



Journal of Student Affairs at New York University

Volume XI|2015



Journal of Students Affairs at New York University

Volume XI|2015

EDITOR IN CHIEF - Melissa Gudiel

CONTENT EDITOR - Lydia Keema

COPY EDITOR - Daniel Wencek

PRODUCTION EDITOR - Brittany Bummer

DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLICITY MANAGER - Annie Le

INTERNAL EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD

Ana Angeles, 2015

Matt Banks, 2016

Ariel Bloomer, 2016

Alana Crosby, 2016

Amanda De La Torre, 2015

Dan N Erosa, 2016

Amanda Holda, 2016

Angie Kim, 2016

Gerasimos Kokkinos, 2015

Kristyne Merritt, 2016

Hannah K Pingelton, 2016

Valory Price, 2016

Kaitlyn Roos, 2015

Dinah Smithey, 2016

Isabel Solano Robles, 2016

Caitlin Williams, 2016

EXTERNAL EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD

Steven Baker, Recruitment Specialist, NYU Abu Dhabi

Patricia Carey, Associate Dean, Student Services and Public Affairs, NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development; Associate Vice Provost for Diversity Programs, NYU

Erin Carlisle, Residence Program Coordinator, Non-Degree and International Programs, Columbia University

Daniel Esquivel, Student Success Specialist, Office of the Vice President, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Lesley Heffel McGuirk, Assistant Director of Alumni Affairs, Office of Alumni Affairs, Yale Law School

Lauren Jordan, Alumna, NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Krista Kohlmann, Program Coordinator, Student Involvement, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Andrew LaVenia, Student Affairs Officer, Office of Student Affairs and Admissions, NYU College of Nursing

Marc A. Lo, Program Associate and PhD Candidate, NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Chris Mosier, Assistant Director of Residence Life, Marymount Manhattan College

Jossie Muñoz, Alumna, NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Zaneta Rago, Director, Center for Social Justice Education and LGBT Communities, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Staci Ripkey, Assistant Dean, Student Affairs and Academic Support Services, NYU College of Dentistry

Buffy Stoll Turton, Director of New Student Programs, Miami University

Debbie Yunker Kail, Executive Director, Hillel Jewish Student Center, Arizona State University

FACULTY ADVISORS

Michael Sean Funk, Ed.D.

Gregory Wolniak, Ph.D.

Cover Photos Courtesy of NYU Office of Interactive Media

MISSION

MISSION JoSA is an annual peer reviewed journal that explores the field of student affairs and addresses contemporary issues and current trends among professionals in higher education. As a student-run publication, JoSA aims to highlight research and scholarship that further develops the practice of student affairs and are of particular relevance to professionals throughout higher education.

EDITORIAL BOARD

The Editorial Board of the Journal of Student Affairs at New York University consists of graduate students in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program in the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development at New York University. The Board has been established to coordinate and carry out all editorial functions for the Journal and to ensure the continuity of future publications. The Editorial Board of the Journal of Student Affairs at New York University promotes the submission of articles that address issues of critical interest to the NYU community and among the larger community of higher education and student affairs professionals. Articles that explore topical issues, suggest innovative programming, and embark upon original research are encouraged. The opinions and attitudes expressed within the Journal do not necessarily reflect those of the Editorial Board.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would also like to acknowledge our sponsors as well as the individuals that make up these departments and organizations for their vision, leadership, dedication, and passion for higher education and student affairs—all which make this publication possible:

NYU Association of Student Affairs Professionals

Leadership Board, 2013-14

Scott Gautney, Executive Chair

Leah McNally, Treasurer

Brittany Bummer, Secretary/Communications Chair

Briget Arndell, Professional Development Chair

Ana Angeles, Academic Support and Advocacy Chair

Byron Tsabetsaye, Social Chair

Capria Berry, Social Justice and Community Service Chair

Hillary Webb, Part-Time Chair

Blaise Baldonado and Jen Maurer, Recruitment and Orientation Co-Chairs

Leadership Board, 2014-2015

Mandy Lancour, Executive Chair

Alana Crosby, Treasurer

Gabrielle Lloyd, Secretary/Communications Chair

Angie Kim, Professional Development Chair

Brendan Wright, Academic Support and Advocacy Chair

Arianna Deans, Social Chair

Amari Boyd, Social Justice and Community Service Chair

Amanda Holda, Part-Time Chair

Ana Reynolds and Yushin Wung, Recruitment and Orientation Co-Chairs

NYU Office of the Vice President for Global Student Affairs

Marc Wais, Vice President for Global Student Affairs

Tom Ellett, Senior Associate Vice President, Student Affairs

Carlo Ciotoli, Associate Vice President, NYU Student Health - GNU; Executive Director, Student Health Center

Christopher Bledsoe, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs; Director of Athletics, Intramurals & Recreation

Monroe France, Assistant Vice President for Student Diversity; Director of the Center for Multicultural Education and Programs

Allen McFarlane, Assistant Vice President for Outreach and Engagement

Zoe Ragouzeos, Associate Vice President, NYU Student Mental Health - GNU; Director, Counseling & Wellness

Trudy Steinfeld, Assistant Vice President & Executive Director, Wasserman Center for Career Development

Elizabeth Kuzina, Chief of Staff

NYU Steinhardt Department of Administration, Leadership & Technology

Colleen Larson, Department Chair

Gary Anderson, Program Director, Educational Leadership

Ann Marcus, Program Director, Higher and Postsecondary Education

Jan Plass, Program Director, Educational Communication and Technology

NYU Steinhardt Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs

Toni Gifford, Visiting Assistant Professor of Higher Education

Martha J. Kanter, Distinguished Visiting Professor of Higher Education and Senior Fellow

Ann Marcus, Professor and Director of The Steinhardt Institute of Higher Education Policy

Matt Mayhew, Associate Professor of Higher Education

Teboho Moja, Clinical Professor of Higher Education

Bridget O'Connor, Professor of Higher Education and Business Education

Frances Stage, Professor of Higher Education

Gregory Wolniak, Clinical Associate Professor of Higher Education and Director, Center for Research on Higher Education Outcomes

NYU Steinhardt Office of the Associate Dean for Student Affairs

Patricia M. Carey, Associate Dean

Linda Chin, Assistant Director, Undergraduate/Graduate Academic Advising

Belkis Baez, Student Advisor

David Zapotocky, Director, Registration Services

Jacqueline McPhillips, Director, Community College Transfer Opportunity Program

Jeanne Bannon, Director, Counseling and Student Services

Justine Kelly-Fierro, Assistant Director for Student Services

Nija Leocadio, Graduate Student Services Counselor

Jill Stephenson, Student Services Counselor - International/Diversity

Tanya Gary, Executive Assistant to the Associate Dean

John Myers, Director of Enrollment Management

Yvette Brown, Associate Director of Graduate Admissions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter from the Editor, Melissa Gudiel	8
The Experiences of Black Women in Student Conduct Administration, Ceceilia Parnter	9
Developing a Successful Doctoral Advising Relationship: An Abridged Review of Literature, Susan Allen Namalefe	15
The Campus Guide for Welcoming Companion Animals, Jason Bewley	20
Hegemonic Masculinity as a Barrier to Student Success in College Men, Joshua L. Moermond	24
Guidelines for Authors	29

Welcome to the eleventh edition of the Journal of Student Affairs (JoSA) at New York University

As I reflect back on all the hard work, patience and dedication that was put into this process, I am filled with excitement and honor in being able to present this year's edition. In the past, JoSA has undergone many changes with the goal of improving the presence and contribution of the journal within the field of student affairs. This year, we came together as a board and focused on adhering to the mission and professional development opportunities that were introduced by the previous board. For us, the goal was to establish a sense of consistency within JoSA so that in having a strong and clear process, we would ensure the sustainability of the journal for years to come. We started by assessing how each manuscript fit within JoSA's mission, particularly when deciding how a manuscript addressed a contemporary issue or current trend and how it could inform future practices. With the wonderful support of our faculty advisor, Dr. Greg Wolniak, we also continued the academic writing workshop for students in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at NYU. The workshop proved once again to be successful in encouraging our peers to develop or engage in research and provided valuable advice on how to seek publishing opportunities. In order to continue with the forward momentum, we also decided to interview and elect the new board earlier than previous years, so that we are able to come together and assist in the transition.

None of the success of the journal would have been possible without the wonderful and committed Executive Editorial Board: Lydia Keema, Daniel Wencek, Annie Le, and Brittany Bummer. Working with all of them this past year has been an absolute pleasure and I want to express my gratitude for all of the time and work they put in to complete this publication. They consistently approached their roles with enthusiasm and were willing to provide their insight on ways to improve the journal and be an effective team. I would also like to thank our amazing faculty advisors, Dr. Gregory Wolniak and Dr. Michael Funk, who were always available to support us at different points throughout this year; we have truly learned a lot from you both and hope that you can continue to support this journal. Finally, I would like to thank the hard work of both the internal and external editors, who supported our authors and provided their valuable feedback to ensure the high quality of this year's edition. Being part of such an amazing endeavor has once again ignited my own appreciation for research and I hope that as you read this edition, you find yourself wanting to continue learning, to continue exploring and to continue discussing how as student affairs professionals, we can better support the students we work with and whose success we genuinely desire. On that note, it is with great pleasure I introduce to you, on behalf of the 2014-2015 Executive Editorial Board, editors and authors, the eleventh edition of the Journal of Student Affairs at New York University.

Melissa Gudiel
Editor-in-Chief

The Experiences of Black Women in Student Conduct Administration

Ceceilia Parnther

Western Michigan University

Abstract

This literature review will explore the experiences of Black women in student conduct administration. While there is limited literature on the topic, the paper will provide a historical overview of Black women in student conduct roles, review scholarship on Black women in higher education administration and student affairs, and conceptualize the topic of interest as introduced by the Association on Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) (Jones, King, Roscoe, Scales, and Vasquez Barrios, 2014). Using the framework suggested by Mary Howard Hamilton (2003), this review evaluates the literature through the lenses of critical race theory and Black feminist thought. The field of student conduct has changed to be developmental, restorative, and inclusive, while continuing to grapple with the intersections of power, privilege, and community building. The administration of student conduct issues is not immune to the civility issues currently prevalent throughout the nation. Differences in experiences and perception demand visible representation when dealing with issues of student conduct. Retention of Black women in student conduct positions is essential to ensure role modeling of career pathways, opportunities for mentorship, and to create an inclusive environment for student participants. The literature reveals the experiences Black female administrators face while navigating student conduct roles. Societal racism, campus climate, sexism, microaggression, mentorship, and leadership pathways are identified.

Introduction

Black feminist thought aligns with the more recent paradigm of intersectionality. Collins (2001) supports this designation noting that for Black women, it is impossible to separate the two identity markers of race and gender. These intersections permeate the field of student affairs for students, and those who are in service to students.

Black feminist thought emerged as a distinct perspective born out of the feminist movement during the Civil Rights Movement (Pasque & Errington Nicholson, 2011). During this time, it became apparent that Black women “faced a unique set of issues that were not being addressed by the predominantly White feminist movement” (Pasque & Errington Nicholson, 2011 p.7). The lack of Black voices contributing to majority feminist efforts failed to address issues of human rights for Black women, an increased need to create theories and perspectives representing the shared experiences of Black women.

The recruitment and retention of Black women in student conduct administration is necessary in higher education. Issues of incivility, academic misconduct, campus conflict, and crime demand coordinated, culturally mindful, and educationally based responses to behaviors that threaten the academic community. Understanding the experiences of Black women in student conduct administration emerges as an opportunity for exploration in an effort to create a sustainable pathway for diverse perspectives. Nance (2006) values the importance of the Black female narrative, contending “the experiences of African American women are different from those of other women and those of African American men is steeped in the historical progression and ideology of Black people in the United States” (Nance, 2006. p. 19). This review will use Black feminist thought to provide a context for the experiences of Black women in student conduct roles. Scholarship on Black women in higher education administration and student affairs will also provide the framework for this analysis.

Conceptual Framework

There are unique shared experiences and perceptions of Black women that inform research

(Collins, 2001). Although the group does not define themselves as homogeneous, their collective responses may represent a common level of understanding, often grounded in an understanding of systemic oppression (Collins, 2001). Recent research moves away from race based literature to include a multiplicity of identities including class, gender identity and expression, and religious privilege. Black feminist thought was an early adopter of this notion, naming the realities intersecting of race and gender. While cognizant of multiplicity, Black feminist thought focuses on the renaming of experiences first through a Black, female lens (Collins, 2001). This designation is important, as some contend that combining additional identities take away from the realities of the experiences of Black woman. This is seen in various social movements, as womanhood was set aside to add strength to racial conflict arguably to the detriment of the Black female experience (Collins, 2001; Howard Hamilton, 2003). Alternatively, the Black Feminist movement emerged from the perception that feminism in the era of civil rights focused on the needs of white women, standing in unity only when a critical mass was necessary (Pasque & Errington Nicholson, 2011). As a result, intersectionality is observed after acknowledging and placing value of the experience, which is both Black and female (Collins, 2001).

One cannot use Black Feminist thought without linking the principles to critical race theory (CRT). Based in a foundation of law, CRT is a response to the racism and oppression that is normalized in Black culture and as a result, coping mechanisms to deal with these practices are systemic, sometimes unconscious, and often inherent (Pyke, 2010).. CRT provides a space from which minority perspectives and theories are valued independent of and altered by the systemic struggle of race-based oppression (Ladson Billings & Tate IV, 1995). Opinions that ignore these viewpoints have created systems with consequences for underrepresented populations, which persist today (Ladson Billings & Tate IV, 1995). The inception of CRT is both radical and political, providing a scholarly response to legal and academic directives, which have excluded or misrepresented minority voices in the creation of scholarship (Ladson Billings & Tate IV, 1995). The historically legal underpinnings of CRT are well suited to the

student conduct profession, as administrators are charged with the balance of matters of law with student development.

Black feminist thought compliments the CRT, by acknowledging the oppression, but also naming the experiences specifically as Black women. This renaming honors intersectionality and gives voice to experiences in an intentional context (Claybourne & Hamrick, 2014). In this framework, the role of the administrator as a professional within the system is examined. Additionally, the perceived responsibility or “race uplift” of Black women in various roles is evident within student affairs (Claybourne & Hamrick, 2014). By focusing attention on the experiences of this group within the frameworks of CRT and Black feminist thought, we add to the current literature in a way that has not been done previously.

Systemic Issues and Workplace Satisfaction

Myrtis Hall Mosely (1980) first identified the need for understanding the experiences of Black women as administrators in the postsecondary setting. She described the experience as riddled with challenges including invisibility, lack of mentorship, racism, and sexism. Mosely (1980) suggests that these barriers threaten the recruitment and retention of Black women in higher education administration. Mosely’s (1980) work was the impetus for later study of Black women in higher education. Using narratives of women of color, Jean Marie and Lloyd Jones (2011) note that despite an environment primed for critical discourse on diverse issues, Black women continue to be affected by the “struggle for space and position in a white hegemonic system” (p.141). This systemic struggle is as personal as it is professional. In student conduct, administrators “grapple with how to respond to the ills of society while at the same time convincing students that these ills may be overcome” (Waryold & Lancaster, 2008, p.11). Black women in particular are faced with representing race and gender when acting in these professional roles.

Differences in satisfaction are evident between Black men and women in the field. Mosely (1980) identified a lack of perceived solidarity as dangerous to the retention of Black female administrators. In her study, Black female administrators perceived feelings akin to

abandonment when describing relationships with both Black male counterparts and subordinates. Singh, Robinson, and Williams Green (1995) conducted a study of 454 participants finding that the experiences of Black women administrators at predominately-White institutions (PWI's) are less satisfactory than Black males in comparable roles, citing isolation, racism, and sexism as factors in dissatisfaction. The study identified specific differences in the experiences of these two groups at different professional levels within four institutions. The study noted that "in general, African American women in the sample perceived more inequity in all aspects of higher education than the men" (Singh, Robinson, & Williams Green, 1995, p.405). The study also suggests a general dissatisfaction for institutions and organizational climate (Singh, Robinson, & Williams Green, 1995). Mary Howard Hamilton (2003) focuses her attention on African American females, suggesting a need for greater representation of Black females in leadership positions. Student conduct offices are often highly visible and political due to the administration of the campus code. Mary Howard Hamilton's monograph *Theoretical frameworks for African American women* (2003) identifies the importance of a critical mass, or number of individuals of the same sociocultural experience as essential to the retention of students and other professionals. She laments the data showing Black females represented in higher education administrative positions at lower rates than the growing Black female student population. Black women have experienced a dramatic increase in postsecondary educational attainment (Desouza, 2001). As this shift continues, opportunities for advocacy and education require a more diverse group of administrators.

Recent literature raises concerns of microaggression and microassaults affecting Black students on campus as the nation faces heightened racial and political conflict (Fisher and Mullins, 2014). These challenges are not limited to underrepresented students on campus. Microaggression, defined by Howard Hamilton and Logan Patitu (2012) as "insidious gender, racial, and heterosexist inquiries or assaults that occur in the lives of most people of color on a daily basis" (p. 87) are a reality for administrators on campus as well. Black women administrators also internalize these experiences. As they simultaneously

experience these actions, they are called upon to resolve these issues on campus in public ways. Recent events, such as the protests surrounding police action in the deaths of Eric Garner and Michael Brown elicit personal and professional responses that may conflict depending on the situation. The comparative silence on issues of Black women and police action is disheartening to many. The assumption of responsibility or a lack of responsibility in many on campus cases brought upon by bias or perception can provide educational opportunities, yet serve as a reminder of the obstacles faced by these administrators on a daily basis.

Despite the ramifications of institutionalized oppression, current literature suggests that Black women in student conduct administration may have unique ways of navigating the profession. In the first study of its kind, Nagle Bennett (2010) interviewed ASCA members and found no difference in job satisfaction when comparing means for ethnicity, but did find a statistically significant number of males more highly satisfied than their female counterparts. In this particular sample, administrators identifying as women constituted 52% of the sample. In regards to the demographics of the study, approximately 80% of the sample identified as white, with the second largest sample number identified as African American, representing 13.2% of the sample. These findings suggest that job satisfaction should be explored in order to proactively retain these individuals and create additional opportunities. Understanding and defining resiliency, mentorship, and community building may help to frame these results in the appropriate context.

Black Women in Student Conduct

Since its inception, the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) has professionalized the role of student discipline facilitators who have been dedicated to providing fair, equitable, and educational outcomes for students (ASCA, 2014). An increase in access for both administrators and students necessitates a diverse group of leaders to coordinate the process. ASCA supports this notion, and has been active in providing opportunities for diverse populations (ASCA, 2014). Pope (2004) reiterates the need for increased research in these areas, suggesting that

it is necessary to warrant a globally minded and socially just conversation.

A fear of perception bias is evident in student conduct. While care is taken to train boards and hearing officers, there are concerns of fundamental fairness. Donovan (2011) identifies “being perceived as innately strong and domineering could increase the blame attributed to Black women who are survivors of sexual assault and/or domestic violence, limiting avenues of support and justice available to these women” (p. 458). Black women administrators, are well suited to identify and address these inequities (Jones, King, Roscoe, Scales, and Vasquez Barrios, 2014) as these stereotypes are not limited to students. Black women often navigate negative perceptions of strength and dominance in addressing conduct situations (Jones, et al., 2014).

While literature does not exist in the field of student conduct on the experiences of Black women, it is important to many in the field. These discussions evolved into a community of practice (COP) for ASCA. COP’s are interest groups dedicated to increased research, comradery, and policy implications for a subset of the membership’s population. In this iteration, leaders of the organization provided opportunities for women of color to discuss the experiences they had related to the manner in which they experience their identity. The COP has evolved over the last five years to provide mentorship, and support for the purpose of retention, professional development, and coordinated response to issues in the field. Themes that have emerged from these conversations include equality in the workplace, combating stereotypes, and perceived competence (Jones, et al., 2014). While the Women of Color COP includes women not identifying as Black, approximately 80% of the COP shared information from the Black female perspective (Jones, et al., 2014)

Issues of race and ethnicity are particularly delicate in student conduct administration for a variety of reasons. Student conduct is charged with providing equity throughout an educational process. In an effort to be equitable, societal norms in US education tend to focus on the erasure of difference, namely race (Decuir and Dixon, 2004). Systemic oppression and civility compound due to a desire to overcompensate colorblindness (Decuir

and Dixon, 2004). These experiences affect morale, often silencing Black women as a result of removing race as a factor. Students and professionals look to student conduct administrators as examples of fundamental fairness and equity (Lancaster & Waryold, 2008). The sensitive nature of cases involving conduct boards, sexual assault survivors, and civility concerns in particular demand a response sensitive to the needs of both visible representation and shared experiences. ASCA as an organization has branded itself experts in equity in student conduct administration. A balance between fundamental fairness, social justice, and cultural inclusivity is necessary (ASCA, 2014).

Retention

Research suggests that the presence of Black females in leadership positions on campus plays a role in retaining students (Howard Hamilton, 2003). Howard Hamilton (2003) identifies these Black female administrators as advocates and mentors. Student conduct professionals serve in these roles while also facilitating the disciplinary process. These responsibilities often lead the administrator to intervene in issues of incivility disproportionately affecting Black female students. Howard Hamilton (2003) identifies the need for community, suggesting that “survival for black women is contingent on their ability to find a place to describe their experiences among persons like themselves” (p. 4). Culture shifts acknowledging the need for these professional spaces are evident. “Counter spaces”, like the COP and defined by Howard Hamilton are a response to the limitations of fit in majority groups.

Lancaster and Waryold (2008) identify the realities of student conduct administration as decidedly different from the average student affairs role. In particular, the navigation of liability, crisis response, mental health, and violence and law are stressful and unique features of the role. The intersections of race and gender when combined with the nature of student conduct positions lead many professionals to seek out alternative positions (Jones, et al., 2014). The limited representation of Black women in student conduct administration ultimately influences students attempting to navigate both the conduct system as well as the greater university.

Despite gains in degree attainment, the historical exclusion of Black women has had lasting effects on recruitment and retention for women in leadership roles (Hamilton, 2003). In the face of years of exclusionary practice and systemic racism and sexism, Black women are one of the fastest college going populations in US higher education. This resiliency can be extended to administrative positions. To address the issue of recruitment and retention of Black women in student conduct administration, the ASCA Women of Color COP identify themes directly linking to both the literature and Black Feminist thought. First, equality in the workplace, or lack thereof, is linked to the issue of workplace satisfaction. (Mosley, 1980; Mary Howard Hamilton, 2003; Howard Hamilton and Patitu, 2012). Secondly, combating stereotypes is a theme directly related to issues of microaggression (Wing Sue et al, 2007; Howard Hamilton and Logan Patitiu, 2012), and perceived incompetence (Pasque and Errington Nicholson, 2011), The COP provides members with an opportunity for mentorship and community building, a positive step in creating safe spaces to think critically about current issues in a professional setting (Jones, et. al, 2014). The need for high quality interpersonal relationships has been shown to be significant for Black women in higher education and in other facets of life (Robinson, 1998). The spaces allow students conduct administrators the space to acknowledge race and gender in a way that is fluid and valuable as they navigate situations within individual institutions. The ASCA is a young and growing organization (Lancaster and Waryold, 2008). The work and support of the COP will have lasting positive implications as the field is faced with continued issues of civility and equity.

Limitations

This literature review should be considered as an attempt to identify related literature on the subject matter, and should not be labeled as comprehensive. This review does not aim to speak for all women who identify as Black, and as a result may not be generalizable. The reviewer recognizes that this analysis is based on the experiences of cis women and as a result, may not be representative of those not identifying as such. In isolating race and gender as factors, the researcher did not include factors such as religion or spirituality,

socioeconomic status, and sexuality. Research indicates that these factors warrant significant consideration as well. As this review is the first of its kind, there were no attempts to limit literature based on job title or years of experience.

Conclusions

Further opportunities to explore the experiences of Black women in student conduct are evident as a result of this review. History illustrates the ways in which systemic oppression has significantly affected the experiences of Black women in the academy both covertly and overtly. Opportunities for Black women to excel and achieve success in student conduct administration are available. To serve new professionals and retain current administrators in the field, a variety of perspectives must be valued. The nature of student conduct work requires an examination that is different than other student affairs roles due to the inherently adversarial, politicized, and visible nature of these positions. While there are challenges, additional information provides opportunity for greater inclusion. The intersections of perceived power and microaggression have an effect of Black women in student conduct administration. Retention of Black women in student conduct roles is essential to the student development, access, and accountability tenets of higher education. Greater understanding of the experiences of Black women in student conduct ultimately provides a more welcoming environment for students, staff and faculty. Student conduct administration serves as an intersection of rule orientation and policy; creating avenues of understanding in this space illustrates what it means to value civility and shared experience. These tenets provide safe spaces in the campus community, and only serve to strengthen the goal that all are valued in the academy.

References

Clayborne, H.L., & Hamrick, F. (2007). Rearticulating the leadership experiences of African American women in midlevel student affairs administration. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 44(1), 123-14.

Donovan, R. A. (2011). Tough or tender (dis) similarities in white college students' perceptions of black and white women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(3), 458-468.

Jones, A., King, J., Roscoe, H., Scales, V., & Vasquez Barrios, C. (2014) Women of Color Community of Practice session presented at the meeting of the Association of Student Conduct Administrators Conference.

Fisher, A., & Mullins, T. (2013) Supporting African American faculty, staff and students in the face of politicized microaggressions. *Excellence in Practice*, 62(4), 10.

Howard-Hamilton, M., Palmer, C., Johnson, S., & Kicklighter, M. (1998). Burnout and related factors: Differences between women and men in student affairs. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 17(2), 80-91.

Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2003). Theoretical frameworks for African American women. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2003(104), 19-27.

Howard-Hamilton, M., & Patitu, C. L. (2012). Decisions to make (or not) along the career path. *Pathways to Higher Education Administration for African American Women*, 85.

Hughes, R. L., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2003). Insights: Emphasizing issues that affect African American women. *New directions for student services*, 2003(104), 95-104.

Jean-Marie, G., & Lloyd-Jones, B. (2011). Women of color in higher education: Turbulent past, promising future (Vol. 9). Emerald Group Publishing. Bingley, U.K.

Mosley, M. H. (1980). Black women administrators in higher education an endangered species. *Journal of Black Studies*, 10(3), 295-310.

Nagel-Bennett, S. (2010). Job satisfaction of university chief student conduct administrators and their intent to stay or leave the position. (Order No. 3410414, Western Michigan University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate IV, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *The Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.

Pyke, K. D. (2010). What is internalized racial oppression and why don't we study it? Acknowledging racism's hidden injuries. *Sociological Perspectives*, 53(4), 551-572.

Skipper, T.L. (1992). How stress affects student affairs professionals' health. *ACU-I Bulletin*, March, 4-9.

Waryold, D. M., & Lancaster, J. M. (2008). The professional philosophy of student conduct administration. *Student Conduct Practice*, 6-13.

Developing a Successful Doctoral Advising Relationship: An Abridged Review of Literature

Susan Allen Namalefe

University of North Texas

Abstract

The doctoral academic advisor is perhaps the most influential person in a doctoral student's journey through graduate school (Barnes & Austin, 2009; Barnes, Chard, Wolfe, Stassen & Williams 2011; Celik, 2013; O'Meara, Knudsen & Jones, 2013). Students expect the advisor to contribute to their research agenda, to induct them into the department, and to establish them into their careers. The academic advisor influences a student's experience, performance, satisfaction and overall success in graduate school. However, not all academic advising relationships are satisfactory (Barnes & Austin, 2009; Barnes, et al., 2011). While advising can be inspirational and fruitful, it can equally be problematic and demoralizing (Celik, 2013). Whether positive or negative, advising affects students' experiences, retention, attrition, time to degree, and attitudes towards the program and profession (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Most of what is known about doctoral academic advising covers the roles of the advisor and the advisee. However, extenuating factors complicate the execution of those roles. Additionally, doctoral advising is too influential to be left to diverse and complex influences. It has to be nurtured and managed. This paper analyzes some underlying forces that complicate advising. The outcome of the review are suggestions on what can be done by both advisors and advisees to develop a successful academic advising relationship.

Conceptualizing Doctoral Student Advising

Academic advising has enjoyed substantial attention in academia since the foundation and development of higher education. Its development can be traced to the influx of 'baby boomers' on college campuses in the 1960s and 1970s increasing the demand for student advising and counseling. Academic advising issues exploded onto the academic forefront (Gordon, 1992). Furthermore, the American graduate school being

built on an apprenticeship model, the choice of a doctoral advisor is among the most consequential decisions a student makes in graduate school (Cassuto, 2012).

Why doctoral advising is associated to the development and success of graduate students is easy to understand. Students seek and are expected to attain self-actualization in graduate school. This is a result of acquiring advanced skills, and getting socialized into the academic culture (Kim, 2007; Lan & Williams, 2005). A student's graduate experience is not only important to professional development but it has a lasting impact on a student's life. Graduate school can either be rewarding and exciting or problematic and frustrating. Many factors influence the graduate experience including a student's educational productivity, and the efficacy of the doctoral advisor (Barnes, et al., 2011; Fedynich & Bain, 2011; Felder, 2010; Kim, 2007; Lan & Williams, 2005).

The influence of doctoral advising, cannot be underrated. Evidence suggests that doctoral advising enhances the intellectual, personal and social development of students. A fruitful advising relationship helps students develop ideas and techniques, and potentially constitutes mutual intellectual development (Celik, 2013). Students expect the advisors to challenge, support, critique, and empower them as they progress through graduate school (Bloom, Propst Cuevas, Hall, & Evans, 2007). Students also depend on advisors for emotional support in turbulent times whether these be emotive, economic or academic (Lan & Williams, 2005). The inspiration and nurturing the advisor provides contributes to student success (Kim, 2007). Academic advising and mentoring therefore contribute to a productive college/university experience (Fedynich, & Bain, 2011).

The significance and implications of doctoral advising can be clarified contrariwise; that is, if a

student is not properly advised, what happens? Entrapment is among the negative consequences of doctoral advising. Students may get entangled in confining, uncomfortable, and unproductive advisory relationships which they fail to break (Cassuto, 2012). A negative advising relationship might affect students' experiences, retention, attrition, time to degree, and attitudes towards the program and profession (Barnes, et al., 2011; O'Meara, et al., 2013). In the extreme failed advisory relationships can result into suicides and/or murder (Zhao, Golde, & McCormick, 2007). Undeniably, advisors can impact their advisees' educational attainment, career development and life after graduation.

Doctoral advising is analogous to a double-edged sword. While advisors may lessen the stress of graduate school, unsatisfactory advising can lead to a deprived graduate school experience, and student attrition (Lan & Williams, 2005; Zhao, et al., 2007). Problematic advising relationships can be boring, unproductive, awkward, isolating, frustrating, and demoralizing (Barnes, et al., 2011; Cassuto, 2012; Celik, 2013). Challenging interactions with doctoral advisors are associated with the 40 to 50% of doctoral students who do not complete their degrees (Hamilton & Loyd, 2012; Harding-DeKam,). Doctoral advising being both expert and delicate, bears various, sometimes complex ramifications if it sours (Barker, 2010; Barnes, et al., 2011). For that reason, doctoral advising is too influential and complex to be left to the influences of diverse dynamics. It must be analyzed, nurtured and managed to benefit students. That is the gist of this paper.

Factors Influencing Doctoral Advising

The success or failure of the advising relationship partially depends on the personality and advising style of the advisor. Based on their approach to advising, advisors can be categorized into the collaborator, the indifferent, and/or the accomplished (Cassuto, 2012). Collaborators are typically the coach type, energetic, ambitious and result oriented which attributes make them ensure the prompt and successful progress of their advisees towards degree completion. The *laissez faire*/indifferent advisors are generally encumbered by other responsibilities. They are generous and very accommodating, and can at times be a source of wise counsel. But they might leave the students

unguided to strive through graduate school. The accomplished advisors are authoritarian, legendary faculty who have probably 'seen it all' and might think they 'know it all'. They may be less available, which might complicate their role as mentors (Cassuto, 2012).

On a scale, advisors can either be renowned but imposing; distant, and busy on one hand; or they can be attentive, friendly, supportive, interested in advisee's work, and ready to devote unlimited time to helping students on the other hand. Students need to be aware of these differences and make decisions and adjustments accordingly. Students might consider advisors helpful if the advisors are empathetic and in sync with contemporary educational trends (Cassuto, 2012). In a study on the contribution of advisors, Celik (2013) employed content analysis to explore supervisor-student relationships based on students' perspectives. This study recapped advisor desirable attributes including dependability, proficiency, willingness to share knowledge, impartiality, a student development orientation, availability and honesty (Celik, 2013).

The advising style is confounded by the lack of formal training, practice and/or mentoring in preparation for the doctoral advising relationship. Institutions view advisors as experts in their fields and expect them to have acquired advising expertise through personal experiences in graduate school. Accordingly, advisors tend to rely on previous experiences as doctoral students, current experiences as faculty, and how others approach advising. These may not constitute the best approach to advising (Bloom et al., 2007; Harding-DeKam, et al., 2012; O'Meara, et al., 2013). O'Meara, and colleagues (2013) observe that advisors are least of all ill prepared for the emotional aspect of advising. Barker (2011) reiterates the lack of skills and experience by graduate advisors especially when it comes to students from different and minority groups. The lack of sustainable formal training and support for advisors, and its challenges to the advising relationship is affirmed by Di Pierro (2012). Similarly, students are often not prepared for the advising relationship and are hence unaware of what to do or not do in order to enhance their success in graduate school (O'Meara, et al., 2013).

Doctoral advising can further be complicated by ambiguity. Barker (2011, p.388) observes that; “doctoral education presents a unique set of academic requirements, milestones, and cultural cues that may be ambiguously communicated or understated”. He adds that from a wider viewpoint, advising remains confusing, and it becomes more multifarious by the intermingling of ethnicity and other personality symbols. This uncertainty was illuminated in a study based on eight Korean doctoral students from a large Midwestern public university (Kim, 2007). Kim (2007) examined the difficulties encountered by international students in developing helpful academic advising relationships. The unique challenges identified included ambiguity, and cultural and linguistic differences between students and their advisors. Students tended to expect the relationship to be steered by advisors and did not aggressively seek advisor support (Kim, 2007). Similarly, Bloom and colleagues (2007) showed that students may expect advisors to show a caring attitude, to respect them and their ideas, and to responsibly execute advising, while advisors may expect initiative, independence, motivation and self-drive from students (Bloom et al., 2007).

This suggests a discordance between the extent and strength of advising expected and that provided by different advisors leading to general disillusionment (Kim, 2007). The absence of a clear universally accepted definition of doctoral advising in academia, plus clear guidelines to direct advising is challenging. Advisors are habitually left uncertain about how to advise and support students, especially because students are unique, different and often have varying intellectual and personal demands (Bloom et al., 2007). Undefined and misaligned expectations can be problematic. The presumption of the advisor as an expert also contributes to some students’ reserved approaches (Kim, 2007)

Despite general graduate students’ experiences and advising needs, some students have specific requirements. For instance, racial/cultural diversity may cause a sense of invisibility, isolation, estrangement and alienation (Barker, 2011). Barker (2011) examined the cross-race advising relationship between black doctoral students and white advisors. Findings revealed that cultural diversity makes students socially and academically

vulnerable. This complicates the advising relationship especially where the advisor fails to consider a students’ cultural or social background. Faculty from different racial groups may inadequately advise students for fear of being thought culturally incorrect/insensitive (Barker, 2011). In a study on the belief systems that doctoral students held about their doctoral experience, Felder (2010) used a case analysis framework to examine the influence of faculty mentorship on African American doctoral student success. Findings revealed that students’ perceptions of faculty advising, faculty behavior, and the lack of diverse faculty leadership complicated degree completion (Felder, 2010). Diversity can thus either advantage or disadvantage the advising relationship. Advisors may fail to recognize and appreciate the academic and socially lived experiences, and resultant advising needs of some of their advisees. Moreover, some advisors lack experience in working in varied cultural contexts. The social and language differences also pose a distinctive challenge to advising (Kim, 2007).

Developing a Successful Advising Relationship

The doctoral advising relationship needs to be managed (Cassuto, 2012). Recognizing that advisors can affect a student’s graduate school experience, institutions should deliberately identify, develop and train advisors (Bloom et al., 2007). Harding-DeKam, and colleagues (2012) suggest a clear and deliberate curriculum for enhancing student development and instruction. Clarifying expectations at the onset of the advising relationship clears ambiguities. In turbulent times, clearly stated expectations help both parties to objectively examine themselves and discover the causes of tension and frustration. Cassuto (2012) affirms that good communication in both directions fosters a productive advising relationship. Both the advisor and advisee ought to be able to raise concerns about their work with no fear of retaliation. They should also be able to address the other’s needs. Given the advisors expertise and familiarity with advising, they have a duty to stipulate expectations. Students similarly need to communicate their expectations of the advisor, although that might be tricky and unpleasant. Advisors are more effective if they are aware of

students' needs, wants and desires for change in the advising relationship (Noor, & Heil, 2012).

O'Meara and colleagues (2013) examined the emotional competencies inherent in advising relationships. Among others, findings from this study revealed the role of optimism, adaptability, political awareness, and collaboration in an advising relationship (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Advisors require self-motivation, self-regulation, and self-awareness. This entails an awareness of individual and others' feelings and reactions, the ability to distinguish among these and to use that knowledge to direct thoughts and actions (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Self-awareness also involves advisors recognizing their feelings towards the advisees, whether frustration, disappointment or approval, and ensuring that such emotions don't interfere with the task at hand (O'Meara, et al., 2013). An awareness of personal strengths, flaws, and capabilities will also empower advisors to improve the advising relationships, and to transfer knowledge and skills. That instills trust and confidence in the students that the advisor cares and is able to effectively lead them through graduate school (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Advisors further need to be committed to the students, to take initiative, and to believe in the students' achievement. This entails deliberately investing time, intellect and other resources into the success of their advisees (O'Meara, et al., 2013).

The increasing diversity of students requiring different levels of advising raises a need for innovative and customized advising mechanisms. Advisors should be receptive of critical feedback about their actions and be able to react positively. Empathy, emotional awareness, and service orientation are essential in dealing with students. Through collaboration and networking, advisors can identify the political and social dynamics in departments, and devise strategies to help students succeed within challenging environments (O'Meara, et al., 2013).

Students' self-awareness and motivation can equally sustain the advising relationship. The nature and structure of graduate programs requires students to be confident, focused and self-driven if they are to succeed (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Students must display initiative and persistence to connect with busy advisors. The students' self-drive and initiative improves advising. Moreover,

such qualities are often commended and appreciated in most graduate school environments (O'Meara, et al., 2013). In order to effectively learn and interact with colleagues, staff and faculty, students require social skills and awareness. These include the capacity to inspire, connect, cooperate, and relate to others (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Advisees need social intelligence to relate to advisors and manage conflict. Although it is difficult and might cause even greater conflict, sometimes it could be imperative for students to confront advisors. By so doing they can address areas of conflict, clearly declare their position and effectively communicate to resolve conflict (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Students must appreciate the multiple roles advisors have to play in addition to advising them. Students should also recognize the politics and power dynamics in their departments and find ways of negotiating them. It is essential for students to know which faculty work well together, and which ones make strange demands. Such information can help a student in navigating the PhD program (O'Meara, et al., 2013).

Conclusion

Doctoral advising will continue to evolve and develop in as far as it makes the difference in a graduate school experience. Advisors can equip students to face the professional world, provide them with supportive networks and generally develop students' self-awareness and confidence. Students learn from the rules, the experience, and the proximity of the advisor (Fedynich & Bain, 2011). Doctoral advising therefore being central to the graduate experience, has to be judiciously managed. Given the dominant power structure that assigns more power to the advisor in the advising relationship, the advisor should bear greater responsibility for guiding, supporting, challenging, and nurturing the advisee through the doctoral program. Successful advising depends heavily on the advisor's ability to communicate, collaborate and cooperate. Advisors ought to display political and social awareness, skill, service orientation, empathy, responsiveness, accessibility and the ability to develop others (Fedynich & Bain, 2011; Felder, 2007; Noor, & Heil, 2012; O'Meara, et al., 2013). Faculty should constantly assess the impact of their emotions, and actions on students' success (O'Meara, et al., 2013). Correspondingly, students need to clarify expectations, show initiative,

communicate, and manage conflict. They should align their behavior to the advisor, and to program expectations and requirements. This will hopefully make the advising relationship more rewarding.

References

- Barker, M. J. (2011). Racial context, currency and connections: Black doctoral student and white advisor perspectives on cross-race advising. *Innovations In Education & Teaching International*, 48(4), 387-400.
- Barnes, B. J., & Austin, A. E. (2009). The role of doctoral advisors: A look at advising from the advisor's perspective. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33(5), 297-315.
- Barnes, B. J., Chard, L. A., Wolfe, E. W., Stassen, M. A., & Williams, E. A. (2011). An Evaluation of the Psychometric Properties of the Graduate Advising Survey for Doctoral Students. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 61-17.
- Bloom, J. L., Propst Cuevas, A. E., Hall, J., & Evans, C. V. (2007). Graduate Students' Perceptions of Outstanding Graduate Advisor Characteristics. *NACADA Journal*, 27(2), 28-35.
- Cassuto, L. (Ed) (2012). Surviving Your Graduate School Advisor. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*
- Celik, K. (2013). The contribution of supervisors to doctoral students in doctoral education: A qualitative study. *Creative Education*, 4(1), 9-17.
- Curtin, N., Stewart, A. J., & Ostrove, J. M. (2013). Fostering Academic Self-Concept Advisor Support and Sense of Belonging Among International and Domestic Graduate Students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 108-137.
- Di Pierro, M. (2012). Strategies for doctoral student retention: Taking the roads less traveled. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 35(3), 29-32.
- Fedynich, L., & Bain, S. F. (2011). Mentoring the successful graduate student of tomorrow. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 12, 1-7.
- Felder, P. (2010). On doctoral student development: Exploring faculty mentoring in the shaping of African American doctoral student success. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(2), 455-474.
- Gordon, V. N. (1992). Handbook of Academic Advising. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. - See more at: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/History-of-academic-advising.aspx#sthash.fGXEge7e.dpuf>
- Harding-DeKam, J. L., Hamilton, B., & Loyd, S. (2012). The Hidden Curriculum of Doctoral Advising. *NACADA Journal*, 32(2), 5-16.
- Kim, Y. (2007). Difficulties in quality doctoral academic advising Experiences of Korean students. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 6(2), 171-193.
- Lan, W., & Williams, A. (2005). Doctoral Students' Perceptions of Advising Style and Development and the Relationship between Them. *NACADA Journal*, 25(1), 31-41.
- Noor, M. F., & Heil, C. S. (2012). Mentor vs. Monolith. *American Scientist*, 100(6), 450-453.
- O'Meara, K. & Knudsen, K. & Jones, J. (2013). The Role of Emotional Competencies in Faculty-Doctoral Student Relationships. *The Review of Higher Education* 36(3), 315-347.
- Zhao, C. M., Golde, C. M., & McCormick, A. C. (2007). More than a signature: How advisor choice and advisor behavior affect doctoral student satisfaction. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 31(3), 263-281.

The Campus Guide for Welcoming Companion Animals

Jason Bewley

University of Phoenix

Abstract

As recently as 5 years ago, colleges and universities felt the freedom to manage on-campus housing as they saw fit, without any concern for the regulations in the Fair Housing Act. Recent case law seems to suggest that on-campus housing is now subject to the Fair Housing Act, at least in some circumstances. This new legal landscape, coupled with a rise in the number of students coming to campus with companion (comfort) animals, has left university administrators uncertain how to respond to this new challenge. Many administrators feel conflicted, as they strive to meet the needs of students struggling with anxiety and depression, while also protecting the interests of the other on-campus students. Many of these companion animals have little, if any, training and can bring a new set of issues to campus. While many of these animals are very well behaved, others can be noisy, damage university property, behave disruptively, and create allergy issues for other students.

This paper seeks to analyze current case law, along with the relevant state and federal regulations, to provide a clear summary of the current legal landscape. This study will conclude with a brief best-practices guide for creating policies and procedures that effectively meet the needs of all parties involved, while complying with the relevant law.

Introduction

For more than two decades, it has been clear that public and private higher education institutions must adhere to the Americans with Disabilities Act. American institutions of higher learning have developed detailed policies and procedures to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, as well as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. These policies and procedures specifically address making reasonable accommodations, such as permitting service animals in the classrooms, residence halls, and

other campus facilities. However, over the past few years, a new “breed” of helping animals has begun making their way to campus: the companion animal.

Companion animals, often referred to as comfort animals or emotional support animals, are not required to undergo any specialized training. They are helping animals who do not meet the definition of a service animal. Accordingly, they are not covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act, or by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. Instead, companion animals are covered by the Fair Housing Act of 1968. The Fair Housing Act was developed on the heels of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to address rampant discrimination that was occurring at the time; specifically aimed at eliminating discrimination related to the rental and sale of housing (Imperatore, 2008).

Until recently, most campus attorneys and administrators felt confident that on-campus residence halls were not subject to the Fair Housing Act. However, more recent case law seems to suggest otherwise. To date, there has not been a “landmark” ruling from the Supreme Court of the United States, and the cases that are available are sparse. However, the few cases that are available seem to foreshadow a coming trend in the law. To give a clear picture of the current legal landscape – and to reduce any potential researcher bias – this paper analyzes those cases, along with current federal law, to conclude with a guide of best practices for university administrators.

The Emerging Cases

In *United States v. University of Nebraska at Kearney* (2013), a student made a request to have her therapy dog live with her in university housing. The university believed that they were not subject to the Fair Housing Act requirements, and subsequently denied the student’s request, enforcing their no-pets policy. The United States sued on behalf of the student alleging a violation of the Fair Housing Act. The University filed a motion

for summary judgment, arguing that their residence halls were not subject to the Fair Housing Act. The district court disagreed, stating that on-campus housing at the University of Nebraska met the definition of a “dwelling” as defined by the Act, and that the anti-discrimination provisions of the Fair Housing Act are applicable.

Under a much different set of facts, in *Franchi v. New Hampton School* (2009), another district court held that on-campus dormitory housing was a dwelling subject to the Fair Housing Act. Other related cases include *United States v. Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency* (1996), where the court held that a residential school was a dwelling; and *United States v. Hughes Memorial Home* (1975), where the court held that a Virginia children’s home was also a dwelling.

Under the Fair Housing Act, universities and other persons are not permitted to deny requests for reasonable accommodations that may be required to give someone with a disability the opportunity to “use and enjoy” the dwelling (Reasonable Accommodations, 2014). Further, under the Fair Housing Act, a person has the right to keep a companion animal in their dwelling as a reasonable accommodation if they meet three criteria: (a) the person has a disability, (b) the animal is required to give the person an equal opportunity to “use and enjoy the dwelling,” and (c) there is “an identifiable relationship or nexus” between the assistance provided by the animal and the disability (Dermott, 2012).

The Supreme Court of the United States has not yet reviewed this issue, so there is currently no final binding authority upon all of the states. Indeed, there are very few rulings on this issue at any level. Currently, all of the rulings have been at the state court or district court level. Rulings at these levels only provide binding authority upon the lower courts in those jurisdictions, and are merely persuasive in all other jurisdictions. As a result, this issue still appears murky for many jurisdictions; and in turn, for many universities across the country.

Despite this lack of clarity, the most recent rulings may shed some light on the direction the courts are heading. In addition, it is important to remember that federal law and court rulings only provide the minimum requirements that universities must follow. This means that university administrators

have the opportunity to move ahead of the curve, and craft cutting-edge policies designed to meet the needs of students struggling with depression, anxiety, or other issues. Choosing to create this type of supportive environment would not only benefit the students, but would also reduce the risk of litigation and could serve as a powerful tool for enhancing an institution’s image.

It is key, however, that university administrators maintain an effective learning environment that is largely free from unnecessary disruptions. Despite the important role that companion animals serve, they can also bring with them a host of issues. Among those issues are noise, smells, ticks and fleas, allergens, and bite hazards. While it is not possible to eliminate these risks entirely, there are some important steps that university administrators can take to help reduce them.

Proper Screening

One of the common concerns shared by university administrators is that students who do not need companion animals will attempt to use this avenue to bring their personal pets to campus. These concerns largely stem from the fact that companion animals are easier to acquire than service animals, because they do not require any formalized training. Universities can help to alleviate these concerns by implementing policies for screening and approving companion animals. Students seeking to bring companion animals to campus should be required to submit documentation from an appropriate medical provider, stating that the student demonstrates a need for a companion animal. This process is not overly burdensome for students, and helps to ensure that students seeking approval have a documented need for a companion animal. On most campuses, this process should be facilitated through student disability services, or a similar office.

Information, Resources, and Training

Once approved, the students should be assigned a designated adviser or counselor. The adviser should meet with the students, educate them on some of the potential challenges that can arise with having a companion animal on campus, and help to teach them strategies for avoiding those challenges.

Living with a companion animal on campus can require more diligent caretaking than living with them off-campus. This is largely due to communal living arrangements, and sharing public spaces with a large number of people. The university should also develop informational resources, and offer training programs designed to educate students on these special caretaking needs and strategies. Universities with the available budget should consider providing a designated area for bathing and grooming companion animals, and may opt to provide access to grooming products, such as pet shampoo and flea collars. While this would increase costs, it would reduce the number of issues that occur on campus, benefiting the students and the staff. Universities who opt to do so should make it clear that those services are contingent upon budget availability, and may not always be provided.

University administrators should also consider creating partnerships with local pet service providers, such as veterinary clinics, grooming facilities, and food stores, to help secure discounts for their students. These partnerships could also lead to co-facilitated educational programs, and to those professionals offering their services directly on campus.

Educating the General Student Population

Students living in the residence halls will live in close proximity with companion animals. For the majority of students, this will not create an issue. However, there are students who have pet allergies. It is important to inform students that service animals and/or companion animals may be living in their building, and to give them the opportunity to disclose any potential pet allergies or other issues. Once housing assignments have been made, students who will share a room or suite with a companion animal should be informed ahead of time and given an additional opportunity to disclose any allergies or other potential issues, and possibly to request a room change.

Policies on Student and Animal Behavior

Even adhering to the strategies outlined above, some issues may still arise. University administrators should be prepared for these issues and should develop clear policies related to bringing these companion animals on campus.

Housing and Urban Development provides some helpful guidelines in developing these procedures, which can be found in Section 5.318 (Discretionary Pet Rules, 2014). Specifically, this section indicates that restrictions can be placed upon the number of animals allowed in each dwelling unit—to one animal—as well as the size and type of pets allowed. Further, it is acceptable for housing departments to set minimum pet care standards to protect the housing unit, as well as the health and safety of the residents. These standards can include (a) requiring the pet owners to keep their pets quiet and odor free, (b) requiring that pets be spayed or neutered, (c) limiting the time that pets can be left unattended, and (d) barring pets from certain common areas (Discretionary Pet Rules, 2014).

University administrators should create a standing committee designed to write and shepherd these policies. These committees should consult with housing professionals across the country to identify common problems and solutions, as well as published policy manuals from other housing departments. The committee should not only carefully review the policies to protect the educational environment—as well as the health and safety of the residents—but also to ensure that they are not unnecessarily burdensome to the residents needing to bring their companion animals onto campus.

Conclusion

Courts seem to understand the important role that companion animals play in the lives of students struggling with anxiety, depression, and other issues. Recent case law shows a trend towards colleges and universities being required to adhere to provisions in the Fair Housing Act, requiring institutions to make reasonable accommodations for comfort animals, for students meeting the required criteria outlined above. Instead of waiting for a landmark case giving universal clarity to this issue—or being party to that case—university administrators across the country should take direction from the most recent court holdings and comply with these limited provisions of the Fair Housing Act.

References

Dermott, J. (2012). Update on accommodating service and assistance animals on campus: Making heads or tails of federal disability law. *NACUA Notes*, 10(6). Retrieved from <http://www.nacua.org/help/NACUANOTES/index.asp>

Discretionary Pet Rules, 24 C.F.R. § 5.318 (2014).

Franchi v. New Hampton School, 656 F. Supp. 2d 252, 260 (D.N.H. 2009).

Imperatore, E. (2008). Discriminatory condemnations and the fair housing act. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 96, 1027–1057. Retrieved from <http://georgetownlawjournal.org/>

Reasonable Accommodations, 24 C.F.R. § 100.204 (2014).

United States v. Hughes Memorial Home, 396 F. Supp. 544 (W.D. Va. 1975).

United States v. Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency, 910 F. Supp. 21 (D. Mass. 1996).

United States v. University of Nebraska at Kearney, 940 F. Supp. 2d 974 (D. Neb. 2013).

Hegemonic Masculinity as a Barrier to Student Success in College Men

Joshua L. Moermond

Eastern Michigan University

Abstract

Identity development is a part of nearly every student affairs professional preparation program. Student affairs professionals must have an understanding of identity development, and currently, as part of the curriculum, this topic is a part of nearly every professional preparation program. However, examining the identity development in college men, still stands as a major challenge. Very few courses are dedicated specifically to college men as marginalized populations receive more attention. Since creating a healthy masculine identity is an important developmental milestone for all college men, this review of literature seeks to address how hegemonic masculinity creates barriers for college-aged men that inhibit them from achieving their fullest potential. The review is structured into two major themes: (1) establishing an understanding of hegemonic masculinity's effect on college men; and (2) adding the voices of other scholars in a call to action for all student affairs practitioners. The review ends with briefly sharing examples of existing programming and established best practices in developing new programming that targets college men as an aid in helping willing practitioners answer the call to action.

Introduction

Student affairs professionals have an understanding of identity development, as it is a part of nearly every professional development program. However, there is a gap in the understanding of identity development in college men. This is highly problematic because, "for college-aged men, identity and becoming a man are central developmental concerns" (Davis, LaPrad, & Dixon, 2011). Identities are understood to be, "multiple, contradictory, disunified, unstable, and fluid," (Gamson, 2000) and "socially constructed, historically situated, multidimensional, intersectional, and mutually shaping" (Kimmel &

Davis, 2011). Masculine identity manifests differently with each individual based on that persons' other identities. "Masculinity comes in many forms and packages and these multiple masculinities are informed, limited, and modified by race, ethnicity, class background, sexual orientation, and personal predilections" (Tarrant & Katz, 2008).

The knowledge gap in understanding masculine identity development extends to student affairs professionals, because, "although formal research and theory exist relative to male identity development, such information is not included in graduate preparation programs or in new staff training (Davis and Laker, 2004). O'Neil and Crapser (2011) found, "no examples of student affairs in-service training programs that sensitize college student personnel workers... to the hazards of being male during the college years." Additionally, O'Neil and Crapser (2011) found very few examples of programming and few institutions that perform annual needs assessments for college men. However, research and theoretical models exist and are accessible to student affairs professionals.

Over the past decade calls for programming that specifically target male students have gained greater voice. However, one might conclude that these calls are falling on deaf ears, as there is still a void in programming for college men (O'Neil & Crapser, 2011). Research has shown that college men are underperforming in higher education and facing serious developmental issues (O'Neil & Crapser, 2011). These issues are in part due to hegemonic masculinity, which goes unchallenged in the lives of many men. Student affairs professionals are uniquely positioned to be able to intervene by developing sustainable men's programming to help students construct healthier masculine identities. This review of literature will

seek to establish an understanding of hegemonic masculinity and its negative effects, add to previous calls to action among student affairs professionals, and offer some guidance in approaching men's programming. This article is not intended to address, or by extension ignore, how hegemonic masculinity manifests differently given the intersections of other identities such as transgender or bisexual individuals. The degree to which hegemonic masculinity creates a barrier to student success is dependent on the degree to which an individual buys into it.

Understanding Hegemonic Masculinity in College Men

Masculinity is a form of gender expression separate from biological sex assigned at birth. An individual may have their sex assigned at birth as male, identify as a man, and display themselves through a masculine gender expression. Broadly, hegemonic masculinity refers to the dominant and pervasive cultural messages that dictate what it means to be masculine. While each man may define his own form of masculinity he must do so through the pervasive atmosphere of hegemonic masculinity. Kimmel and Messner (1998) argue, "The important fact of men's lives is not that they are biological males, but that they become men." But what is hegemonic masculinity?

Connell (2005) defines hegemonic masculinity as the dominant "configuration of gender practice... which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women." Hegemonic masculinity is communicated through cultural messages in the form of ideas, words, and actions. This form of masculinity has its own set of rules and expectations. "The hegemonic model of masculinity portrays men as physically dominant, aggressive, independent, pragmatic, narcissistic, and sexually prolific" (Davis, LaPrad, and Dixon, 2011). Additionally, Mckee (2013) argues hegemonic masculinity teaches men to be objective in decision making, powerful, in control, heterosexual, and to avoid appearing feminine.

The surprising thing about these two views on hegemonic masculinity is that they both draw on the earlier work of Brannon, who in 1976 identified the fundamental rules of hegemonic masculinity based on his own research. Brannon's (1976) rules are: (1) no sissy stuff; (2) be a big wheel, (3) be a

sturdy oak; and (4) give 'em hell. No sissy stuff means the rejection of femininity and weakness. It is the basis of homophobia in hegemonic masculinity. Be a big wheel, the primary values system, teaches that money, power, and success, is the basis for which masculinity is judged. Be a sturdy oak teaches men to be calm and rigid in crisis. Combined with no sissy stuff, it is the basis for being emotionally restricted. Give 'em hell teaches men to be daring and take risks. It also emphasizes aggression and competition.

That Brannon's rules, which are now over thirty years old, are still part of the dominant male gender script is revealing. It demonstrates the cultural power and pervasiveness of hegemonic masculinity. While many men seek to live up to this ideal, many have difficulty doing so. Their failure is actually a good thing as pleck called traditional masculinity full of "adverse consequences" and "psychologically dysfunctional" (pleck as quoted by Capraro, 2004). Despite their failure men still feel the negative effects of hegemonic masculinity that create barriers to their success. Given that the dominant masculine gender script teaches men that they are powerful, one may wonder why then men do not flip the script to create healthy, positive masculine identities. The answer lies in what has been termed the paradox of masculinity.

Paradox of Masculinity and Gender Role Conflict

The paradox of masculinity is that, "objectively men as a group may still have power over women as a group [through hegemony], but subjectively it was observed that many individual men do not feel powerful" (Capraro, 2004). This relationship between the collective power of men and the feeling of powerlessness in individual men warrants examination. In historical and cultural contexts men have been the beneficiaries of unearned privilege at the expense of women. However, the discovery of the powerlessness that individual men feel is a newer phenomenon and it is troubling for two reasons. First, the sense of powerlessness comes from men's inability to live up to hegemonic masculinity. Secondly, the feeling of powerlessness also means that men do not feel that they can change hegemonic masculinity. By example, a man may have difficulty identifying and/or accepting responsibility for his role in the oppression of women if he feels unable to control

his surrounding influences. Unfortunately, men persist in this paradox state in part because they have little else on which to model a healthy masculine identity when establishing their own.

The masculine paradox when felt internally may contribute to gender role conflict. Gender role conflict is defined as a “psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences on the person or others” (O’Neil, Good, and Holmes, 1995). It occurs when “rigid, sexist, or restrictive gender roles result in personal restriction, devaluation or violation of others or self” (O’Neil, Good, and Holmes, 1995). O’Neil and associates developed an instrument, the gender role conflict scale (GRCS), to test for gender role conflict (GRC) and its relationship with other outcomes.

Using the GRCS, over 200 studies to date have found that GRC is significantly correlated to many men’s problems (O’Neil and Crapser, 2011). Specifically, GRC has been found to be correlated with: loneliness, self-esteem, anxiety, depression, shame, help seeking attitudes, alcohol and substance use and abuse, problems with anger, health risk taking, homophobia, rape myth attitudes, sexual violence, victim blaming, and many others (O’Neil, 2008; O’Neil and Crapser, 2011; O’Neil, Good, and Holmes, 1995; Blazina, Settle, and Eddins, 2008; Thompkins and Rando, 2003).

In addition to the negative outcomes associated with GRC there is additional statistical data revealing the state of college men today. O’Neil and Crapser (2011) report that in comparison to women more men go through university conduct review systems, spend more time partying and watching television, and are more likely to skip class. College men consume more alcohol than their female peers and five times as many 15-24 year old men commit suicide compared to females (O’Neil and Crapser, 2011). O’Neil’s GRCS is just one of several scales that measure the impact of hegemonic masculinity. The combined results of many studies conclusively show that, “masculinity ideology and masculine gender role conflict/stress significantly correlates with men’s psychological and interpersonal problems” (O’Neil and Crapser, 2011). Given the plethora of issues that college men are struggling with and the available data, it is concerning that programming for college men has not kept pace with need.

A Call to Action

College men need long-term programming specifically targeting them and their masculine gender identity. Hegemonic masculinity does not serve the needs of college men. Until men learn how to construct self-authored, healthy, masculine identities they will continue to subscribe to it. This is the juncture where student affairs professionals can intervene. There are barriers though to developing successful interventions for college men. These barriers are often the debate to provide additional programming to a privileged population, hegemonic masculinity, and few existing examples of men’s programs.

Some have questioned the need or justification for men’s specific programming since men have been the beneficiaries of centuries of unearned privilege. At face value this appears a fair challenge, however, under scrutiny it fades. Men have been the beneficiaries of unearned privileged, it is a primary cause of the gender inequality present in society. However, the nature of inequality is that the inequality impacts all parties. The conversation can be changed so as to focus on the ways in which those in the privileged role are harmed by their privileges. Laker and Davis (2009) quote hooks to support this shift, “Men are not exploited or oppressed by sexism, but there are ways in which they suffer as a result of it...the pain men experience can serve as a catalyst calling attention to the need for change” (hooks, 1984, as quoted by Laker and Davis, 2009). Therefore, while men have been the beneficiaries of unearned privilege the resistance to provide men’s programming on those grounds is short sighted. If systems of privilege are to be deconstructed then all parties must be included.

Another barrier to successful men’s programming is hegemonic masculinity because of the messages men receive about seeking or needing help. Seeking or needing help is seen as making one weak and effeminate. “Men who adopt traditional attitudes about manhood... are more likely than nontraditional men not to seek help from others and underuse professional services on campus” (Courtenay, 2011). However, this barrier can be overcome. It will mean getting creative, no longer expecting that typical marketing strategies that passively encourage attendance to an event will work. Since hegemonic masculinity discourages

positive help-seeking behaviors, student affairs practitioners need to understand that men's programming is not a build-it-and-they-will-come venture. A real commitment to successful men's programming will require thoughtful and intentional outreach and institutional resolve in providing resources.

Strategies for successful men's programming are evident in the literature. Engaging college men in traditional masculine structures is an important starting point. In developing programming for college men go where they already are, be that athletic teams, fraternities or all male residence halls. Engaging men in fraternities is particularly a great option as a starting point for developing and testing new men's programming. Research has shown that hegemonic and hyper masculinity are strongly encouraged and reinforced in fraternities. Syrett (2009) has argued that college fraternities have protected white male privilege and hegemony throughout their history. In the important work of constructing healthy masculine identities and addressing gender inequality, fraternities offer a starting point where historical and social roots of hegemonic masculinity may be deepest and are regularly reinforced. Anderson (2008) showed that inclusive masculinity existed amongst fraternity brothers in his study. Inclusive masculinity is characterized by "the acceptance of homosexuality, respect for women, and emotional intimacy among brothers."

The encouraging thing that should help student affairs practitioners in their work is that gender identities are socially constructed and can therefore be deconstructed. Through effective program design and delivery student affairs practitioners can assist students in building healthier gender identities. Programming for men's development can help students at these critical points in establishing healthy masculine identities. Practitioners that choose to answer this call should remember that "Masculinities are diversely experienced, the interventions necessary to assist struggling students will need to take that into account" (Kahn, Brett, and Holmes, 2011).

Conclusion

Men's programming can work and ought to be implemented. Hegemonic masculinity socializes men to be objective, rational, and dispassionate

decision makers. It stands to reason that those same thinking patterns can be used by professionals to reveal the truth, which is that hegemonic masculinity is limiting those that subscribe to it. Men's programming cannot be successful without institutional planning and long-term commitment. As McKee (2013) notes, "the gender-specific outreach that research scholars have been calling for will not be successful if it is just a one-time program or service; rather, the male-specific outreach and education has to occur through both the curricular and co-curricular experience."

References

- Anderson, E. (2008). Inclusive Masculinity in a Fraternal Setting. *Men and Masculinities*, 10(5), 604-620.
- Blazina, C., Settle, A. G., & Eddins, R. (2008). Gender role conflict and separation-individuation difficulties: Their impact on college men's loneliness. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 16(1), 69-81.
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture. In D. D. Brannon & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role* (pp. 1-45). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Capraro, R. L. (2004). Men's studies as a foundation for student development work with college men. *New Directions for Student Services*, 107, 23-34.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities*. (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Courtenay, W. (2011). Best practices for improving college men's health: Designing effective programs and services for college men. In J. A. Laker & T. L. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 177-192). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Davis, T., & Laker, J. A. (2004). Connecting men to academic and student affairs programs and services. *New Directions for Student Services*, 107, 47-57.
- Davis, T., LaPrad, J., & Dixon, S. (2011). Masculinities reviewed and reinterpreted: Using a

critical approach to working with men in groups. In J. A. Laker & T. L. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 147-160). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gamson, J. (2000). Sexualities, queer theory, and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 347-365). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kahn, J. S., Brett, B. L., & Holmes, J. R. (2011). Concerns with men's academic motivation in higher education: An exploratory investigation of the role of masculinity. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 19(1), 65-82.

Kimmel, M., & Davis, T. (2011). Mapping guyland in college. In J. A. Laker & T. L. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 3-15). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kimmel, M., & Messner, M. (Eds.) (1998). *Men's lives* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Laker, J. A., & Davis, T. L. (2009). Continuing the journey toward multicultural campus communities. In G. McClellan, J. Stringer (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (3rd ed., pp. 242-264). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mckee, S. P. (2013). *Mantalk: Fraternity men and masculinity*. (Doctoral dissertation), Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Full Text. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1458633168?accountid=10650>

O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the gender role conflict scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 36(3), 358-445.

O'Neil, J. M., & Crapser, B. (2011). Using the psychology of men and gender role conflict theory to promote comprehensive service delivery for college men: A call to action. In J. A. Laker & T. L. Davis (Eds.), *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations* (pp. 16-49). New York, NY: Routledge.

O'Neil, J. M., Good, G., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 164-206). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Syrett, N. L. (2009). *The company he keeps: A history of white college fraternities*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Tarrant, S., & Katz, J. (2008). *Men speak out: Views on gender, sex, and power*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Thompkins, C. D., & Rando, R. A. (2003). Gender role conflict and shame in college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4(1), 79-81.

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS

The Journal of Student Affairs at New York University publishes articles that further develops the practice of student affairs and are of particular relevance to professionals throughout higher education. Examples of topics include: Student Development, Emerging Trends, Global Education, Innovative Models of Student Affairs Practice, College Student Funding and Finance, and Campus Diversity.

Manuscripts should focus on original research; replication of research; reviews of research/literature; essays on theoretical, organizational, or professional issues; reviews of current literature relevant to the field; or practical reports of experiences from the field. All the original research articles that use human subjects must be approved by the NYU Institutional Review Board (nyu.edu/ucaihhs) prior to submission.

Abstract Submission Guidelines

Abstracts must be submitted to the Content Editor and should be no longer than 250 words. Authors should provide the editorial team with an overview of the proposed article that demonstrates interest level in the proposed topic and the article's relevance to higher education and student affairs. The following information must be included with the abstract: name, title, address, e-mail address, year of graduation from NYU's Higher Education and Student Affairs program (if applicable). Authors of selected abstracts will be requested to submit a first draft in order to be considered for publication.

Style Guidelines

Manuscripts must be clear, concise, relevant to the field, and demonstrate a well-organized development of ideas. The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition should be followed for reference style and general guidelines.

- Double-space all material, including references, quotations, tables, and figures. Leave extra space above and below subheadings, and include generous margins.
- Because manuscripts are processed through an anonymous review system, they should contain no indication of the author's identity or institutional affiliation (with the exception of a separate title page as outlined in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition). Where appropriate, institutional identification will be inserted after acceptance of a manuscript.
- Research manuscripts, reviews of the literature, and essays on professional issues should total no more than 12 double-spaced, typewritten pages, including references, figures, and tables. Shorter articles are accepted and encouraged. • Original research (literary, qualitative, or quantitative) is encouraged. All such work should be applicable to the higher education and student affairs professions.
- Field reports should not exceed three pages (approximately 600 words in length). They should briefly report on or describe new practices, programs, or techniques. • Dialogues and interviews should follow the manuscript guidelines outlined in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition. They should take the form of verbatim exchange, oral or written, between two or more people.
- Book reviews should not exceed five pages in length. Proposed title to be reviewed should be approved by the Executive Board. Authors are fully responsible for obtaining such texts. Additionally, it is the author's responsibility to secure permission to quote or adapt text content. The publisher's original written permission must be provided to the Executive Board before any manuscript can be published.

- Authors are responsible for the accuracy of all references, quotations, tables, and figures. Authors should make every effort to ensure that such items are complete and correct.

Submission Instructions

- Form and text content of manuscripts should comply with the above style guidelines and the general guidelines of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Sixth Edition. Manuscripts that do not conform to these guidelines cannot be considered.
- Manuscripts that have been previously published or are being considered for publication elsewhere should not be submitted. Authors will be asked to affirm non-duplication of submission before their manuscripts will be reviewed.
- Each submission should be submitted electronically in MS Word document format.
- It is imperative for all authors to adhere to all dates outlined in the Timeline. Failure to do so could result in omission from the Journal.
- The Executive Board will be responsible for all publication and editorial decisions. Submissions and other inquiries should be directed to the Executive Board of the Journal of Student Affairs at New York University. Please visit us online at <http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/josa> for updates regarding contact information for the current Executive Board and submission dates for future editions of the Journal.