

AN HISTORICAL CASE STUDY OF
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY
IN LOCO PARENTIS

by

JULIE A. SINA

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Student Personnel Services and Counseling

Approved:

~~_____~~
D.G. Creamer, Chairperson

T.C. Hunt

M.D. Alexander

E.G. Creamer

C.B. Flora

March, 1994
Blacksburg, Virginia

**AN HISTORICAL CASE STUDY
OF VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY
IN LOCO PARENTIS**

by

Julie A. Sina

Chairperson: Dr. Don G. Creamer
Student Personnel Services and Counseling

(ABSTRACT)

This study was designed to identify the unique shaping of the university/student relationship through the lens of the in loco parentis concept. The questions asked were to what extent has in loco parentis defined the relationship of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and its students through the institution's history as framed by: (a) the institution's mission, (b) university governance, (c) the definition of in loco parentis, and (d) institutional culture? Has in loco parentis found its sustenance at this institution through legal or cultural justification, or both?

Qualitative case study methodology was utilized to examine in loco parentis within four time periods: (a) Shaping of a Land Grant University, 1891-1907, (b) Expansion of VPI Post World War II, 1945-1955, (c) Establishing the University, 1945-1955, and (d) Framing the Present, 1988-1992.

The research concluded that in loco parentis was historically grounded in the legal interpretation provided by the court. In loco parentis was sustained within this study by the culture of one particular land grant university grounded in its original charge of structuring a military lifestyle.

The legal system provided a steady and constant external sustenance of in loco parentis and the institutional culture provided internal justification for in loco parentis as demonstrated within the history and tradition of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Each time period studied provided a view of the University that defined its role to its students in place of parent under the dominant influence of presidential leadership.

This work is dedicated to my daughter,
I appreciate her patience and constant reminder of what is
really important in life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend both my acknowledgement and gratitude to the members of my doctoral committee. I am grateful to Dr. Cornelia Butler Flora for inspiring me with the curiosity to pursue a study of sociology and institutional culture. Dr. David Alexander provided me with the skill and ability to conduct legal research. Dr. Elizabeth Creamer was a constant inspiration for the study of culture and offered the irreplaceable gift of supportive friendship.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Tom Hunt for resurrecting my interest in history and for being the first to aggressively encourage my interest in historical research. I have found a life long mentor in Dr. Don Creamer. I thank him for his patience, persistence, sense of humor, and his endless resource of time in serving as my chair. He always believed I could do it. I am grateful for his belief in me.

My appreciation is extended to Dr. James D. McComas, Dr. Jim Wolfe, and Dr. Tom Goodale for supporting my educational leave and for the institutional financial

support that allowed me to pursue this degree. I am also appreciative of the support of my supervisors, Dr. Beverly H. Sgro and Dr. Cornel N. Morton. I value the support of my colleague and friend, Dr. Steve Janosik. His door was open to me on daily basis for consultation and encouragement.

I appreciate the encouragement provided by the Dean of Students Office staff: Carole Carey, Shirley Stone, Becky Shelor, Ron Giddings, Susanna Short, Jerry Riehl, Jennie Reilly, Carol Crawford Smith, Ellie Haughey, and Jillian Joncas. Rarely a day went by that one of these good people did not offer a word of encouragement.

There are several friends that provided emotional support that it is important for me to acknowledge. Dr. Cathy McHugh Engstrom provided my 'TJ' balance and fought the battle of keeping my 'FP" in check. I am grateful to the entire family: John, Cathy, Erin, and Meghan. I want to thank Dr. Betty J. Glick, my friend for all ages and dissertation support service. I also want to acknowledge the support and friendship of and

This experience made me keenly aware of the support and friendship I have found in my Blacksburg family. Finally, I appreciate the support of Dr. Paul Torgersen and each every person that gave of their time in sharing their stories of Virginia Tech.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	3
Legal Definition and Review of <u>In Loco Parentis</u>	3
Historical Role of <u>In Loco Parentis</u> as a Philosophical Underpinning of the Student Affairs Profession	17
Definition of Institutional Culture	23
Summary	30
CHAPTER TWO	
METHODS	31
Qualitative Research Methods	35
Summary: Outline of the Report	38
CHAPTER THREE	
CHOICE OF VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY AS A CASE STUDY OF <u>IN LOCO PARENTIS</u>	41
Summary	45
CHAPTER FOUR	
SHAPING OF A LAND GRANT UNIVERSITY 1891-1907	46
Mission	48
University Governance	50
Definition of <u>In Loco Parentis</u>	52
Institutional Culture	56
Summary	64
CHAPTER FIVE	
EXPANSION OF VPI&SU POST WORLD WAR II 1945-1955	66
Mission	67
University Governance	70
Definition of <u>In Loco Parentis</u>	79
Institutional Culture	84
Summary	98

CHAPTER SIX	ESTABLISHING THE UNIVERSITY	
	1964-1974	101
	Mission	102
	University Governance	108
	Definition of <u>In Loco Parentis</u>	116
	Institutional Culture	135
	Summary	148
CHAPTER SEVEN	FRAMING THE PRESENT 1988-1992	152
	Mission	154
	University Governance	155
	Definition of <u>In Loco Parentis</u>	159
	Institutional Culture	165
	Summary	172
CHAPTER EIGHT	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS	
	AND IMPLICATIONS	174
	Discussion of Findings	174
	Mission	175
	University Governance	177
	Definition of <u>In Loco Parentis</u>	178
	Institutional Culture	180
	Conclusions and Implications	182
REFERENCES		192
VITA		212

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between a student and the university encompasses the entire collegiate experience and beyond. It is a relationship that begins with admission and is maintained as the student's status changes to alumnus/alumna. In the view of the university, the student is then connected to the university for life.

The university/student relationship has been compared to that of parent to child due to the expectation that the university must assume certain responsibilities when establishing a relationship with its students. These responsibilities have been likened to parental responsibilities and the relationship between the university and its students has been labeled in loco parentis.

The term in loco parentis has been primarily affiliated with legal terminology, although it is a concept traced to the very roots of the university. Brubacher and Rudy (1976) traced the concept of in loco parentis to the English system of higher education which viewed the college as having the responsibility to look after the moral as well as the intellectual development of its students.

Brubacher and Rudy (1976) described the concept of in loco parentis as placing an emphasis on the collegiate way of life through on-campus living and enforcement of discipline. Stamatakos (1990) wrote that in its fullest form, the doctrine of in loco parentis enabled colleges to devise, implement, and administer student discipline and to foster the physical and moral welfare of the students.

The history of in loco parentis is one of negotiating relationships between the university, students, and students' parents. In loco parentis has provided the university with a metaphor within which to shape these relationships. As a metaphor, it is an analogy that has taken on a negative connotation as the symbol of university control.

The implied comparison of the in loco parentis metaphor has contrasted the parent/child relationship to that of the relationship established between university and student. The courts legally protected this relationship until 1960 through the legal reinforcement of the institution's assumption of the role of a student's parent and the institutional duty to protect the morals and safety of each student (Thomas, 1991).

The purpose of this study is to look at the unique shaping of the university/student relationship through the

lens of the in loco parentis concept. The questions asked within this historical case study are to what extent has in loco parentis defined the relationship of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and its students through the institution's history as framed by: (a) the institution's mission, (b) university governance, (c) the definition of in loco parentis, and (d) the institution's culture? Has in loco parentis found its sustenance at this institution through legal or cultural justification, or both?

BACKGROUND

LEGAL DEFINITION AND REVIEW OF IN LOCO PARENTIS

"My boys left this morning for your college. Charles is a husky boy and will get along. William is in poor health. Please see that he wears his hat and coat when the weather is bad" (Johnston, 1986, p. 25).

This letter from the parent of an incoming freshman to President McBryde is illustrative of the literal interpretation of the college acting in place of parent. Parents of traditional age college students harbored expectations that parental responsibilities would be

transferred to the university. The definition of in loco parentis had provided the reinforcement for this type of parental expectation.

In loco parentis was defined in Black's Law Dictionary (1979, Fifth Edition) as: "in place of parent; instead of parent; charged, factiously with a parent's rights, duties, and responsibilities" (p. 708). Historically, the courts have been reluctant to be involved in higher education and consequently, adhered to this literal definition of in loco parentis.

The legal definition of in loco parentis (Black's Law Dictionary, 1979; Stamatakos, 1990) coupled with Kaplan's (1978) observations concerning the reluctance of the court to become involved in higher education provided insight into the parameters used by the college to shape its relationship with students prior to 1960.

Kaplan (1978) offered three observations concerning why the courts had traditionally maintained a separation of law and higher education: (a) courts viewed higher education as a unique enterprise which regulated itself through reliance on tradition and consensus, (b) the perception of the academic environment as delicate and complex, and (c) the higher education mission was thought to support a special

virtue which included a mission of personal sacrifice.

A fourth observation that supported the reasons for separation of law and higher education, as cited by Kaplan (1978), is the notion of charitable or sovereign immunity (Gibbs & Szablewics, 1987). This notion of charitable or sovereign immunity implied that the university was protected from litigation due to the court perception of the university as a government agency (Kaplan, 1985). The legal doctrine of sovereign immunity, as practiced in the United States, evolved from English common law which essentially stated that the "sovereign could not be sued without its permission" (Alexander & Alexander, 1992, p. 532).

Cases which placed liability upon a college citing in loco parentis are scarce. This is partially due to the perception on the part of the court that legal battles drained an already weak university financial base and that this type of claim could be a violation of public policy as implied by the application of the concept of charitable or sovereign immunity (Gibbs & Szablewicz, 1987).

An example for the court's affirmation of its view concerning the sovereign immunity issue is Ewing v. Board of Regents of University of Michigan (1982). A student who had been dismissed from the University of Michigan medical

school alleged that his dismissal was in violation of his constitutional and contractual rights. The court ruled that his dismissal was justified and utilized an argument based on the 11th amendment. The court stated that to find in favor of the student would be to diminish the resources of the state (Ewing v. Board of Regents of University of Michigan, 1982).

In 1866, the Supreme Court of Illinois ruled in support of the in loco parentis doctrine. In People ex. rel. Pratt v. Wheaton College (1866), the court upheld the college's decision to suspend a student for joining a secret society (Strickland, 1965). It was the opinion of the court that the college was regulating student behavior in a manner similar to the domestic discipline of the father in his family (Bickel, 1993).

In Commonwealth ex rel. Hill v. McCauley (1877), the court required Dickinson College to readmit a student it had suspended because the college had not provided the student with an adequate hearing process. In this particular case, the court viewed the dismissal of the student as based on secondary and unreliable evidence and held the college accountable for providing a fair hearing process. The court did not view Dickinson College as having the authority to act in loco parentis (Fowler, 1984).

In Gott v. Berea College (1913) the court reversed the Hill v. McCauley (1877) ruling and stated that the college stood in loco parentis. The court held that Berea College had the legal right to act in loco parentis concerning physical and moral influence, the mental training of students, and had the authority to make regulations for the betterment of the student that a parent would use for the same purpose (Alexander & Solomon, 1972).

The Gott v. Berea College (1913) ruling was reflective of the standard law dictionary definition of in loco parentis in which the college assumed parental rights and responsibilities (Black's Law Dictionary, 1979, Fifth Edition). The court viewed the college as having complete authority and responsibility for the student and tended not to attempt to substitute the judgement of the court for the judgement of educators (Gregory & Ballou, 1986). The court supported a relationship in which the college, as parent, set the rules and decided what was best for a student who rarely questioned the authority of the college administrator.

Prior to 1960, the courts tended not to substitute the judgement of the court for the judgement of educators, particularly concerning disciplinary matters (Millington, 1979). Millington (1979) observed that the courts gave

unilateral use of disciplinary authority to colleges and the courts were reluctant to apply constitutional guarantees to students unless it could be clearly demonstrated that the colleges acted in a malicious manner.

The legal concept of in loco parentis eroded during the 1960s. Students rebelled against their parents and saw no reason for the college to stand in their parents' stead (Gibbs & Szablewicz, 1987). A Carnegie Commission Study (1977) tasked to review the 1960s, reported that this era of dissatisfaction on college campuses was reflective of overall societal problems.

In an earlier Carnegie Commission Report, Touraine (1974) presented the 1960s attack on the in loco parentis doctrine within the political context of opposition to the university as establishment. The response of the courts to the 1960s era of student dissatisfaction with the authority establishment reshaped the legal concept of in loco parentis and introduced the application of student constitutional rights on the college campus.

Beginning in 1960, a series of four cases reversed the Gott v. Berea College (1913) application of in loco parentis. These cases demonstrated that a college could not: "under the pretext of academic discipline, suspend or disenroll a student for exercise of rights guaranteed by the

constitution, particularly those of speech, association and press; or subject to unreasonable search of person or premises; nor deprive the student of enrollment in a public, tax-supported college absent due process of law; for to do so would be illegal under constitutional principles, and against public policy" (Bickel, 1993, p. 3).

Dixon v. Alabama (1960) was the landmark procedural case that reversed the parameters of Gott v. Berea College (1913). This case was reflective of the student view of the university as establishment. Students were dismissed by a public university in Alabama for participation in an off-campus civil rights demonstration. The students challenged the court to consider whether the institution followed due process provided within the fourteenth amendment.

Dixon v. Alabama (1960) changed the university/student relationship from a relationship based on in loco parentis to a relationship based on the constitution (Henderson & Gibbs, 1987). As a result of this case, the courts required the university to provide procedural safeguards such as notice of judicial hearing and the opportunity for the student to have a defense at the hearing. The Dixon v. Alabama (1960) ruling was similar to the 1877 Commonwealth

ex. rel. Hill v. McCauley ruling that had required Dickinson to readmit a student due to an inadequate hearing process.

This case was a step away from the court's view of in loco parentis post Gott v. Berea College (1913) and a step toward the requirement of the university to protect a college student's constitutional rights. The court continued to reinforce a student's constitutional right to due process in 1960s cases which followed Dixon v. Alabama (1960), (Knight v. State Board of Education et al. (1961), Esteban et. al., v. Central Missouri State College (1967), Moore v. The Student Affairs Committee at Troy State University (1968), Wasson v. Trowbridge (1967), Scroggin v. Lincoln University, (1968), Marzette v. McPhee (1968), and Strickland v. Regents of the University of Wisconsin (1969).

The second case in this evolution of student constitutional rights was Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District (1969). Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District (1969) stated that the school district had an obligation to guarantee a student's first amendment rights. Neither the school district nor the college could restrict a student's freedom of speech, assembly, and petition.

In Tinker v. Des Moines (1969), the court stated that students were free to associate to further personal beliefs

as guaranteed by the first amendment. If a student's freedom to associate was denied, advised the court, then all first amendment rights would be in jeopardy. Tinker v. De Moines (1969) was a substantive case in that it provided broad protection for individuals against government infringement on individual rights (Alexander & Solomon, 1972).

Tinker v. Des Moines (1969) defined and enlarged the parameters of the student's first amendment right to associate when the court stipulated that: (a) students cannot infringe on the rights of others, and (b) students cannot impede the educational process through substantially disrupting the educational enterprise.

Healy v. James (1972) was the third case in this series and directly applied the court application of first amendment rights within the college environment as was delineated in Tinker v. Des Moines (1969) to include student rights of association. The court stated that denial of recognition of a student organization without justification violated a student's first amendment right to associate to further their personal beliefs (Maloney, 1988).

In Healy v. James, the court stated that the only grounds to deny student organization recognition are similar to parameters defined within Tinker v. Des Moines (1969).

An organization cannot infringe on or interfere in a student's right to obtain an education (Maloney, 1988). Maloney (1988) described the court's ruling in Healy v. James (1972) as making it virtually impossible for a campus to deny recognition to a group that complied with a reasonable application procedure. A university, in place of parent, cannot decide for its students who they associate with and what types of organizations would be acceptable.

Finally, the court ruled on the fourth amendment in Piazzola v. Watkins (1971) and stated that the administrators of public institutions could not avoid the fourth amendment simply by asserting that a student has no reasonable expectation of privacy in institution-sponsored housing through asserting its authority in loco parentis (Kaplin, 1985).

The courts defined the constitutional rights of students during the 1960s and the concept of in loco parentis was no longer viewed as legally tenable (College Students and the Courts, 1977). Gordon (1971) attributed the courts defining of student constitutional rights during this particular time period to what he cited as two sociological trends.

The first sociological trend Gordon (1971) cited was a legal trend to uphold the rights of the individual over the

rights of society. Gordon (1971) attributed this trend to the idea that the perception of the government was that it sufficiently protected society as a whole and it was time to acknowledge the rights of the individual.

Secondly, Gordon (1971) observed a change in the student society during the 1960s. Gordon (1971) described the student of the 1960s as: "more serious, more intellectually involved, more rebellious than committed, more self-conscious, and even more self-centered than the student of yesterday " (p. 100). The student of the 1960s was contemptuous of adult values and had a great need for individual freedom (Gordon, 1971).

During the 1970s, colleges were challenged to deal with the chaos of the 1960s and redefined the relationship between the college and the student as an adult-to-adult relationship. In loco parentis may have eroded in the eyes of the court, yet the validity of in loco parentis on campus was tested as institutions continued to provide for the health, safety, and welfare of their students (Fioravanti, 1994).

For example, in 1971 the court upheld the policy of a state institution which required unmarried full-time undergraduate students regardless of age of emancipation to live in on campus housing. In Pratz v. Louisiana

Polytechnic Institute (1971) the court stated that the policy held based on the living and learning environmental concept maintained within the on campus requirement.

It was more usual for cases which cited in loco parentis post 1960 to involve tort law. Tort law stated there is no duty to control the conduct of a person or to prevent injury unless a special relationship exists (Alexander & Solomon, 1972). Thus, students and/or plaintiffs attempted to demonstrate that a special relationship existed between the student and university. The court looked to the plaintiff to specifically define the nature of the relationship .

This challenge was illustrated in Bradshaw v. Rawlings (1979). In Bradshaw v. Rawlings (1979) a student was injured in an accident on the way home from a class picnic. Alcohol had been served at the picnic. The student alleged that the college had a duty to care because of the special relationship between the institution and the student (Kaplan, 1985).

Kaplan (1985) reported that although the jury originally ruled in favor of the student, the appellate court stated that the college is not the insurer of the safety of its students and that the historical duty of the college to exercise control over students through in loco

parentis no longer applied. Although this particular case was a Pennsylvania state supreme court case, other jurisdictions have looked to Bradshaw v. Rawlings (1979) as a precedent-setting case (Baldwin v. Zoradi, 1981, Zavela v. Regents of the University of California, 1981, Beach v. The University of Utah, 1986, University of Denver v. Whitlock, 1987, Grahm v. Montana State University, 1988, and Hartman v. Bethany College, 1991).

The court cited that a special relationship did exist between university and student in Furek v. The University of Delaware (1991) but carefully pointed out that it was not a relationship based on in loco parentis. In this particular case, a freshman scholarship athlete was injured during fraternity hell week activities. The court looked at this student as a business invitee and stated that it was the duty of the university to protect and held the university responsible for conduct of a third person (the fraternity) on campus (Furek v. The University of Delaware, 1991).

Boyer (1990) articulated that the trend of the court has been to recognize that a special relationship between the plaintiff (student) and university must be demonstrated to create duty and that this relationship continues to be a struggle with the concept of in loco parentis. A distinguishing feature of the new

conceptualization of in loco parentis is a linkage to campus safety (Boyer, 1990).

Mullins v. Pine Manor (1983) depicted Boyer's (1990) observation. In Mullins v. Pine Manor (1983), the court found Pine Manor College liable for the on-campus rape of a student. The court stated that while the college was not responsible for morals, the college was responsible for the safety of the plaintiff (Gibbs & Szablewicz, 1987). The court stated that the college should show foreseeability of harm and held that the college had a duty to provide for the student's safety.

Stamatakos (1990) wrote that in loco parentis was rejected as a legal doctrine because it no longer represented a legal relationship between college and student. He stated that to restore in loco parentis would be to restore a lifeless doctrine (Stamatakos, 1990). Zirkel and Reidiner (1986) stated that the college context is the only educational context within which the in loco parentis theory has undergone a clear legal rise and demise.

While a review of the legal literature might suggest that the coffin is sealed on in loco parentis as legal doctrine, it is not sealed with equal certainty from the student affairs perspective of a relationship among the college, the student, and the parent.

The student affairs perspective is based upon the formation of relationships which have served as the philosophical underpinning of the profession. It is a relationship that regardless of legal philosophy, values a safe environment as a learning environment (Bickel, 1993; Boyer, 1987).

Knock (1988) described the mission of the student affairs profession as a mission to : "personalize and humanize the educational experience of college students" (p. 3). This philosophical perspective and mission as it relates to in loco parentis will be explored in the next section.

HISTORICAL ROLE OF IN LOCO PARENTIS AS A PHILOSOPHICAL UNDERPINNING OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSION

Brubacher and Rudy (1976) traced the application of in loco parentis as a philosophical underpinning of the student affairs profession. The early American university emulated the seventeenth century English university and was described by Brubacher and Rudy (1976) as a regime of paternalism from which grew the student personnel profession.

The articulation of student affairs as a profession separate from faculty and presidential responsibilities was

unique to the development of higher education administration within the United States. The development of student affairs represented a transgression from the way in which U.S. higher education modeled itself after its English, and in particular, German counterparts (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978; Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

As early as 1890, a Freshman Board of Advisors at Harvard University established a division of labor between an academic dean and a dean of student affairs (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). Miller and Winston (1991) described the motivation behind the formation of these early student affairs functions as a concern for the development of citizenship, preservation of moral conduct, and the capacity to meet the vocational needs of the new world.

Appleton, Briggs, and Rhatigan (1978) described several factors which led to the identification of student affairs functions in American higher education. Specific factors included: (a) a rapidly growing heterogeneous student population, (b) the development of the land grant and public university, and (c) a system of higher education shifting from early influences, for example, a religious based curriculum, to the shaping of a comprehensive university.

The evolution of the dean of student affairs, as a parent-like dean, has been one of the most persistent images

of the student affairs profession (Creamer, 1990). Student affairs on early American campuses replaced what had been family responsibilities in the 'old world' and it was this family relationship that ultimately resulted in in loco parentis (Miller & Winston, 1991). This image of the student affairs practitioner as parent-like, however, is not necessarily the same relationship defined by the courts as in loco parentis.

Appleton, Briggs, and Rhatigan (1978) stated that the legal concept of in loco parentis was established long after the creation of the dean of students, yet it is the legal concept of in loco parentis versus the educational relationship between student and practitioner that has been associated with the student affairs profession. The legal definition, argued these authors, focused solely on the student affairs practitioner as disciplinarian. In loco parentis originally implied not only discipline, wrote Sanford (1967), but generous personal help.

Functionally, the early student affairs practitioner, similar to today, provided substantive assistance to the faculty and administration in other than curricular matters (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978). This included areas such as judicial affairs, residence life, health service, counseling, student life, admissions, and advising. The

development of student affairs as a profession paralleled the personnel movement of this country and was influenced by the heterogeneity of the student body following times at war (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

The functions, tasks, and developmental role provided by student affairs practitioners has been described through the use of parental analogies by writers within the student affairs profession. Wood (1991) wrote that the university is shifting from a definition and analogy of the university/student relationship in loco parentis to a university/student relationship in loco familia. He defined the concept of in loco familia as a shift from parental controls to students seeking values and support from the university (Wood, 1991).

It is not the parental analogy that the student affairs profession disagreed with, but the legal image that has been shaped primarily by the courts. The student affairs parental analogy, as described by Rhatigan, Appleton, and Briggs (1978), and as Wood (1991) articulated in the concept of in loco familia, involved caring, mutual respect, and a concern for a student's growth and development while moving beyond the legal definition shaped solely by an authoritative administrative figure.

In contrast to the student affairs parental analogy, the legal interpretation of the university as parent placed the university in an authoritarian role that automatically assumes that the 'parent' knows more than the student (Burns & Klawunn, 1990). The erosion of the legal definition of in loco parentis during the 1960s reflected student reluctance to accept the university as an authoritarian parent.

What proceeded to occur, observed Burns and Klawunn (1990), was a change in a relationship based on the university as authoritarian parent and student as dependent child to a relationship of student as an independent child and the university in the difficult position of attempting to accommodate the student demands for their own authority.

Upcraft and Moore (1990) reported that so much has been made out of the relationship between students and their institutions that we forget that the relationship originally had a developmental rationale. If the in loco parentis concept is dead, it does not replace the developmental needs of students for counsel and advice (Dwyer, 1989).

The concern for student growth and development is addressed within student development theories. Student development, according to Rodgers (1990), takes a value stand on the purpose and outcomes of higher education and is

synonymous with the historical value and concern for the development of the whole student.

Rodgers (1990), Wood (1991), Rhatigan, Appleton, and Briggs (1978), and Thomas (1991) focused on the critical difference between the legal view versus the student affairs view of in loco parentis. The legal view represented university as parent versus student as child whereas the student development perspective is one of university as parent/educator and student as adult. From a student developmental perspective, even if the doctrine of in loco parentis were declared legally dead, the awareness that students still have needs for counsel and advice remains very much alive for the student affairs practitioner (Dwyer, 1989).

Morrill and Fass (1986) stated that whatever its shortcomings, in loco parentis provided a coherent understanding of how rules are made, what they should be, and who should enforce them. While the language Morrill and Fass (1986) used is legalistic, the student development point of view might suggest that the coherent understanding the authors described might take shape through an ongoing adult to adult dialogue between university and student.

DEFINITION OF INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

In loco parentis, whether through the perspective of the educator or the court, has influenced how a student, parent, and university form expectations of their relationship. The context of institutional culture provides a lens through which to view how the student, parent, and university find meaning and order in their relationship. This particular lens is framed by the rituals and symbols distinct to each university as an institution (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

The external influence and impact of case and legal precedent as well as how relationships are shaped from a student development and or educational perspective is indicative of a culture unique to each institution. Kuh and Whitt (1988) viewed the shaping of institutional culture as both a process and a product. As a process, institutional culture is shaped by interaction of people both on and off campus and as a product, is reflective of interaction among institutional history and tradition (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

The extensiveness and complexity of institutional culture can be described within Goffman's (1961) conceptualization of the total institution. Goffman (1961) defined the total institution as a setting in which all aspects of life are carried out in the same place and where

activity is brought together in a rational plan to fulfill the aims of the institution. Total institutions have unique traditions, rituals, and schemata of establishing relationships and expectations of relationships within a culture unique to the institution.

The culture of a total institution, in this case a university, includes the basic assumptions and beliefs, whether conscious or unconscious, shared by members of the organization (Schein, 1985). Echoing Goffman's (1961) description of the total institution, institutional culture includes observed behavior, norms, values, philosophy, and climate (House, 1981; Schein, 1985). Culture, wrote Kuh and Whitt (1988), is the glue that holds institutions together.

A component of the culture is how this information is transmitted to new members as they learn the patterns and relationships of the institution/university (Goffman, 1961; House, 1985). The patterns of an institution's culture, sometimes unconscious or taken for granted, are reflected in the myths, fairy tales, stories, rituals, and other symbolic forms unique to each institution (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Institutional culture, as defined within this case study, will adapt a modified or narrowly focused definition of culture as suggested by Kuh and Whitt (1988): "the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values,

practices, beliefs, and assumptions which guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institution of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus" (pp. 12-13).

One frame of reference within this case study concerns the way in which the institution shapes and views its relationship with students within its culture. This relationship is potentially influenced by the process with which the university interacts with people on or off campus, which in this case, might include case precedent and or legal influence.

An example of the shaping of the university/student relationship within institutional culture was provided in what Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (1991) have labeled as an involving college. At an institution described as an involving college: "philosophy, institutional culture, and people work together to enact policies and practices that encourage students to take responsibility for their learning and the quality of campus life" (p. 55).

An example of the influence of culture and university/student relationships is provided by Tinto (1987). Tinto (1987) demonstrated that an institution's ability to retain students is directly related to the

ability to do what Kuh, Schuh, Whitt and Associates (1991) described as elements of an involving college. He reported that to retain its students, an institution needs to form relationships with students through intentional contact and integration of students into the social and intellectual fabric of the institutional life (Tinto, 1987).

The university as a total institution shapes a relationship with its students and retains students through the process of interaction and through the product of history and tradition unique to each campus. The cultural frame of reference concerning in loco parentis is influenced by whether the campus culture values and supports a legal or student development interpretation of the university/student relationship. It is culture in this context, in a particular institutional setting, that was studied for the purpose of this research.

Authors cited in this section speak to the comprehensive nature and holistic impact of institutional culture. It was the intent of this research to look at the impact of culture on the nature of the relationship between student and university. Two themes have been identified in an attempt to narrow the comprehensive scope of the concept of institutional culture (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). The first theme is one of student freedom and responsibility and the

second theme concerns gender as a variable within institutional culture.

One of the unique aspects of an involving college, as described by Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (1991), was that students were encouraged to take responsibility for their learning and behavior. Student affairs professionals at institutions within the involving colleges study demonstrated an appreciation and awareness of culture as an influence on student behavior (Kuh & Schuh, 1991).

As suggested by the involving colleges study, the theme of student freedom and responsibility was studied within the context of culture (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt & Associates, 1991). The culture of an institution can encourage student freedom and responsibility through structure or a lack of structure.

For example, rules and regulations may be intended to be ambiguous guidelines for student behavior that encourage student responsibility for behavior or may be set up in a way that students take no ownership and abdicate responsibility for their behavior (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt & Associates, 1991).

It is interesting to think of the notion of freedom and responsibility within the conceptual framework of freedom as explored by Greene (1988). Greene (1988) described freedom as the urge to always reach beyond the limits being imposed.

Greene's (1988) discussion of freedom included thinking of freedom in parallel with imagination or the capacity to take initiatives to choose.

The definition of freedom as suggested by Greene (1988) will be explored in terms of the conditions which potentially empower avenues of student freedom and responsibility as suggested by Kuh, Schuh, Whitt and Associates (1991).

Gender is the second theme that will be studied as a variable within the context of institutional culture. Horowitz (1988) described the first women who went to college as: "outsiders because they broke the canons of feminine behavior within American culture outside the college gates" (p. 197).

Horowitz (1988) reported that men at co-ed institutions tended to create a male college culture that kept women out of key activities. Solomon (1985) observed that campus life was a venue to reinforce differences between men's and women's lives and that on campus, a woman could not forget that she was in a man's world.

Women entered and some might argue, continue to enter, what Anderson (1993) labeled as a gendered institution. As Horowitz (1988) and Solomon (1985) reported, women entered a male dominated culture. In this type of culture, Anderson

(1993) suggested that women live within: "gendered cultures not just gender roles" (p. 6).

The theme of gender will be studied within the pattern of involvement of men and women in institutional culture such as traditions, rituals, practices, and policies. The analysis of gender as a theme within institutional culture will be interesting from the perspective that single gender images of collegians have dominated the public consciousness (Horowitz, 1988). Horowitz (1988) observed that there has been a failure to recognize that undergraduates have divided into contending, or as Anderson (1993) noted, gendered cultures.

Culture provides a lens to view the legal and student affairs influence on the shaping of the relationship of student, parent, and university in loco parentis. Of particular interest are two themes within the conceptualization of institutional culture. Student freedom and responsibility within an institution's culture has been identified as one theme and gender has been identified as a second variable within the theme of institutional culture.

SUMMARY

Historically, the term, in loco parentis, has been defined as providing the framework for the relationship between college and student in place of parent. The courts looked to in loco parentis to support the rationale of the college acting as parent concerning morals, policies, and discipline. This rationale supported the reluctance of the court to become involved in higher education.

On the other hand, student affairs practitioners argued that in loco parentis did not stand in place of parent, but provided a framework for the building of a healthy and caring relationship between university and student. This relationship would provide a basis to encourage student growth and development.

The interpretation of the meaning of in loco parentis was complicated by significant societal change as well as the cultural influences unique to each institution. It is the cultural lens that will provide a means to analyze the unique shaping of in loco parentis from both a legal and student affairs perspective within this case study.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

The outline of the case study research followed the historical development of Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University by focusing on four time periods. The time periods were chosen based on significant periods of institutional growth and transition within the history of VPI&SU: (a) Shaping of a Land Grant University, 1891-1907, (b) Expansion of VPI&SU Post World War II, 1945-1955, (c) Establishing the University, 1964-1974, and (d) Framing the Present, 1988-1992.

The time periods provided a framework for the case study protocol (Yin, 1989). Four conceptual categories provided case study guidelines to study legal and cultural influences within each time period.

Mission: Each of the time periods were marked by a shift in the university mission. Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and Associates (1991) wrote that an institution's mission establishes the tone of the university and conveys educational purpose. The language of the mission statement of the university within each time period was reviewed as suggested by Kuh, Schuh,

Whitt, and Associates (1991), for the way in which the university serves as a "touchstone, influencing behaviors of all members of the community, and helps students differentiate between what is right and wrong, what is valued and what is not" (p. 43).

University Governance: The role of the university governance structure within each time period was scrutinized to determine how student life policy was shaped and formed. The documents reviewed to determine the governance structure within each time period included: (a) presidential papers, (b) minutes and documents pertaining to the Board of Visitors, (c) university governance minutes and documents, and (d) university self-study.

Definition of In Loco Parentis: The definition provided by Black's Law Dictionary (1979), Fifth Edition): "in place of parent; instead of parent; charged factitiously with a parent's rights, duties, and responsibilities" (p. 708) was used to review the legal interpretation of in loco parentis within each time frame. University records were explored to ascertain whether there were specific cases during each time period concerning student vs. university.

Institutional Culture: The culture of the university within each time period was examined using the definition developed by Kuh and Whitt (1988): "the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions which guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institution of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus" (Kuh & Whitt, pp. 12-13). It is important to note that this particular case study was concerned with the study of institutional culture in student life outside the classroom.

Two specific themes were utilized to study institutional culture. The first theme studied was student freedom and responsibility and the second theme was a study of the impact of gender within the time periods identified in this case study.

Student freedom and responsibility was studied within the rituals and traditions unique to the culture of VPI&SU as well as the structure or lack of structure with university policies concerning student life outside the classroom.

University policies for student life outside the classroom were reviewed as Boyer (1987) suggested, with the guideline that: "standards should clarify the expectations of the institution and make rules understandable" (p. 204). The written policies and regulations which governed student life were studied from the perspective of the structure or lack of structure provided which shaped student freedom and responsibility. Policy sources included the college catalogue for the respective time period, Guidon, University Policies for Student Life, and the Pylon. The source(s) will be specified as appropriate for each time period studied.

Gender is the second theme that will be studied within the context of institutional culture. The pattern and presence of involvement of men and women concerning policies, rituals, and traditions was studied within each time period.

These themes were explored through the editorials in student newspapers, The Techgram, Collegiate Times, Virginia Tech, Preston Journal, and an alternative papers, Alice and FANYA. In particular, the editorials provided insight to the culture and values of each time period. One of two yearbooks, The Bugle, was studied as a chronicle of culture within each time period. A second yearbook, The Tin Horn,

was a yearbook published to chronicle women's experience but was not published during the time periods analyzed for the purpose of this study.

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS

Qualitative research methods were engaged to research each time period and the categories within each time period. While most of these methods have been reviewed in the previous section, it is important to note that some of the sources may overlap and could apply to several of the conceptual categories within each time period. In addition, there are additional qualitative methods that were used that were not mentioned in the above section.

Primary sources included documents and materials available in the Special Collections Department of the Carol M. Newman Library and university archives such as: (a) presidential papers concerning policies and or issues shaping the university/student relationship, (b) minutes and documents pertaining to the Board of Visitors that concern student life issues such as the Student Life/Student Affairs Committee, (c) university governance minutes and documents regarding student life issues such as the Commission on

Student Affairs, and (d) court records involving university/student cases.

University and local publications provided further sources of information during each time period: (a) university self-study, (b) student yearbooks, (c) college catalogues, (d) editorials in student newspapers, and (e) student handbook.

The long interview process as described by McCracken (1988) was applied in this study. The interview provided a technique to obtain oral historical perspectives concerning the legal and cultural influences of in loco parentis as perceived by members of the university community involved in shaping culture of the university.

Interviewees were chosen through sampling techniques utilized in reviewing primarily sources such as: (a) personal correspondence, (b) minutes from governance meetings, (c) presidential files, and (d) newspaper articles. Interviewees were chosen among names that were predominant and reoccurring through the research and interviews were depended upon their availability.

A review of the literature assisted in the process of framing an interview of the interviewees concerning their view of the university/student relationship, in loco parentis. As McCracken (1988) suggested, the framing of the

interview assisted by the literature, served as a guide in viewing the world of key individuals within the institution's history and the logic through which he or she viewed the shaping of the university/student relationship during their tenure.

The interview procedure was semi-structured and focused. The interview procedure was modeled after case study dissertation research completed by Winters (1985). Open-ended questions were formulated based on the research and issues that had been identified within each time period.

Each interviewee received a written request which included a statement of purpose of the interview, and were invited to depart from the questions whenever necessary to expand upon or clarify the content of the interview (Winters, 1985). Interviewees were invited to recall incidents within the time period in which they served the institution. As McCracken (1988) suggested, interviewees were encouraged to describe what was most striking about an incident and share observations of the culture.

The final step of the interview process was the analysis of interviews. The objective of the analysis was to determine categories, relationships, and assumptions that shaped the interviewees' view of the university/student relationship in loco parentis (McCracken, 1988).

McCracken (1988) described the qualitative research tool of identifying one's cultural categories as a researcher. The identification of cultural categories is woven into each phase of the interview process. This process required that the researcher use the self as an instrument of inquiry and that a clear understanding of one's vision of the world permits one to establish distance from it (McCracken, 1988).

The cultural category which most influenced my perspective in this case study is one of a student affairs practitioner. My view of the world is one of philosophical commitment to the development of an interactive campus community and a view that values interaction with students. While this view frames my vision of the world, as McCracken (1988) suggested, understanding this framework will permit me to establish distance for the purpose of this research.

SUMMARY: OUTLINE OF THE REPORT

The writing of this study will take shape in the form of a case study. The case study will be divided among eight chapters. Four chapters will focus on one time period per

chapter: (a) Shaping of a Land Grant University, 1891-1901, (b) Expansion of VPI Post World War II, 1945-1955, (c) Establishing the University, 1964-1974, and (d) Framing the Present, 1988-1992.

Four conceptual categories served as guidelines to analyze the qualitative data collected within each time period: (a) mission (b) university governance, (c) definition of in loco parentis, and (d) institutional culture. Personal interviews served as an oral historical analysis component to enhance the data collected within the time periods.

The long interview process (McCracken, 1988) was utilized to interview the current and former faculty and staff. Individuals interviewed serve a role as historical patriarchs of the institution and the interviews breathe life into the richness of the qualitative archival data. Interview data is woven through the chapters as appropriate.

The concluding chapter served as a final analysis and summary in an attempt to address the primary research questions: to what extent has in loco parentis defined the relationship of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and its students through the institution's history as framed by: (a) the institution's mission, (b) university governance, (c) definition of in loco parentis,

and (d) the institutional culture? Has in loco parentis found its sustenance more from legal (external) or cultural (internal) justification, or both?

CHAPTER 3

CHOICE OF VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY AS A CASE STUDY OF IN LOCO PARENTIS

The questions asked within this case study are: to what extent has in loco parentis defined the relationship of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and its students throughout the institution's history as framed through: (a) the institution's mission, (b) university governance, (c) definition of in loco parentis, and (d) institutional culture? Has in loco parentis found its sustenance more from legal (external) or cultural (internal) justification, or both?

The case study method is an opportunity to examine the phenomenon of in loco parentis within a specific setting. Merriam (1988) described the case study method as providing the means to address the complexity of a situation with the advantage of hindsight, examine the influence of people and issues, and the advantage of passage of time. In this case study, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University provided the setting to study the complex issue of in loco

parentis and assess the forces that shaped a particular University's relationship with its students and parents.

The journey of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University began with the passage of the Morrill Land Grant Act. In 1862, Congress donated large bodies of public lands for the endowment of colleges giving special prominence to the instruction in agriculture and mechanical arts (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1891-92).

The Virginia legislature, meeting in Alexandria and guarded by federal armies, accepted the provisions of the Land Grant Act in February, 1864, but due to turmoil of the war, did not pass the legislation implementing the act until March 19, 1872 (Virginia Polytechnic Institute Self-Study, 1966).

Virginia colleges battled for several years before the legislature to be recognized as the site for the implementation of the land grant act (Kinneer, 1972). Each of the Virginia colleges made a proposal to the legislature to establish the land grant campus and secure the land grant funding on their respective campus. The proposal to establish a college separate from the existing Virginia colleges was eventually successful.

Senator John Penn and William H. Ruffner proposed that the Preston and Olin Institute, located in Montgomery County, along with the Hampton Normal Institute be established as the Virginia Agriculture and Mechanical College (Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College Catalogue, 1891).

The trustees of the Preston and Olin Institute and the citizens of Montgomery County offered to: (a) reorganize the institute into an agricultural and mechanical college, (b) pledge \$20,000 for the new college, and (c) one of the trustees, Colonel. Robert Preston, sold the Commonwealth 250 acres of his farm which included his historic home, Solitude, which still stands on the campus (Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University Self-Study, 1988). Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College opened its doors in the fall of 1872. The college began as an all male institution and did not admit women until 1921 (Kinnear, 1972).

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University provided a rich setting for the study of in loco parentis from the perspective of legal issues, student affairs philosophy, and institutional culture. This setting included the military nature of the institution embodied in loco parentis prior to 1960, its struggle with a growing

post World War II heterogeneous student body, and its goal to become a comprehensive research university.

The case study method, as Denzin (1970) described, provided a map to study this institution from the perspective of those who were involved through a sequence of past experiences and situations. A component of this sequence of events is the evolution of name of the University: Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College; Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. In addition to this evolution, the University has been popularly known as VPI or Virginia Tech since the 1896 name change (Robertson, 1972).

The VPI&SU history is one that permeates the campus as described by a former president, William E. Lavery. Dr. Lavery captured the sense of tradition on the VPI&SU campus when reflecting on evenings on the center of campus, the drill field: "...yet on those evenings, in the stillness, one can also sense the tradition and permanence of the university...shared experience is the essence and pride of Tech..." (Johnston, 1986, p. 9).

SUMMARY

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI&SU) was chosen as the site to conduct case study research concerning in loco parentis. This particular land grant institution provided a rich historical setting to analyze and assess the forces that shaped institutional relationships with parents and students. Case study methods have been utilized to examine legal and cultural perspectives of in loco parentis within a specific setting.

As a land grant university, VPI&SU was a unique setting for a case study due to the way in which this particular institution chose to embrace the military lifestyle originally charged to all land grant institutions. VPI&SU and Texas A&M remain the two land grant institutions that maintain a military lifestyle option and document a history rich in military tradition.

CHAPTER 4

Shaping of a Land Grant University

1891-1907

The shaping of a land grant University encompasses the presidency of the man who is known as the 'father of the modern VPI', John M. McBryde (Robertson, 1972). There were 150 students at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College when McBryde assumed the presidency in 1891 as compared to 577 students when McBryde left his office in 1907 (Kinnear, 1972; Robertson, 1972).

The college was all male. Women were not admitted until 1921 (Kinnear, 1972; Robertson, 1972). Tuition and fees were \$180.50 at the beginning of McBryde's term and had risen to \$247.40 at the conclusion of the term (Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1871-1872; Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, 1906-1907).

McBryde provided the leadership to move from a technically focused college to providing a foundation for a University. He accomplished this through the successful implementation of a curriculum that included a set of core

courses prior to the core curriculum as a common element within higher education (Kinnear, 1972).

McBryde served as a father to the birth of a University and its curriculum, and as parent, in loco parentis, to the men of VPI. When McBryde took office, the age of admission to the university was 15 years old. The only exception was in the case of two or more brothers and the younger was allowed to be slightly under the required age (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, 1898-99). In this case, the brothers were required to room together so that the older brother could look after the younger brother (Temple, 1993).

The issues faced by McBryde are an illustrative foreshadowing of issues which were faced by each of the presidents within this case study. McBryde was the first of the presidents to shepherd the college through a period of intense growth and curriculum change. McBryde, as did each president within this case study, struggled with an element of institutional culture which had a stubborn preference for a distinctly defined military lifestyle.

MISSION

The mission of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College was based upon the directive of the land grant act as stated in the Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College (1891-92): "The sciences, especially those related to the agricultural and mechanical arts, hold at this college, in strict accordance with the acts of Congress from which it derives its income, the foremost place" (p. 11).

The mission, reflective of McBryde's vision and influence, also specified that each course would contain an element of general or liberal culture in addition to technical studies. The goal of this element within each course was to: "give the student a practical as well as a theoretical knowledge of the sciences related to the profession and at the same time to fit him intelligently to the discharge and duties of citizenship" (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1891-92, p. 12).

One of McBryde's first initiatives which affected the academic mission was to implement a plan to drop the three year degree program and move toward a four year degree

program (Temple, 1993). From his first day on campus, McBryde strove to make the land grant college in Blacksburg a University.

The sciences were not the only directive of the land grant University. A second directive, equal to the academic mission of the college, was that of military exercises. Military exercises were offered in conjunction with every course. The military exercises were designed to assist in the development of the bodily powers of the student and were viewed as contributing to the student's well being (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1891-92).

In 1896, the Virginia legislature recognized the efforts of McBryde to create a comprehensive academic program. The name of the college was changed, in recognition of McBryde's curriculum, to Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, 1896-97).

McBryde was beloved by the Corps of Cadets. One illustration was provided upon his return to Blacksburg following the change in the college's name. The cadets celebrated with McBryde and met his train in Christiansburg.

The Cadets escorted McBryde to his home, serenaded him, and formally saluted the father of VPI (Temple, 1993).

The name, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, continued to include Agricultural and Mechanical College in recognition of the mission and funding designated within the Morrill Land Grant Act (Kinnear, 1972).

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

Prior to the McBryde administration, the governing Board of the college attended to the details concerning the overall management and administration of the college. The Board, appointed by the governor, determined the purpose of the college, developed and supervised curriculum, and both hired and supervised the president and the faculty (Kinnear, 1972).

When the Board selected McBryde they felt confident that they had selected a president who could develop and manage the academic program, select and supervise faculty, formulate policy, and manage the physical plant (Robertson, 1972).

The Board offered complete support to McBryde as he expanded the curriculum and laid the groundwork to move from

a college toward a University. Until the early 1900s the governance of the college was a relationship between president and board. As the college grew in size and scope, so did the role of the president. McBryde indicated this to the Board.

In a report to the Board, McBryde wrote that he could no longer keep up with the demands of the presidency (J.M. McBryde, personal communication, June 13, 1904). McBryde's duties at this time included: selection and supervision of the faculty; supervision of all aspects of the curriculum; teacher; academic advisor and counselor to each student; admissions director; architect of the growing physical plant; secretarial duties; and, VPI advocate throughout the commonwealth (Kinnear, 1972; Robertson 1972).

McBryde sought and obtained Board approval to begin to delegate responsibility and establish an internal governance structure. In 1904, McBryde appointed a dean of the faculty, four academic deans, and a Commandant of Cadets (Kinnear, 1972). The deans and commandant served as an executive council and began to frame the internal governance structure and policies of the college. McBryde's executive council reflected the gender of the student body in that it was all male.

DEFINITION OF IN LOCO PARENTIS

In loco parentis has been defined as: "in place of parent; charged factiously with a parent's rights, duties, responsibilities" (Blackstone's Law Dictionary, 5th ed., 1979, p.708). As the father of VPI, McBryde embodied this definition of in loco parentis in practice and perception. Parents sent their sons to "McBryde's" college and entrusted their sons to the father of VPI: "Your school is supposed to build character so I am sending you my son. I do not want him to smoke, chew, cuss, loaf or run around. He does all these things now" (Kinnear, 1972, p. 182).

Philosophically, and in practice, in loco parentis was taken seriously during McBryde's tenure. Temple (1993) attributed this to the type of student that attended VPI. The typical student was a young male from the farm that because of the farming lifestyle was accustomed to a disciplined way of life. Temple (1993) described these young cadets as disciplined with a respect for authority.

In his role as academic advisor and counselor, McBryde wrote monthly reports to each parent (Kinnear, 1972). The reports contained information regarding grades, class attendance, and any behavioral issues. Parents frequently wrote McBryde and in some cases requested further

clarification: "I have just received my son's report. I do not understand a single thing on it. Do you? If so please explain it to me and make it simpler next time" (Kinnear, 1972, p. 182).

In addition to his role as academic advisor and counselor, McBryde served the role of banker. He was responsible for keeping track of and allocating money which had been deposited by a student or parent. Parents would hold McBryde accountable for the student funds and asked for his assistance with student finances: "I sent my son some money. He writes that he got it but doesn't know what he did with it. Please check and let me know" (Kinnear, 1972).

Documentation does not exist which indicated civil action between student vs. University. Documentation did exist, however, that indicated that the increased size of the student body was accompanied by increased behavioral issues between student and University. McBryde kept the Board and parents apprised of these issues. There are four specific cases cited in various sources.

The cadets of VPI were held accountable for behavior off campus. The May 11, 1901 edition of The Virginia Tech cited a Richmond report concerning two cadets on furlough. The cadets were reported to be intoxicated while on furlough and were insulting to young ladies. The cadets were ordered

to leave the institution and the article announced that the honor system prevailed at VPI.

The cadets were ordered to leave VPI by their fellow cadets. The faculty of VPI conferred upon cadets, through the honor code, the power to inflict punishment to any cadet (Temple, 1993). In this particular incident, the cadets called a meeting of all cadets, presented evidence against the cadets alleged to be intoxicated on furlough, and escorted the convicted cadets off campus (Temple, 1993). The faculty did not learn of the incident until after the convicted cadets left VPI.

McBryde wrote to the board concerning several cases in 1904. McBryde reported that the boys would go to Radford or Roanoke and would return with intoxicants in their dress suit coats. He resolved this problem by securing a detective in both Radford and Roanoke and prosecuted barkeepers for illegal sale of alcohol (J.M. McBryde, personal communication, June 13, 1904). There was not a record concerning the fate of students who returned to the college with intoxicants in their coats.

In this same report, McBryde cited an incident in which nine boys whipped an African American youth from town. McBryde stated that the student response concerning the incident was that this particular "worthless negro youth" as

well as other "negro" youths defied the law against the sale of whiskey (J.M. McBryde, personal communication, June 13, 1904). While McBryde expressed concern regarding the incident, there was not an indication of how the incident was resolved or if there were reoccurrences.

The incident that received the most attention and took a toll on McBryde involved the suspension of a student during the 1905 term. A junior was expelled for insubordination and told his classmates and his family that he had not been granted a fair trial (Robertson, 1972). In a show of support, his junior classmates withdrew from the college. Most of the classmates expressed regret and reapplied for admission second semester (Robertson, 1972).

The student's father, a prominent Richmond judge, decided to appeal to the legislature and the legislature appointed a committee to investigate this case as well as the possibility of other matters at the college (Kinnear, 1972). Although McBryde dreaded the investigation, it concluded to his advantage.

Prior to the arrival of the legislative committee, the judge dropped the charges as he learned that his son had been given a fair hearing at the college and was guilty as charged (Kinnear, 1972). The investigation served only to call attention to the incredible work and direction McBryde

had provided the college.

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

"... about 4:30 a.m., the drummers struck a lively note, which almost startled some of us, when the old cadets began to yell, 'long role', for that was something new to us. Many of us had not even heard a drum before. We now, for the first time, began to realize that we were at a military school" (The Bugle, 1895 p. 25).

Kuh and Whitt (1988) defined institutional culture as: "the collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions which guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institution of higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off campus" (pp. 12-13).

The mission of a land grant college framed the definition of institutional culture for the men of VPI. Daily ritual and tradition was maintained within a military culture and lifestyle one lived as a student at a military land grant school. The standards and parameters of student freedom and responsibility were outlined within the college catalogue while the reality of student freedom and responsibility was defined by students with rank within the

cadet corps.

This section will review the standards and policies regarding student freedom and responsibilities as outlined in the college catalogue(s), the rituals and tradition that applied cultural standards within the cadet corps, and the attempt of the college president to bridge the gap between written standards and the reality of day to day college life.

Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College was a residential college: "no student will be allowed, without expressed permission from the president to room and board out of the college, such permission is rarely given and only for exceptional reasons" (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1891-92, p. 70).

The requirement was further defined in later years to include: "only students having near relatives in the village will be allowed to room or board out of the college. Applicants unwilling or physically unable to room in the dormitories, and take their meals in the college dining hall, will not be received" (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, 1901-02, p. 69).

The way in which students took their meals was very much a ritualistic tradition carried out within a schemata

reflective of the nature of a total institution (Goffman, 1961). Cadets ate at assigned tables of ten in the mess hall (Temple, 1993). Each table was under the supervision of a cadet officer who was responsible for the flow of the meal as well as the flow of the conversation (Temple, 1993).

In addition to academic and military lifestyle requirements, students were also expected to attend religious services (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1891-92). Local churches were uncomfortable with this policy and did not support the requirement. The administration stood by the policy and felt it was an expectation that parents would prefer (Temple, 1993).

Student gatherings were restricted outside of gatherings required of them as students of the University. For example, students were not allowed to hold meetings of any kind without obtaining permission from the president and also needed presidential permission prior to giving or engaging in a pleasure party celebration (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1891-92).

Student off campus behavior was regulated. The cadets of VPI were required to wear their uniform on any leave of absence, including Christmas break and were required to have presidential permission to deliver public speeches,

presentations, and plan public celebrations (Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, 1903-04; Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1891-92). A cadet was ever cognizant of who and what he represented and the duty of upholding the honor of the grey line.

Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and the expanded, Polytechnic Institute, fit the conceptual categories of Goffman's (1961) description of a total institution. As Goffman defined the total institution, the residential college provided a setting in which all aspects of life were carried out within the same place. The corps lifestyle provided the tradition and ritual significant to establishing the culture unique to this institution.

The legacy of the cadet culture was passed on to each new generation of cadets by the generation that came before: "...the duties of the sophomore; to teach the rat mysteries of snipe hunting at moonlight. In short, to remove from the person of said rat disease so common to youths just entering college - the enlarged head" (The Bugle, 1895, p. 53).

The person with the rat disease is a freshman cadet. The freshman, or rat, had perhaps the most difficult year. One of the early traditions was that each room of upperclassman had a rat assigned to them, similar to a

valet, who would be available for chores such as drawing bath water or fetching fire wood (Temple, 1993).

A sophomore offered this following look back on his rat year.

...the moment we broke ranks, the old boys began to yell, 'rats go to your holes'. Of course the rats almost broke their necks to get to their rooms, as some were even imprudent enough to lock their doors. Soon the hideous yells of the old cadets and rattle of bayonets and scabbards were heard in the barracks. No rat was neglected that night. There were no calls to quarters and the old cadets were in their glory while us poor rats were suffering intense agony. Everyone had to make a speech, sing, dance, whistle, kiss his room mate, no matter how ugly he was, and do every other ridiculous thing imaginable. Some refused, but afterwards wished they had not (The Bugle, 1895, p. 25).

McBryde attempted to impact the corps culture in two ways. First, McBryde implemented a policy that stated there would only three regular 'buckings', or hazing incidents: (a) a fall bucking following the issuance of uniforms, (b) a winter bucking when the students returned following the holidays, and (c) a late spring bucking to celebrate the survival of winter (Kinnear, 1972).

While students adhered to the letter of McBryde's policy, there continued to be irregular buckings or hazing incidents at the whim of the upperclassmen (Kinnear, 1972).

For example, while students would not engage in buckings or hazing incidents that involved physical contact due to the policy, that did not preclude student creativity.

One way in which students worked around the stipulated regulation of no physical contact was to use water. Students would not physically touch another student and thus did not violate the letter of McBryde's policy. Their creative solution was to throw water on one another during the night while one was sleeping. Water thrown on a straw mattress held no promise of a comfortable night's rest (Kinnear, 1993).

The second way in which McBryde attempted to impact the military culture was to encourage and support the development of student organizations in addition to student organizations solely connected to cadet activity. Both college football and a college band were established during McBryde's early years (The Bugle, 1895).

McBryde established the college motto, ut prosim, (that I may serve), in 1896 (Kinnear, 1972). He encouraged literary arts through the development of a campus newspaper, The Virginia Tech and a monthly literary magazine, The Grey Jacket (Virginia Tech, 1897). Tech men were also active in debate societies.

The organization which provided the most active social outlet external to the corps was the YMCA. The YMCA provided each new student with the "Rat Bible," or YMCA Handbook which traced college history, traditions, and rules (Temple, 1993).

The Y provided movie nights, discussion groups, and spiritual fellowship which in essence, became the social life of the students. One parent, uncertain of his son's involvement in the Y wrote McBryde: "My son joined the Y and goes to meetings but I do not know if it does any good. Where does he go after the meetings? Please let me know, but don't tell him I asked" (Kinnear, 1972).

The success of the Y was evident in the alumni support for a Y building. In 1899, the cornerstone was laid for the YMCA building and donations to cover the cost were estimated at \$20,729 (Kinnear, 1972).

The Bugle displayed the Klu Klux Klan as a student organization in 1902. Pictures of the students accompanied by their Klan names were displayed in the yearbook. The student Klan names included Dingbat, Fallen Angel, and Doc (The Bugle, 1902). This was the only year Klan pictures were displayed.

Fraternity clubs composed of college men initiated into greek letter fraternities were listed as student

organizations beginning in 1904 (The Bugle, 1904).

Fraternities on campus at this time included Kappa Alpha, Phi Kappa Alpha, Phi Gamma Delta, and Phi Kappa Sigma.

Fraternities were not officially recognized by the University until the early 70s.

Toward the end of his presidency, McBryde observed that student behavior had improved: "There is marked improvement in student behavior, a commitment to being a full time student, and less fire crackers from dorm windows before a holiday" (J.M. McBryde, personal communication, January, 1908). While McBryde attempted to build a holistic curriculum and campus culture inclusive of students, a Tech man was most likely to define himself first and foremost, as a cadet.

If you want to really feel how much goods there is in you, what a fine figure you have, just go to a military school and get a corp! Then you have pretext that is denied to none of your military bearing, trying your lovely voice, and best of all you can gaze lovingly upon the bands of gold encircling your sleeve (The Bugle, 1903, p. 39).

SUMMARY

John M. McBryde provided the leadership to shape the land grant University in Blacksburg. Through his role as father figure to both student and parent, he embodied the spirit of what Stamatakos (1990) labeled as, in loco parentis, in its fullest form. Stamatakos (1990) defined in loco parentis in its fullest form as enabling colleges to devise, implement and administer student discipline and to foster the physical and moral welfare of the student.

McBryde was innovative in the development of the curriculum as well as cocurricular activities. He was always required to work within the original directive of the land grant mission: the military lifestyle. The corps shaped and provided a legacy in culture that was to have the greatest effect on the day to day life of the men of VPI.

To what extent has in loco parentis defined the relationship of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and its students throughout the institution's history? Has in loco parentis found its sustenance at this institution through legal or cultural justification or both?

At McBryde's VPI, in loco parentis was defined within the culture of the residential military land grant institution. McBryde had a close relationship with his

students reflective of his job description. He had an ability to establish close relationships with faculty and students.

The college was a one gender culture in which in loco parentis found its sustenance through the ritual of the daily military lifestyle. It was this culture that would prevail even in the midst of the father of VPI who embodied the cultural spirit of in loco parentis.

The culture of McBryde's VPI was illustrated in an article of one of the publications he encouraged, The Grey Jacket.

Friendship formed among college students that in sincerity, possibly surpasses any formed in afterlife. Here we are thrown together day after day; our heads bent over the same problems; our minds are forced into the same channels; we have a common home and our interests seem the same. We are thus bound together in a brotherhood, the endearments of which are little less than those which bind us to our loved ones at home and when the time comes for those bonds to be severed it is not strange that we look forward to the day of separation with regret (The Grey Jacket, 1897).

CHAPTER 5

Expansion of VPI&SU Post World War II

1945-1955

The expansion of VPI post World War II was an era of startling growth and a decade of intense organizational confusion. The decade of 1945-1955 began with the short tenure of one president and concluded in the midst of the long tenure of the next president. Jack Hutcheson's presidency began in 1945 and was cut short in 1947 due to his ill health. He continued to serve the University in the valued and effective role as chancellor. He had great impact in establishing University fund raising. Walter Newman began his presidency in 1947 and served as president until 1962.

The expansion and confusion VPI experienced during this time was reflected on college campuses throughout the country. A post World War II student body presented an influx in sheer numbers of college students not yet experienced on any college campus. For VPI, it was the first time in its history, that the institution attracted a student body in which the civilians grew from the minority to the majority population (Kinneer, 1972).

The enrollment of this decade peaked during the 1948-49 school year at 5,689 students (Robertson, 1972). This number was significant not only in size, but in the fact that of this total, only 804 students were cadets (Robertson, 1972). The enrollment stretched the size of the faculty, capacity of the physical plant, and challenged a culture confused by the demand of a new student population of civilian men and women not immersed in the ritual and lifestyle of the Corps of the Cadets.

MISSION

The mission of VPI attempted to embrace three significant changes within the student body: the growth in size; the impact of returning servicemen; and, the increase of women students within a male dominated institution.

Colleges across the country experienced both an increase in size and in the heterogeneity of the student body following World War II (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). VPI was no exception. VPI was an approved institution for the training of discharged veterans who were entitled to education compensation under the terms of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, or GI Bill (VPI Bulletin, 1945).

The mission of the institution was expanded to include the priority of providing services and assistance to veterans concerning the problems and adjustments that they might face both inside and outside the class room (VPI Bulletin, 1945). The curriculum was revised to include accelerated programs to accommodate veterans.

All courses were open to both men and women in the fall of 1945, however, many of the courses for women were offered at Radford College, the Women's Division of VPI (VPI Bulletin, 1945). The Women's Division of VPI was created when the Virginia General Assembly passed an act to consolidate the state teachers college at Radford and VPI (VPI Bulletin, 1949).

Women enrolled in classes such as engineering, agriculture, chemistry, and industrial physics at VPI and took teacher training at Radford (Kinnear, 1972). Women lived on campus at VPI in a residence hall that the cadets referred to as the "skirt barn" (Temple, 1993).

While women lived in the skirt barn, the existing barracks were not large enough to accommodate the numbers of male veterans entering the institution. The mission was revised to include a policy that veterans were not required to participate in the cadet lifestyle which still left an absence of on campus housing as well as housing for a new

and extensive population of married students. To accommodate married students, VPI provided over 200 trailers and the Radford Arsenal provided housing in facilities that became known as RadTech (Kinnear, 1972).

The minimum age of admission remained a young age of 16 in 1945 (VPI Bulletin, 1945). Applicants were required to present evidence of good character and honorable dismissal from the school or college last attended (VPI Bulletin, 1945). Within the mission of the institution, students were counted on to show themselves true men and women and know that they were responsible for what became of the traditions of the college (VPI Bulletin, 1948).

The extended description of the college mission within the VPI Bulletin of this decade included additional statements regarding student character. It was interesting to observe minimal attempts toward language inclusive of men and women to the VPI Bulletin in 1952. The regulations were written in the early 1950s to include changes in campus policy and as an extension of the application of the VPI mission to the student body. For example, the student life section stated that: "The purpose and mission of the college is to provide through its personnel and to develop in its students superior professional proficiency, leadership, democratic ideals, and moral character" (VPI Bulletin,

1952, p. 5).

The 1953 VPI Bulletin included an expanded mission statement which specifically addressed student life. The mission statement is a written elaboration of the college vision of its parental role and responsibilities.

The college accepts full responsibility for

- 1) providing the atmosphere and training that will permit the greatest degree of development of the individual student in his chosen professional field
- 2) encourage and promote the leadership potential of the student so that he may assume his maximum degree in any community in which he finds himself
- 3) fostering and nurturing student behavior in the highest type of democratic ideals and,
- 4) providing the atmosphere and training that will permit the greatest degree of moral character (VPI Bulletin, 1953, p. 211).

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

Kinnear (1972) described the Board of Visitors of this decade as a Board with strong leadership. The Board grappled with the need to broaden the vision of what it meant to be a land grant University. The challenge inherent in this broader vision would be to deal with activities and decisions that would sharply differ from past traditions (Kinnear, 1972).

This section will review three areas of governance and some of the issues each area dealt with in the midst of a rapidly growing institution. These three areas of governance included: (a) the Board of Visitors and in particular, the Student Relations Committee, (b) the Corps of Cadets, and (c) the structure and issues faced by student governance organizations.

The Board of Visitors Student Relations Committee had a strong chair in L.W. Webb. Webb served on the Board from 1942-1952 and during most of this time chaired the Student Relations Committee. The purpose of the Student Relations Committee was to serve in an advisory role to the Board and to the administration concerning student life issues (Board of Visitors, 1947).

One of the first issues faced by this Board was coordination and cooperation among students as a whole (Board of Visitors, 1947). Prior to World War II, students at VPI were small in number and one in lifestyle. The Board was now faced with the realization that differentiation, to some extent, existed between the rules governing the civilian student body and the cadets (Board of Visitors, 1947).

While realizing this on one hand, the Board continued to articulate a philosophy which sounded as if it was

grounded in the military nature of VPI. This philosophy was that the entire student body should be considered as a whole and with no special privileges for any group at a particular time (Board of Visitors, 1947).

The Board and the administration put in place one new position and changed a second position with the goal of working with the increase in size and the change in composition of the student body. The administration recommended and the Board approved that VPI hire a Director of Student Affairs (Board of Visitors, 1947).

President Newman requested the Board's support for this new position. He wrote that the rapid turnover of the student body was confusing (Newman, personal communication, August 3, 1946). Newman felt that the Director of Student Affairs could improve the situation through handling details of student life and serving as a liaison between the student body and the administration (Newman, personal communication, August 3, 1946).

The role of this position was to study the student life program with the objective of improving student life. The Director of Student Life was to be charged with integrating student life with the educational program of the institution (Report of Administration to the Board of Visitors, 1947).

Prior to the creation of the Director of Student Affairs position, the leadership for student affairs issues came primarily from the Commandant of Cadets. The Commandant was responsible for the corps, which basically was inclusive of all students. The Commandant also taught courses. As the size of the student body continued to grow, the Board recommended that the Commandant position be a full time permanent position, not to include to teaching responsibilities (Kinnear, 1972).

The Board was concerned with the changing social life of students, in particular, the use of alcohol. The Board recommended that alcohol policies be strictly enforced and recommended that the president talk with students firmly and directly about this issue during the orientation program the first week of school (Board of Visitors, 1949).

The Board was asked to give consideration to the recognition and sanctioning of social fraternities (Board of Visitors, 1953). The Board investigated fraternity life at other campuses and the minutes reported that institutions surveyed had trouble relating any good features of these groups (Board of Visitors, 1953). The Board declined to recognize fraternities at this time and local chapters that had begun to organize off campus were cooperative and reorganized as social organizations (Board of Visitors,

1953).

The Board recognized that student organizations which existed prior to the war could not meet the demands of the civilian dominated student body (Kinnear, 1972). Rather than support the colonization of fraternity chapters, the Board supported approved social clubs in the dorms as a means to fill what the Board called an apparent need for group loyalty and interest among civilians (Board of Visitors, 1952).

The Board was forced to look at the mission of VPI concerning who would or would not be required to participate in the corps. The corps was a male institution and as a woman, one did have a choice as to whether or not one would participate. Women were not allowed in the corps.

Also exempt from the corps were students who were graduate students, married, physically unfit, older transfer students, and honorably discharged veterans (VPI Bulletin, 1945). Any student who was a minor and requested to withdraw from the corps could not do so without written permission from his parents (VPI Bulletin, 1950).

In 1950, President Newman proposed that the Board undertake a study to determine whether to require that future cadets take military training (Robertson, 1972). The discussion of the study prompted rapid response from alumni

which resulted not in an answer to the question Newman posed, but in a statement of commitment from the Board and a nine point plan submitted by alumni to strengthen the corps (Kinnear, 1972; Robertson, 1972).

There were two primary sources of governance for the student body and two separate student governments. There was a student government organization for the corps and a student government organization for the civilian students. Likewise, there was an honor system for the corps and an honor system for the civilian students.

There were four stated objectives that applied to each student governance organization: (a) remedy evils which may occur in the student body, (b) consider all such matters as may concern the global interest of the student body, (c) promote college spirit, and (d) aid in the attainment of those things that would make the institution greater in every way (VPI Bulletin, 1945). The governance system with the longest history was the VPI Honor System. The honor code and the honor system was introduced to cadets in 1872 by General Lane who served as Commandant (Temple, 1993). The intent of the honor system was to cherish and develop manly virtue (VPI Bulletin, 1945).

Temple (1993) wrote that while grades were the official measure of student progress, a greater test was placed on a

sense of honor. Traditionally, students were entrusted with responsibility to uphold integrity and community and "purge" from their midst those persons proved unworthy of honorable trust (Temple, 1993).

In the May 3, 1947 Report of the Administration to the Board, concern was expressed by the administration that the Board may have heard of difficulties with the honor system. The difficulty was that the new student body did not have a great deal of interest in the ideals of an honor system embedded in VPI corps tradition (Report of the Administration to the Board, 1947).

The two student governments became involved in the discussion of the honor system and one of the obvious difficulties was that the civilian students, including the returning veterans, had minimum to no experience with an honor system (Report of the Administration to the Board, 1947).

The civilian senate put forth a resolution that stated that unless there was improvement in the attitude of civilian students toward the honor system, it should be abolished. (Report of the Administration to the Board, 1947). The resolution and subsequent efforts to educate the civilian students toward the honor system improved the knowledge, respect, and use of the honor system.

The cadets, on the other hand, took the Honor System and their responsibilities with the Honor System seriously. In the mid 1950s, cadets were concerned that faculty were not taking their role with the Honor System as seriously. The president of the corps indicated this concern in a letter to Rector of the Board, Vernon G. Eberwine.

Rector Eberwine responded to this letter by stating that while he appreciated the interest of the cadets and the seriousness with which they took the honor system, he expected that the statement that faculty did not take the system seriously would have strong facts behind it (Eberwine, personal communication, May 31, 1955). Eberwine advised the cadets to work with the administration prior to approaching the Board directly. This was the only direct correspondence from a cadet to the Board within the University archives.

The Board endorsed financial support to strengthen student organizations. The Student Relations Committee recommended that the Board approve a student fee that would assist in supporting and strengthening student organizations (Board of Visitors, 1946). The structure of the Corps had been able to support student organizations prior to World War II. VPI was not able to meet the demands of the civilian dominated student organizations following World War

II (Kinnear, 1972).

The Board approved a compulsory student fee which was to be administered by a Student Fee Board (Board of Visitors, 1946). Each VPI student would be required to pay a student activities fee of \$21.00: \$11.00 toward athletics; \$8.00 toward publications; and, \$3.00 toward religious organizations (Board of Visitors, 1946).

The organizational structure to administer the fee was provided by the Student Fee Board (Student Fee Board, 1946). This was significant in that it reflected the slow movement to be inclusive of student involvement in the University governance process through participation in decision making that impacted student life.

The Board of Visitors took on the challenge of a rapidly expanding institution during the decade of 1945-55. Previous to this decade, the Board governed a college campus with a lifestyle and student body that literally marched to the same drummer. In this decade, the Board struggled with maintaining the governance of this ritualistic military lifestyle in the midst of a student body that was not looking for the same sense of direction and was eager to set off in a direction of their own. The direction provided by the Board seemed to set up and reinforce two distinct governance channels: cadet and civilian.

DEFINITION OF IN LOCO PARENTIS

Presidents in this decade no longer wrote monthly reports home to parents nor did Hutcheson and Newman maintain the multiple roles required of McBryde. One of the many challenges faced by these two presidents was the application of structured rules and standards that were once easily applicable to a military lifestyle. These same rules and standards were now applied to a large diverse student body that was accustomed to and expected fewer controls.

As in McBryde's era, there were no documented civil cases external to the University involving student vs. University, in loco parentis. Also, as in McBryde's era, the most frequent judicial case on campus involved the enforcement of alcohol policies.

The college regulations stated that disorderly conduct under any circumstances was unbecoming of a student of VPI and would not be tolerated (VPI Bulletin, 1950). The policy specifically stated that the use of and or possession of alcoholic beverages was prohibited (VPI Bulletin, 1950).

Newman's administrative council minutes reviewed cases of administrative misconduct and at times served as an appeal board. There were frequent notations in these minutes which described student behavior problems concerning

alcohol. For example, the minutes of January 22, 1949, referenced three students dismissed for conduct unbecoming to a gentleman. The students were intoxicated in the town of Blacksburg and arrested. Newman dismissed the students and requested that they apologize to the town police (Administrative Council, 1949).

Col. Thomas Munford, Commandant, wrote to the Administrative Council expressing his concern that nothing was being done to enforce the widespread alcohol violations of civilian students on campus and in the community while he and his officers were firmly holding cadets accountable for their behavior (Munford, personal communication, July 29, 1949).

Munford's statement illustrated the frustration of real and perceived differences in standards for the two student bodies attending one institution. Munford appealed to Newman to discuss the drinking laws and concern for student behavior with student leaders (Munford, personal communication, July 29, 1949).

Like McBryde, Newman struggled with the hazing policy and cadet behavior. Newman appointed a task force to study this issue within the corps. In his letter to the task force, Newman cited two cases of alleged hazing that had been reported to the Governor.

The first case alleged that freshmen in the corps were treated as if they were slaves and the second case reported that freshmen meetings had taken place in which freshmen had fainted (Newman, personal communication, November 3, 1947).

Newman charged the task force to study the freshman year experience in the corps and appointed William Gay, a business faculty member, to chair the task force (Committee on Freshman Year Experience, 1948). The task force offered a series of recommendations and stated that the hazing policy applied to hazing customs under the guise of any voluntary organization, whether corps or student organization (Committee on Freshman Year Experience, 1948).

Hazing was prohibited in any form and Gay clearly stated that this policy would work only with the full support of the Commandant (Committee on Freshman Year Experience, 1948). Munford issued memorandums in support of the committee report (Munford, personal communication, 1948).

While neither Hutcheson nor Newman wrote monthly reports home to parents, there remained specific

instances in which parents were contacted. For example, a notice was sent to the parent or guardian of any student with an unsatisfactory report of class standing, unexcused absence from class, or behavioral problems (VPI Bulletin, 1947; VPI Bulletin, 1948).

Students living off campus were held accountable to the same standards of behavior as on campus students (VPI Bulletin, 1947). These standards of behavior included seeking permission to leave the college grounds from the Commandant if a cadet or from the Director of Student Affairs if a civilian (VPI Bulletin, 1946; VPI Bulletin, 1947).

VPI struggled with in loco parentis in this decade. Policies held students accountable for behavior and clearly stated expectations of participation in aspects of University life. When conflict occurred, the college expected students to respond promptly when summoned by authority (VPI Bulletin, 1950).

The college responded to the confusion of strict adherence to the old policies in a new era by establishing systems to handle the two broad categories of student: civilian and cadet. The cadet lifestyle

continued to support and enforce former policies while the administration worked to develop and apply variations of these policies to the now larger civilian student body.

The college revised its policies and included statements concerning student rights such as: (a) the right to be respected, (b) respect for personal feelings, and (c) freedom from indignity (VPI Bulletin, 1953).

The next section looks further at the impact of in loco parentis and the evolving student body within the culture or daily life of students. The college was going through a period of adolescence where in loco parentis was concerned. It was almost as if VPI had given birth to two children, each with a different response to adolescence. The administration, as the parent of an adolescent, was looking for, yet struggled to find common ground to communicate with its offspring.

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

In many ways the culture of VPI was on sabbatical during World War II. The men of VPI were overseas and soldiers in training programs were the primary occupants and students of VPI during the war (Temple, 1993). The student yearbook, The Bugle, was not published from 1943 through 1946.

In the first edition published after the war, it was stated that the yearbook had not been published due to conditions necessary to discontinue the publication (The Bugle, 1947). Similarly, the culture of VPI was discontinued or put on hold during the war and when students and faculty returned they did not return to the VPI they once knew.

VPI was growing at a pace too rapid to keep up with and the culture was no longer one of a primary male military system that reflected a regimented military lifestyle. VPI struggled with how to define itself as a new community, one now inclusive of civilians and women. This section will address how that occurred and how a new culture was in the process of gradually being shaped.

Prior to the war, all student activities and rituals were corps based (Kinnear, 1972). The corps dominated and regulated culture could no longer serve the role of providing the primary activities, rituals and traditions which brought the culture together. Hutcheson recognized this and developed several initiatives which he hoped would serve all students.

Hutcheson appointed a committee of faculty and students charged with the task of recommending social and cultural activities to enhance educational opportunities for all students at VPI (Hutcheson, personal communication, August 7, 1946). One of the recommendations, which Hutcheson implemented, was to have monthly assemblies for students and faculty (Hutcheson, personal communication, October 16, 1946). The assemblies were mandatory and classes were suspended in order to allow faculty and students to attend.

Hutcheson turned to a member of the committee who was already responsible for many student life initiatives to provide the leadership to implement a second recommendation of the task force. The individual was YMCA Secretary Paul Derring and the new

initiative was an orientation program.

In accepting responsibility for this initiative, Derring wrote Hutcheson that he felt that students needed a sense of direction in the midst of a student body composed of cadets, civilians, veterans, and women (Derring, personal communication, May 29, 1946).

Derring wrote that, in his opinion, an orientation program at the start of the school year could be helpful to students in getting adjusted physically and emotionally to a new way of living before classes began (Derring, personal communication, May 29, 1946).

Derring's philosophy and approach toward student issues of freedom and responsibility resembled what Wood (1991) has labeled, in loco familia, or establishing a relationship with students based on concern, mutual respect and commitment toward student growth and development. This was reflected in the remarks Derring offered to students at the first VPI orientation program for the entire student body.

VPI is a friendly campus, genuine and wholesome. VPI is not perfect - make it more. Each person needs to make a place for oneself - not by money and not by name - but doing. Make friends of the best students you can find. Choose your associates carefully. Join organizations

you like, be careful. Get acquainted with ministers and churches and their organizations. Don't forget the good training of home and keep its principles. Going to college should strengthen them and not destroy them. Going to college is an enterprise, a partnership. Students, make it a successful business. Place great value in your stock. Don't look to professors as bosses but as partners. Give the best you have to college work and you will reap great rewards (Derring, personal communication, September 12, 1946).

While Derring and others were encouraging the building of partnerships between students and faculty, the reality of the culture of VPI was that it was a gendered institution that had few mechanisms in place which lent themselves to partnership.

As has been stated earlier, historically, student life and campus policy was regimented and defined by the male military culture. The cadet student perception was that this was the way of life and the rules went with the territory (Dekker, personal interview, 1993).

The administration made some attempts to bridge both the perception and reality of student life through initiatives inclusive of civilians and women. In a memorandum to Hutcheson, then vice president Newman

recommended that the first floor of the student activities center be a social center and recommended that VPI make arrangements to invite girls to social events and take responsibility for providing transportation (Newman, personal communication, September 17, 1946).

Women were admitted to VPI in 1921 and had experienced, well before the returning veterans, living within a culture separate from the primary culture of VPI. As suggested, and perhaps encouraged, by Newman's correspondence (September 17, 1946), women may have participated in the academic culture of the institution but were not active participants in the social culture.

The social life of the VPI student revolved around athletics and major dances which were sponsored by the German Club or the Cotillion Club (Temple, personal interview, 1993). A former cadet summed up the attitude of dating a VPI woman as "one was looked on with sorrow if you dated a co-ed or a local girl" (Temple, personal interview, 1993).

Families in town stood to profit through the housing of women who visited VPI for a dance weekend. Families charged two dollars per night and were

required to sign an agreement stating that they would take responsibility for their guest which included adherence to a curfew (Bodell, personal interview, 1993).

Dorothy Bodell, a VPI student during this time period, described the experience of housing women guests during this decade as probably not much different than what might happen today (Bodell, personal interview, 1993). The agreement would be signed, the guest would return at her appointed hour, and leave shortly thereafter to socialize at an undisclosed location through the wee hours of the morning.

Bodell (personal interview, 1993) related an amusing incident concerning a group of Cadets and their dates who followed this pattern only to be snowed in a cabin in the county due to a surprise blizzard. While she is not sure of what followed, she speculated that this might have been their last dance weekend!

Special provisions and regulations were designed for the women of VPI. While Hutcheson appointed a committee to develop a set of regulations for civilian men, the report was not documented (Hutcheson, personal

communication, February 2, 1946).

Among the special provisions for women was the opportunity to participate in segregated physical education classes. Women took a great deal of interest in what was described as suitable sports: basketball; volleyball; tennis; and, swimming (VPI Bulletin, 1945).

Dr. Mildred Tate served as the first Dean of Women and was responsible for developing the regulations for women students who lived in Hillcrest Hall. Tate expressed her concern regarding the role of women on campus in a letter to Hutcheson.

...frankly, women students are not recognized on this campus by the administration or Director of Student Activities. They are ignored on the whole. Orientation week is held without mention of women students. Money to the YMCA is collected by the college while women must go out and get their own money. The Dean of Women's Office is not represented on administrative council or student life committee. I feel the representation should be the same for men and women (Tate, personal communication, February 1, 1946).

Hutcheson responded to the Tate's concerns and sent a copy of Tate's letter to Earl Shiflet, who was responsible for student activities. Shiflet wrote Hutcheson that he did not concur with Tate's concerns

regarding the recognition of women. He reported that an invitation was extended to all women students to attend orientation (Shiflet, personal communication, 1946).

Tate's issue did not appear to be whether or not women were invited to orientation, but the concern that they were not recognized as students within the life of the institution. Documentation which supported Tate's observations and concerns is found in the student handbook, the Guidon, which was published by the YMCA and distributed to all new students.

The Guidon begins with the statement: "Remember, when you enter VPI, you are considered a man" (Guidon, 1946, p.12). From their entrance to VPI, women students entered a male culture. Tate's concerns regarding the recognition of women students are illustrated in student publications, orientation programs, and within campus culture.

The Guidon offers advice to students concerning the campus culture: "Gentlemen, you are newcomers, but by this time you will feel that you are college men, men of the world starting out on a big career. You are in a new world and you will do well to learn the

customs and traditions of this campus in order to become a part of it" (Guidon, 1946, p. 10). As suggested by Tate, no mention was made of women students or advice given on learning campus traditions in order to become a part of the campus culture.

Hutcheson's response took issue with Tate's concern: "I do not find myself in agreement with your statement that women students are not recognized on this campus by the administration or the Director of Student Activities. However, I would be glad to discuss this with you" (Hutcheson, personal communication, February 4, 1946).

There were no records of follow-up meetings or documentation concerning the issues raised by Tate nor are their records of appointment of women, including Tate, to serve on the President's Administrative Council or appointment of women students to student governance boards.

The Bugle published pictures of student organizations and students in leadership positions. The photos illustrated that women were involved in student media and drama societies. Each student organization typically pictured a woman sponsor that

appeared to be the spouse of a faculty member or veteran student. Men held the leadership positions in all governance organizations and, of course, the Corps of Cadets.

Likewise, the campus newspaper did not demonstrate involvement of women in campus life other than as sweetheart or queen of a particular dance. The Virginia Tech did feature a woman student each week, however, it was not a feature which highlighted campus or academic involvement, or achievements.

The campus newspaper featured a "Tech Girl of the Week" on nearly a weekly basis. A brief description of the chosen woman was run next to the co-ed and was typical of the following: "...135 pounds - all in the right places. Nancy is what we call versatility personified, bachelor bait - and she can cook!" (Virginia Tech, 1946).

There is evidence of consistent difference in policy and regulations for men and women students. In 1946, the regulations for civilian men focused on alcohol and prohibiting students from owning or riding in automobiles (VPI Bulletin, 1946). Regulations for men did not mention issues such as date night hours.

The Hillcrest Regulations submitted by Tate provided specific instructions regarding this issue.

Seniors and grads may date on school nights providing they are back by closing hours of the hall and maintain the required scholastic average. Sophomores and juniors have special privileges as long as they maintain average. Girls are to be in the dormitory on week nights at 8:30 unless they have a late date privilege which means that the girl has a right to attend a show or some legitimate social function during the week. The girl is expected to come directly from the function to the dormitory. In no case should she return later than 10:30 p.m. (Hillcrest Regulations, 1948, p. 1).

Dorothy Bodell (personal interview, 1993) lived with her family in Blacksburg but was required to live on campus for one term as a home economics requirement. She described on campus life as restrictive and regulated. It put life at home in perspective and she could not wait to return home!

Women's regulations were somewhat revised in 1950. Women were allowed to attend an approved campus program and activity on Friday and Saturday until 11:00 p.m. and were only allowed to ride in cars driven by their parents or driven by a faculty member providing that they had written permission from their parents (VPI

Bulletin, 1950).

At no time during this decade were there rules documented that spoke to the dating regulations of men or specifically to the social life of men students. The difference among the student body rules and regulations escalated and caused problems in the 1950s.

Webb reported to the Board that the Student Relations Committee believed that there was too much difference in the general rules governing the military, civilian, and women within the student body in areas such as study and dormitory supervision (Board of Visitors, 1950). Webb also recommended that VPI study the use of automobiles on campus (Board of Visitors, 1950).

Robert Bates, who replaced Earl Shiflet, concurred with Webb's observation. Bates wrote that student life had reached a crisis of severe proportions (Bates, personal communication, 1951). Bates reported that, in the student's opinion, the administration viewed student concerns as petty complaints (Bates, personal communication, 1951).

Student complaints were cited as: (a) congestion in the dining halls, (b) not being able to have

automobiles on campus, (c) chaos regarding housing assignments, (d) lack of adequate meeting space, and (e) refusal to fill coke machines (Bates, personal communication, 1951).

The YMCA played a critical role in bringing together administration and students together in dialogue sessions to talk about these issues. Kinnear (personal interview, 1993) credits Derring's assistant, Al Payne, with getting students and administration to talk with one another.

As mentioned in the previous section, new student life policies were written and initial steps were taken to care for the student population other than the Corps. The effort was not to merge the cultures but to preserve the separate cultures.

VPI also dealt with another student social phenomenon, panty raids. The men of VPI tended to raid the women on the Radford campus more frequently than women of the VPI skirt barn. Newman reported to the Board that the panty raids were one more illustration of the gulf between the civilian students and the corps (Administrative Report to the Board, 1955). The civilian students tended to orchestrate the raids but

all men of VPI, which included cadets, were credited.

In a letter to Newman, a parent of a Radford student wrote: "I have a daughter in school and have always been interested in schools and what they did for young people. I am upset about the panty raid. I wonder what education has done for these boys and whether they should have gone to college in the first place" (Newman, personal communication, May 29, 1954).

Another letter in Newman's file was from the husband of a Radford student who was stationed in San Francisco: "If the authorities at VPI can't do anything - I will address these concerns to my congressman" (Newman, personal correspondence, June 7, 1953).

Newman's response to the husband was to express his concern that such an unfortunate incident had occurred. He wrote that although it is difficult to know exactly who was involved, VPI had cited 100 young men and they were now on disciplinary probation (Newman, personal correspondence, 1953).

SUMMARY

The 1945-55 decade hosted the first significant period of expansion experienced by VPI. The institution dealt with a decade of confusion as the students, faculty, and physical plant struggled to shift to reflect the expanded community. VPI was hesitant to embrace the change that the sheer numbers of students demanded and this hesitancy was reinforced by an alumni passionately committed to the maintenance of the military mission of the land grant University.

The two presidents of this decade no longer had the responsibility of writing reports home and were not bound to wear the countless hats of responsibility worn by McBryde. There did remain, however, vestiges of institutionally defined in loco parentis.

Reports were still sent home in the event of poor class performance and parents received reports concerning behavioral problems outside the classroom. Students were required to seek permission to leave campus and were extremely frustrated that they were not allowed to have or drive automobiles.

VPI attempted to move toward in loco familia (Wood, 1991) with small steps toward involvement of students in governance and some inclusive and developmental language within policy statements. These steps were taken toward the inclusiveness of the dominant gendered culture and remained exclusive of the women of V.P.I.

The growth and expansion of VPI continued to reflect a culture that valued a patriarchal view of students, in loco parentis. Dr. Laura Jane Harper, former Dean of the College of Human Resources observed: "one of the odds against women gaining prominence at Virginia Tech was the length of time it took this institution to embrace co-eds in the first place" (1980).

Kuh and Whitt (1988) described culture as the glue that holds an institution together. The cultural glue in this turbulent decade was the military culture of the Corps of the Cadets. Temple (1993) observed that in loco parentis ceased at VPI during this decade and attributed this the changes in the student body.

Visiting the campus after more than a half a century, the old timer finds empathy among some of the physical

aspects of today's campus, but there always is a vivid and haunting awareness of evasive ghosts of long remembered charms and graciousness (Temple, Bugle's echo, 1993).

CHAPTER 6

ESTABLISHING THE UNIVERSITY 1964-1974

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University was to undergo major transformation during the 1964-1974 decade. The key event which foreshadowed this change was the appointment of Dr. T. Marshall Hahn, Jr. as President of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Hahn's legacy was one of change, expansion, and a decisive leadership style.

Each person who worked with Hahn had a favorite story to tell. He led the University during a time that stories were easily created in the midst of change and protest. Consistent in each story is that Hahn had the lead role. He authored the script, clearly defined the roles, and had no qualms of offering clarification whether requested or uninvited.

The backdrop was provided by Hahn's ability to create, manage, and maintain institutional change. Hahn structured the emergence of a comprehensive research University and engineered change of the organizational structure he had inherited.

The student life issues Hahn was to face were mirrored in the campus culture of the decade. Unique to Hahn's experience was the challenge of working with these issues while he created a student affairs structure able to serve what was slowly evolving into an inclusive student body.

Hahn's leadership style was marked by the consistency with which he defined his relationships. There was no doubt who was in charge. The students of this era experienced the breadth, confusion, and excitement of a growing university as well as the authority of a president, acting strongly in place of parent.

MISSION

Hahn was the first president who successfully challenged and significantly altered the emphasis of the military mission of Virginia's land grant college. Robertson (1972) described Hahn's agenda for the mission of VPI as one of maintaining tradition where it served the goals of the institution and one of modification when tradition held back the institution's

capability of achieving distinction.

Hahn was aggressive in the assessment and implementation of his agenda for what was then Virginia Polytechnic Institute. There are three areas in which Hahn impacted a shift in institutional mission: (a) military lifestyle, (b) academic scope, and (c) statements concerning student life.

Each president prior to Hahn struggled with the tradition of the Corps of Cadets. As a land grant campus, VPI held on to the military lifestyle as a fundamental element inherent to its mission. Hahn was the first president who was able to orchestrate a shift in the preeminence of the military tradition.

The Board approved voluntary corps membership beginning in the 1964-65 academic year. This issue had been discussed by previous presidents but it was Hahn that effectively placed this issue on the table (Kinnear, 1972). The significant change in policy was that participation in the corps was no longer required except of men who elected to participate in ROTC.

One of the difficulties each previous president faced was the alumni allegiance to the VPI corps tradition. Hahn faced similar difficulty. This could

have been fatal to his plan due to the release of the information to the media concerning the move toward a voluntary corps status prior to informing the VPI alumni association. Hahn immediately wrote the alumni board and apologized for the premature release of information as well as made a convincing commitment to strengthen the ROTC participation in the corps (Hahn, personal communication, June, 30, 1964).

There was an uproar of alumni reaction and a series of hearings. Hahn, a persuasive communicator, made a convincing case for a shift in mission and his policy stood. When it was over, Hahn received one of his many notes from campus chaplain, Rev. Al Payne: "I know you feel much better. Congratulations for many things - for knowing the score, for sticking to your guns, and for keeping your voice down when it was difficult. It's good to be aboard" (Payne, personal communication, June 30, 1964).

Hahn had shifted the military emphasis of the land grant institution and also had a vision for the academic map of the college. In 1964, Hahn called for an intensive examination of the academic mission of VPI and had as his underlying agenda that enrollment should

not be limited, graduate programs would be strengthened, and the need to recognize the educational needs of women at VPI (Kinnear, 1972).

There were two events which coincided with the issues that Hahn intended to address within his plan of institutional self-examination. The first was that Radford was established as a college totally separate from VPI and that all VPI courses were open to women (Robertson, 1972). Second, Hahn's quest for reexamination coincided with the institutional self-examination required by an accreditation self-study.

Hahn argued that the purpose of VPI as a multi-purpose land grant University was to meet the many educational needs of the commonwealth and at the same time make significant contributions to the changing economy (Kinnear, 1972). The purpose of the University, as identified within the self-study report, extended Hahn's vision to include a balanced program of resident and off campus instruction, extension activities, fundamental and applied research, and to extend its scope of activities to the state and nation (Virginia Polytechnic Institute Self-Study, 1966).

The use of the word university was intentional. In 1965, Hahn received a vote of confidence toward the incorporation of VPI as a University from the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission. The Commission recommended that VPI be recognized as a university through expanding the institution's mission through the doctoral level in scientific and non scientific areas (Report of the Higher Education Study Commission, 1965). VPI's name officially changed to Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University On July 1, 1970 (Kinnear, 1972).

Hahn's expansion of the academic mission also was reflected in the written mission statement concerning student life. In the same year as the publication of the self-study, the section dedicated to student life in the college catalogue, resonated language indicative of the expanded path Hahn's University had embarked upon.

The philosophy of VPI was described as working toward the goal of providing the opportunity for the fullest development of student capabilities within educational programs where importance is placed on the assisting students in working toward their potential

(Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1965-66).

The word, university, was inserted in the 1967-68 edition of the catalogue. The purpose of Virginia's land grant University was defined to provide the "intellectual atmosphere, the scholarly quality and the modern facilities for the education of men and women of the commonwealth, and the region, and the nation"

(Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1967-68, p. 8.).

Robertson's (1972) assessment of Hahn was an interesting observation of a president who chartered a course which led to a path of intentional change in the mission of VPI. Hahn shifted the direction of a Virginia's land grant campus. The course Hahn guided was one that underscored tradition yet assertively chose not to limit the particular paths explored. During Hahn's term: (a) the enrollment more than doubled, (b) forty new degrees were created (c) ten new departments were implemented, and (d) more than forty new buildings were completed (Collegiate Times, 1973).

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

The one constant within University governance was the structure provided by the Code of Virginia. The Code of Virginia outlined the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Visitors. The VPI Board of Visitors during Hahn's tenure tended not to move beyond raising questions concerning policy and did not attempt to micromanage the University (Virginia Polytechnic Institute Self-Study, 1966).

The internal governance system did not observe such a constant state. University governance evolved during the Hahn era. Hahn moved from the administrative advisory forum implemented and utilized by previous presidents to a representative form of governance through the University Council, Faculty Senate, and evolution of student governance. The college was organized around a centralized decision making process with a president clearly in control (Wheeler, personal interview, 1993).

The University Council assumed the role of an umbrella governance structure with representation from the vice presidential level which reported to Hahn, the

individual college deans, and faculty. There was minimal student representation in the early years of the University Council. This was an ongoing issue for students during this time period.

The primary avenue for faculty input to the governance structure was through the Faculty Senate. The officers of the senate would meet with Hahn once a month (Hammond, personal interview, 1993). The Faculty Senate grew to be viewed by the administration as aligned with the students and was perceived as disruptive (Hammond, personal interview, 1993). This will be discussed further in the next section.

The student body voted to merge the two forms of student governments, cadet and civilian, and formed one government in 1966 (The Bugle, 1966). The vote to merge the two student governments had been previously defeated. The defeat was attributed to the ability of the corps government to mobilize cadets to vote against the merger (Collegiate Times, 1964).

The unified student government was composed of all undergraduate students including civilian men and women and the men of the corps (Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1967-68). The honor system

maintained its structure of a separate academic honor system for cadets and civilian students.

The student voice was heard primarily through the student government and structures set up within the governance system. The University Council established a commission structure which included the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Student Life, which eventually emerged as two separate commissions, the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Student Affairs. Student representation came from the student government, dormitory councils, and the corps (Kinnear, 1972).

Hahn had strong encouragement from the self-study report at the beginning of his tenure to seek out and include student input within the governance structure. While Hahn provided the structure within the evolving governance system, students would debate the forum and opportunity for input throughout his presidency.

In the early 1970s, students argued for more representation in university governance and greater input in the university decision making process. A 1970 Collegiate Times editorial offered the student

perspective concerning the definition of oppression.

Our definition of oppression is the state of being heavily weighed down either mentally or physically - a definition applied to Tech students. The administration has ultimate control or power of review over every Student Government Association decision or other student organizations - the administration has their education: why can't we? (Collegiate Times, 1970. p. 2).

The student response to their perception of the oppression of the system of student governance was to propose alternative governance structures. One of the forms of alternative student governance was the Independent Organizing Committee (IOC). The stated purpose of the IOC was to provide an association of concerned persons dedicated to social change (University Council, 1970). In a confidential memorandum to Hahn, the Vice President for Student Affairs described the IOC as a student organization representative of 'liberal elements' attempting to get an organization approved in order to picket and demonstrate (Dean, personal communication, December 1, 1969).

The IOC constitution had a difficult path through the approval process. The path to recognition included

approval by the Student Constitutional Affairs Board, a subcommission of the Commission on Undergraduate Students and Student Life. The Student Constitutional Affairs Board had become an active subcommission in 1969 (Harder & Janney, personal communication, February 6, 1969). A student organization seeking approval would submit its constitution to the Student Constitutional Affairs Board and if approved, the constitution would be forwarded to through the governance structure.

In the case of the IOC constitution, the University Council approved the constitution with the condition that the IOC would change its preamble to reflect university policy provisions required of student organizations (University Council, 1970). These policy provisions basically required that student organizations adhere to university policy and would submit future constitutional changes through the designated governance channels.

As one of the first alternative student organizations, the IOC had difficulty with what they perceived as oppression from the University governance system. The leadership of the IOC expressed their

frustration to Hahn. Hahn attempted to explain to the IOC student leadership that the University Council was not questioning the purpose of the IOC but was concerned with maintaining consistency in requiring all student organizations to adhere to the same policies (Hahn, personal communication, February, 9, 1970).

Student government president, Sandy Hawthorne, chaired a subcommittee of the Commission of Student Affairs which took forward a proposed tri-partite governance structure. The primary purpose of this proposal was to increase the role of students in University governance because: "the dictatorship of the university over its students is not only incongruous with academic freedom, but falls outside the bounds of tolerance. Rhetoric can no longer circumvent the question of control of the individuals protected by the constitution by a university in the name of scholarship" (Report of the Special Subcommittee of the Commission of Student Affairs, 1971, p. 1).

The Faculty Senate went on record as being opposed to the tri-partite governance proposal. The senate voted to reaffirm its previous commitment to the principle of increased student representation in

existing forms of governance and on the college and department levels (Report of the Faculty Senate and Ad Hoc Committee on Increased Student Representation in University Governance, 1971).

The Faculty Senate position was one held by Hahn and the University Council. The student frustration remained one of a sense of oppression due to the small number of votes on University Council and a perceived lack of input concerning student life policies.

The student government approved a student bill of rights at the same time it was attempting to gain approval of tri-partite governance proposal. The purpose of the bill of rights was to assert minimal guarantees, such as student participatory status in the university, and to establish collective student constitutional rights (Student Government Minutes, 1971). The student bill of rights sounded very much like a predecessor to the Buckley Amendment in that it stipulated limited (and non parental) access to student records (Student Government Minutes, 1971). The passage of this bill did not appear to have an impact on University policy or policy decisions.

The attitude of the student government appeared to change toward the end of Hahn's tenure. Beginning in 1972, the student government worked to change its adversarial role with the administration and sought to work in conjunction with the administration for the benefit of the students and the community (Virginia Tech Historical Data, 1974). Hahn's message to the 1972 student government was: "I expect you to do a good job. In the past, student leaders have not lived up to the trust placed in them and instead of engaging in productive activities were obsessed with attacking the administration and tilting windmills. Student government, contrary to popular belief, does not run the university" (Collegiate Times, 1972, p. 1).

The system of University governance emerged at VPI&SU during the Hahn years and remains today as a legacy of his presidency. The Board of Visitors did not micro manage the institution and allowed Hahn to define the parameters of governance. The mission of University governance changed the pattern of input concerning University decision making from one of an administrative council to one of organized input on behalf of administration, faculty, and students.

The process of creating the University governance system was complex and provoked heated discussion. Faculty and students raised questions concerning issues of representation and at early stages attempted to create alternative structures. Hahn was a decisive leader and had a clear vision for the University and the new governance structure. The ramifications and reactions to this vision will be viewed from various lenses in the next section.

DEFINITION OF IN LOCO PARENTIS

Hahn attempted to directly meet the challenge of defining the limits and parameters for student life during the 1964-74 decade. The students of this decade loudly defied the limits set by the administration, in place of parent. Kinnear (1972) observed that the struggle in setting these limits was accentuated by dramatic changes in the characteristics of the student body.

The students of this decade, wrote Kinnear (1972), were attracted to the new programs introduced on the campus and were indicative of the generation gap who

were more conscious of the world beyond than were their predecessors. The new student Kinnear (1972) described encountered difficulty when dealing with the vestiges of parental order evident on campus.

Students who arrived on the VPI campus in 1964 was required to keep their room neat and orderly, subject to periodic inspection (Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1964-65). Judicial letters were sent home to parents while the Dean of Students and his staff were eager to cooperate with parents in helping solve problems affecting the welfare of their student (Harder, personal communication, December 17, 1979; Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1966-67).

The decision to move to the voluntary corps status had ramifications for the organization of what was then known as student personnel services. Hahn followed the recommendation of the self-study and reorganized as well as centralized student services. Hahn created the position of Vice President for Student Affairs and appointed Dr. James Dean as the first Vice President in 1968 (Kinnear, 1972). The mission of his office was:

To be interested in the welfare of every student and attempt to be of service in the student's total development. Assistance is provided on

matters relating to vocation, finances, discipline, organizations, personal problems and the office is eager to cooperate with parents (Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1969-70, p. 18).

The centralization of student personnel services and creation of the office of the vice president eliminated the previously held positions of dean of men and dean of women (Board of Visitors, 1969). The Board of Visitors approved a student affairs organizational structure consisting of: (a) student services, (b) on and off campus housing, (c) health services, (d) orientation and leadership programs, (e) selective service registration, (f) religious affairs, and (g) the office of the vice president.

This new organizational structure was now responsible for taking on the institutional parental role (Lavery, personal interview, 1993). The issues faced by this staff included battles over residence hall visitation policies, availability of birth control, and would mirror the social issues dealt with on college campuses throughout the country.

The first of these issues was the right of students to participate in demonstrations. Parallel to

the 1969 Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District case which ruled on the first amendment, VPI was forced to deal with a student's first amendment rights. Saunders, a had been readmitted only to be denied readmission to the University because of his participation in a peaceful demonstration at the June commencement (Kinnear, 1972).

His readmission was denied based on a policy approved by the Board of Visitors in 1968 which stated that:

Every student who is privileged to matriculate to VPI is obligated at all times to assume a sense of responsibility for his or her action, to respect constituted authority, to conform to the ordinary rules of good conduct, to respect the rights of others, to protect private and public property, and to make the most effective use of his or her time in securing higher education (Board of Visitors, 1968, August, p. 1).

Important to Saunders case, the University policy stated that only currently enrolled students could participate in campus demonstrations. The court ruled against the University policy and stated that a public university is powerless to restrict or deny student's freedom to express dissent on campus as long as it is peaceful (Saunders, v. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1969).

The 'ordinary rules of good conduct' were contained in the University Policies for Student Life, now a separate publication from the college catalogue. These policies stated that each student had the right to individual freedom and personal privacy, except as provided by explicit University regulations, which were to be observed by both students and University authorities (University Policies for Student Life, 1969-70).

These policies further stated that the maintenance of the policies, as well as the state and federal laws, required that the University exercise their authority as endorsed by the Board of Visitors (University Policies for Student Life, 1969-70). These policies were developed primarily by staff, placed on the agenda of the Commission on Student Affairs, and eventually, the agenda of University Council.

The passage of the University Policies for Student Life through the University governance system would cause the majority of battles between University and student through the late 1960s and early 1970s. These were the policies that set the University parental limits and the policies in which students did

not feel as if they had sufficient input.

The major student life issues to come before the Board of Visitors for the May meeting in 1968 were changes in the student life polices such as the serving of beer with 3.2 alcohol level in Squires and the open house hours for women, pending parental approval (Board of Visitors, 1968). The serving of 3.2 beer in Squires was approved and it is interesting to note that Virginia Alcohol Beverage Control Board consulted with Hahn prior to granting an alcohol license to establishments adjacent to the campus (Board of Visitors, 1969). Hahn was appreciative of this consultation and explained that it assisted in managing problems involving students and alcohol (Hahn, personal communication, January, 24, 1966).

In April of 1970, an incident occurred which once again raised the issue of the right to demonstrate. On April 14, 1971, and group of faculty and students disrupted a corps drill on the drillfield (Kinnear, 1972). The drill was an approved University scheduled ROTC class activity (Hahn, personal communication, April 16, 1970).

Hahn's response to the corps drill obstruction was swift and decisive. He obtained an injunction from the Montgomery County District Court which applied to faculty, staff, and students. The temporary injunction was put in place as a measure to avoid further activities which deliberately disrupted the normal functions and activities of the University (Hahn, personal communication, April 16, 1970).

Hahn was consistent throughout his presidency in defining the limits of student behavior which would or would not be tolerated. In this case, Hahn explained that the corps had been authorized by the University to use the drill field for class purposes. He explained that the injunction did not prohibit the rights of non-disruptive expression or peaceful assembly (Hahn, personal communication, April 16, 1970).

University policy required that groups obtained prior approval for use of university facilities and or university grounds. This policy would be frequently confronted by students and faculty who would not seek prior permission and would be challenged in return by the University who had defined the limits.

Hahn and his administration dealt with the most serious challenge to first amendment rights and campus policies following the Kent State tragedy. VPI students requested that classes be cancelled on May 7, 1970, in observance of the students killed at Kent State. The administration did not cancel classes, but instead, encouraged faculty to be sensitive to students who chose to participate in programs (Hahn, personal communication, May 19, 1970).

Hahn met with hundreds of students assembled on the lawn of the President's home, the Grove. Hahn moved off campus during his presidency and the president did not return to living in the Grove until recent years. The students assembled on Hahn's lawn were in protest of his decision not to cancel classes and met with students who made an unsuccessful attempt to take over Cowgill Hall on May 11 (Hahn, personal communication, May 19, 1970).

Students were successful in taking over the busiest classroom building on campus, Williams Hall. Students locked and barricaded the doors and issued demands, such as amnesty for students who occupied the building (Hahn, personal communication, May 19, 1970).

Hahn requested assistance from the state police. It was the state police who removed students from Williams Hall, and in moving vans, took the students to the Montgomery County Court House (Hahn, personal communication, May 19, 1970). Once again, Hahn obtained an injunction and all students who were removed from Williams Hall were suspended.

Hahn requested the Montgomery County Circuit Court to dissolve the temporary injunction (Hahn, personal communication, May 26, 1970). He felt that there had been an effective cooling off period and that the injunction had been helpful in making it clear that the University would not tolerate activities which were disruptive to normal campus activities, and in particular, the University's academic mission (Hahn, personal communication, May 26, 1970).

Hahn reiterated the point he had made clear in the earlier incident which had involved the disruption of the corps drill. His point being that he would take whatever action necessary to protect the freedom of expression and actions of all segments of the University community (Hahn, personal communication, May 26, 1970).

Hahn received some criticism from the faculty regarding the handling of campus disruption and the Williams Hall evacuation. Faculty members were, at times, charged with disruption and felt as if they were caught between students and the administration (Hammond, personal interview, 1993). One faculty member wrote of the frustration at not being acknowledged for attempting to talk with students and encouraging students to talk through issues:

...last year faculty voluntarily decided that such large groups of angry students needed some watching over and were joined by others, the senate approved. I was out every night until two or three in the morning and took no small number of physical risks. What burns me up is that nobody in the administration has ever seen fit to thank us or show otherwise any appreciation. Nor has Burruss made any efforts other than 98% police tactics to ward off future problems such as last night (Salmon, personal communication, May 25, 1971).

Hahn did, however, receive an overwhelming vote of confidence from press throughout the commonwealth and from the Board of Visitors. The Board adopted a resolution which expressed its admiration and appreciation for the leadership Hahn provided in implementing University policies during the campus

disruption (Board of Visitors, 1970). Hahn had demonstrated unwavering firmness in setting limits for the behavior of students at VPI.

Campus unrest shifted from external to internal issues during the 1970-71 academic year. Hahn wrote a confidential memorandum to his vice presidents which foreshadowed his valid concern regarding the proposed 1970-71 student life policies. He stated that the proposed changes were the most liberal the University had faced and was concerned that provisions for implementation were non-existent (Hahn, personal communication, March 30, 1971). He suggested that the University needed to seriously study the disciplinary policies before it moved into the implementation of more liberal visitation and alcohol policies (Hahn, personal communication, March 30, 1970).

Hahn faced two very emotional adversaries, one at the state legislative level and a second being the student body who adamantly felt that the proposed visitation policies were not liberal enough. The Virginia legislature clearly communicated its views concerning visitation policies through the Senate Joint Resolution no. 24, better known as the Bateman

Resolution. The resolution stated:

... any state supported institution of higher learning that permitted visitation of students of the opposite sex in college dormitory rooms without proper regulation, control, and supervision, and without prior consent of parents of any student under 21 years of age, is contrary to the public decency and decorum which are indispensable for a stable, well-ordered society (Senate Joint Resolution, No. 24, p. 1).

The visitation policy discussion at University Council was heated and on one occasion had to be adjourned due to conditions described as inconsistent with thoughtful deliberation (University Council, 1971). The visitation policy approved by the University Council included a provision that required parental permission and stated that room doors must be left open six inches when a student had a visitor of the opposite sex (University Council, 1971).

It was the 'six inch' rule that enraged students. The student protest slogan was 'close the doors or close Tech' (Student Government Association, 1971). Students organized protests through the town of Blacksburg, occupied a residence hall and, had protests on the steps of Burruss (Kinnear, 1972). Demonstrations escalated in the burning of an old

extension building (Kinnear, 1972).

The building was described as a minor building scheduled for replacement (Hahn personal communication, May 29, 1971). Most of the individuals who were arrested at the scene of the fire were not students (Malprass, personal communication, May 29, 1971). Once again, Hahn sent the message to the University community that the University would not tolerate the tensions on campus. He attributed these tensions to a small group of students and nonstudents and stated that the University would not condone politics of the streets (Hahn, personal communication, June 2, 1971).

Buildings were not the only items students burned. The University Policy for Student Life documents were burned on the steps of Burruss during a student government organized protest concerning the visitation policies (Norris, personal communication, May 24, 1971). Student government president, Sandy Hawthorne, also organized protests in what he called Virginia Tech's People's Park (Norris, personal communication, May 25, 1971). The People's Park was the student government name for the drillfield.

Dean would often meet with students on the grounds of their protest or request that his staff would meet with the protesting students. Dean received a letter from a student who had observed him talking with students on the steps of Burruss in May 1971. The letter from Ken Pittman illustrated that there were students who supported the strong administration stance.

I am a rednecked conservative southern farm boy. Maybe I am ignorant because of my background - but I believe to have a good university, there must be a strong administration. A good majority of students back you. I am glad we have administrators such as you (Pittman, K., personal communication, 1971).

Student reaction to the six inch rule grew beyond a reaction to in loco parentis and into the realm of a safety issue. Students reacted to the requirement to have the door open six inches by building a door inside the exterior of the their room (Lavery, personal interview, 1993). The intent was to maintain the spirit of the rule, while more importantly, to honor the spirit of what the students wanted. The University response was to cite students with fire code violations (Lavery, personal interview, 1993; Wheeler, personal

interview, 1993).

The spring of 1971 was the second consecutive year of campus unrest at that particular time of year. Hahn attributed this, in part, to the timing of the review of the student life policies within the governance system and suggested the timing of this review could be altered (Board of Visitors, 1971). Hahn also had decided to appoint a committee to formally study the relationship of the student university relationship, in loco parentis.

The In Loco Parentis Committee consisted of faculty members who were appointed by Hahn to: (a) clarify the university's role regarding the in loco parentis concept, (b) advise the University Council and president concerning the in loco parentis concept, and (c) propose a course of action for the University (In Loco Parentis Committee, 1971).

This committee offered a final report which offered four assumptions concerning the role of the University, in loco parentis: (a) no university whether large or small, is willing at the present time to assume all responsibilities of the parent, (b) in loco parentis can never be complete or total at any

institution (c) a small private school can provide more supervision than a large university and parents and students choose a university based on this fact, and (d) there is agreement that a state university, unlike a private one, cannot seek to impose a code of personal morality except in so far as the moral code impacts the educational process (In Loco Parentis Committee Report, 1971).

The report submitted by this committee offered a different perspective than that of the Bateman Resolution concerning the obligation of the public institution to control campus morality. The committee specifically stated that while the state university undertakes the task of educating the young, it cannot undertake the parental tasks of inculcating the young of a code of moral behavior (In Loco Parentis Committee Report, 1971).

The committee offered one final observation based on readings and policies on other campuses. The committee found support for adherence to student constitutional rights and suggested an interesting perspective concerning suspension as a disciplinary action (In Loco Parentis Committee Report, 1971).

Suspension was viewed as unnecessary severance because it was representative of an act that, in the view of the committee a parent could not legally do, completely sever all relationship with their son or daughter (In Loco Parentis Committee Report, 1971).

In light of the committee report and observations concerning morality, the committee was requested by the administration to undertake a second analysis. The committee was asked to study and recommend whether or not the University should prescribe contraceptives through the student health service. Following consultation with the Virginia Attorney General and the Director of the Student Health Service, the committee went on record as in support of licensed medical practitioners of the VPI&SU Student Health Service prescribing contraceptive products when they deemed it medically advisable (In Loco Parentis Committee, 1972). The recommendation was not initially endorsed by Hahn and the Board of Visitors (Holliman, personal communication, 1972).

The Faculty Senate supported the recommendation of the In Loco Parentis Committee and passed a resolution which endorsed the prescription of contraceptives at

the Health Service (Faculty Senate, 1972). It was the opinion of the Faculty Senate that whether or not one approved of the sexual freedom of college students, the availability of contraceptives would reduce unwanted pregnancies (Wiggert, personal communication, February, 16, 1973).

Student unrest seemed to have subsided during the 1972 academic year. The visitation policy was an open house policy with a series of options depending on where the student chose to live (University Policies for Student Life, 1972-73). One of the options did allow for a closed door during the designated visitation hours (University Policies for Student Life, 1972). Students continued to have difficulty with the requirement of signed parental permission for the visitation option chosen. Students were pleased with the increase in visitation options but viewed the requirement of parental permission as an unwarranted compromise with the administration (Collegiate Times, 1972-73).

A key piece of federal legislation had an impact on issues such as parental permission forms for visitation options and parental access to student

records. The 1974 Family Rights and Privacy Act, often referred to as the Buckley Amendment, changed campus thinking on what had been done and why concerning student privacy (Lavery, personal interview, 1993; Wheeler personal interview, 1993).

The Buckley Amendment is described as so extensive that it is the predominant legal consideration in dealing with student records (Alexander & Alexander, 1992). This amendment respects the legal age college student's right to privacy concerning all records. On a larger scale, legal rights that once were the parents, are now the legal rights of the college student as a legal adult (Alexander & Alexander, 1992).

Dr. T. Marshall Hahn, Jr. was clear about his agenda, his limits, and what exactly would be tolerated within those limits. As a president, he dealt with similar issues, in loco parentis, as did previous presidents. As did his predecessors, he dealt with rules for two cultures. He did experience challenges, both internally and externally, to student constitutional rights. He set up structures to deal with these issues and there was rarely a doubt as to who established the agenda.

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

Today's student who goes to college believing that the propaganda of the conventional wisdom that he is the future leader in whom America should place great trust - should be quickly disabused of that notion by the treatment he receives. He will find that his sexual life is limited by a campus banning women from the dorm, alcohol consumption limited by policies banning liquor from campus, and travel limited by not being able to have a car as a freshman. The university makes all these regulations under the guise of in loco parentis. This father knows best attitude is probably worse in church schools and negro schools and one wonders if the administration really cares about students or if they are just fearful of adverse publicity that students create. There is no need of these restrictions unless one firmly believed that the moment he is freed from restrictions, the student would get drunk, high on pot, and mow down innocent pedestrians while fathering illegitimate children in the back seat of a speeding car (Alice, 1968, p. 1).

The authors of Alice were the students involved in the protest described in the previous section. Within the realm of the Greene's (1988) notion of freedom and responsibility, these students strove to move beyond any limits being imposed.

Freedom and responsibility was defined in a manner unique to the cultural tapestry of VPI&SU. Within the adversarial activity of protest and policy challenges of the Hahn era, remained the ritual of the military, traditions of lavish dances, and symbolism of southern

culture. Students who challenged the limits of policy and traditions did so within an authoritarian institution not yet willing to relinquish the southern culture it valued (Leach, personal interview, 1993).

The University maintained a philosophical position concerning the responsibility for freedom within the institutional culture. The catalogue stated that the all members of the community shared the responsibility to secure and respect conditions conducive to freedom (Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1970-71). Consistent with the underpinning policy philosophy of this particular era, the catalogue specifically stated that the University is the final authority concerning policies to safeguard the freedom to learn within the University community (Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1970-71).

The students involved in protest are perhaps the most recognizable students who challenged the safeguards of freedom during this era. These students did not necessarily represent the broad profile of the VPI student of the Hahn years. The student profile was one of a student body that tended to be somewhat more

conservative than students on other campuses (Cook, 1968). Students profiled indicated that while they felt that there might be a good possibility that they would participate in a demonstration or protest, they felt that the college had a right to control student behavior (Cook, 1968).

The college literature was direct with students regarding student life and the range of choices that they would face within the student culture. The college catalogue advised students that student life outside the classroom could be as rewarding as a student made it, but could be detrimental if allowed to excessively interfere with one's academic work (Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1965-66).

Previous sections reviewed the role of students in the development of student life policy through the University governance system. What was the student role and responsibility in the implementation and enforcement of policy on a day to day basis?

The campus was primarily residential. A former student observed that life off campus did not seem to exist (Smoot, personal interview, 1993). Student role in policy implementation and enforcement was primarily

within the residence halls through the Resident Assistant (RA) role. RAs were predominantly undergraduates with several halls staffed by graduate students (Wheeler, personal interview, 1993).

The RAs were responsible for policy enforcement reflective of the highly structured policies and administrative control. The University attempted to provide a structure for enforcement of policies. The role of the RA was to refer policy violations to the full time housing staff and it would be this staff that would follow through on disciplinary action (Wheeler, personal interview, 1993). A former RA observed that she had not realized how intensely structured this campus was until she attended another university (Purdy, personal interview, 1993).

RAs were not put in the role of confronting student protestors in or adjacent to the residence halls. Hahn placed this responsibility with the housing staff and held them accountable for enforcement of University policy regarding disruptive behavior. (Wheeler, personal interview, 1993). It was not uncommon for Hahn to directly call on staff and instruct them in how to handle and respond to student

disruption (Wheeler, personal interview, 1993; Harder, personal interview, 1993).

The students who pushed the limits of freedom and responsibility were not as concerned with social issues external to the campus but were focused on internal policies of the evolving University of this era. The previous section discussed these policy protests. The Viet Nam War was not the predominant focus of protest on this particular campus as was the case on other campuses.

Students who protested against the war in Viet Nam formed a student organization called the Viet Nam Committee. Dean described this group as promoting the agenda of the more militant students and observed that they were not successful in causing heated campus debate (Dean, personal communication, May 24, 1968). Dean cautioned that their lack of success in one academic year did not mean that they would not continue to attempt to promote vigorous confrontation with the University administration as the perceived authoritarian establishment (Dean, personal communication, May 24, 1968).

As stated earlier, students involved in protest had more success rallying students around campus visitation policies than social issues. The only exception was the Williams Hall takeover which was spurned by the student anger concerning the University's lack of support in observance of the student deaths at Kent State.

One of the areas Hahn created in his reorganized student personnel services division was the University Counseling Services. The Counseling Service and the University had serious disagreements with the campus ministry community concerning the services that would be provided to students. For example, the University had debated the issue of prescription of contraceptives on campus.

The campus ministries were concerned that students who sought counseling concerning issues such as pregnancy or drug abuse would not find the assistance they needed on campus. The campus ministries was an organization of clergy who were assigned by their local churches to work with college students. The campus ministries observed that the University did not want to admit that these problems such as pregnancy or drug

abuse occurred on campus and more importantly, that they could not control these issues (Leach, personal interview, 1993).

The response of the campus ministries was to create a volunteer community crisis center and counseling center available to students off campus. A former campus minister attributed the conflict in what these services should be about as reflective of the University's discomfort with students seeking independence from the university who viewed itself as the authoritarian parent (Leach, personal interview, 1993).

The student drug culture created yet another alternative newspaper, FANYA. FANYA was described as a well written left-wing newspaper (Savage, personal communication, April 9, 1971). FANYA detailed drug arrests of VPI&SU students and gave a check list of advice on what to do when arrested as well as how to grow your own marijuana (FANYA, 1971).

While students were in protest and debating alternative cultures, the Corps of Cadets marched on. The majority of students who were not cadets prior to the decision to maintain the corps as voluntary were

veterans. What this meant after the 1964 decision, was that for the first time, the University would be dealing with traditional age students who would resign from the corps after a designated time period and either continue as civilian students or drop out of the university (Cannon & Cook, 1965).

The Counseling Service staff attempted to work with and support students who contemplated this decision. The decision to drop out of the corps had the potential to be particularly devastating for the student whose father, grandfather and/or other family members had been a cadet (Cannon & Cook, 1965). The Counseling Center spent a great deal of time processing this decision with students and attempted to provide support for the direction chosen by the student.

The students that seemed to remain silent during the Hahn years were women. The 1966 yearbook optimistically reported that as the school was expanding, students found co-eds to be more of a normality than an exception and proceeded to describe the attributes of a beautiful co-ed (The Bugle, 1966). The Tech freshman co-ed of 1966 was described as:

...she can be easily spotted from her seniors during the first week of college life. Thrown into a predominantly male wilderness, she has at first a rather self-conscious expression. This is quickly lost amidst the hustle of orientation, registration, and moving in. She soon becomes involved in various extracurricular activities such as cheerleading tryouts (The Bugle, 1966, p. 20).

Women students were not among the leadership of protest groups nor of mainstream organizations. As in previous decades, women were called on to fulfill positions of campus royalty.

Feminine beauty has definitely found a place on the Virginia Tech campus. Until recent years, the attractiveness and personality of our co-eds has not been fully realized. Most striking examples found at Tech are represented by our reigning queens. Through the year various events occur which demand the election of campus beauties such as homecoming, Miss VPI, Mrs. VPI, and the Bugle Queen (The Bugle, 1966, p. 104).

The campus newspaper continued to recognize the papermate of the week. This recognition was bestowed upon a co-ed for her contribution to the paper and the University (Virginia Tech, 1964). Students elected the first woman to serve in a leadership position, other than campus royalty, in the role of 1974 class

president. Women were admitted to the corps in 1973 (The Bugle, 1973).

Women had been admitted in 1921 yet remained in the background of the institution through this decade. One observation, as the In Loco Parentis Committee (1971) suggested, is that parents and students selected an institution based on perceived compatibility. In choosing this campus, women were choosing an authoritarian southern college that had strict policies pertaining to women (Harder, personal communication, 1993).

For example, in this decade as in the previously studied decades, women adhered to a separate set of rules specific to their gender. Women had an established curfew and had to sign in and sign out of the residence halls whereas men did not (Harder, personal interview, 1993; Wheeler, personal interview, 1993). There were separate handbooks for women, male civilians, and cadets (University Policies for Student Life, 1969-70). In the early years of the Hahn administration, women had house mothers responsible for their residence hall (Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1964-65).

The self-study was critical of the University for lack of attention to women within the institution and recommended that a priority be placed on the enhancement of the involvement of women (Self-Study, 1965-66). One of the first steps taken by the institution was to hire a Dean of Women.

Audrey Rentz was appointed in 1965 as the first full time Dean of Women (Kinnear, 1972). An interview in the student newspaper suggested that inadequate facilities for women was reflective of the lack of emphasis on women within the institution (Virginia Tech, 1965). She identified her first priority as putting together a women's dormitory executive council who would hopefully assist in the feminization of the women's dormitory (Virginia Tech, 1965).

Martha Harder became Dean of Women in 1967 and was responsible for replacing the house mothers with RA's and attempting to bring the women's dormitory policies in line and compatible with the men's policies. Harder dealt with the issue of interracial dating. Two women living on campus were dating two black men from Blacksburg who were not Virginia Tech students. Harder described her conversation with the women in a letter

to Hahn.

...while there is no policy, I feel that I would be remiss in my position if I did not talk to the girls. I make it clear that I was not telling them that they could not date the boys. I tried to take myself out of the position of Dean of Women and talk with them as a friend, an older person. I spoke with them about the tone of society and that they could find themselves ostracized. Some question has come up of parent notification, but I don't think that I have that right (Harder, personal communication, April 12, 1967).

There is no record of a response from Hahn or a further written documentation concerning the incident. Harder recalled this incident in a conversation and reported that she was concerned that the women were not going to class and that the men were constantly hanging around the dorm (Harder, personal interview, 1993). She spoke of having a conversation with one of the young men who was angry that she had talked with the women (Harder, personal interview, 1993). She spoke of her concern for the women and the choices that they were making at this time (Harder, personal interview, 1993).

Harder (personal interview, 1993) fondly recalled a policy that students were effective in overturning. Until 1968, women were not allowed to wear pants unless

the weather reached an extremely chilly temperature. Students were placed on probation for protesting this policy and for polling students in the dining halls without having obtained prior approval (Virginia Tech, 1968). The probation stood, but the policy did not.

The visitation policy options were expanded in 1971 and the parental permission forms remained in place. The women's interdormitory council approved a permission form as well as an accompanying policy which stated that violators would be reported to parents by the women's interdormitory council and the judicial board (Commission on Student Affairs, 1971). The campus newspaper was critical of this policy and stated that policies such as this were pushed through in an attempt to convince parents that this would protect any girl residing in the dorm from the evils of sexual intercourse (Collegiate Times, 1971).

In 1972, the Commission on Student Affairs took a major step in attitude toward the development of visitation policies. The Commission recommended that all future policies regarding visitation and curfew be made without discrimination on the basis of sex (Commission on Student Affairs, 1972).

The institutional culture of this era was fragmented amidst protest, student life changes, and the protective veil of southern culture. As Greene (1988) suggested, students challenged the limits of freedom and responsibility. The leadership of the institution was equally consistent in defining the limits of student freedom and responsibility.

SUMMARY

To what extent did Hahn and the institution of his era define the University/student relationship, in loco parentis? Was this a relationship that was legally or culturally driven? An important observation raised by the committee Hahn appointed to study the relationship between student and University was that students and parents considered this issue when choosing an institution to attend. The relationship of the university to student, in loco parentis, was cited as a factor in this decision making process (In Loco Parentis Committee, 1971).

What would a parent and student have found when studying the relationship of Virginia Tech, in loco parentis, with its students? The answer is found in the leadership style of the president of this era. The style was one of establishing clear policies that allowed minimal room for questions and questioning. Rules and guidelines were not ambiguous and judicial reports and visitation violations reports were sent home. Hahn was a president who maintained a clear authoritarian line during an era when both courts and campuses throughout the country were shifting away from strong authoritarian positions.

In loco parentis was driven at Virginia Tech during this era by a president who established, and adhered to, legalistic and clear authoritarian policies and procedures. In an era where the courts declared the philosophical interpretation of in loco parentis legally dead, this particular University was managed by a leader who believed in upholding a cultural tradition with respect for clear lines of authority.

While the culture of the University was broadening and the corps was now voluntary, there remained separate polices for men, women, and cadets. Students

mirrored protest of the decade but rallied strongest over the development of policies concerning visitation. VPI students did not mirror the adamant protest concerning the Viet Nam War and social issues which were prevalent on campuses throughout the country. The limits of VPI student protest and the parameters of student life policies were defined by the president.

Kinnear (1972) observed that a challenge to the culture and authoritarian leadership style of the president was brought on by a new type of student that was attracted to the breadth of programs now offered at VPI&SU. Campus protest was spurned by students attracted to these new programs. The values of these new students conflicted with the institutional culture of an authoritarian parent.

As Gordon had observed (1971), the students of the protest decade were contemptuous of adult values and had a need to express their desire for individual freedom. VPI&SU students of this decade reflected Gordon's (1971) observation.

This decade is perhaps most appropriately summed up by Dr. Guy Hammond, in his closing remarks as the president of the Faculty Senate. It was a decade in

which a culturally driven, yet legalistic presidential interpretation, of in loco parentis had prevailed.

The university is a unique community in many respects. One of its present features is the peculiar form the generation gap takes on the college campus. We who are over thirty sometimes experience difficulty in understanding the young. In our occasional bewilderment, let us remember two things: (1) we are partly responsible for the very peculiar environment in which they must seek to make their own way, and (2) the tensions that we presently experience may seem merely provoking but at best they may be the first step in a creative interaction between the generations. (Hammond, 1970, personal communication, May).

CHAPTER 7

FRAMING THE PRESENT 1988-1992

The 1988-1992 time frame was selected for study in anticipation that these years would lend themselves to viewing the present University philosophy and practice regarding in loco parentis. It was a time period that was marked by the beginning and ending of a presidency. James D. McComas was inaugurated in 1988 and retired effective January 1, 1994. This particular chapter reflects the framing of in loco parentis during the McComas years.

The turbulence of the late 1960s and early 1970s had nearly disappeared and the campus was relatively quiet during the McComas years. There were few exceptions. The most noteworthy cause of turbulence, which resembled the protest of the Hahn years, revolved around protest and anger concerning budget cuts imposed upon higher education within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

McComas is credited with stabilizing the University during a difficult fiscal time and took the

opportunity to express his concern regarding the budget crisis in his closing remarks: "Now is the time for the faculty, students, and staff to rally together to protect the University. Now is the time for the in-state alumni to contact local legislators asking for higher education to be exempt from further cuts" (Spectrum, 1993. p. 8).

The McComas agenda largely revolved around undergraduate education. He is credited with improving undergraduate education through initiatives such as the Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching, attention to academic advising, and his role as an academic advisor to sixteen students (Spectrum, 1993). McComas's attention to valuing student relationships was also evident in his attention to student relationships, in loco parentis.

McComas appointed Dr. Thomas G. Goodale as Vice President for Student Affairs in 1988. McComas and Goodale implemented a philosophical position concerning the University's relationship with its students that valued an adult to adult relationship. Their philosophy toward students was that students were to be valued, nurtured, and cared for within a university

community. This underlying philosophy guided the shaping of University policy during the McComas years.

MISSION

The mission of VPI&SU in 1988 remained faithful to the philosophical foundation of the comprehensive land grant University: instruction, research, and extension (Virginia Tech Bulletin, 1988-89). Reflective of the expansion of the Hahn era, there were 67 departments within 8 colleges (Virginia Tech Bulletin, 1988-89). The student population had grown to 22,000 with approximately 40% women and only 3% of the total student population was represented in the corps (Virginia Tech Bulletin, 1988-89).

VPI&SU framed its philosophical agenda for student behavior as one of recognizing students as adults and encouraged students to make healthy and responsible decisions as members of a University community (Virginia Tech Bulletin, 1988-89). The new president and his vice president for student affairs provided a new organizational structure designed to support students as adult members of the University community.

This new structure was the Dean of Students Office. As noted in previous decades, a Dean of Men and Dean of Women were not new to the university. The mission of the Dean of Students Office implemented at this time was to: "serve as a first line response for student issues of a non-academic nature, work with faculty and staff on these matters, and serve as an advocate for student concerns" (Virginia Tech Bulletin, 1991-92, p. 4). The extent to which the Dean of Students Office served this role will be explored within the next sections.

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

The Code of Virginia framed a significant initiative within the University governance structure. A 1985 change in the Code of Virginia allowed for one or more nonvoting student representatives on Virginia college and university Boards of Visitors (Code of Virginia, 1985). VPI&SU selected a student representative for the Board through a selection process which utilized the Commission on Student Affairs and the Student Affairs Committee of the Board.

The function of the Student Affairs Committee of the Board was described as one of formulating policy related to student services, programs, and quality of student life, primarily through the Division of Student Affairs (Board of Visitors, 1988). The Student Affairs Committee and the Board continued to serve as the final approval process for the University Policies for Student Life. This approval process had become a non issue and was accomplished quietly as compared to the turbulence it caused during the Hahn era.

One initiated change in the University Policies for Student Life in one of two ways. One option followed a process of submitting the policy through the University governance structure and the second option required policy submission through administrative channels (University Policies for Student Life 1992-1993). The administrative channel applicable to student life policies was through the vice president for student affairs. Policy changes were initiated through the administrative channel during this particular time period.

There was one issue which did cause considerable turbulence within the University governance at the

start of this time period. The issue revolved around a proposed policy concerning the showing of x-rated films on campus. Dr. Sandra Sullivan, Vice President for Student Affairs, had opposed the proposed policy which allowed for the showing of x-rated films.

Student advocates of the policy utilized a first amendment argument and gained passage of the policy through the University governance system (Board of Visitors, 1988). Sullivan resigned during this same year and the student press attributed Sullivan's resignation to her opposition to this policy (The Bugle, 1988).

McComas appointed a task force to review the University governance structure. One recommendation led to a significant change in the leadership of the Commission on Student Affairs. Traditionally, this commission was chaired by the vice president for student affairs. The Task Force on University Governance recommended that the vice president serve as the vice chair and that a member of the commission should serve as chair (Report of the Task Force on University Governance, 1991).

Goodale viewed the role of the Commission on Student Affairs and the Commission on Undergraduate Studies as representative of avenues for student participation in governance (Goodale, personal interview, 1993). It was his preference, as vice president, that the Commission on Student Affairs should not be the primary focus of student governance and that the primary governing role should be maintained by the Student Government Association (Goodale, personal interview, 1993).

The Student Government Association did not emerge in the primary governing role per Goodale's preference. Student leadership had a preference for establishing its voice through the Commission on Student Affairs versus looking to the Student Government Association to assume the role as the leader among student organizations. Voter turnout for student government elections continued to be low and was exceeded by voter turnout to elect a Homecoming Court.

The Student Government Association took on an issue which led to change in the University's equal opportunity and affirmative action statement (Collegiate Times, 1990). The student government

leadership shepherded a policy change which added sexual orientation to the nondiscrimination statement (Board of Visitors, 1989).

DEFINITION OF IN LOCO PARENTIS

The Buckley Amendment ended the University's history of sending reports home to parents, parental notification of judicial charges, and parental permission concerning visitation options. In compliance with the 1974 Family Rights and Privacy Act, the university no longer released educational records or personally identifiable information without a student's written consent (University Policies for Student Life, 1992-93). The only exception was information publicly available through the University directory (University Policies for Student Life, 1992-93).

In addition to the Buckley Amendment, the University had also demonstrated compliance with other federal legislation within its policies such as equal opportunity and affirmative action statements,

Americans with disabilities act, and the drug free school act (Janosik, personal interview, 1993). The University is also required by the amendments to the 1992 higher education act to inform victims of violent behavior of the outcome of the judicial hearing (Janosik, 1992).

While external forces seemed to take on a stronger voice concerning the way in which the campus dealt with students, there were internal voices that spoke to the style in which this campus would choose to relate to its students. The University Judicial System was guided by one particular individual during this time period. Dr. Steven Janosik served as Associate Dean of Students and Director of the University Judicial system.

Janosik was the primary architect of the University Policies for Student Life and reported that they remained fairly stable, with minor changes during this time period (Janosik, 1993). The philosophy of the policies as well as the judicial system was one that echoed the mission statement. Student's were responsible for their behavior as well and were held accountable for knowledgeable of University policy.

The majority of cases in the judicial system followed a theme consistent with each of the time periods studied. Violations of the alcohol beverage policy constituted the greatest number of infractions throughout this time period (Janosik, 1992). The number of students referred to the judicial system by student's and/or faculty and staff during this time period included: (a) 1191 students in 1988-89, (b) 1327 students in 1989-90, (c) 1411 students in 1990-91, and (d) 1451 students in 1991-92 (Janosik, 1992).

The guiding assumption of the judicial system was that the relationship between student and university is an educational relationship. A component of the educational process is that a student takes responsibility for one's actions (Janosik, 1993). A student chose between an administrative action hearing which indicated that the student is pled guilty, an administrative hearing, or a committee hearing. One of Janosik's initiatives was involved the training of students as hearing officers.

While a letter was not sent home concerning a judicial hearing, students are encouraged to tell their parents. Although one hoped that it does not occur,

Janosik (1993) encouraged hearing officers to offer this advice in light of future incidents that may of led to a more severe sanction (Janosik, 1993).

Students signed a consent form before any judicial information was be shared and/or discussed with other individuals, including parents.

As stated earlier, the largest number of judicial cases concerned alcohol. For example, in 1990, 11 students were arrested for the manufacture and sale of fake ID's and faced up to 90 days in jail and a \$300 fine (Collegiate Times, 1990). There were a small number of incidents involving illegal substances, other than alcohol.

In 1991, six students were arrested on charges that they took part in a scheme to buy and distribute cocaine (News Messenger, 1991). McComas stated that:

Where illegal drug activities are the exception at this university, no violation will be accepted as a simple reality of today's culture. Virginia Tech will not be a place removed from the responsibility of a larger society. We are encouraged that this is a campus with a commitment to both student rights and student responsibilities. Yet a single act of illegal drug use is one act too many (News Messenger, 1991, p. 1).

A student could have been referred to the judicial system for behavior in violation of university policy, whether the behavior occurred on campus or off campus. The University involvement in incidents off campus reported by community police depended on the offense and the relationship with the police.

The level of University involvement in off campus student behavior reflected the philosophy of an administration that believed that the University had an obligation and a duty to care and to get involved with student behavior (Goodale, personal interview, 1993). The policy during this time period was that the Blacksburg Police notified the Dean of Students Office of incidents in which students were cited off campus. The Dean of Students Office wrote each student and stated University knowledge of the incident. The letter reiterated the expectation of student responsibility for behavior within the entire University community.

The University was involved in writing a local ordinance concerning the size of gatherings in the Town of Blacksburg, or what had become large apartment complex or block parties. Goodale appointed a

town/university task force through the Commission on Student Affairs which worked to develop a town ordinance concerning the size and registration of off campus gatherings (Commission on Student Affairs, 1992).

The issue that was beginning to drive in loco parentis was the issue of campus safety. The issue that most concerned parents was sexual assault (Janosik, 1993). In September of 1991, Goodale (1991) warned students that Blacksburg was not a sanctuary and in conjunction with the University policy theme, encouraged students to take responsibility for their own safety. He was quoted in a Collegiate Times article that reported on alleged incidents of sexual assault involving VPI&SU students.

The tone of University policies and judicial procedures was somewhat legalistic during this time period. Yet, the language also reflected a University attempting to establish an adult to adult relationship with students reminiscent of the language Woods (1991) utilized in defining the concept of in loco familia. This was a shift in the parental controls and structure of the 1964-74 decade to a relationship that involved

concern and caring, articulated by Goodale (1993) and Janosik (1993) during the 1988-1992 time period. How that philosophy is present in the culture of the institution will be explored in the next section.

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

VPI&SU maintained the historical tenets of a comprehensive land grant University within its mission statement but experienced significant change in land grant tradition which had been the cultural glue of the institution: the military lifestyle. The Corps of Cadets maintained a prominent position within the history of the institution but began this time period with only 3% of the total student population within its membership (Virginia Tech Bulletin, 1988-89).

Each president faced the issue of alcohol misuse and each president faced the issue of hazing in the corps. In fact, alleged hazing in the corps was among the first student life issues that McComas and Goodale were forced to deal with. In October of 1988 cadets who were members of the cadet band, the Highty Tighties, were charged with abduction and assault of

one of the corps band members (Collegiate Times, 1988). In March, seven of the cadets were placed on probation and one cadet was expelled (Collegiate Times, 1989).

Gone were the protests concerning policies, such as visitation. First year students were still required to live on campus and had the option of single sex or coed living and options of minimum visitation to a 24-hour visitation option. Articles concerning anger over visitation and living restrictions were replaced with articles concerning safe sex (The Bugle, 1988).

Student protest during this time period focused on issues such as a student NAACP led protest against apartheid (Collegiate Times, 1989) and protest when the Klu Klux Klan came to town. The University administration encouraged the University community as well as residents of Blacksburg to boycott the Klan march and planned a campus ecumenical service on the morning of the march (Board of Visitors, 1991).

The number of women students on campus had grown closer to the number of male students. During this time period, women served as president of the student government, class presidents, student member to the Board of Visitors, and a women served as the regimental

commander of the corps. Denise Shuster, who served as regimental commander, advised women students to "never think you are shut out because you are a woman" (The Bugle, 1988, p. 58).

As has been cited within the earlier sections of this time period, VPI&SU was in the process of attempting to shift from an institutional philosophy of making decisions for students to encouraging students to take responsibility for their own decisions. The student affairs philosophy was not one that spoke to acting literally in loco parentis but indeed was a philosophy that spoke to valuing relationships with students within the university community.

For example, Goodale articulated a student affairs philosophy in which he stated that despite Buckley, the responsibility to care for students does not go away (Goodale, personal interview, 1993). He addressed the commitment of student affairs practitioners to care for and nurture students (Goodale, personal interview, 1993).

The foundation of the University Policies for Student Life discussed in the previous section was a belief that the exercises of individual freedom was to

be accompanied by the acceptance or responsibilities (University Policies for Student Life 1993-94). Individuals living in the community were expected to: (a) respect the rights of others, (b) be responsible for their actions, (c) were obligated to respect authority, (d) be truthful, (e) respect authority, (f) protect private and public property, and (g) uphold federal, state, local, and university regulations (University Policies for Student Life, 1993-94, p. 1).

The policy agenda in the above paragraph framed the parameters of freedom and responsibility for VPI&SU students within the McComas era. A key phrase in this description of freedom and responsibilities is that students are expected to live within the framework of a community. Janosik (1993) conducted research to measure the student perception of community at VPI&SU.

Janosik (1993) reported that men perceived the University community to be significantly more just than did women. This observation concurred with a culture that had a history for framing its standards by and within a male dominated culture. Janosik's (1993) results also suggested that women perceived the campus as a chilly environment within which to learn.

Janosik (1993) suggested that some of the ways to enhance the sense of community would be to encourage women and minorities to participate more fully in all aspects of the campus life and to enforce the institution's rules and regulations in a consistent and fair manner.

At this point in time, there were no separate rules for men and women. Cadets adhered to policies in addition to the University Policies for Student Life and the Greek letter student organizations housed in special purpose on campus housing also had policies in addition to the University Policies for Student Life.

The administration that was interested in nurturing and caring for students within their community was also concerned about the amount of stress the community generated for students. In 1990 Goodale charged a committee to study campus stress. The committee cited five areas as universal sources of stress for college students: (a) separation from family, (b) freedom, (c) competition, (d) peer pressure, and (e) choosing a major (Campus and Student Stress, 1990).

This research demonstrated that while students did not want total removal of stress, they did want support, fairness, and trust in their VPI&SU experience (Campus and Student Stress, 1990). The University continued to respond to this need through establishing guidelines and policies that defined student freedom and responsibilities as members of a community.

In the event that students experienced difficulty, whether in daily campus life or through an incident that might lead them to the judicial system, they were encouraged to seek out assistance. The office that was formed to take on this nurturing and caring role was the Dean of Students Office. This was established through two mechanisms.

First, a professional staff member was on call each day to respond to student or parent need for assistance. Second, the vice president for student affairs appointed the Dean of Students as chair of what he called the 'care team' (Goodale, personal interview, 1993). The care team was convened by the Dean of Students and consisted of the directors of the Counseling Service, Health Service, and Residential

Programs.

Janosik (personal interview, 1993) described the purpose of the care team as to find a sense of balance in the continuum of institutional decision making concerning student crisis. The care team met on a weekly and as needed basis and discussed serious student incidents and developed a response and/or treatment plan. On several occasions, this group decided that it would be in the student's best interest to meet with the parent and student together.

The student culture of this time period was certainly unlike the student culture of the previously studied decade. Student issues were not prevalent and the university entered a phase of a new type of student relationship and philosophy which emphasized a priority of caring for and nurturing students. Goodale (personal interview, 1993) observed that history prevails within institutional culture and this was documented in Janosik's (1993) research concerning campus community.

SUMMARY

The time period began with the inauguration of a new president who placed an emphasis on the teaching mission of a land grant university. In particular, this president focused on the teaching and advising of undergraduate students within a comprehensive research institution.

Federal legislation had an impact on the type of relationship the university could have with students and McComas and Goodale instituted a philosophy which valued a caring and nurturing relationship with students framed within a policy expectation that students would take responsibility for their behavior.

McComas, as did his predecessors, dealt with a student problems concerning alcohol. Unlike Hahn, he was not faced with the protest of students angered by university policy. Students, in small numbers, protested over social issues, and in large numbers, protested with an entire university community angered over budget cuts.

Was in loco parentis legally or culturally driven?
In loco parentis was creeping back within the legal

framework driven by issues such as campus safety yet the university remained bound by the legal framework of the Family Rights and Privacy Act. The culture of VPI&SU was supported by an administration that expected its staff to care for and nurture students and instituted an office to specifically address student and parent concerns.

In loco parentis was alive and well during the McComas era. The vice president for student affairs stated that: "... despite Buckley, the responsibility to care, and to care deeply, does not go away...the parental role will always be there" (Goodale, personal interview, 1993).

CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was designed to describe the shaping of university/student relationship at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI&SU) through the lens of the in loco parentis concept. The questions asked within this historical case study were to what extent has in loco parentis defined the relationship of VPI&SU and its students through the institution's history as framed by: (a) the institution's mission, (b) university governance, (c) definition of in loco parentis, and (d) institutional culture? Has in loco parentis found its sustenance at this institution through legal or cultural justification, or both?

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

VPI&SU provided a rich historical setting to analyze and assess the forces that shaped institutional relationships with parents and students. Case study methodology was utilized to examine in loco parentis within four time periods: (a) Shaping of a Land Grant

University, 1891-1901, (b) Expansion of VPI Post World War II, 1945-1955, (c) Establishing the University, 1964-1974, and (d) Framing the Present, 1988-1992.

Four conceptual categories served as guidelines to analyze the qualitative data collected within each time period: (a) mission, (b) university governance, (c) definition of in loco parentis, and (d) institutional culture. This final chapter will be used to summarize the research in an attempt to address the primary research questions.

MISSION

Kuh, Schuh, Whitt and Associates (1991) described the mission statement as the touchstone of the institution. The mission is a touchstone in that the language provided insight into expectations for behavior as well as the parameters for defining meaning in campus life. This research studied the mission statement and university policy statements published in the VPI&SU catalogues.

Throughout this case study, the touchstone of VPI&SU has been its mission as a land grant university and in particular, the seriousness with which VPI&SU

maintained the directive of the land grant legislation to provide a military lifestyle as an active component of its mission. It was the military lifestyle that guided an authoritarian point of view concerning the institution's relationship with students.

The basis of the authoritarian perspective is found not only in the land grant mission, but in the reality that until the 1950s, the institution had accepted students at the age of sixteen and sometimes younger in the case of siblings. Reflective of early American higher education, most students had left behind a structured and disciplined farming lifestyle to attend college.

The mission of the institution included sweeping statements which spoke to the recruitment of students with upstanding character, democratic ideals, and moral convictions. The mission statement broadened as the institution evolved into a comprehensive research university.

Elements of personal character have been replaced in mission statement verbiage with language that emphasized recruiting the brightest students representing the diversity of the commonwealth. These

students were expected to attend the university prepared to educate themselves concerning university policy and take responsibility for their behavior.

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

University governance was studied to determine how student life policy was developed and implemented. The University was solely governed through an administrative structure until the mid 1960s. Prior to the implementation of University governance in the 1960s, student policy was formed by the President and his Administrative Council.

The individual that most influenced student life policy on a daily basis until the mid 1960s, was the Commandant of Cadets. The president consulted with his Administrative Council, which included the Commandant, and would bring policies and issues before a Board of Visitors that historically did not take on the day-to-day management of the University.

Students began to have a role in governance during the Hahn presidency and loudly disagreed with an administration that had grown accustomed to deciding what was best for students without student input. The

governance structure provided a process for student participation in policy decision making and gave students a vote in what appeared to be a consensus driven process.

Students rarely challenged the decisions of the administrative policy makers in the pre Hahn years. The implementation of a governance structure was one example of a formal step away from granting the university total authority, in loco parentis. The governance structure provided a route which defined a role for student involvement in University decision making. The style of presidential leadership was the most influential factor in determining whether a structure for student involvement was derived by an authoritarian parent or supported a dialogue toward consensus.

DEFINITION OF IN LOCO PARENTIS

Prior to 1960, colleges had the courts' permission to literally act in place of parent. Black's Law Dictionary (1979, Fifth Edition) defined in loco parentis as acting in place of parent and: "charged factiously with a parent's rights, duties, and

responsibilities" (p. 708). This patriarchal legal interpretation kept the courts off campus and put administrators in place of parent on campus.

The military lifestyle offered the structure of the authoritarian parent. As the student body expanded beyond the corps, the corps leadership grew frustrated with policy implementation, or lack thereof, among a civilian student body that could not be as closely controlled. As corps numbers decreased, President Hahn implemented the structure of the Division of Student Affairs which evolved as a means to care for students.

The University dealt with few off campus cases involving in loco parentis. Student judicial cases, whether on campus or off, usually involved alcohol and each president dealt with an incident(s) of hazing within the corps.

The University mirrored campuses throughout the country when it experienced the rebellion of the 1960s. University visitation policies were the target of an angry student body that wanted additional behavioral freedom as well as the responsibility to influence policy. The University's civil case occurred during this era when the campus was required to readmit a

student it had suspended for protest.

The University directly communicated with parents until the passage of the 1974 Family Rights and Privacy Act. President McBryde wrote monthly reports, grades and judicial records were sent home, and parents had authorized permission for visitation options. The University replaced these types of parental contact with a Dean of Students Office charged to be an advocate for parents and students and a 'care team' of staff responsive to student crisis.

Hahn's In Loco Parentis Committee (1972) observed that the parent and student take into consideration the type of relationship a university has with its students when selecting a college to attend. The choice of VPI&SU signified a choice in a southern institution that believed in defining its relationship with students in loco parentis. The depth of the in loco parentis relationship was dependent on the year that the choice was made.

INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE

Institutional culture provided the lens through which to view the rituals and tradition, freedom and responsibility, and the influence of gender within the

culture of VPI&SU. The military culture clearly overshadowed this perspective. It is a shadow largely dominated by a male gendered institution.

The military lifestyle shaped the daily ritual and tradition of the land grant campus to the extent that it dictated what students wore, when and how they ate, and literally, how they walked. The legacy of the military culture was, and continues to be, passed from one cadet generation to the next.

The military lifestyle adhered to a culture that valued a legalistic interpretation of in loco parentis. Rules were not made to be questioned but to be followed. The limits of the military culture began to be challenged with the influx of returning servicemen and were loudly challenged by the students of the 1960s.

Student freedom and responsibility was shaped by the military lifestyle and by an administrative structure until the implementation of a university governance structure. Student freedom and responsibility was defined within the University Policies for Student Life. While avenues existed for student input, the policies as well as the parameters

of freedom and responsibility were predominantly guided and influenced by administrators.

Women were admitted in 1921. Women were assigned a separate set of rules, only allowed in designated classes, and were told that: "when you enter VPI, you are a man" (Guidon, 1946, p. 12). The rituals and traditions were based on a male military culture and women did not begin to become active participants in the culture until the late 1960s and early 1970s. Research as late as 1993 continued to suggest that women found the VPI&SU campus a chilly place within which to learn (Janosik, 1993).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

To what extent has in loco parentis defined the relationship of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and its students through the institution's history as framed by: (a) the institution's mission, (b) university governance, (c) definition of in loco parentis, and (d) institutional culture?

In loco parentis is historically grounded in the legal interpretation provided by the court and was supported within this research by the unique story of a land grant university that had been dominated by the military component of its mission throughout its history. The influential force of presidential leadership within each time period studied provided a view of a University that has defined its role to its students in place of parent.

Presidential leadership emerged as a powerful force in the shaping of the student/University relationship. Presidential leadership was not identified as one of the four conceptual categories in the initial mapping of this research, yet it in retrospect, it was the driving force of the University's relationship to its students in place of parent.

The strength of the president's role can be attributed to several factors. One observation is that the VPI&SU functions within an insular setting. VPI&SU is located in a rural southwest Virginia and is geographically isolated. The isolation of the geographic location is further enhanced by a

decentralized higher education governance structure in Virginia. Each public institution has its own governing Board appointed by the governor and as was evidenced in this study, the Board rarely micromanaged the university and followed an agenda largely structured by the president.

The insularity of VPI&SU was further accentuated by the dominance of a military lifestyle that placed value on strictly adhering to lines of authority. The president was recognized as the campus leader and policy maker. How policy was shaped included the determination of the University's relationship to its students. The insularity of the campus geographically and culturally provided a setting which empowered a patriarchal and powerful style of presidential leadership.

The presidents studied within this research included a president who was literally called father and presidents who created a place for returning servicemen. The third time period was dominated by an authoritarian president who defined limits for a rebellious generation during a time period in which the courts were lessening legal restrictions on campuses.

The fourth time period was the study of a presidential administration who stressed the need to care for and nurture its students.

Has in loco parentis found its sustenance at this institution through legal or cultural justification, or both? In loco parentis was sustained by the legal interpretation provided by the court. In 1913, the court literally gave college's permission to act in place of a student's parent (Gott v. Berea College, 1913). The court further defined student/university relationships in the 1960s through the clarification of student constitutional rights (Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 1960). In loco parentis continued to be nourished through the influence of a litigious society and a multifaceted system of federal and state compliance demands.

While the legal system, in a multifaceted context has defined in loco parentis, the justification for in loco parentis at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University has been provided within a culture unique to this institution. Kuh and Whitt (1988) described culture as being shaped by interaction of people both on and off campus and as reflective of

interaction among institutional history and tradition. The legal system provided a steady and constant external sustenance of in loco parentis and the internal institutional culture provided justification for in loco parentis as told within the history and tradition of VPI&SU.

The culture of VPI&SU provided the backdrop to trace the legal forces which validated in loco parentis on one particular campus. It would be of interest to trace these same legal forces among different types of institutions. While legal framework was helpful in guiding this type of case study research, there were limitations in the structure of the research that could be helpful in guiding future researchers.

A limitation in the structure of the research was in the breadth of the undertaking. Future researchers could benefit from a narrowing in focus and scope. A narrower focus would assist the researcher in looking more closer at details of a particular setting and specific aspects of the university student relationship.

For example, the study of culture is important in researching an institutional story. Culture, as a

construct, presented a challenge in terms of this research. In this study, the breadth of culture as a construct presented a challenge in that the researcher set few limitations on what was to be observed.

One element which was studied was the concept of student freedom and responsibility. This proved important in terms of looking at how students were involved, if at all, in the decision making process concerning policies which affected them. The element which emerged to be of greater importance, although not cited in the initial component of the research, was the role of institutional leadership portrayed by the university president. The presidential papers were rich resources in tracing the historical role of students within the culture of VPI&SU.

Gender was a second issue studied in relation to institutional culture. Gender was interesting to observe and as reported, the institution acted more strongly in loco parentis toward women students than toward male students. Gender in and of itself did not play role in whether in loco parentis was sustained at VPI&SU.

What are the implications for the student affairs practitioner and/or researcher? It was interesting to observe the transition experienced by the student affairs practitioner in relation to in loco parentis. The courts blessed the practice of in loco parentis in a motion that kept the courts off campus and supported the student affairs practitioner in a parent-like role. Student affairs practitioners engaged in a role of care taker and taking the initiative to assist students in their development.

A important transition for the courts and the student affairs practitioner occurred with the assertion of student constitutional rights and the role of the student as an adult. Student affairs practitioners expanded a theoretical base which focused on student development to include the concept of community. The concept of community is inclusive of Woods' (1991) definition of in loco familia which defined a university/student relationship as an adult relationship based on caring and mutual respect.

In loco parentis has been and seems to continue to be driven and sustained by a legal system and the delegation of the enforcement of policy by agencies

external to the institution. The role of institutional culture and the history of implementing policy concerning the university/student relationship has a great deal of importance for the student affairs practitioner. How the student affairs practitioner transfers policy from litigious forces external to the institution is based on whether the student affairs practitioner values a role of care taker or a shared university/student role in building community.

VPI&SU has made a transition from a culture based solely on a military lifestyle to one that is attempting to establish and maintain a relationship caring for students as adults within a university community. Will the trend be to return to a solely authoritarian interpretation of in loco parentis?

Pavella (1992) observed that while the trend has been to move to treat students as adults and have less institutional control, the courts are moving toward expecting universities to take more control for student behavior. He attributes this to a national trend of accountability in that colleges could be held accountable for events on property and activities sponsored by students (Pavella, 1992).

Pavella's (1992) point of view is supported by a legislative trend holding colleges accountable for campus safety issues within policies. Further research concerning the trend toward holding campuses legally accountable would be of interest in comparison to the history of the legal rise and demise of the in loco parentis concept.

Willimon (1993) sadly observed that the modern university is structured in such a way that the chances of faculty and staff befriending students are slim and that detachment is the ruling mode. It has been predicted that the university will not return to a caretaker mode of in loco parentis, yet as has been observed, students have always been in need of generous personal help (Sanford, 1967) to negotiate one's way within a new culture.

This study will close through offering one final analogy of the university/ student relationship.

We cannot reinstitute in loco parentis, yet might it be possible for the university to act as a wise friend? Could it be argued that there is a relationship between good teaching and good parenting? What can we do at the modern university to nurture friendship as the normative means of education? Rejecting in loco parentis has rendered the university a sterilized community, without the diversity we say we crave.

Diversity is the ability to be different, to enjoy one's difference, to stand alone against the crowd if needed, to exercise bold thought and judgement. This may, in great part, be fostered by the values that our elders demonstrated in their lives and teaching (Willimon, 1993).

References

- Alexander, K. & Alexander M. D. (1992). American public school law. (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.
- Alexander, K. & Solomon, E. (1972). College and university law. Charlottesville, VA: Miche.
- Alleged incidents of sexual assault involving Tech students. (1991, September). Collegiate Times. p. 1.
- Anderson, M. L. (1992). Gender and society. Newbery Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Anti-apartheid rally. (1989, March). Collegiate Times. p. 1.
- Appleton, J. R., Briggs, C. M., & Rhatigan, J. J. (1978). Pieces of eight. Portland, OR: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Institute of Research and Development.
- Baldwin v. Zoradi. 176 Cal Rptr. 804 California Court of Appeals. Fifth District (1981).
- Ballou, R. A. & Gregory D. E. (1986). In loco parentis revisited: Is there still a parenting function in higher education? NASPA. 2. 28-32.
- Beach v. The University of Utah. 726 P. 2d 413 Supreme Court of Utah (1986).

Bickel, R. D. (1993). A brief history of the doctrine of "in loco parentis" to characterize the legal relationship of the college to its students and the misperception of its applicability in defining the college's duty to provide a safe learning environment. Paper presented at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Black's Law Dictionary. (1979). (5th ed.). St Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Board of Visitors. (1946, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1946, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1947, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1947, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1949, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1950, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1952, April). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1953, November). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Board of Visitors. (1955, May). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

- Board of Visitors. (1955, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1968, May). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1969, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1969, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1969, September). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1970, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1971, July). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1971, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1988, January). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1988, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

- Board of Visitors. (1989, March). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1989, August). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Board of Visitors. (1991, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Bodell, D. (1993, August 4). Personal interview.
- Bolman L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). In search of community. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; American Council on Education.
- Bradsaw v. Rawlings. 612 F2d 135 United States Court of Appeals (1979).
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition. New York: Harper and Row.
- Burns, W. D., & Klawunn. (1990). Web of caring: An approach to accountability in alcohol policy. Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey.
- Cadet hazing charges. (1988, October). Collegiate Times. p. 1.

Cadets on probation and one expelled. (1989, March).
Collegiate Times. p. 1.

Cannon, H. J., & Cook, T. E. (1965). A note on corps drop-outs. Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1977). Dissent and disruption: Proposals for consideration by the campus. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1974). The academic system in American society. New York, NY: McGraw Hill: Touraine.

Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. (1891-92). Salem, VA: Sentinel Publishing.

Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute. (1896-97). Salem, VA: Sentinel Publishing.

Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute. (1898-99). Danville, VA: Dance Bros. Co., Artistic Printers.

Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute. (1901-02). Lynchburg, VA: J. P. Bell and Co.

Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute College. (1903-04). Lynchburg, VA: J. P. Bell and Co.

Catalogue of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute. (1906-07). Richmond, VA: Chase Picot Printing.

- Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1964-65).
Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing.
- Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1965-66).
Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing.
- Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1966-67).
Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing.
- Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1967-68).
Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing.
- Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1969-70).
Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing.
- Catalogue of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. (1970-71). Blacksburg, VA: VPI&SU Printing.
- Code of Virginia. (1985). Vol 5. 166. 23-9. 2.5. (482).
- College students and the courts. (1977). Ashville, NC:
College Administration Publications.
- Commission on Student Affairs. (1971, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Commission on Student Affairs. (1971, July). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Commission on Student Affairs. (1972, January). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

- Commission on Student Affairs. (1991, October). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Committee on Freshman Year Experience. (1948). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Committee on Student Stress. (1993). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: Division of Student Affairs.
- Commonwealth ex rel. Hill v. McCauley 3 PA C. 77 (1887).
- Cook, T. E. (1968). Some characteristics of 1968 entering freshman as reported on ACE student information form. Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Council of Administration. (1947, January). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Council of Administration. (1949, November). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.
- Creamer, D. G. & Associates. (1990). College student development: Theory and practice for the 1990s. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.
- Dekker, H. (1993, September 23). Personal interview.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education. 186 F.Supp. (1960).

Dwyer, J. O. (1989). An historical look at the freshman year experience. In J. N. Gardner (Ed.), The freshman year experience. (pp. 25-39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Esteban, et al. v. Central Missouri College. 277 F. Supp. 649 (1967).

Ewing v. Board of Regents of University of Michigan. F. Supp 881, United States District Court, E.D. Michigan, S.D. (1982).

Faculty Senate Resolution FS-72-6. (1972, November). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Fass, R. A. & Morrill, R. L. (1986). In loco parentis revisited? Two views of a resurfacing issue. Change. 18. 34-41.

Fioravanti, J. M. (1994). Campus assault scenario: The evolution of the university's duty to protect. Proceedings of the fifteenth annual national conference on law and higher education. (pp. 1-6). Clearwater Beach, Florida. St. Petersburg, FL: Stetson University College of Law.

Fiske, E. B. (1987). Colleges playing larger role in guiding lives of college students. The New York Times. February, 22:1.

Fowler, G. A. (1984). The legal relationship between the American college student and the college: An historical perspective and the renewal of a proposal. Journal of Law and Education. 13. 401-416.

Furek v. The University of Delaware. 595 A 2d 506 (1991).

Gibbs, A. & Henderson, R. M. (1987). The college, the constitution, and the consumer students: Implications for policy and practice. ASHE-Eric Higher Education. 7.

Gibbs, A. & Szablewicz, J. J. (1987). Colleges increasing liability: The new in loco parentis. Journal of Law and Higher Education. 16. 453-465.

Girl of the week. (1946, November). Virginia Tech. p. 2.

Goodale, T. G. (1993, November). Personal interview,

Goffman, E. (1961). Asylums. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Gordon, K. W. (1971). Due process: A swing toward student rights. The Journal of College Student Personnel. 12. 95-101.

Gott v. Berea College. 161 S.W. 204 KY (1913).

Graham v. Montanta State University. 767 P 2d 301 Supreme Court of Montanta (1988).

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Guidon. (1946). Blacksburg, VA: YMCA.

Hammond, G. B. (1993, October). Personal interview.

Harder, M. (1993, November). Personal interview.

Harper, L. J. (1980). Against the odds: Women at VPI. Founders Day. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Hartman v. Bethany College. 778 F. Supp. 286 United States District Court N.D. West Virginia (1991).

Healy v. James. 408 U.S. 169, 92 S. Ct. 2338 (1972).

Hillcrest Regulations. (1948, September). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Honor system prevails at VPI. (1901, May). Virginia Tech. p. 1.

Horowitz, H. L. (1988). Campus life: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the 18th century to the present. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

House, J. S. (1990). Social structure and personality. In M. Rossenberg and R. Turner (Eds.), Social psychology. (pp. 525-561). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

In Loco Parentis. (1971) A synopsis of current readings. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA.

In Loco Parentis Committee. (1971, July). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA.

In Loco Parentis Committee. (1972, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA.

In Loco Parentis Committee Report. (1971). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA.

Interview with Audrey Rentz. (1965, November). Virginia Tech. p. 1.

Janosik, S. M. (1993, December 13). Personal interview.

Janosik, S. M. (1992). A practical guide to the Virginia Tech judicial system. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: Office of the Dean of Students.

Janosik, S. M. (1992). The university judicial system manual. Virginia Polytechnic and State University. Blacksburg, VA: Office of the Dean of Students.

Janosik, S.M. (1992). The university judicial system 1991-1992 annual judicial report. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: Office of the Dean of Students.

Janosik, S. M. (1993). The university judicial system 1992-1993 annual report. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: Office of the Dean of Students.

Janosik, S. M. (1993). Report: Campus community at Virginia Tech. Currents. 1. pp. 41-47.

Johnston, G. B. (1986). Virginia Tech: A portrait. Howell Press.

Joint Senate Resolution n. 24.

Kaplan, W. A. (1978). The law of higher education (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Kaplan, W. A. (1985). The law of higher education (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kinnear, D. L. (1972). The first 100 years: A history of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute Educational Foundation, Inc.
- Kinnear, D. L. (1993, August 23). Personal interview.
- Knight v. State Board of Education et. al. 300 F. Supp 174 (1961).
- Knock, G. H. (1988). The philosophical heritage of student affairs. In A.L. Rentz and G.L. Saddlemire (Eds.), Student affairs functions in higher education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thompson.
- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H. & Whitt, E. J. (1991) Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D. & Schuh, J. H. (1991). The role and contribution of student affairs in involving colleges. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.
- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H. & Whitt, E. J. (1991). Some good news about campus life: How "involving colleges" promote learning outside the classroom. Change. 23. 48-55.
- Kuh, G. D. & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Lavery, W. E. (1993, September). Personal interview.

Leach, H. U. (1993, November). Personal interview.

Maloney, G. W. (1988). Student organizations and student activities. In M.J. Barr (Ed.), Student services and the law. (pp. 284-307). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marzette v. McPhee. 294 F. Supp 562 (1968).

McComas announces retirement. (1993, September). Spectrum. p. 1.

McCracken, G. (1988). The long interview. Qualitative Research Methods Series. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, T. K., & Winston, R. B. (1991). Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing development in higher education. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development, Inc.

Millington, W. G. (1979). The law and the college student. West Publishing.

Moore, L. V. & Upcraft, M. L. (1990). Evolving theoretical perspectives of student development. In M. Barr & M. Upcraft (Eds.), New futures for student affairs. (pp. 41-68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moore v. The Student Affairs Committee of Troy State University. 284 F. Supp 725 (1968).

Movement to unify student body defeated at the polls. (1964, April). Virginia Tech. p. 2.

Mullins v. Pine Manor. 389 M A 449 N.E. 3rd 33 (1983).

Parents must sign for permission for visitation. (1972, January). Collegiate Times. p.2.

Pavella, G. (1992, July 29). Today's college students need both freedom and structure. Chronicle of Higher Education. pp. B1-B2.

Payne, A. C. (1993, August 24). Personal interview.

People ex. rel. Pratt v. Wheaton College. 40 Ill. 186 (1866).

Piazzola v. Watkins. 442 F2d 284 5th Cir (1971).

Pratz v. Louisiana Polytechnic Institute. 316 F. Supp. 872; cert. den 401 U.S. 1004 (1971).

Purdy, R. S. (1993, October 8). Personal interview.

Regulations for Women. (1950, November). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Reidiner, H. F. & Zirkel, P. A. (1986) Is the in loco parentis doctrine dead? Journal of Law and Education. 15. 271-282.

Report of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Increased Student Representation in University Governance. (1971, January). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Report of the Higher Education Study Subcomission. (1965, December). Richmond, VA: General Assembly.

Report of the Special Subcommittee of the Commission of Student Affairs on Tri-Partite Governance. (1971, January). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Report of the Task Force on University Governance. (1991, March). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Robertson, J. M. (1972). V.P.I. historical data book. Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.

Rodgers, R. F. (1990). Recent theories and research underlying student development. In D. Creamer & Associates, College student development: Theory and practice for the 1990s. (pp. 27-79). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Sanford, N. A. (1967). Where colleges fail. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Saunders v. Virginia Polytechnic Institute. 417 F. 2d 1127. United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit (1969).

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Scoggin v. Lincoln University. 291 F. Supp 161 (1968).

Solomon, B. M. (1985). In the company of educated women. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Smoot, R. D. (1993, October 21). Personal interview.

Stamatakos, T. C. (1990). The doctrine of in loco parentis, tort liability, and the student-college relationship. Indiana Law Journal. 65. 471-490.

Statement by James D. McComas, president Virginia Tech, September 28, 1993. (1993, September). Spectrum. p. 1.

Strickland, D. A. (1965). In loco parentis - legal mots and student morals. The Journal of College Student Personnel. 6. 335- 340.

Strickland v. Regents of the University of Wisconsin. 297 F. Supp 416 (1969).

Student Fee Board. (1946, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Student Government Association. (1971, May). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Student Government Association. (1990, September). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Student Life Regulations. (1952). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.

Students are pawns. (1971, September). Collegiate Times. p. 2.

Students placed on probation for conducting poll on dress in the dining halls. (1968, January). Virginia Tech. p. 1.

Students arrested for manufacture and sale of fake ID's. (1990, April). Collegiate Times. p. 1.

Students ask why strike? (1970, May). Collegiate Times. p. 1.

Tech students busted on drug charges. (1971, April). FANYA. p. 1.

Temple, H. D. (1993, August 31). Personal interview.

Temple, H. D. (1993, September 20). Personal interview.

Temple, H. D. (1993). The bugle's echo. Unpublished manuscript.

The Bugle. (1895). Meridan, CN: Meriden Graving Co.

The Bugle. (1897). Nashville, TN: Brandon Printing.

The Bugle. (1902). Lynchburg, VA: Moose Brothers Printing Company.

The Bugle. (1903). Lynchburg, VA: Moose Brothers Printing Company.

The Bugle. (1904). Roanoke, VA: Stone Printing and Manufacturing.

The Bugle. (1947). Lynchburg, VA: Lynchburg Engraving Co.

The Bugle. (1966). Lynchburg, VA: C.W. Warthen Co.

The Bugle. (1973). Winston-Salem, NC: Hunter Publishing Co.

The Bugle. (1988). Winston-Salem, NC: Hunter Publishing Co.

The Grey Jacket. (1897, May). Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. Blacksburg, VA.

Thomas, N. L. (1991). The new in loco parentis. Change. 23. 33-39.

Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District. 393 U.S. 503 506 S. Ct. 733 L. Ed. 2nd 731 (1969).

Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Today's student. (1968, November). Alice. p. 1.

University Council. (1970, February). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

University Council. (1971, May). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

University of Denver v. Whitlock. No. 85 SC391. Supreme Court of Colorado (1987).

University Policies for Student Life. (1969). Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing.

University Policies for Student Life. (1972). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: VPI&SU Printing.

University Policies for Student Life. (1992). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: VPI&SU Printing.

University Policies for Student Life. (1993). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Blacksburg, VA: VPI&SU Printing.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1947, May). Report of the Administration to the Board of Visitors. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1953, November). Report of the Administration to the Board of Visitors. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute. (1970, May). Report of the Administration to the Board of Visitors. Blacksburg, VA: University Archives.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Historical Data. (1974). Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Tech News Bureau.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute Self Study. (1965-66). Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Self Study. (1986-88). Blacksburg, VA: VPI&SU Printing Department.

VPI Bulletin. (1945-46). Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.

VPI Bulletin. (1948-49). Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.

VPI Bulletin. (1949-50). Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.

- VPI Bulletin. (1950-51). Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.
- VPI Bulletin. (1951-52). Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.
- VPI Bulletin. (1953-54). Blacksburg, VA: VPI Printing Department.
- Virginia Tech Bulletin. (1988-89). Blacksburg, VA: VPI&SU Printing Department.
- Virginia Tech Bulletin. (1991-92). Blacksburg, VA: VPI&SU Printing Department.
- Wasson v. Trowbridge. 382 F.2d 807 (1967).
- Wheeler, R. (1993, September). Personal interview.
- Willimon, W. H. (1993). Reaching and teaching the abandoned generation. Christian Century. 10. pp. 1016-1019.
- Winters, R. W. (1985). Metamorphosis of a dream: The history of Appalachian Bible College. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Wood, S. A. (1991). Toward renewed collegiality: the challenge of the 1990s. NASPA. 29. 2-9.
- Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zavela v. Regents of The University of California. 178 Cal Rptr. 185 (1981).

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 3**

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 3**

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 3 of 3**