

Empowerment opportunity was the best way to describe student involvement in leadership positions, whether they were in student organizations, involved in such work as laboratory assistants or in residence hall positions. Being valued as a member of the campus community was often achieved through student organizations.

Recommendations

The advantage of working with a cross-section of undergraduates through an intense study focused on the subject of community, gives one
a keener insight into the ways in which students think, feel, and act. The following recommendations have been drawn from the six factors encompassing all the students' first choice dimensions that emerged from the study. In addition, direct quotations from participants are included where appropriate. Student interactions, suggestions, and ideas that were presented in the workshops and included on their worksheets were also referenced.

1. The university might consider encouraging greater cultural pluralism and establishing more effective methods of informing the student population of the availability and activities of multiple communities. This is particularly crucial for minority groups on the campus. In factor 2, which covered social and interpersonal activities, ethnic diversity and multiculturalism were viewed by the student participants as not only welcomed but celebrated. Thoughtfulness, sensitivity, and respect for all members of the community was a dimension unanimously agreed upon.

One History major pointed out that, "Foreign students coming here knowing little of our culture or language must feel a sense of isolation. Even though we hold out the hand of friendship, there has to be a certain longing to relate to others of the same culture and language. I think how I would feel if I were to end up in Peking University. If there were an English speaking student anywhere around you can bet I would search him/her out and cultivate a relationship."
A campus resident and sophomore Hispanic Communications major observed in a portion of her definition that: "Relations between all members of a community, regardless of race, class, gender, sexual orientation) is positively exhibited."

A junior Civil Engineering student made a number of observations and wrote: "We need to have good representation, not just a token vote. There needs to be greater tolerance and inclusion of people different than others."

A Landscape Architecture major living in a campus residence hall made some astute observations in his personal definition. "An effective campus community comes from fair and equal representation in regard to decision making. A community is one where a student is a member because they are students, not because they are white, black, or oriental."

A senior commuter Finance major wrote in his definition based on a number of dimensions he viewed as pertinent to the discussion: "create small school atmosphere by encouraging subset student groups."

Students in the on-campus group had a lengthy discussion about those undergraduates who need support in their efforts to educate other students about their interests and backgrounds. It was generally agreed that cross-cultural interaction was beneficial and educational but that female faculty members and faculty of color could aid immensely.
2. Greater services meeting the needs of off-campus and commuting students would be welcomed additions to the student affairs program. One of the first line dimensions agreed upon in these workshops as indicated in factor 2 was for greater consideration to be given to off-campus students. Factor 4 on student involvement in community stressed the importance of both on-and off-campus students feeling a part of the community. In factor 5 a major dimension recommended by all three workshops was the emphasis on improving town/gown relationships, by each helping the other.

Commuting students experience difficulty being involved in campus community because of the difference in life-styles. Programs designed to meet the particular needs of off-campus residents and commuters would enhance campus community for that segment of the student population.

The importance of commuter students from the Roanoke area being involved in the new Hotel Roanoke project was mentioned as a way to tie the institution and its mission more closely to the local community.

A single senior coed Spanish major defined "the 'ideal Campus Community' would be one in which there was adequate parking for all the students that would be close to classes, in order to minimize absenteeism on bad-weather days, and 'slow-moving' days-as far as health goes. There would also be more job-search type meetings, possibly within majors, and more actual 'guidance counselors'
whose jobs are strictly that--to guide! Also, no one would have to work much to pay the rising financial costs." Her last statement was made somewhat facetiously.

A senior commuter History major wrote in his definition "Involve students in those fields outside the college in which they are studying. Involvement in the surrounding community is part and parcel of campus community."

The University could sponsor "Campus Community Workshops" in outlying communities who count commuter students as citizens. Students and faculty living in the area could be invited to discuss ways they could achieve a more mutually desirable sub-community, and determine how it might meet the needs of the students. Communications centers and campus mailboxes along with more campus spaces for commuter interaction with faculty and peers could be provided. Frequent correspondence sent to commuters about campus activities would encourage participation.

3. Academic support systems to assess the needs of students and prevent them from experiencing undue academic difficulties are seen as essential for the achievement of community. In factor 1, academic involvement on campus, an emphasis on teamwork is viewed as essential to creating a superior academic atmosphere. One of the triads included the phrase, "communicating multidimensionally to improve the collective standard of living and learning." Those students who are from disadvantaged backgrounds
or those of the academic environment for some years should be assisted in reducing the pressure that accompanies a fear of failure. The provision for peer counselors, tutors, and advisers for these students at risk would enhance their involvement in the academic environment.

4. The university could conduct in-service training for administrators, faculty, staff, and students on crucial topics involving students. One of the commuter students had served in the Navy as a corpsman. He currently works in a hospital in Roanoke. In the course of our workshop at Lewis Gale Hospital, he related how in-services were utilized in the medical field to make sure everyone who needs to know certain policies or procedures were informed. He related ways this technique could be incorporated by the university to enhance community. His entire group of commuting students agreed with his ideas. Under factor 2 the students felt that faculty and staff show interest in them through efficient and effective communication. Fair representation and interaction between students and faculty would be enhanced through such in-service meetings.

Orientation workshops on cross-cultural communications, affirming a campus environment for a diverse student population, reaffirming and encouraging dissemination of the institution's mission are a few of the in-service type suggestions. According to these student's views, honesty dictates that not just faculty and staff,
but key students could effectively present the institutional views. They are more likely to present the underlying character of the university as experienced by the students. As one Business major commuter student pointed out, "Since students are the consumers as well as stakeholders, their perception of the product would serve as enlightening."

5. Student-faculty contact appears to be a significant element in student perception of the quality of campus life, especially when it extends beyond the normal, formal boundaries. A junior Blacksburg resident observed in the group dialogue that, "a vitalization of campus community would be enhanced by having a greater number of avenues for faculty-student interaction outside the classroom." An on campus freshman Chemistry major felt that "campus community is a place for students to interact, grow, and learn without segregation and confinement. The faculty and students interact and learn from each other."

A married senior Business Management major observed in his definition that "it is the atmosphere on a campus based on how people interact and feel about one another. Whether it is student vs. student or faculty vs. student (It is generally a positive, happy atmosphere or a negative cold atmosphere). Campus community must involve communication between all parties who have a stake in what is going on in their community."
Every student participant in each group agreed on the premise that greater interaction between faculty and students, especially outside the classroom in informal settings would build greater campus community.

6. If the institutional mission focuses on a holistic concept of education, the University's primary commitment is to the students. If the mental, physical, emotional, and spiritual development of students is the primary goal, reconsideration might be given to changing the requirements imposed on the faculty to focus primarily on research. The current structure has research receiving inherent rewards of recognition and promotion. Rewards for teaching excellence pale in comparison. One Biology major observed that "there is an overwhelming need of the students not to be short-changed in the classroom."

Under factor 1 on Academic involvement on campus, the desire for faculty to balance teaching and research was a primary dimension.

A Student-Faculty Steering Committee could be created in each college with the Dean appointing representative members and empowering it to focus on holistic education and recommend rewards for teaching excellence.

7. The University could consider offering more avenues for interdisciplinary instruction. A senior commuter student
commented, "I really would like to attend special meetings of the other sciences when they have invited outside speakers or have special programs. Unfortunately, I hear about them after they have happened." The pursuit of an issue, theme, or idea involving the integration and synthesis of methods, ideas, and influences of various disciplines would bring to bear judgments and methods of inquiry that is the holistic nature of human thought.

Cross-departmental/discipline invitations for special speakers and events closely related to academic majors was a primary dimension which emerged in factor 1 concerning academic involvement on campus.

Interdisciplinary instruction recognizes that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts and that there are findings from other disciplines that would naturally interact with one another regardless of artificial separations imposed by traditional departmental or discipline compartmentalization.

8. Residence Life could include discussions on campus community in each residence hall during orientation. This study is recommended as well for use at different times of the year such as following homecoming.

This recommendation is incorporated in all six of the factors composing first choice dimensions. Following the on-campus workshop a group of the students joined the workshop facilitator at a local student hang-out. The idea was posed that with some
modifications, the "Operationalizing the Fuzzy Concept" approach could be used in each hall each year. It would serve to focus student's attention on the fact that there was community in each living area. By participating in a Campus Community Workshop, the students could have greater impact on their environment.

The discussion followed along these lines. When students are invited to participate in the governing of their own environment as a natural part of their education, the university is showing its most profound concern for their personal development. Self-determining responsibility cannot be thrust upon a person while he or she lives and moves in an environment with little responsibility for bringing ideas to bear upon the design of that environment. If students are always forced to conform to a pattern designed by someone else, they are being deprived of the right to grow up.

To develop competence and a sense of personal autonomy as well as identity, an environment needs to be maintained in which students can be responsible. The conditions needed in such an environment are trust, care and a willingness of institutional leadership to share control with students. There is a need to be open to the possibilities that there are many ways to achieve the goals of the university that may not have even been considered. Starting with students defining their ideas of community where they are living could serve as the "pebble in the pond" with ripples extending throughout the university.
9. The University is able to foster the concept of community by encouraging students to contribute to the larger community. A married senior Chemical Engineering commuter student wrote the following as his personal definition: "The campus and the city or town helping each other out. Engineering students may help the town planning commission. The town may provide free parking for football games. The town may provide rooms or buildings for student groups. The students may provide day care for working families."

One on-campus Business major suggested, "graduate and undergraduate business school students might serve on teams of advisors to assist small-business owners. Small businesses must constantly strive to become more informed, efficient, and productive. The small business would benefit from learning the latest management theories, problem spotting techniques, problem-solving approaches, expansion ideas, and trend updates while the students would benefit from 'real world' experience of applying their business skills to specific management problems."

Many departments are already conducting similar programs. The Student Personnel Department in the College of Education sends out evaluation teams and task forces to offer general strategies for effecting positive change in college student affairs programs. Engineering students are involved in major projects such as the space plane. This idea could be expanded throughout the university for involvement to be effective is best shared.
Uses of Findings

If the university takes up the challenge to enter into the national dialogue on community-building and seeks to define its role in developing ways to create and strengthen campus community, this study could serve as a demonstrative model for obtaining student opinion on the subject.

1. This study could be used to modify the student handbook to incorporate a section on campus community, encouraging students in all areas and life styles to consider what this means to them and how they might implement the concept.

2. This model could be used for team building for there is synergistic power in students working together to achieve positive results.

3. An observation for future research using the Hutchinson methodology would be for the researcher to use extreme care and planning in setting up the composition of the triads. In that way one can keep interpersonal conflicts to a minimum in the development of the goal.

4. This study could be incorporated into the residential life training curriculum as part of the education for residence life staff.

5. This research lends itself to a study on the impact of community on the life of the institution.
Conclusions

Campus community is like motherhood, apple pie and the flag. Everybody agrees we need it, but when its implementation encroaches on discipline territorially there ensues the seemingly inevitable paradigmatic debate. A factor which would relate to consensus complexity is the "pre paradigm" state of academic definition with diffuse disciplines competing for recognition and sanction. "Paradigm" from Kuhn (1962) refers to the extensive "overt disagreements between social scientists about the nature of legitimate scientific problems and methods" (viii).

Countless needs assessments have established that students require much more than enlightenment of their cognitive capabilities to be fully actualized as educated individuals. This study reconfirms that students want to take action as integral parts of the university, to be involved. For their education to be relevant to the society in which they live, they want to be a part of the change toward a better way. Both student efforts and institutional efforts are needed to promote the quality of student involvement necessary for operationally realizing campus community. Optimum academic vitality, in the view of these students, is achieved when shared responsibility is extended by those at the top.

To foster student involvement is to respect their integrity and uniqueness as individuals striving to achieve authentic responsible personhood in an ever changing environment. To paraphrase Dostoeievsky, students are persons and not the keys of a piano.
When students are involved as a natural part of their education they can more readily handle interpersonal relationships, develop a sense of purpose, and develop personal integrity.

Attitudes shape the quality of our lives. If one's attitudes are positive, their lives are viewed as largely of their own making. Students are limited by attitudes, not by opportunity. What one judges to be a miserably rainy day, will be to another a tremendous opportunity to sell umbrellas.

To create "campus community" like-minded faculty in every discipline who view education in this manner need to be involved. Our mathematicians, scientists and men of engineering competence, and those in the humanities who recognize the value of "educating the whole person" not just creating technocrats, need to come forth to testify to the value of building integrated men and women. It was Aristotle (384-322B.C.) who said, "Educating the mind without educating the heart is no education at all". It is strange that man confronts last what lies nearest. We handle all of life's problems before we will deal with the real one--being an authentic human being, a real person.

The core of holistic education is the intervention brought about by "real people" challenging young persons to be authentic human beings. Recognizing that personality is not so much like a structure but a river continuously flowing, to be a person is to be engaged in a perpetual process of becoming. A real person is integrated, with the major criterion of success -- *e pluribus unum*. The achievement
of personal happiness depends on inner unity. Dependability is possible only in so far as the whole personality achieves a solid unity that can be counted on. Integrity is impossible without integration. The achievement of integration runs deep into the core of selfhood. Community helps in the development of the whole person. One might venture to say, holistic education is impossible without community for students can, with proper instruction, become more integrated persons. Wholeness involves mind, body, and spirit.

Campus community could help give students the desire to be lovers of wisdom. In Ancient Greece being a "philosophos" indicated a love of thinking about things and the possession of a thoughtful and reflective attitude towards life in general. Does the university have a greater responsibility than just giving students the tools to make a living without also imparting the ideals to make a life? Ideals come in community.

Much of the pain students feel from anxiety, loss of confidence, self-deprecation, that lonely sense of being shut up within one's self, powerlessness, apathy, pessimism, and fear can all be eradicated by attitudes of confidence in life, belief in its possibilities, trust in its available resources, assurance of its worthwhileness, attitudes that emerge from a caring community. Community is powerful stuff. It is the "releaser" of personal energy. Whatever one puts before self is always the object of one's faith, and to believe in something, to belong to something greater than one's self is to trigger tremendous human energy through commitment.
We need to put these ivy-covered halls into the pro-active mode of expressing faith in this idea of educating the whole person in this community of learning. To do that takes a commitment, a personal response made in freedom, with initiative and creativity to achieve a well-knit, efficient, and admirable community.

Man's ability to project a purpose into the future and head for it is unique among creatures of this world. A unique community can be created here by involving all those in the university. The organizations, the people and the relationships of each to all the others can be coordinated and integrated toward the growth and development of the total campus environment as a democratic community. As the individual and the group contribute to the total community they give the community the capacity to create the conditions that contribute to the enhancement of the individual and the group. This symphony relationship of the individual to the community is the classical definition of democracy.

The campus student body is made up largely of determined idealists who down deep, if motivated, would dedicate themselves to helping change the world for the better, one clod at a time. They are our promise for the future. Our role as student "involvers" is to help them find their way. Not only do we teach them how to use their brains, we motivate them to express their feelings, and challenge them to go out into the world and help make it a better place. When there is community on the campus, students learn how to make the world a community.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO
DR. THOMAS E. HUTCHINSON
December 12, 1991

Dr. Thomas E. Hutchinson, Professor
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Dear Dr. Hutchinson:

it was good to make your acquaintance via Ma Bell on the 25th of November. Since Dr. Jimmie Fortune speaks so highly of his former colleague, I was looking forward to our communication. I sincerely appreciate your kind offer to supply materials on "The Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts".

I want to thank you in advance for sending copies of those materials you feel would help me best represent the work which you have done. I plan to use your methodology in gathering my data in the preparation of my doctoral dissertation in student personnel on the topic "Campus Community: In Search of an Operational Definition".

Dr. Fortune, Dr. Don Creamer, my committee chairman, and I feel this would be the perfect technique to employ. Your interest in my effort is most encouraging.

Hope you and yours enjoy a happy holiday

Sincerely,

William E. Baker

cc:  Dr. Don G. Creamer
     Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune
APPENDIX B

"FUZZY CONCEPT LETTER"
A RESEARCH STUDY OF
CAMPUS COMMUNITY

Graduate Studies in College Student Affairs
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

William E. Baker
3840 View Avenue S.W.
Roanoke, Virginia 24016-4043
(703) 989-4492

August 17, 1992

Dr. Gerald J. Kowalski
Director of Residence Education
Virginia Tech-109 East Eggleston Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0428

RE: "FUZZY CONCEPT FOCUS GROUPS ON CAMPUS COMMUNITY"

Dear Dr. Kowalski:

As we discussed, my dissertation, "Campus Community: Students' Search of an Operational Definition" is being undertaken partly in answer to Dr. Ernest L. Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He has called for a national dialogue on campus community building and challenged higher education to define its role in finding ways to build and strengthen the concept of community on American campuses.

The term "campus community" is, in many respects, a "fuzzy concept". It has been defined in many ways by many individuals and groups. Our goal in this study is to obtain a Virginia Tech residence hall students' operational definition. We have chosen to use The Hutchinson Research Procedure (Un. of Mass.) of operationalizing "fuzzy concepts" to obtain our data. This research procedure has proven highly effective for eliciting and refining the opinions of groups of people. I would like to conduct my research by working with focus groups in six residence halls during the month of September to determine what our students think and feel about campus community and how they would define it.
I would appreciate your assisting me in my study by nominating student groups in six diverse residence halls featuring different styles of living arrangements, such as all male, all female, coed, special purpose, graduate and foreign students, and barracks for the Corps of Cadets. Each group should be composed of an R.A. (co-ordinator) and 8-10 other students differing in class (freshmen, juniors etc.), gender (other than single sex halls), cultural and ethnic backgrounds, academic majors, and social and political inclinations (i.e. Greeks, Gay Rights, Young Democrats etc.). Ideally, one group meeting each of six nights of your choosing, from 7:30-9:00 would serve our purposes better than trying to squeeze in two groups in an evening.

These individuals would participate in an hour and a half long "Fuzzy Concept Focus Group" held at a date and place directed by your residence life staff. A private conveniently located lounge area would be most appropriate. The final step of the six step process has the students coming to a consensus on their group's concept of defining campus community operationally.

I am most grateful for your interest in my subject and your willingness to assist in this way. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

William E. Baker
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO AND FROM RESIDENCE LIFE STAFF
July 26, 1992

Residence Life Staff
C/o Dr. Gerald J. Kowalski
Director of Residence Education
Virginia Tech-109 East Eggleston Hall
Blacksburg, VA. 24061-0428

Dear Staff Member:

As a former "Dorm Daddy" for Freshmen Halls at U of R, I envy you in the experience you are about to have in residence life this year. In many ways I wish I were where you are. On the other hand you might prefer to be where I am educationally, that is two chapters to go to complete my doctoral dissertation in student personnel.

I have observed through the years that when "Campus Community" was discussed, experts were quoted to define its meaning. That always bothered me for I happen to believe the best experts on this subject are those most affected by it-undergraduate students. For that reason I have chosen as my dissertation "Campus Community: Students' Search for an Operational Definition."

In this endeavor I need your help. I have no way of knowing who the best students would be to participate in the 90 minute workshop on Campus Community. You are in the best observation post on campus and more than anyone could help select those with "the right stuff." Would you be willing to serve on our "Blue Ribbon Nominating Committee" to help select eighteen of our brightest and best resident undergraduates to participate in a Campus Community Workshop? Would you indicate the information requested about your nominee and return same on this pre-addressed postcard.

If you would be willing to help with the workshop, please indicate in the space indicated. You may be in my situation sooner than you think, and having the skilled input of a Residence Life Professional like yourself will make a big difference. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

William E. Baker
3840 View Avenue S.W.
Roanoke, Virginia 24018-4043
(703) 989-4492
TO: Mary Dee  
   Kim  
   Lisa C  
   Dan  
   Lisa R  

FROM: Gerry Kowalski  

RE: Assistance with Doctoral Research  

DATE: September 11, 1992  

I am pleased to announce an exciting opportunity for both student staff and students to participate in a research study about community. Mr. Bill Baker, a doctoral student in the College Student Affairs program, has asked for our assistance with his thesis. Given the nature of the project and the potential learning opportunity for staff and students, I have granted him permission to conduct the study.

TOPIC

Bill is attempting to obtain an operational definition of the concept of campus community. The term is a "fuzzy concept" because it is defined in many ways by many individuals and groups. Other examples might be love, democracy, and peace.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Through a research technique called "operationalizing fuzzy concepts", Bill wants to obtain the residence hall students' definition of campus community. He needs a minimum of six (6) Resident Advisors, representing at least six different living arrangements [(1) all male, (2) all female, (3) co-ed, (4) greek, 5) Corps of Cadets, and graduate] to volunteer to participate in a triad group discussion with two other residents. These types are not "set in stone", but he would like to get a representative sample of student input. Within the triads, diversity of class standing, gender, cultural and ethnic background, major, sexual orientation, and campus involvement is desired.

RESEARCH METHOD AND TIMELINE

Bill plans to talk to each RA volunteer prior to the discussion to help prepare for his/her role. At a convenient date, time and location mutually agreed upon by the RA and identified students (evening times are suggested), Bill would facilitate a 90 minute "fuzzy concept" discussion to determine a group definition of campus community. In all, he would conduct six sessions in the halls. Each group would submit their definition to him. The final step of the process would be another meeting of each of the triads...
in which the students would come to a consensus in defining campus community operationally. Bill would like to conduct these sessions in late September/early October.

Please share this opportunity with student staff and have them contact me no later than September 25th if they are interested in participating in this valuable study.

Please call me if you have any questions about any aspect of this study. Thank you for your help and cooperation!

cc: Jean Eversoie, Gail Kirby, Jerry Riehl
    Head Residents and Graduate Resident Managers
    Bill Baker
March 4, 1993

Mr. William E. Baker
360 View Avenue SW
Roanoke, VA 24018

Dear Bill:

Please find enclosed a copy of the letter I sent to selected students who might serve as leaders of the triads for your research project. As you will note, the students have been directed to contact me. I will notify you, shortly after spring break, about the students who have chosen to participate.

You will also find enclosed a listing of the students and demographic information about them. I hope the variety within the list and subsequent diversity of the other students selected to complete the triads will be sufficient for your study.

Please call me if you have any questions regarding our assistance with your project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gerald J. Kowalski
Director of Residence Education

GK/nj
Enclosure
July 29, 1993

Dr. Gerald J. Kowalski
Director of Residence Education
Virginia Tech - 109 East Eggleston Hall
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0420

Dear Gerry:

Enclosing 100 copies (original request) of letter to Residence Life Staff and 150 self-stamped cards and 50 blank address cards for you to have your stamp applied to. You know how vital this is to me and I appreciate the extra special effort you are making to see I get the folks to obtain the data to complete my study. You and your lady will get a night out on the town once I get this baby done.

Again, many thanks old friend.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William E. Baker

cc: Dr. Don G. Creamer
    Dr. Jimmie Fortune
    Dr. Thomas Goodale
TO: Student Staff Members
FROM: Gerry Kowalski
Director of Residence Education
RE: Assistance with Doctoral Research
DATE: August 30, 1993

Please find attached a letter from Mr. Bill Baker, a doctoral student in the College of Education (student personnel). He is looking for volunteers to complete his dissertation about campus community. He needs approximately 20 students with a mixture of the backgrounds (class year, major, gender, race, in/out of state residence, Cadet/civilian, city/country, Greek-letter affiliation/independent, etc.) to participate in a 90 minute workshop that will be conducted in late September.

Mr. Baker’s research effort is valuable. The outcomes of his work would be applicable in the residence halls and beneficial to our work. Likewise, I support and encourage graduate students in the student affairs field to use the residence halls as a good resource for research subjects and data. As a result, I write to endorse his project and ask you to promote it as an opportunity for involvement. Please consider nominating one or more of your residents to participate in the research. They would have the opportunity to meet new people and learn something about themselves and others while participating in a worthwhile project. You are eligible to participate, also.

Please read his letter, ask students if they want to participate, complete the postcard and mail it back to Mr. Baker by Wednesday, September 15th. Nominated students will be contacted by him with further information about the workshops.

Thank you for your support.

cc: Area Coordinators
Assistant Directors
Bill Baker
TO:       RHF Members
FROM:     Gerry Kowalski
          Director of Residence Education
          Residence Hall Federation Advisor
RE:       Assistance with Doctoral Research
DATE:     September 1, 1993

Please find attached a letter from Mr. Bill Baker, a doctoral student in the College of Education (student personnel). He is looking for volunteers to complete his dissertation about campus community. He needs approximately 20 students with a mixture of the backgrounds (class year, major, gender, race, in/out of state residence, Cadet/civilian, city/country, Greek-letter affiliation/independent, etc.) to participate in a 90 minute workshop that will be conducted late this month.

Mr. Baker's research effort is valuable. The outcomes of his work would be applicable in the residence halls and beneficial to our work. Likewise, I support and encourage graduate students in the student affairs field to use the residence halls as a good resource for research subjects and data. As a result, I write to endorse his project and ask you to promote it as an opportunity for involvement. Please consider nominating one or more of your fellow residents to participate in the research. They would have the opportunity to meet new people and learn something about themselves and others while participating in a worthwhile project. You are eligible to participate, also.

Please read his letter, ask students if they want to participate, complete the postcard and return it to me by Wednesday, September 15th. Mr. Baker will contact nominated students with further information about the workshops.

Thank you for your support.

cc:       Area Coordinators
          Assistant Directors
          Bill Baker
          Community Assistants
          RHF Graduate Advisor
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO CAMPUS
COMPUTER CENTER
Mr. Jerry Robertson  
Programmer, SSCS  
Virginia Tech-248 A Burruss Hall  
Blacksburg, VA 24069

Dear Jerry:

As we discussed, my dissertation, "Campus Community: Students' Search of an Operational Definition" requires three random sample groups. The first group, composed of residence hall students, is being obtained through Dr. Gerald Kowalski and his staff. The two groups remaining are students living off-campus in rented quarters and those students who commute from their homes in the Roanoke, Vinton, Salem areas. A random sampling of thirty students from each category would be sufficient to obtain the required number to participate in the Campus Community Workshops. What I need initially is the data that will be entered in the campus directory in order to invite their participation.

I am most grateful for your your willingness to assist in this way. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

William E. Baker  
3840 View Avenue S.W.  
Roanoke, Virginia 24018-4043  
(703) H-989-4492 W-776-0918

cc. Dr. Don G. Creamer  
    Dr. Jimmie Fortune  
    Dr. Thomas Goodale
APPENDIX E

COMMUNICATIONS WITH STUDENTS
October 30, 1993

Dear Fellow Student:

Congratulations on being selected to represent the Blacksburg area for the Campus Community/Pizza Party Workshop to be held in Pritchard Hall, Wednesday, November 3rd. at 6:00 PM. Take the elevator to the 4th floor, take a right and follow the signs.

We appreciate your willingness to add your thoughts to our discussion on this vital subject especially from the off-campus perspective. If you have a friend or two who live off-campus who would like to join in the discussion, feel free to invite them.

To have an accurate count for ordering pizza, drinks etc., please call Dawn Hensley at 552-9465 prior to Wednesday to let us know who will be accompanying you. I look forward to meeting you and hearing your ideas.

Sincerely,

Bill Baker
NOMINATION FOR CAMPUS COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

STUDENT
NAME____________________ADDRESS________PHONE_______

CLASS SOPHOMORE, JUNIOR, SENIOR
   MAJOR____________________
   (Circle one)
RACE/ETHNIC GROUP
   BLACK  AMERICAN INDIAN  ASIAN-AMERICAN  HISPANIC  CAUCASIAN
   (Circle one)

RESIDENCE LIFE
STAFF NOMINATOR____________________ADDRESS________
PHONE_______

PLEASE INDICATE IF YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO ASSIST IN
CONDUCTING THE WORKSHOP.      YES/NO  (Circle one)
NOMINATIONS FOR CAMPUS COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS
OF STUDENTS LIVING OFF CAMPUS IN BLACKSBURG OR
COMMUTING FROM ROANOKE AREA

STUDENT
NAME________________________ADDRESS________________________

CITY___________________________PHONE________________________

NOMINATOR____________________

STUDENT
NAME________________________ADDRESS________________________

CITY___________________________PHONE________________________

NOMINATOR____________________

STUDENT
NAME________________________ADDRESS________________________

CITY___________________________PHONE________________________

NOMINATOR____________________

STUDENT
NAME________________________ADDRESS________________________

CITY___________________________PHONE________________________

NOMINATOR____________________

STUDENT
NAME________________________ADDRESS________________________

CITY___________________________PHONE________________________

NOMINATOR____________________

STUDENT
NAME________________________ADDRESS________________________

CITY___________________________PHONE________________________

NOMINATOR____________________
A RESEARCH PROJECT ON
CAMPUS COMMUNITY
A Study in College Student Affairs
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

October 22, 1993

Lee Carter
246 Randolph Ave.
Salem, VA 24153

Dear Lee:

We tried to reach you unsuccessfully by phone to let you know of an opportunity you might wish to take advantage of next week. On Wednesday, October 27 a number of students who commute to Tech will meet to discuss being more a part of the campus community. The meeting will be held at Lewis Gale Hospital in the first floor conference room next to the Personnel Office beginning at six in the evening.

If you would you be willing to spend an hour and a half over pizza and coke sharing your thoughts and ideas on how the Virginia Tech commuting student fits into the whole concept of Campus Community just give me a ring at 989-4492 so we'll have enough pizza and other goodies.

I look forward to seeing you.

Sincerely,

William E. Baker
DEAR BILL:

- I ACCEPT THE NOMINATION OF THE RESIDENCE LIFE STAFF TO REPRESENT MY RESIDENCE HALL IN THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY WORKSHOP AND LOOK FORWARD TO SHARING MY THOUGHTS ON WHAT CAMPUS COMMUNITY MEANS TO ME.
- I AM UNABLE TO ACCEPT THE INVITATION DUE TO PRIOR COMMITMENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will be happy to participate in the 90 minute discussion of Campus Community at Virginia Tech over pizza at the Tech graduate center.
CAMPUS COMMUNITY PHONE INVITE

Hello _______, my name is Bill Baker. I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Education conducting research on how the concept of campus community affects students living on and off campus. Do you have a minute to talk?

How do you feel about Campus Community at Tech?

Is it important to you?

If so, why? If not, why not?

Are you content with things the way they are?

Do you feel left out of a lot because you are not a campus resident?

Does being out of the "on-campus mainstream" suit you just fine?

Would you like your opinions to be heard?

Would you be willing to spend an hour and a half one evening over pizza with other Roanoke area commuting students to discuss this issue?

Would Wednesday October 27th, from 6:00 to 7:30 or Thursday, October 28th, be the most convenient time for you to meet? We will be getting together at Lewis Gale Hospital, in the conference room next to the Personnel Department on the first floor. Since we'll be ordering pizza, drinks and other goodies may I put your name down here as a definite participant in the campus community workshop?

You will enjoy this exercise in free-speech, and I look forward to meeting you.
APPENDIX F

WORKSHEET


**CAMPUS COMMUNITY WORKSHEET**

Name: ROO SWATT  Age: 23  Phone: 232-2164

Address: 241 PAYNE HALL  (Currently On Campus One Year 1st Year)

(On-Campus/Off-Campus/Out-of-town commuter) Number Years: 2 Years

Gender: M  Marital status: Single  Year in college: 6th  Major: Landscape Architecture

Race/Ethnic group: Black American-Indian Asian-American Hispanic  White

(Circle one)

Average number of hours spent on campus per week: 20

Average number of hours worked on campus employment: 14

Average number of hours working at a job off-campus: 20

(Summer Employment)

(If more space is needed on any step, utilize the reverse side of page)

Step 1. Positive dimensions (words or phrases) of *Campus Community* observed in the first hypothetical situation.

- Democracy and representation
- Efficient distribution of power/cooperation (sense, class cooperation)
- Warm and welcoming environment of students/faculty
- Concerns and feedback
- Feeling of inclusion by student community

Step 2. Negative dimensions observed in the second hypothetical situation.

- Alarmed by campus disorder
- Alarmed by being off-campus two weeks
- Difficult to come from off-campus anywhere (except for me)

There is a feeling of disconnection for off-campus students. They only come to campus for class, maybe one meal a day. They essentially become a member of the university in the same respect as the faculty member — only coming to campus when they need to.

When classes are terribly boring, badly organized, there is no motivation to come to class. Students will take chances on the finals, quizzes, and attendance. As far as campus coming to sporting events, not really a concern to off-campus kids. It's out of 10 they wouldn't recognize them anyway. Teaching is what matters — it's the professor's attitude.
Step 3. Test of completeness—positive or negative dimensions you think of which were not evident in the two hypothetical situations.

**POSITIVE**
- RAMP consisting of students' friends
- SFTA
- Student culural diversity
- AREA cooperation
- Community activities

**NEGATIVE**
- Power família real
- Would be better screening for the FAQs
- Heavy bureaucracy
- Racial aspects
- Black-white fairly chance

Step 4. Dimensions having nothing to do with Campus Community but might have implications for your concept.
- Funding for building (new dorm) (academic building)
- Sports program
- Cooperation by staff
- Student activities, registration, etc.
- Feelings of pride

Step 5. Review your dimensions and strike out those which are fuzzy concepts themselves i.e. not observable.

New prioritizing only those dimensions which are observable, Add any new dimensions you think of that are not fuzzy concepts themselves.

- Donorship
- Inclusion
- Representation
- Power
- [RAMP]
- [ABILITY OF UNIVERSITY TO ENHANCE FACILITIES]

Step 6. From the observable dimensions on your list, write your own operational definition of Campus Community.

An effective campus community comes from fair and equal representation in regard to decision making. A place where a student is regarded as an equal to faculty and administrators, so far as their input to decision making is concerned. A community includes on campus as well as off campus students through things such as committees for improvement of facilities and sporting events. A community is one where a student is a member because they are students—not because they are white, black, or oriental. It's staff that the university has also plays a role in the makeup of the students and this, in turn, makes them want to belong.

Diplomat's Respect
Endowed by peers & faculty
Step 7. Working with the other two students in your triad, write a consensus operational definition of Campus Community:

- Community - fair, equal representation w/ regard to opinion
- Student is equal, preclude personal identification based on involvement
- Includes world off and on campus, inclusion by SGA, committees for improvement of facilities
- Students are members - not Black, White or Oriental members
- Staff cooperation/willness
- Sense of belonging

Step 8. On the large poster size sheet, print out in large letters your triad's operational definition and tape it to the wall for the entire group to be able to observe. It will be considered along with definitions from the other triads in reaching a consensus operational definition of Campus Community.

Step 9. If you would like to meet with representatives from the off-campus and home/campus commuter groups who will complete the same operationalizing of this fuzzy concept to obtain a consensus definition for the entire campus community, just circle.

YES/NO

Step 10. If you would be willing to have your name listed in the dissertation appendix as a workshop participant and have your selected dimensions as part of the definition analysis, just circle.

YES/NO

(UPON THE COMPLETION OF THIS WORKSHOP ON CAMPUS COMMUNITY, PLEASE RETURN YOUR WORKSHEETS TO BILL BAKER. MANY THANKS FOR YOUR HELP IN SEEKING TO CLARIFY THIS OFTEN MISUNDERSTOOD CONCEPT.)
APPENDIX G

THREE DEFINITION LETTER
A RESEARCH STUDY OF
CAMPUS COMMUNITY
Graduate Studies in College Student Affairs
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

William E. Baker
3840 View Avenue S.W.
Roanoke, Virginia 24018-4043
(703) 989-4492

November 5, 1993

Dear Fellow Student:

First I want to thank you for meeting and sharing your ideas on Campus Community. Groups from on-campus, off-campus in Blacksburg and commuting students from Roanoke met to give a cross section of student opinion. The following definitions were developed from these three groups:

**ON-CAMPUS STUDENTS**
Campus Community is a complex educational and social environment composed of all faculty, students and staff interacting and communicating multidimensionally to improve the collective standard of living and learning in an attempt to promote the success of everyone involved.

**ROANOKE COMMUTING STUDENTS**
Campus Community is effective communication and meaningful participation among stakeholders through college and socially related functions to provide a healthy environment for living and learning.

**BLACKSBURG OFF-CAMPUS STUDENTS**
Campus Community is all individuals comprising the university, united in cooperative efforts, interacting through effective participatory communication towards an efficient and productive learning and growing environment.

Since my goal is to determine how you would operationally define our fuzzy concept of campus community, would you take a few minutes and write out a definition based on these three definitions? A pre-addressed, stamped card is enclosed for you to write out your definition. One person from each of the three groups will meet on campus prior to Thanksgiving to pull the final definition together based on what you have written. Many thanks for your help. If you would like a copy of the final consensus definition, simply sign your name to your rendering.

Sincerely,

Bill Baker
William Edmond Baker

Residence Address
The Bakery
3840 View Ave. S.W.
Roanoke, Virginia 24018
(703) 989-4492

Professional Address
Good Samaritan Hospice
3825 Electric Road S.W. Suite A
Roanoke, Virginia 24018
(703) 776-0198

Personal Data
Excellent Health
Married, Five Children, ages 14-30
Interests: Boating, fishing, hunting, & photography

Education
1994 Ed. D. Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA
Major: Student Personnel and Counseling
1990 M.A. Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA
Major: Counseling and Student Personnel
1963 M. Div. Southeastern Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC
Major: Counseling
1960 B.A. University of Richmond, VA
Major: Philosophy

Other Training
1984 Wilson Learning Center, Eden Prairie, Minn., Certified Trainer in leadership, management and interpersonal relations.
1979 Summer Graduate Realtors Institute, University of Virginia, School of Business, Charlottesville, VA.
1973 Greater Washington Transactional Analysis Institute, Training in the use of TA with student groups. Washington, DC
1972 National Leadership Methods Institute, Exxon Corporation Fellow, Austin, TX .
1971 National Training Lab, Organizational Development Training, Bethel, ME.
1964 Naval Schools Command, Newport, R.I., Naval Officer Training.
Professional Experience

1993-Present  Director of Pastoral Care, Good Samaritan Hospice
Roanoke Virginia.
Responsible for development and supervision of chaplains

1990-1991  Graduate Assistant to the Director, Counselor Education
Program Area of the College of Education. Virginia
Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech).
Responsibilities include co-ordination of all graduate
applications for the postmasters program in counseling and
student personnel.

1990  Assistant Vice President for Educational and Student Services
St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, FL.
As part of the Doctoral Internship Program in Student
Personnel at Virginia Tech, developed college policies on
alcohol and drug abuse prevention, a video orientation
program, a photo identification system for all 22,000 students
on the four campuses, a professional staff development
program for all student services personnel, and served as
leadership counselor with newly elected student organization
leaders.

1983-1989  President, WEB & Associates, Consultants in Washington, DC
Organizational development strategist, fund raising and
management-Major clients included: Navy Memorial
Foundation, U.S. Navy Recruiting Command, Design Plus
Two, Creative Dimension Group, Airman Memorial

1987-1988  Special Assistant, Chief of Naval Operations Seapower
Program, U.S. Navy.
Recruiting Command, Washington, D.C.  As U.S. Naval
Reserve Captain on active duty, created, planned and
implemented a pro-active pilot project joint venture with the
Navy League of the U.S. and Toastmasters International to
extend the dissemination of information concerning the
Navy's role in national security through a team of nation-
wide Pro-Navy Speakers. Scripted, directed, narrated and
produced a promotional 20 minute video on the Navy's Sea
Power Program.
1986-1987  
Served as Staff Director for the Secretary of Defense's Aerial Demonstration Team Study in preparation for Congressional Hearings. Designed a in-depth DoD Community Relations Out-Reach Program to national organizations. Staffed and managed a team of organizational experts to establish greater professional interaction between the Office of the Secretary of Defense and national organizations.

1983-1985  
**Associate Dean of Students and Assistant Professor at Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, VA.**
Retained on a two year contract to assist in rebuilding the staff in the Office of the Dean of Students after seven top student personnel administrators left the college. Planned, supervised and coordinated all student activities for 3,000 students, including orientation, residence halls and services encompassing all phases of student life. Led Creativity Seminar/Workshops for students, faculty and administrative personnel to encourage innovation and interdisciplinary collaboration toward novel goals of leadership through recognition of the need for mission-oriented learning activities that transcended departmental lines. Collaborated with campus leaders in developing a major leadership training effort, LEAP (Leadership Effectiveness Achievement Program).

1979-1983  
**Managing General Partner, Brandermill Medical Associates, Midlothian, VA**

1977-1979  
**National Marketing Director, Medical Data Services, Richmond, Virginia.**
Responsible for training and supervising marketing and sales staff nation-wide for this Richmond-based data processing and management company. Achieved over $3.5 million in annual sales through reorganization of marketing services. Planned effective promotions and advertising campaigns, and improved competitive position in the mini-computer market place, and initiated innovative sales incentive program doubling 1977 gross sales in the first six months.
1972-1977  Project Director, Virginia Independence Bicentennial Celebration and Manager of the Richmond Operation for Design and Production Inc., Alexandria, VA. Supervised creation and implementation of Virginia's Bicentennial programs in Yorktown, Charlottesville and Alexandria using three-dimensional graphic and audio-visual communications of sight, sound and touch. In addition, served as project director for major government, corporate and private clients including the U.S. Navy's Bicentennial at the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

1967-1972  Dean of Students and Assistant Professor for Richmond College and the School of Business Administration of the University of Richmond, Richmond, VA. Responsible for planning, supervising and coordinating all activities outside the classroom for over 3,000 students. Became adept at rapid analysis of problem situations, developed flexibility and managerial skills to prevent counter-productive activities, maintaining a challenging educational environment during six years of crises in higher education (Vietnam era). Served on the Curriculum Development Committee, the University Planning Committee, President's Advisory Council, Admissions Committees and was involved in setting all student personnel policy, manpower resource utilization, workload distribution and budget preparation, analyzed programs, and briefed key university officials on major issues impacting on the welfare of the university.

1966-1967  Assistant Dean of Students for Richmond College and the School of Business Administration of the University of Richmond, Richmond, VA. Responsible for supervising all student organizations and activities including the twelve Greek-letter fraternities, trained all residence hall personnel, wrote a manual for training Residence Hall Directors and Resident Assistants, developed a student leadership program and trained all new student leaders in Robert's Rules and leadership methodology. Served as Faculty Secretary-Treasurer for Omicron Delta Kappa, national leadership fraternity.
Military

1955-1992 United States Naval Reservist, promoted to Captain in 1982
1961-1976 Chaplain, primarily at Naval Air Station, Norfolk, VA and
Bethesda Naval Hospital, Bethesda, MD
1976-1992 As a Public Affairs Specialist served as:
Aide to the Reagan-Bush Transition Team in the 1981
Presidential Inauguration.
Aide-de-Camp to Charles Robb, the Governor of the
National Deputy Director, Sea Power Media Program of the
Commanding Officer of four reserve units (1976 - 1985).
1975, 1987 Awarded Navy Commendation Medal with gold star in lieu
of second medal for outstanding accomplishments 1978, 1981
Scroll of Honor awarded twice by the National Board of
Directors of the Navy League of the United States for
significant achievements in community relations.
1980 Designated a "Centurion" by the Chief of Naval Operations
for accomplishments in the National Sea Power Program.
1987 Selected to represent the Navy at the Spring Technical
Meeting, Defense Science Study Group, for the Institute of
Defense Analysis.

Civic Activities

1969-1972 Director, Virginia Association of Student Personnel
Administrators
1972-1978 Director, Richmond Public Relations Association
1974-1976 Associate Chairman, Richmond Area Heart Fund
1971-1973 Vice-President, Richmond Jaycees
1982-1983 Membership Chairman, U.S. Chamber of Commerce,
Richmond, VA.
1976-1978 Richmond Council President, Navy League of U.S.
1978-1980 National Director and VA State President, Navy League of U.S.

Professional Affiliations

1990-1994 American Association for Counseling and Development
1990-1994 American College Personnel Association
1987-1994 National Society of Fund Raising Executives
1966-1985 National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
1966-1985 Virginia Association of Student Personnel Administrators
Creative Products

1994  "Campus Community: Students' Search for an Operational Definition". Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education. Virginia Tech.


1984  "Leadership Education Achievement Program (LEAP)", Mary Washington College.


1975  Task Action Leadership, Handbook for Naval Reserve Officers, Norfolk, VA.


"Students in Crisis" THE EDUCATOR.

1968  Handbook for Head Residents University of Richmond

1966-1990 Facilitated groups in "Team Development", "Conflict Resolution", "Leadership Styles", "How to motivate People", and "Increasing Organizational Effectiveness".

1956-1959  "Insight on Outlook". Columnist for THE COLLEGIAN.

University of Richmond