

A qualitative analysis of historical documents uncovered three "domains" of essential values in student affairs: individual human dignity (with freedom, altruism, and truth), equality, and community (with justice).

The Essential Values of the Profession

Robert B. Young

Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying, and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those that come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we have received it.

--John Dewey (1934, p. 87)

John Dewey's words seem familiar. The American Council on Education's (1986a) 1937 *The Student Personnel Point of View* (SPPOV) opens with the following: "One of the basic purposes of higher education is the preservation, transmittal, and enrichment of culture" (p. 76). The 1949 SPPOV begins, "The central purpose of higher education is the preservation, transmittal, and enrichment of culture" (American Council on Education, 1986b, p. 122). Both documents seem to borrow from Dewey, who made values synonymous with culture. Our values mission is implicit in the opening words of our two most important documents. Thus, a discussion of the essential values of our profession keeps faith with our heritage and that mission.

Values in Student Affairs

Sandeen (1985) explored several historical documents in writing about the values education legacy of student affairs. I used his technique to analyze the historical importance of eight values of the field: aesthetics, altruism, community, equality, freedom, human dignity, justice, and truth. Five documents were analyzed: Clothier's ([1931] 1986) "College Personnel Principles and Functions," Cowley's ([1936] 1986) "The Nature of Student

Personnel Work," the American Council on Education's (1986a, 1986b) 1937 and 1949 SPPOV, and the Council of Student Personnel Associations' (COSPA, [1972] 1986) "Student Development Services in Post-Secondary Education." The list of works was not all-inclusive, nor was the search unbiased. The eight essential values in Young and Elfrink's (1991) study were sought in the five documents in order to determine their historical nature and priority. Conclusions were organized using Spradley's (1979) semantic domain analysis technique and Rokeach's (1973) categorization of terminal and instrumental values. Rokeach defined terminal values as desirable end states and instrumental values as desirable modes of conduct to achieve those end states.

My review uncovered three domains of essential student affairs values, two of which encompassed subordinate instrumental values: human dignity (with freedom, altruism, and truth), equality, and community (with justice). Aesthetics was not mentioned enough to be included with the others. The values of human dignity and community were ordered along a continuum from the individual to the broader society, respectively, with equality reflecting aspects of both.

Human Dignity

Young and Elf rink (1991) defined human dignity as the inherent worth and uniqueness of an individual. While the label is contemporary, the definition fits one of the most important historical values of the student affairs profession.

Clothier ([1931] 1986) defined student affairs work as a systematic intervention to promote an individual's development of body, mind, and character. He emphasized the individual because the principle of individual differences was a fundamental tenet of student affairs work. Five years later, Crowley ([1936] 1986) used this definition and four others to illustrate the emphasis of our field on the individualization of education. Although Crowley thought that these definitions were too "inclusive," he still defined the personnel point of view as a 'philosophy of education which puts emphasis upon the individual' (p. 69). By 1949, the emphasis was shifting to the individual in social situations. The 1949 SPPOV begins with a list of three new social goals for higher education. However, it notes that these goals still "affect positively the education and development of each individual student" (American Council on Education, 1986b, p. 122).

Freedom: The Instrument of Individualism. The 1949 SPPOV declared that the student is a responsible participant in his or her own development and not a passive recipient of knowledge and skills. The document linked individual development with responsibility; freedom must be disciplined for the fulfillment of human dignity. This point was driven home in the COSPA ([1972] 1986, p. 392) statement, which declared as its primary assumption

that "human beings express their life goal as becoming free, liberated, [and] self-directed." COSPA defined student development as the process by which individuals gain increasing mastery of their own self-direction and fulfillment, thus seeming to consider freedom an end and a means, a product and process of student development.

COSPA indicated that the movement of students toward self-direction should be facilitated by student affairs professionals whose own freedom was enhanced in their graduate preparation programs. COSPA seems to imply that the personal experience of freedom is necessary for student affairs professionals to model this value for students, another indication of the instrumental nature of this value.

Altruism to Free Human Dignity. The relationship between the student affairs professional and students is described in all of the major documents of the field, but it is delineated best by Clothier ([1931] 1986). He stated that the worth of a student affairs professional was determined by his or her sincere and intelligent interest in the individual student. He linked this interest to truth and freedom when he wrote that the student affairs professional had to know each student fully in order to help him or her, and that each student was free to reject the counsel of the professional. The relationship was altruistic, not dictatorial. This was reaffirmed in the 1949 SPPOV, which declared that skilled student affairs professionals (specifically, counselors) must stimulate self-understanding without directing decisions.

The 1949 SPPOV related altruism to social service as well as to the relationship between professional staff and students. Altruism thus became a goal of education: Students should learn how to contribute to the improvement of society. Still, this goal seems connected to the student affairs value of human dignity. Colleges were supposed to fulfill their "broad responsibilities for aiding in the optimum development of the individual (emphasis added) in his relations to society" (American Council on Education, 1986b, p. 126).

Truth: The Instrument of Freedom and Human Dignity. Student affairs exists, in part, to define "truth" more broadly than do academicians. We have connected "faithfulness to fact" with the self-realization of students, not just their intellectual development. The COSPA statement declared that knowledge of self and environment constitutes not just ideas but the basis of teaching. Earlier, the 1949 SPPOV stated that teaching must include social, moral, and physical concerns as well as intellectual ones.

Each student needs full information in order to develop fully, both outside and inside the classroom. Student affairs has provided some of that information through vocational and instructional research. In 1931, Clothier stated that colleges should make full information available to students about different vocations and help students evaluate their aptitudes and interests in light of that information. The placement function of student affairs was

related to a broadly conceived value of truth that was implemented through an altruistic relationship.

The importance of instructional research is apparent in these historical documents. As Clothier ([1931] 1986, p. 14) stated, "The college must recognize that research is an integral part of its [student affairs] work." Cowley ([1936] 1986, p. 56) noted that this function was primary after World War I and many still believed that the field was "nothing more than personnel research." Personnel research included instructional research because nobody else was doing it. The 1937 SPPOV recommended cooperation between student affairs professionals and instructors on the premise that instructors needed full information to individualize the education of students. Our efforts at research provided fuller truths to serve human dignity in the classroom.

Evolution of Equality

The emphasis of equality has shifted from individuals to groups. "Having the same rights, privileges, or status" was applied first to holistic education. Later, it included underrepresented groups in higher education.

Equal Abilities. The notion of individual dignity is closely connected with a holistic view of truth, declared as an appreciation of individual differences beyond the intellectual. Cowley's ([1936] 1986, p. 69) summary definition of our field put emphasis "upon the individual student and his all-round development as a person rather than upon his intellectual training alone."

The 1937 SPPOV mentioned not only the intellectual capacity of students but also their emotions, physical conditions, social relationships, vocational skills, moral and religious values, economic resources, and aesthetic appreciations. The 1949 SPPOV was more succinct, limiting the discussion to physical, social, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual characteristics. Regardless of the exact characteristics, the student was to be considered a whole, with equal attention paid to all attributes. As Clothier ([1931] 1986, p. 15) stated, "We are interested in the individual student's development, not in any one phase of his program such as scholarship, intellect, leadership, but from the aspect of his whole personality. We are concerned with all those methods and the procedures which bring influences to bear upon him "of whatever nature."

The historical documents mandate action on behalf of equality. Clothier believed that every agency within the college had to know the diversity of student characteristics and use that knowledge to improve student success during and after college. Cowley ([1936] 1986) viewed such admonitions as the "torch" of progressive education that our profession carried to faculty who considered only the student's mind. Thus, Cowley retraced our path of values to Dewey.

Equal People. President Truman's Commission on Higher Education emphasized the importance of good citizenship as a goal of education (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1948). It recommended the expansion of higher education opportunities for more citizens, eventually assisting the community college movement in the United States. The 1949 SPPOV reflected the goals of that report, thus our value of equality began to include different social groups. That SPPOV makes indirect allusions to disadvantaged groups in society, whom socially conscious students were supposed to help. The only direct expressions concern the staffing of student affairs offices. The 1949 SPPOV stated that competent male and female counselors should be available to students who preferred to consult with a man or a woman.

Most of these historical documents antedate recent social movements. For example, contemporary authors (for example, Hammond, 1981; Sandeen, 1985) have discussed the impact of civil rights on the student affairs profession. The COSPA ([1972] 1986, p. 392) statement indicated that professionals bear responsibility toward the "broad spectrum of persons who can profit from post-secondary education," presumably without bias, because "the potential for development and self-direction is possessed by everyone" (p. 393). The COSPA statement contains another interesting and more specific declaration about equal people. One of its keystones is that "students are viewed as collaborators with the faculty and administration" (p. 391), putting to rest in *loco parentis* during the last year's of student activism.

Community and One of Its Instruments, Justice

Roberts (this volume) notes that community has always been a value of the student affairs profession. The 1949 SPPOV stated that "the development of students as whole persons interacting in social situations is the central concern" (American Council on Education, 1986b, p. 122) of student affairs, but the document focused more on individual than on social relationships.

Cowley ([1936] 1986) contrasted relationships between students and business officers, faculty, and student affairs professionals. Business relationships were essentially impersonal, instructional relationships focused on instruction, and student affairs relationships consisted of all other activities related to personal development. Thus, personal empowerment (half of the definition in Young and, 1991) was a distinctive purpose of student affairs relationships in the campus community.

Both the 1937 and the 1949 SPPOV focused on campus community with limited additional references to broader communities. They listed functions related to the development of campus community and described the need for collaboration among student affairs officers and others to create campus community.

The 1949 SPPOV listed eleven student needs that require "opportunities for intensive classroom teaming supplemented by many of the major elements of community living. Students live, work, make friends, have fun, make financial ends meet-all within the community of scholars" (American Council on Education, 1986b, p. 126). One need is orientation to the college environment, so that students "feel at home" (p. 127). Admissions and orientation functions are listed under this need, the same student affairs functions that received first mention in the 1937 SPPOV. Another need in the 1949 SPPOV is "a sense of belonging to the college" (p. 128). Students must find a role in relation to others that will make them feel valued, contribute to their feelings of self-worth, and contribute to a feeling of kinship with

others--in other words, they need to be empowered through community. The 1937

SPPOV extended the value of community beyond the campus.

Student affairs had to help college graduates understand the "social, recreational, and cultural interests of the community. Such concern implies their willingness to assume those individual and social responsibilities which are essential to the common good" (American Council on Education, 1986a, p. 83). As noted earlier, the 1949 SPPOV reflected the goals of the Truman Commission on Higher Education to improve citizenship education after World War II. Good citizenship was an obligation of all graduates.

The 1937 SPPOV urged cooperation among student affairs officers on individual campuses and nationally. This might reflect Cowley's (1936/1986) influence on that document. He closed his essay with an opinion that personnel officers should be working together at local and national levels. He added that such cooperation required an appreciation of the unity 'of the diverse functions of our field. The 1937 SPPOV advocated national cooperation and leadership, noting the development of professional associations for student affairs administrators and counselors. This-extension of our professional community across campuses was evident in Young and Elfrink's (1991) findings about community.

Cowley's document distinguished between the student personnel point of view and student personnel work. The personnel point of view reminded everyone on campus, especially faculty, of the need to mutually empower students. Each of the historical documents contains advice for faculty. While our field reacted against their focus on intellectual truth, it also sought their cooperation in holistic individual development. Specifically, Cowley related our efforts in instructional research to the empowerment of faculty. Few faculty were prepared to research student characteristics, even though it would have increased their effectiveness as teachers. The 1937 SPPOV made the same comment, perhaps because of Cowley's participation in that project.

As noted earlier, COSPA ([1972] 1986, p. 391) declared that students were "collaborators" with faculty and administrators in the process of learning. This reflected the value of equality and it took the value of

community as mutual empowerment to a new level. The 1949 SPPOV stated only that students could make "significant contributions" (American Council on Education, 1986b, p. 138) to the development of effective student affairs programs.

Current wisdom links justice with individualist values such as freedom and truth (for example, Kohlberg, 1969; Rickard, this volume). Although justice (through discipline) is connected to individual human dignity in the historical documents of student affairs, it seems more properly connected to the value of community. This is its apparent priority; it is not disconnected from either the individual or the group. The 1937 SPPOV stated that the goals of discipline are that 'the individual will be strengthened, and the welfare of the group preserved" (American Council on Education, 1986a, p. 78).

Rhatigan (1978) wrote that there was almost no chapter on discipline in *Pieces of Eight* (Appleton, Briggs, and Rhatigan, 1978), a book about chief student affairs officers. He argued that our field did not understand the central, values education purposes of one of its original functions. The 1937 SPPOV affirmed the fact that the first student affairs officers were appointed to relieve administrators and faculties of discipline problems. However, this statement did not address the goal of discipline, the value(s) that it might serve. The historical documents in this review made few references to those purposes of discipline.

While discipline is a justice function, the 1949 SPPOV related it to student development as well. The value of upholding moral and legal principles is connected to "an educational function, designed to modify personal behavior patterns and to substitute socially acceptable attitudes for those which have precipitated unacceptable behavior" (American Council on Education, 1986b, p. 133). Discipline was considered a special case of counseling for the development of responsible behavior, not simply punishment for misbehavior. This seemed to fit the values conception of empowerment within the campus community. It also elevated our discipline activities above legal interests, to the moral plane.

The historical documents related the value of justice to activities other than discipline. For example, Clothier ([1931] 1986) noted that the college should not select students with negligible chances for success. The 1949 SPPOV said that students deserved teaching and courses that fit their characteristics and the purposes of the curriculum. These suggestions related fairness to the actions of the campus community. Students needed just treatment in order to be empowered by the college.

Case for Aesthetics

Few student affairs professionals today would include aesthetics in a list of their essential values (Young and Elfrink, 1991), and few references were made to aesthetics in the documents reviewed here. Aesthetic appreciations

were listed with the other holistic interests of students in the 1937 SPPOV. That document also described a need for "creative imagination" (American Council on Education, 1986a, p. 76), potentially an aesthetic concern. Aesthetics received indirect recognition in two of the eleven areas of student needs that were listed in the 1949 SPPOV. the understanding and use of emotions, and the development of lively and significant interests. In sum, however, aesthetics did not seem to be an essential value in the historical documents reviewed. It is an important value, but considerable discussion needs to occur before aesthetics can be accepted as an essential value of student affairs (see Young, this volume, Chapter Five; Young and Elfrink, 1991).

Evolving Nature of Values

This review of historical documents revealed the primacy of three values in student affairs: human dignity, which involved the instrumental values of freedom, altruism, and truth; equality; and community, which involved the instrumental value of justice. Individual human dignity seemed to be the most essential historical value, given the commentary about it and the support from other values. Equality underwent a transition from the individual to the group. Community focused on students in the campus setting, but it contained hints of a nascent professional community of student affairs administrators.

Our values seem somewhat different today. Factors such as cultural diversity have affected them. This evolution is only natural because internal and external factors always change values priorities (Morrill, 1980). Such changes mandate further review of the essential values of student affairs. Which are eternal and which are ephemeral? How can we use our values well? The other chapters in this volume seek answers to these questions.

References

- American Council on Education. "The Student Personnel Point of View." In G. Saddleire and A. Rentz (eds.), *Student Affairs: A Profession's Heritage*. Media Publication No. 40. Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association, 1986a. (Originally published 1937.)
- American Council on Education. "The Student Personnel Point of View." In G. Saddleire and A. Rentz (eds.), *Student Affairs: A Profession's Heritage*. Media Publication No. 40. Alexandria, Va.: American Council Personnel Association, 1986b. (Originally published 1949.)
- Appleton, J., Briggs, C., and Rhatigan, J. (eds.). *Pieces of Eight*. Portland, Oreg.: National Institute for Research and Development, 1978.
- Clothier, R. C. "College Personnel Principles and Functions." In G. Saddleire and A. Rentz (eds.), *Student Affairs: A Profession's Heritage*. Media Publication No. 40. Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association, 1986. (Originally published 1931.)
- Council of Student Personnel Associations. "Student Development Services in Post-Secondary Education." In G. Saddleire and A. Rentz (eds.), *Student Affairs: A Profession's Heritage*. Media Publication No. 40. Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association, 1986. (Originally published 1972.)

- Cowley, W. H. "The Nature of Student Personnel Work." In G. Saddleire and A. Rentz (eds.), *Student Affairs: A Profession's Heritage*. Media Publication No. 40. Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association, 1986. (Originally published 1936.)
- Dewey, J. *A Common Faith*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1934.
- Hammond, E. "The New Student-Institutional Relationship: Its Impact on Student Affairs Administration." *NASPA Journal*, 1981, 19 (2), 17-21.
- Kohlberg, L. "Continuities and Discontinuities in Childhood and Adult Moral Development." *Human Development*, 1969, 12, 93-120.
- Morrill, R. *Teaching Values in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy: *The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education*. New York: HarperCollins, 1948.
- Rhatigan, J. "There Was Almost No Chapter on Discipline." In J. Appleton, C. Briggs, and J. Rhatigan (eds.), *Pieces of Eight*. Portland, Oreg.: National Institute for Research and Development, 1978.
- Rokeach, M. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Sandeen, A. "The Legacy of Values Education in College Student Personnel Work." In J. C. Dalton (ed.), *Promoting Values Development in College Students*. Monograph Series No. 4. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1985.
- Spradley, J. P. *The Ethnographic interview*. Troy, Mo.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1979.
- Young, R. B., and Elfrink, V. L. "Essential Values of Student Affairs Work." *Journal of College Student Development*, 1991, 32 (1), 47-55.

ROBERT B. YOUNG is associate professor and leader of the graduate program in higher education and student personnel at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.