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KISSLING, MARCIA KENNARD. Spirituality as a Component of Holistic Student Development in the Practice of Student Affairs Professionals. (Under the direction of Dr. Alyssa N. Bryant).

This quantitative research study measured self-reported spirituality of student affairs professionals, practices of student affairs professionals in regard to integration of spirituality into their work, and predictors of holistic, spiritually-infused practice of student affairs professionals. The independent variables were demographic and work environment characteristics, spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences. The dependent variables were Community Building, Modeling Authenticity, Reflective Practice, and Focus on Students’ Personal Development. The survey was developed utilizing pre-existing scales from the Higher Education Research Institute’s national student and faculty studies, scales developed by Seifert and Harmon (2009) and two newly developed scales, graduate school curricula and mentoring experiences. The theories of Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003), together with the concept of holistic student development provided the theoretical foundation for this dissertation. Demographics and graduate school curricula were not predictors of holistic spiritually-infused practice. Mentoring and several individual spirituality scales were predictors of holistic, spiritually-infused practice. Student affairs professionals exhibited low levels of spirituality and religious interest. The findings from this research indicate that there is a gap between the espoused goal of holistic student development and the actual practices of student affairs professionals.
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Chapter One: Introduction

“I am confused. I am confused by the sheer irrationality, ambiguity, and abundance of things coming into being at all. I am confused by having been born into a world from which I will be ejected at death. I am confused as to who or why I am. I am confused by the labyrinth of choices I face. I don’t know what to do.” (Batchelor, 1997, p. 67)

Such a struggle as noted above is not unique. Similar concerns have had and continue to have a central place in the human experience. Young adult learners, in particular, struggle with finding meaning and purpose in their lives. Scholars attuned to this struggle have noted that higher education virtually ignores the inner lives of students, giving little opportunity for them to explore their values, beliefs, or spiritual development (Chickering, Dalton, and Stamm, 2006). Consistent with this view, Astin and Astin (2006) illustrate how higher education has “paid relatively little attention to the student’s ‘inner’ development – the sphere of values and beliefs, emotional maturity, moral development, spirituality, and self-understanding” (p. vii). This lack of attention to inner development is common in western higher education, where practice values and elevates intellect above all else (Dalton and Crosby, 2006). Thus, the academy’s apparent comfort with educating for intellect and seeming disregard for creating a holistic environment in which students live and learn becomes evident. This has not always been the case, as the evolution of the relationship between religion and spirituality in higher education illustrates.

Student affairs professionals provide potential points of challenge and support in young adult college students’ struggles to find meaning. The intersection of the student
affairs profession and the goal of creating a holistic, spiritually-infused learning environment is the focus of this research. This study will examine the spirituality and practice of student affairs professionals in regard to their degree of commitment to integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development into their work.

History and Rationale for Holism in Student Affairs

In higher education, and particularly in the field of student affairs, holistic student development is a key concept and espoused value (Komives, Woodard & Associates, 1996; Love, 2001). Holism is closely aligned with the view of developing the whole individual, which is central to the concept of student affairs (Love, 2001). Lloyd-Jones (as cited in Komives, Woodard, & Associates, 1996) credited W.H. Cowley with creating the term “holoisim,” now termed “holism,” to “capture the conviction that an individual reacts in any situation as a totally integrated person” (p. 88).

The concept of educating the whole student is the core idea defining the role of student affairs. “What is now called student affairs formally began in 1890, when President Charles Eliot was busily transforming Harvard College into a university” (Sandeen, 2004, p. 30). Essentially, Eliot appointed an English instructor to serve as a “student dean,” a position created to attempt to retain the humane values of the old college. As other schools followed suit, and hired deans, “the education of the whole student was eventually adopted as the core idea of student affairs and it remains so today” (p. 30). As is evidenced by organizational structures at various institutions throughout the United States, student affairs includes a variety of functional areas. While the role of student affairs extends into provision of
necessary services such as meals, housing, judicial services, and sometimes financial aid and athletic administration, there is an essence, a core component, which values holistic student development above all else.

Evans and Reason (2001) note a common foundation of the student affairs profession in the pragmatic philosophy and influence of John Dewey and the principles that he advocated. These include “worth of the individual, a holistic approach, the importance of experience, and attention to the environment” (p. 375). The Student Personnel Point of View II (American Council on Education, 1949), a report from the 1949 committee meeting of the American Council on Education that revised the 1937 ACE report included, “The concept of education is broadened to include attention to the student’s well rounded development – physically, socially, emotionally, and spiritually, as well as intellectually” (p. 2).

To be sure, holistic student development is the overarching purpose of the student affairs profession. For years student affairs professionals have touted both their role and contributions in the development of the “whole student” when, in fact, the critical area of spiritual development has been isolated and rarely acknowledged. How are our emerging professionals being encouraged in their spiritual development? In what ways are young or seasoned student affairs professionals encouraging such development in students? In what ways do spiritual beliefs influence the practices of student affairs professionals and influence the learning experiences of students? Before these questions can be addressed, clarity about what spirituality means needs to be achieved.
Definitions of and Distinctions of Religion, Spirituality, and Spiritual Development

Love (2000) writes that the terms religion and spirituality are often used synonymously and provides an example of resulting confusion. In a conference paper presentation, he made the point that all people are spiritual. The discussant understood this to mean that all people are religious, and in feedback to Love, disagreed. Love’s reason for sharing this example is that regardless of the fact that he specifically wrote about a difference between religion and spirituality, it did not prevent this misunderstanding. Religion and spirituality as synonymous appears to be a societal assumption. Though in the academy and in our discussions with students we see signs of this changing, it is important to recognize that this assumption exists.

In a review of the extant literature on definitions of religion and spirituality, it became clear that while there is a great deal of literature on the topics, there is no general agreement of definitions for these terms (Bryant, 2007; Estanek, 2006; Love & Talbot, 1999; Speck, 2005; Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999). Scholars offer their own definitions, which range broadly from belief in a deity to non-theistic concepts that include notions of humanity and meaning-making. The concepts are often compared as a way of differentiating them.

A variety of perspectives and definitions of the terms religion and spirituality has been offered within the formal discourse. Parks (2000) acknowledged that the soul is “rooted in a longing for ways of speaking of the human experience of depth, meaning, mystery, moral purpose, transcendence, wholeness, intuition, vulnerability, tenderness, courage, the capacity to love, and the apprehension of spirit (or Spirit) as the animating essence at the core
of life” (p. 16). Kazanjian (1998) also wrote of meaning-making: “During discussions with students, I settled on spirituality in education as that which animates the mind and body, giving meaning, purpose and context to thought, word, and action. Think of it as the meaning-making aspect of learning” (p. 38). Gilley (2005) noted that “most religious people consider themselves to be spiritual but that not all spiritual people consider themselves to be religious” (p. 95). This definition recognizes an important separation between religion and spirituality.

While it is recognized that spirituality can equate with religion for a given individual (Gilley, 2005; Teasdale, 1999), the direction of this research focuses on what is most important in one’s life. Whether that includes religion or not is purely personal. Astin (2004) contends of spirituality that “there’s little point in trying to develop a precise definition” (p. 34). Among Astin’s descriptors are that it “has to do with the values that we hold most dear …our beliefs about why we are here – the meaning and purpose that we see in our work and our life – and our sense of connection to each other and to the world around us” (p. 34). Thus, this concept of spirituality can include, but does not necessarily include, a theistic underpinning. Critical to the definitions above is that they and this study deal with spirituality as meaning-making in an individual’s life based on his or her perspective and values, which can be theistic or non-theistic. It is with these understandings and inclusive intent that this research was undertaken.
Scholarly Views on Spirituality in Higher Education

General interest in the topic of spirituality, in both scholarly and popular circles, is increasing. This interest has included scholars in the academy (Astin, 2002; Astin, 2004; Hoppe, 2005; Jablonski, 2001; Palmer, 2003). The inclusion of spirituality in higher education has taken shape in a variety of forms. Some faculty and administrators recognize the developmental value and wish to incorporate spirituality into their classes (Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Diamond, 2008; Kazanjian & Laurence, 2002), while some student affairs professionals seek to integrate spirituality into the framework of holistic student development (Allen & Cherrey, 2000; Jablonski, 2005; Love & Talbot, 1999). Additionally, spirituality has been written about from a legal concerns perspective (Clark, 2001; Hall, 2008; Lowery, 2005).

Zajonc (2003) recognized the increasing numbers of members of the academy, including faculty, staff, and academic administrators “speaking openly about their interest in the contemplative and spiritual dimensions of higher education” (p. 52). Much of the literature about spirituality in higher education is characterized by papers written by scholars or scholars/practitioners arguing for the value of spirituality in higher education and student affairs. Such literature supports the scholarly contention that spiritual integration is devalued in our society and often considered inappropriate for higher education. After a plethora of reflective and justification articles in the literature base, empirical research articles are becoming more prevalent.
Empirical Evidence: Moving From Stories to Evidence

Some professional fields have a long and rich history with attention to and integration of holism, including spirituality, as a valuable component of their work. The fields of nursing and psychology are two such professions. More recent attention to spirituality and holism appears in studies related to spirituality in the workplace (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Duchon & Plowman, 2005; Duerr, 2004; Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2004; Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006; Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2008; Milliman, Czaplewski, & Ferguson, 2004; Mitroff & Denton, 1999). Other studies span topics including spirituality as a component of cultural competence (Hodge, 2007) and public administrators’ attitudes toward spirituality (Bruce, 2000). As indicated above, empirical research spans many disciplines and fields; however, the focus here is on empirical research in higher education.

Because the focus of this research is spirituality as a component of holistic student development in the field of student affairs and higher education, studies related to spirituality and higher education are most relevant. In the past several years, a variety of studies have been undertaken related to this area of inquiry, including dissertations, studies published in scholarly journals, and national research projects funded by national organizations. The increasing literature base is bringing attention to spirituality as an area worthy of study in the academy. Completed dissertations include spiritual development as a predictor of college student coping (Creel, 2000), spirituality and leadership (Pintus, 1998; Ruiz, 2005), spirituality and religious life in regard to moral development of college students (Washington, 1999), religious communities and college student experiences (Bryant, 2004), development
of instruments to assess spirituality (Wheat, 1991), mid-level student affairs professionals’ perceptions of spirituality (Hanson, 2005), and graduate school spiritual climates (Wiese, 2006). As is evidenced by these topics, with few exceptions, most of the studies in higher education have as their focus student spirituality and development as opposed to how staff perceive their own spirituality and impact student spirituality and spiritual development.

Studies published in scholarly journals or as projects that specifically address spirituality and faculty, students, or both include the ongoing Higher Education Research Institute’s Project on Spirituality, Reese’s (2001) study of the implementation of spiritual development programs at Christian colleges and universities, Bryant, Roseboro and Luzader’s (2008) study of spiritual struggles of college students, Rogers and Love’s (2007) study of aspects of graduate students’ preparation programs, Bryant’s (2008a) exploration of contexts and practices for engaging student spirituality, and her (2007) study of gender differences in spiritual development of college students. These studies extend the literature base in terms of what we know about a range of spiritually-related topics, and they make clear the value of addressing spirituality and spiritual development in the academy, yet they fall short in terms of inclusion of the student affairs profession in this important developmental area. Thus, while spirituality in higher education has been approached from a variety of perspectives, the focus has not been on the impact of the student affairs profession in regard to self perceptions of spirituality and practices of integrating spirituality as a component of the holistic developmental work that is done with students.
Though the following studies focus on faculty, they are more closely aligned with this area of inquiry because of their applicability to the student developmental role that both faculty and student affairs professionals embrace. The most sweeping studies include projects undertaken by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) through the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education Project. Of specific interest in regard to applicability to student affairs staff are the studies “Spirituality and the Professoriate: A National Study of Faculty Attitudes, Experiences, and Behaviors” (Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Calderone, & Szélényi, 2006) from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education Project, and Lindholm and Astin’s (2008) study of faculty spirituality as a predictor of a student-centered pedagogy that was made possible through use of data from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty study. The UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty study is of importance because it focused on attitudes, beliefs and values of faculty in their work with students and has applicability also to student affairs professionals, who work closely with students. Lindholm and Astin’s research is of particular interest because it studied the impact that the spirituality of faculty has on their practice, specifically on their style of pedagogy. This examination of practice is closely related to the purpose of this research; however, this research shifts the focus of analysis from faculty practice to student affairs practice. Similar to the research findings related to spirituality and students, these studies related to faculty make clear that spirituality is an integral part of who faculty are and that their spirituality impacts how they approach their work and hence their interactions with students.
While the above-cited studies have a common component that is inclusive of spirituality in a higher education setting and are drawn heavily upon for this research, there are at least four studies and one dissertation that directly address this topic of interest on spirituality and student affairs professionals. The studies were conducted by Dalton (2006), Moran and Curtis (2004), Seifert (2008), and Seifert, Harmon, Goodman, and Watt (2009). The dissertation was completed by Hanson (2005). All have a focus on student affairs professionals and each is presented in the literature review because of this close alignment with the purposes of this dissertation. Even though these research projects address student affairs professionals specifically, there is still much to be learned by a quantitative study of student affairs professionals’ perceptions of spirituality and practices of integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development. None of the existing studies takes this specific approach.

Statement of Problem and Purpose

While the profession of student affairs espouses the goal of holistic student development (Komives, Woodard & Associates, 1996; Love, 2001; Sandeen, 2004), little research has been conducted regarding the spirituality of student affairs professionals or their practice in terms of integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development (Love & Talbot, 1999).

In recent years, a variety of research has been conducted in higher education with a focus on spirituality, including both theistic and nontheistic perspectives (Dalton, 2006; Moran & Curtis, 2004). These studies have increased our knowledge base regarding
spirituality and faculty (Astin et al, 2006; Lindholm & Astin, 2008); spirituality and student affairs professionals (Dalton, 2006; Hanson, 2005; Moran & Curtis, 2004; Seifert 2008; Seifert, Harmon, Goodman, & Watt, 2009) and spirituality and undergraduate students (Bryant, 2008a; Bryant, 2008b; Bryant, Roseboro & Luzader, 2008) and graduate students (Rogers and Love, 2007; Wiese, 2006).

However, there appears to be a gap between the espoused goal of holistic student development and research on the spirituality and practice of student affairs professionals in regard to their degree of commitment to integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development into their work. If student affairs professionals do not include spirituality as a component of holistic student development in their work, then the profession is not practicing that which it espouses as a foundational goal, and students may not be provided opportunities for holistic development. Without such research, we remain unaware of student affairs professionals’ practice of integrating spirituality into their work, or of what influences and predicts such practice. The opportunity for integration of spirituality as a component of holistic student development has potential to be further enhanced by this knowledge.

Because holistic student development is foundational to the practice of student affairs, it is important to address and learn more about the spirituality and practice of student affairs professionals and their degree of commitment to integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development. The following section provides the research questions that will be addressed in this study.
Research Questions

To support this research, the following research questions were addressed:

1. How do student affairs professionals perceive their own spirituality?

2. What are student affairs professionals’ practices in regard to integration of spirituality into their work?

3. To what extent do student affairs professionals’ demographics, spirituality, graduate preparation, and mentoring experiences predict the practice of integrating spirituality into their work?

Theoretical Framework

The theories of Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003), together with the concept of holistic student development provide a strong theoretical foundation on which to develop this dissertation.

Fowler

Fowler (1981) provided the initial theory that considers issues of faith development and meaning-making. Importantly, he introduced the concept of holism through his inclusion of affect in his theory. Fowler did not agree with the “Piaget-Kohlberg assertion that cognition and the affections, though intertwining in behavior and choice, must be analytically separated in cognitive-structural research” (p. 273). By omitting affect, Kohlberg dismissed the important role of feelings, emotion, values, and attitudes. Fowler found this unacceptable. Describing his conviction, Fowler wrote: “Faith, I knew, involves rationality and passionality; it involves knowing, valuing and committing. In the structuring activity that is faith, I saw,
we had to have a wider understanding of cognition than that with which Piaget worked” (p. 273).

Fowler provided two important foundations. The first is that he developed a theory to study faith development, thus elevating the importance of this part of life as worthy of scholarly attention, and the second is that he embraced the concept of holism by recognizing and honoring both cognitive and affective dimensions of development. These provide a strong connection to spirituality as a component of holistic student development within the field of student affairs. Specifically, the aspect of Fowler’s theory that supports this framework is the notion that intellect and affect are intertwined. Theoretically, student affairs professionals’ practice is informed by both intellect and affect. Spirituality embraces both. This research seeks to learn more about the extent to which spirituality influences the practice of student affairs professionals.

Parks

Parks’s (2000) theory provides justification for studying student affairs professionals’ ways of working with students in a non-theistic manner and the importance of mentoring and mentoring communities in young adult development. Her attention to the depth and importance of how individuals make meaning provides a wide view that embraces deep aspects of being and becoming. Her attention to mentoring is aligned with the way that many student affairs professionals engage with their students, as advisors in a variety of capacities. This is important because it provides specific support for the concept of holistic student development.
In particular, Parks’s work with college students has applicability. Parks’s theory of faith formation is, in its essence, the primary articulation of student development in the realm of spirituality, meaning-making, and what really matters in students’ lives. Parks’s work centers directly on the important topics of meaning and purpose, the relational task of understanding one’s place in the larger scheme of life, and the important role that mature adults have in helping with this development through the mentoring of young adults. Her work embraces concepts of spirituality and holism and has been cited heavily by scholars in higher education as highly relevant.

Parks (1990, 1993, 1995, 2000, 2008) emphasizes how much undergraduate students need this kind of mentoring. She is quite specific in her description of the roles of mentors, which include recognition, support, challenge, and inspiration (Parks, 2000, p. 129), and also in her belief that the university is an appropriate environment for a mentoring community to support the development of young adults (1995). Further, she believes that it is important for young adults to have support in developing an understanding of themselves, including the potential of their power for shaping community and society. Thus, Parks (1993) sees the role of mentoring as including young adult development both individually and within community:

A mentoring community is a group (which could take the form of a class, a task force or working group, or even a corporation or a division of a corporation) that welcomes and affirms the competence and promise of young adult lives, while offering a vision on behalf of a larger possibility and an experience of acting together in concert with that vision. (p. 51)
Parks (2000) further articulates that good mentoring practices include a network of belonging, noting that it “offers a sociality that works, physically, emotionally, intellectually, and spiritually as the young adult becomes more fully at home in the universe” (p. 135). Additionally, she contends that mentoring provides an environment in which development can be supported by the roles of the mentor to support big enough questions, encounters with otherness, and development of important habits of mind as well as worthy dreams. According to Parks, a mentoring environment offers access to key images, understanding of concepts and context, and development of practices that mediate these gifts. Student affairs professionals can provide this kind of mentoring to students.

Tisdell

Tisdell (2003) attaches value to context, in particular the importance of the role of culture and identity in the development of a young adult. Much of Tisdell’s work deals with student development specifically in the classroom (Tolliver & Tisdell, 2006), which is a different domain from the majority of the work of student affairs professionals. However, what is very applicable for this study is the attention to the learning environments in which student affairs professionals work. Just as Tisdell (2003) contends that “it is possible to design a curriculum and a learning environment that attends to the symbolic domains of learning that are part of spirituality” (p. 212), so too are these concepts applicable to the learning environments created by student affairs professionals.

Tisdell provides attention to the quickly changing world with her focus on culture and identity. She urges educators to be inclusive, to understand and honor student experiences
and voices different from their own. Tisdell recognizes that students’ identities are largely defined by their experiences and cultures of origin. A powerful part of that identity emanates from values, beliefs, what is held most dear, including spirituality. Spirituality is a part of our culture, hence, Tisdell argues, it cannot be ignored as we develop learning environments for our students.

With changing student demographics and increasing access to higher education, it is critical for student affairs professionals to be aware of and understand cultures broader than their own. Tisdell’s work highlights this importance through her notion that educators do, indeed, shape the learning environment. Tisdell urges educators to acknowledge that an individual’s culture is relevant to her or his identity and to integrate this knowledge into learning environments. Religious and spiritual identities are important parts of culture and hence identity development. By acknowledging and not ignoring these facets of life, student affairs staff engage in and support holistic student development.

The theoretical framework for this research combines the concept of holistic student development with the theories of Fowler, Parks, and Tisdell. Parks’s theory is the most applicable of the three utilized in the theoretical framework. However, as described above, each adds an element of support for inclusion of spirituality as an integral component of holistic student development and worthy of research. Together they provide a foundation for spirituality as a viable component of holistic student development in the work of student affairs professionals. Figure 1 provides a visual diagram of the theoretical framework for this dissertation.
Holistic student development provides the foundation for the profession of student affairs and for this theoretical framework (see Figure 1). Though holism is a concept espoused throughout the history of higher education (Evans & Reason, 2001; Komives, Woodard & Associates, 1996; Love, 2001; Sandeen, 2004), the reality is that the emphasis of higher education is on intellectual endeavors supported by scientific methods.
Immediately above holistic student development, the three theories developed by Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003) are depicted with their specific theoretical contributions toward support of spirituality as a component of holistic student development. These theories each support notions of integrating spirituality as a component of holistic development.

The work of Fowler in integrating both cognitive and affective as important in the study of spirituality is a key concept. The work of Parks highlights the notion of the important role of adult mentors (student affairs professionals) and their influence on the meaning-making search and recognition of connection with community of young adults (traditional college students). Tisdell recognizes the changing demographics of our students, and helps explain how identity and culture, which include spirituality, impact and are impacted by the learning environments set for our students. The work of these three scholars helps to fill the gap in student development theory as related to spirituality in the practice of student affairs professionals. In particular, these theories support integration of spirituality in the practice of student affairs professionals as an appropriate concern.

Student affairs professionals’ practice is located above spirituality, indicating that the practice of student affairs professionals is impacted by various dimensions of their spirituality, as will be measured in this study. Specifically, this research seeks to measure if demographics, spirituality, graduate school curricula, or mentoring experiences predict student affairs professionals’ practice in regard to integration of spirituality as a component of their work.
Lastly, Figure 1 indicates an arrow to students. Though students are not a part of this study, they are the ultimate purpose of this study. Information regarding how student affairs professionals interact with and provide opportunities and experiences for and with student learners is of great value to our profession. Because the student affairs profession espouses holistic student development, learning more about the spirituality and practice of student affairs professionals is one avenue for elevating holistic learning environments for students that include the important developmental component of spirituality.

Conceptual Framework

In order to conduct this research, a conceptual framework has been developed that illustrates the variables for the study. Figure 2 provides an illustration of the conceptual framework and identifies independent and dependent variables.

There is evidence that demographic characteristics inform spirituality during the college years (Bryant, 2007; Bryant, Choi, & Yasuno, 2003; Stewart, 2009). Therefore,
spirituality was examined as a function of demographic characteristics as a part of this research.

Spirituality was examined for its impact on student affairs practice. Literature indicates that spirituality is of interest to students (Astin, 2004) and impacts how faculty carry out their responsibilities (Lindholm & Astin, 2008). Thus, it is possible that the spiritual disposition of student affairs professionals will impact the way that they approach their responsibilities and hence, their interactions with students.

This research explored the impact that the graduate school curricula has on student affairs professionals’ practice. Rogers and Love (2007) found that while spirituality may be a component of graduate school curricula, graduate students do not make connections between their learning and how they will practice once in the field. Little is known regarding what connections exist between graduate school curricula and related practice of student affairs professionals in regard to spirituality. Indeed, it will be of interest to measure if there are connections between spiritually-infused graduate school curricula and student affairs practice in the realm of integrating spirituality into practice.

Parks theorizes that mentoring has tremendous impact on the young adult stage of development (Parks, 2000). The work of many student affairs professionals is characterized by the manner in which they interact with young adult student leaders in mentoring environments. Thus, it is possible that the type and degree of mentoring that student affairs professionals provide to students will be impacted by their spirituality and perhaps also by the mentoring experiences that they experienced as graduate students.
Overview of Methodology

This study is a quantitative, non-experimental study. A cross-sectional design was utilized. Data were gathered by a questionnaire that was sent to participants via e-mail.

Participants

Sampling. The population consists of student affairs professionals who are members of the National Association of Campus Activities (NACA). During the 2008-2009 year, institutional membership of the organization totaled 1,100 and full-time professional staff membership totaled approximately 1,450. Undergraduate students were not included in this figure, even though they are also members of NACA. For the purposes of this research, only full-time student affairs professionals with master’s degrees or higher levels of education were included in the sampling pool.

Instrumentation

The survey developed for this study consists of two parts. Part one includes ten demographic questions that relate to stage of career, level of education, type of institution, gender, racial/ethnic background, and age. Stage of career includes the number of years employed in the student affairs profession, highest degree completed, and level of current employment. Other demographic data collected includes type of institution for which the respondent currently works, as well as whether that institution or the institution where the respondent completed graduate school is religiously affiliated, and primary area of responsibility.
Part two of the survey includes a variety of questions such as Likert-type questions with scales ranging from 1-5 and 1-7. Some of the scales were widened from three or four point scales to provide more variance. This was done following scale examples by Gable and Wolf (1993). Respondents self-selected from a range of questions including agreement with statements, importance of various items, and frequency of specific practices with students. Examples of content are questions about meaning of life, self-perceptions of characteristics such as caring, and interest in understanding and contributing to the welfare of others. Examples of holistic, spiritually-infused practices include questions related to communicating and interacting with students in authentic ways, providing time to reflect and share during meetings, and valuing educational goals such as helping students to develop personal values and enhance their spiritual development.

The survey was developed by using and modifying components of three different surveys, which are all fully described in Chapter 3 under the instrumentation section. Additionally, the survey was piloted at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Region III Summer Symposium in June of 2009 and refined as a result of that feedback and of feedback from Dr. Alyssa Bryant, chair and Dr. James Bartlett, committee member.

Data Collection

Data were collected via an online instrument. The survey for this data set was sent to student affairs professionals whose institutions are members of NACA and who have e-mail addresses in the membership directory for NACA. Prior to the survey implementation,
NACA sent their staff e-mail data base to Student Voice, an assessment organization. Following approval through the North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board process, Student Voice staff sent an e-mail to all student affairs staff members who were members of NACA. Participants followed a link to a secure website to complete the survey, which took approximately 10-12 minutes. The initial plan was for Student Voice to send at least one additional reminder e-mail, and depending upon the rate of return, the researcher and the Director of Research at NACA had a plan to work together to determine additional appropriate follow-up. Because of their prior relationship, NACA agreed to share the e-mail database with Student Voice. This was congruent with NACA’s policy of not allowing an individual researcher access to membership information. This procedure was an asset for this study because it enabled the follow-up e-mails to be sent only to non-respondents, thus eliminating the possibility of double-response error.

Variables

There are four sets of independent variables in this study: demographic and work environment characteristics, spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences. Demographic and work environment characteristics have been described earlier, and were used to provide cross-sectional descriptions of the sample. Spirituality is a multidimensional concept, and was measured through the use of select proposed scales from two projects undertaken by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty survey (Astin, et al.: 2006) and the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education student survey (Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Szelényi, &
The pre-existing scales that were proposed for use in this research included Spirituality, Spiritual Quest, Equanimity, Ethic of Caring, Ecumenical Worldview, and Compassionate Self-Concept. The last two independent variables, expected to relate to the practices of student affairs professionals, were inclusion of spirituality in the curriculum of student affairs professionals’ graduate programs and mentoring experiences of graduate students. These sets of variables consist of a series of questions on a Likert-type scale relating to graduate students’ graduate school curricula and mentoring experiences. Results of factor loadings and confirmatory analyses determined the final scales retained for these variables.

The dependent variable for this study was holistic, spiritually-infused practice. Practice is defined as the degree to which student affairs professionals integrate spirituality as a component of holistic student development into their work with students. Four proposed scales were used to measure practice. Three of the four proposed scales are Community Building, Modeling Authenticity, and Reflective Practice and are from the survey developed by Seifert and Harmon (2009). The final scale used to measure the dependent variable practice is from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty factor scale and is titled Focus on Students’ Personal Development. Together, this combination of scales was used to measure the relationship between demographics, spirituality, graduate school curricula, mentoring experiences, and the practice of student affairs professionals.
Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS 17 software. Pre-data analysis included Cronbach’s alpha to test for inter-item consistency in each proposed or pre-existing scale. Confirmatory analysis was also used to test scale reliability. The specific analyses for the first question included descriptive reporting of means, standard deviations, and frequencies regarding student affairs professionals’ perceptions of their spirituality. In addition, both ANOVA and Pearson’s correlation were used to analyze relationships between spirituality and various demographic characteristics of student affairs professionals. Likewise, descriptive data were used to report on question two, student affairs professionals’ practices in regard to integration of spirituality. For question three, regression was used to predict how demographics, spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences impact the dependent variable, holistic, spiritually-infused practice. Independent variables were entered into the regression model, with a separate block for each set of variables. This research also explored how spirituality mediates the influence of demographics characteristics on the practice of student affairs professionals.

Significance of Study

Understanding what predicts integration of spirituality as a component of holistic student development in the work of student affairs professionals moves the knowledge base forward by positioning that profession to better understand how to intentionally integrate the exploration of spirituality into work with students and into work with graduate students preparing to enter the profession. Currently, there is interest in this area as evidenced by a
growing body of scholarly literature and empirical research. Spirituality is important to students, being a part of their culture and identity, and hence, an aspect of holistic student development. Student affairs professionals are particularly well-situated to assist, challenge, and encourage student spiritual development. It is not known how spirituality is operationalized in the field of student affairs or what predicts the commitment of student affairs professionals to integrate spirituality into practice.

Through the efforts of theorists Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003), there is a solid foundation upon which to build this investigation and with which to begin to practice what the profession has long espoused: holistic student development. In interactions with student leaders, which are largely out of the classroom, student affairs professionals integrate affect and cognitive learning. They witness students moving through their developmental growth in spurts and lapses, and strive to support and challenge them in a balanced way that results in positive long-term growth experiences. In short, student affairs staff watch and support as their students become. Intentionally integrating spirituality by acknowledging how students make or struggle to make meaning, and acknowledging this often private part of students’ development, supports such journeys and supports holistic student development.

In such a complex and changing world, the development of meaning and purpose, an understanding of one’s own as well as other’s values and beliefs, and the ability to have discussions with others with differing values and beliefs is becoming more important (Nash, 2007; Tisdell, 2003). Helping students develop purpose is a large part of the work of student
affairs. Understanding what predicts student affairs professionals’ engagement in activities which, at their core, deal with these topics is an important contribution to the future of the profession.

When pondering the ethics of inclusion of spirituality in higher education from a holistic perspective, one can equally question the ethics of such omission. Such prevalent omissions reflect and strengthen the direction and materialistic values our society has embraced over the past few decades. The profession of student affairs can impact this through intentional inclusion of spirituality as a component of a holistic student development experience. Such attention to inner development has potential to balance these societal tendencies. Moreover, it also provides the opportunity for the profession to practice that which it espouses, and to positively impact individual students. In so doing, student affairs impacts society as students assume roles that make contributions to their communities.

This research provides a descriptive snapshot of the self-perceived spirituality of student affairs professionals, as well as the practice of student affairs professionals in regard to integration of spirituality into their work. Further, it seeks to learn what predicts student affairs professionals’ practices of spirituality in their work with student leaders. The literature base is extended as a result of this study in regard to the practice of student affairs professionals related to demographic variables, dimensions of spirituality, inclusion of spirituality in the graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences. In particular, findings regarding graduate curriculum and mentoring are two areas that can directly inform this profession in terms of new or continued directions.
Definition of Terms

Holistic Student Development – developmental approach that intentionally considers and addresses the individual in all aspects of development, both outer development (i.e. skill sets, etc.) and inner development (values, meaning-making, purpose). Closely related to student development as defined below, yet more intentionally inclusive.


Spiritual Integration – intentional integration by student affairs professionals of spirituality as a component of holistic student development.

Student Affairs Professionals - individuals who have earned master’s level or higher educational degrees in a field related to student development and who work to support student life out of the classroom, with an emphasis on student development.

Student Development - a philosophy that has guided student affairs practice and served as the rationale for specific programs and services since the profession’s inception, manifested by a “concern for the development of the whole person” (Rodgers, 1990, p. 27).

Assumptions

1) This research accepts the premise that spirituality is a valid and valued component of holistic student development.

2) This study excluded student affairs professionals whose institutions are not members of the National Association of Campus Activities, and who did not have their e-mail address on file in the membership directory. Because student affairs professionals
should have a focus on student development, an assumption was made that this group of professionals will be fairly representative of the field.

Limitations

1) Agreement on a universal definition of spirituality is lacking. The term spirituality often embraces concepts of theism and non-theism. For the purposes of this study, spirituality can, but is not required to, include both.

2) Spirituality is a difficult topic to study. In fact, some would argue that it is not at all measurable. Nonetheless, it is important to begin to identify and measure various components related to spirituality and spiritual integration because of the significance of holistic student development in the profession of student affairs.

3) The UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education Project instruments used were originally intended to be a measure of student and faculty characteristics, respectively, related to spirituality and practice. In this study, student and faculty scales were applied to student affairs professionals.

4) Parks’s theory is used in this research as one component of the theoretical framework; however, it has not been operationalized. It has been cited extensively by scholars to support their work, and was used in this study as justification for the work of student affairs professionals in terms of their efforts to foster student development. Further, this theory provides support for the practice of mentoring students.
5) Because NACA has a focus of membership to professionals involved in student development through campus programs and activities, the findings cannot be generalized to the entire student affairs profession.

6) Based on focus group and dissertation chair feedback, the survey response options were modified so that all questions have a response range of either five or seven. This was done to increase variance of results. These changes were made based on Gable and Wolf’s (1993) *Instrument Development in the Affective Domain: Measuring Attitudes and Values in Corporate and School Settings*. Certain scales were broadened from three or four point responses options to five point response options. Thus, a limitation of this study is that the scales are not as they were in the original version. The inherent weakness of a three point scale in terms of possible variance justifies this action.

7) The factor scale Reflective Practice was retained even though it had a Cronbach’s alpha of only .65.

8) Even though Modeling Authenticity was .034 beyond the suggested skewness range, it was retained because it represented one aspect of practice that has been used in previous studies and was considered by the researcher to be important.

9) The low response rate was an issue that caused the researcher to revise the survey administration plan. Two additional invitations were sent out to the original distribution list with an incentive for response. This increased the response rate, but the end result was still relatively low.
10) There was limited variance in the demographic characteristics of the sample. Because NACA does not maintain demographic characteristics of their membership, there was not a way to compare the sample with the full membership for proportionality.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

This literature review consists of five sections that provide context and a foundation for the study. The first section is an overview and analysis of how the relationship between religion/spirituality and higher education has evolved over time. Particular emphasis on the role of holism as a guiding force for the profession of student affairs and how it has been reflected in this evolution is included as one aspect of this history.

Section two provides an overview of the literature on definitions of religion, spirituality, and spiritual development, and illuminates the central issues and challenges scholars have identified in regard to these areas. Clearly, there has been a great deal of debate and lack of consensus on the meaning of the term spirituality.

The third section is an exploration of the challenges, justification, and support of inclusion of spirituality in higher education. Special attention is given to legal implications of spirituality in society and higher education. One of the constraining forces influencing student affairs professionals’ inclusion of spirituality as a legitimate component of holistic student development is fear and confusion of what is and is not legal. Another area of considerable debate has revolved around the appropriateness of spirituality in higher education; thus, this section also provides justification and support for inclusion of spirituality as a component of holistic student development in higher education.

Section four is comprised of a review of related empirical research of spirituality that is relevant to the field of higher education. It begins with a broad range of studies and concludes with a focus on the research most pertinent to this study: research on spirituality
and student affairs practice. Specific attention is given to the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty and student surveys as well as to Seifert and Harmon’s (2009) survey for the measurement of student affairs practices, which are all quantitative studies. This section addresses empirical evidence suggesting that demographics influence spirituality. It also reviews the limited empirical evidence regarding the role of student affairs graduate preparation programs in preparing young adults to be effective advisors and mentors of student leaders in the realm of spiritual development.

The fifth and final section explores select student development theories that touch upon spirituality and provides an in-depth review of the specific theories of Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003). These theories are compared, contrasted, and used to support the theoretical framework. Particular attention is given to Parks’s concept of mentoring and the related impact on young adults as they develop.

Historical Overview

*Historical Relationship between Religion/Spirituality and Higher Education*

The academy has not always dismissed faith as a valuable component of the role of education. The following section provides historical context of the shifting role of religion and spirituality in higher education, which has been characterized by a series of changes influenced by societal shifts and trends. In an attempt to recount and explain the history of American higher education, scholars have offered a variety of perspectives (Cohen, 1998; Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 2005; Lucas 1994).
One common concept contained within all accounts is the importance and role of religion both in society and in the founding and history of American higher education. Addressing societal context at the beginning of higher education, Cohen (1998) notes the importance of religion as an integral part of the day-to-day existence of the colonists, and as having an important role in the founding of higher education.

Colleges that were founded during the colonial era were intricately affiliated with religion and specifically with Christian churches (Blimling & Alschuler, 1996; Bryant, 2004; Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Diamond, 2008; Marsden, 1994). These institutions were the chief training ground for the clergy, and theology was foundational to higher education, held in high esteem alongside studies of Greek and Latin (Diamond, 2008; Marsden, 1994; Strange, 2000). Though higher education had initially been developed for training clergy and statesmen, it also began serving the elite and providing training for a few professions, illustrating the initial broadening of its origins.

Congruent with student affairs concepts of holistic student development, these institutions reflected the British tradition. As an example, faculty lived with students, interacting regularly both in and out of class and serving as mentors, guides, role models, counselors and resident models (Blimling & Alschuler, 1996; Strange, 2000). Responsibilities of the academy were not specialized. Duties currently structured into divisions of academic affairs and student affairs were considered responsibilities of each individual who held a position at a colonial college. In loco parentis, the concept that the relationship between student and university was patterned after that of child and parent was
fully operationalized by colleges (Caple 1998). Colleges operated as an extended family.

“Education of the whole person – knowledge, talents, soul, and character – guided the enterprise, and questions of ultimate meaning formed the discourse of the day” (Strange, 2000, p. 1). In this were concepts integrating religion and holism as primary strands within the basic fabric of higher education relative to how it developed and how it operated.

Religion, recognized in a fairly strict sense as Protestantism to this point in time, was not immune to these cultural shifts. According to Lucas (as cited in Murphy 2005), a significant shift began around the end of the nineteenth century, in the late 1800’s. During this time, there began a weakening of Protestant values and theology and an emphasis on valuing positivism and the scientific method. This shift ultimately resulted in the changing role of the American university to a research institution “dedicated to the exploration of knowledge as a means of investigating and mastering science and technology – often at the expense of and in contrast to spiritual explorations and understandings of the natural world” (Murphy, 2005, p. 23). These developments were among the factors that had very detrimental effects on the prominence of religion and spirituality in higher education.

The fading prominence of religion was not limited to the influences of science, however. As science was emerging, political influences impacted the standing of religion in society and in higher education. This marginalization of religion was neither swift nor solely about the nature of knowledge. To be sure, the changes were also political. “Clergy and church boards lost control over the purse strings and administration of major colleges; Christianity also ceased to be regarded as having a particular corner on the truth” (Wuthnow,
In addition to the church’s loss of political clout, additional forces that had been arising in the realm of science would prove to significantly change the face of society and higher education, reshaping what was valued and who had power.

The work of Auguste Comte was one of those forces. In the first half of the nineteenth century, Comte expressed his principal doctrines of Positivism. These three doctrines included: empirical science as the only source of positive knowledge in the world, the need to purge pseudo-knowledge such as mysticism from minds, and a move to extend scientific knowledge and technical control to human society, moving it into the realm of the political and the moral (Caple, 1998; Schön, 1983). Before the twentieth century began, Positivism was a dominant philosophy. Comte, along with others such as John Stuart Mill and his *System of Logic* (1852), provided support for what Caple (1998) claims started a “general movement, that with other elements, produced an approach to the study of human behavior patterned after the natural sciences” (p. 7). “Propositions which were neither analytically nor empirically testable were held to have no meaning at all” (Schön, 1983, p. 34). Unchallenged Protestant dominance ceased to exist, and concepts of Positivism and science surfaced and dominated society and higher education. Thus, a major cause of the historic separation between religion and concepts of spirituality in higher education is related to the emergence of science as the predominant mode of knowledge.

Denominational colleges came about in a variety of ways, including at the initiative of local communities, of national denominational organizations, through combined efforts of local citizens and local church, and by benefactors (Chickering, Dalton, and Stamm, 2006;
Cohen and Kisker, 2010). The majority received support from state or community taxes. Most states, before granting institutional charters, required religious nondiscrimination. Peterson (1970) provided a history of denominational colleges that traces their founding and growth as well as their governance and financial support. Interestingly, while many colleges had members of their boards from their denominations, this was not universally the case. Many struggled financially, often as a result of financial support being withheld due to disapproval of college programs and emphases or because the restrictions of the board or others made it difficult to seek other sources of revenue. One example of an important influencer that changed historical religious connections in denominational institutions was the Carnegie Foundation’s effort to provide a pension for faculty working in higher education, restricted to those who worked at non-denominational colleges. Portraying trends of the day, Peterson (1970) wrote:

> Coming on the heels of the exodus of clerical trustees from the church colleges, with the eclipse of authoritarian norms of administrative behavior, and with the evisceration of the overly-pious classical curriculum, the 1906 proposal caught the church-related colleges at perhaps their greatest moment of weakness and stress in intradenominational relations.

(p. 29).

Following this proposal, many institutions immediately sought to extricate themselves from perceptions that they were or might be religiously affiliated. Dickinson College, as an example, declared that they were non-sectarian, “under the friendly auspices of the Methodist
Church” (Peterson, 1970, p. 30). Thus, a variety of influences impacted the role of the denominational churches. They were, however, instrumental in the creation of colleges during the expansion of the United States, particularly in the West, and provided opportunities for many more young people to attend college than had previously been the case.

It was the initial Morrill Federal Land Grant Act, signed by President Lincoln in 1862, however, that served as the primary force to reshape and expand American higher education. Through it, Congress endowed colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts, which resulted in a great increase in both the number and focus of colleges in America. Education became more vocationally-oriented as efforts were directed toward improving America’s ability to progress technically and agriculturally. Newly settled areas were supported in their higher education needs, which limited the creation of additional church colleges (Marsden, 1994; Pattillo & Mackenzie, 1966). Thus the impact of the Morrill Act was a general increase in public education with an emphasis in practical skills intended to strengthen the nation’s economy, particularly in areas of agriculture and mechanical arts.

Though the Morrill Act encouraged education toward a more practical and service-oriented direction, the establishment in 1876 of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore was modeled on the German university, which “provided an impetus for development in the opposite direction, towards the German model of the university as a home of ‘pure science,’ the locus of lofty and abstruse research and specialized graduate training” (Keohane, 2006, p.
Existing universities such as Harvard and Yale and new institutions including University of Chicago and Stanford adopted this German model. Soon after World War II, higher education experienced yet another significant shift, this one tying higher education more directly to a business model (Murphy, 2005). In this move, there was further estrangement from concepts of religion and spirituality and more value placed on potential economic impacts of higher education. Coupled with this transition were concepts of bottom line, with rising expectations of cost-effective institutions geared toward meeting needs of the work force. It was during the more recent part of this stage that students began to be labeled as customers, symbolizing the view of the business model. Concerns for public accountability and increased access to education made clear the stark contrast between the early system of higher education intended for training the clergy and serving the elite and the modern system of higher education with a focus on training for the workforce to strengthen the economy.

Globalization represents an aspect of business influence melding into society at large, an influencer that Dirkx (2005) believes is resulting in “our sense of meaning in life becoming dangerously frayed” (p. 156). Alternately described by proponents and opponents with terms of either opportunity and prosperity or greed and inequality (Stiglitz, 2002), there are signs that globalization influences higher education. Weber and Duderstadt note that there is a strong sense that higher education is “in the early stages of globalization, both through the increasing mobility of students and faculty and the rapid growth in international partnerships among universities” (http://www.glion.org/?a=6202&p=1611, accessed on Jan.
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9, 2009). Because universities are in the business of creating knowledge through research and through development of students’ intellectual capacities, it is likely that higher education will become more intertwined with wealth and consumerism, major purposes of globalization. This influence has potential to further weaken both society’s and the academy’s relationship with religion and spirituality as values of consumerism and economic growth take increasing precedence over valuing of religion and spirituality. The issue of globalization may well extend the debate between higher education for the public good and higher education for individual gain.

Thus, there has been through the centuries a variety of societal influences that have changed the shape of religion and spirituality in colleges and universities. This overview of the relationship between religion, spirituality and higher education began at an initial point of development in which religion enjoyed a position of prominence. Influences as outlined above, including significant federal support for the sciences following World War II, provided the impetus for the dramatic shift that positioned science in that position of prominence. It is clear that society has benefited from science as is evidenced by a better standard of living in many aspects of life. Nonetheless, the integration and influence of science in society and higher education has created a dualistic system. Stamm noted that “As a correlate of the separation of faith and knowledge in modern society, the church has become the sole guardian of faith and the university the prime champion of knowledge” (Collegevalues.org, accessed 3/21/07, p. 2). As science enjoyed ascendancy, concepts of religion and spirituality lost their status and societal value. This fragmented way of viewing
life, if perceived differently, could consider science and religion or spirituality as valuable parts of one whole. The academy has developed the knowledge component and in many ways dismissed the faith component. The current state of higher education appears to be a fragmented, yet specialized system that is quite effective in many ways, yet lacking balance in other ways.

Positivism, empiricism, rationalism, and modernism have been challenged by scholars claiming that there are broader ways of knowing (Palmer, 2003; Schön, 1983; Tisdell, 2003). Postmodern thought challenges concepts of rational knowing as the only form of knowing. Gaining support are broadened ways of knowing that incorporate influences of multiculturalism and feminism, both of which have slowly gained credibility (Gilligan, 1982). Such concepts challenge the grand narrative and value intuition, narrative, and affect. As Klages (2006) asserts:

Postmodern micronarratives thus are multiple – there is one for every situation, rather than one narrative covering all situations – and they are necessarily different and largely incompatible; there’s no way to put all the micronarratives together to form one unified coherent idea of how the world, or human beings, operate (p. 175).

Interest in religion, seen by some as a part of the grand narrative, long pushed to the periphery of society and higher education, is experiencing resurgence. The convergence of many factors has included growing expectations for a more accessible educational system; legislation in 1965 which increased immigration patterns and introduced additional customs and religious beliefs and hence, micronarratives; and legal challenges toward restrictive
interpretations of law regarding religion. They have provided impetus for a shift that has become visible during the late 20th and early 21st century toward re-integration of religion and spirituality in higher education (Caple, 1998; Chickering, Dalton & Stamm, 2006). The reappearance is in a form that differentiates between religion and spirituality, expresses value for both, and includes micronarratives (Zinnbauer et al., 1997; Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999). Micronarrative is the concept that there are many explanations of knowledge, not one as is proposed in the concept of grand narrative.

It is possible that religion and spirituality will find a true home in the academy once again. There are signs that this may be the case. Clearly, influences of postmodernism are present as varied narratives compete for a status formerly possessed by the doctrines of organized religion and currently possessed by the influence of positivism. If the student affairs profession truly embraces holistic student development as a foundation of the field, this notion and integration of spirituality as one component thereof represents an area in need of attention in both research and practice.

*Spirituality and Student Affairs Role in Holistic Student Development*

This history that has been traced above provides but a glimpse of the shifting role of religion and spirituality in higher education. It is vital to more thoroughly address the specific domain of student affairs and the concept of holism, as it is with the holistic practice of student affairs professionals in higher education that this study is concerned.

This close connection between the development of the student affairs profession and the inclusion of the concept of holism is acknowledged in the literature (Caple, 1998;
Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Evans & Reason, 2001). According to Dalton, the creation of the role of dean of students “symbolized a commitment on the part of American colleges to preserve the long tradition of concern for the holistic development and welfare of students” (p. 145-146).

A review of some of the earliest philosophical and conceptual statements about the field of student affairs make clear that college leadership recognized the need for consideration of the student in a holistic sense, a role that is foundational to the profession of student affairs. Caple (1998) noted that The Student Personnel Point of View (1937) “emphasized the student as a whole rather than in intellectual training alone” (p. 45). As can be seen from the direct text, the authors encouraged the profession and academy of their responsibility to “consider the student as a whole – his intellectual capacity and achievement, his emotional make-up, his physical condition, his social relationships, his vocational aptitudes and skills, his moral and religious values, his economic resources, and his esthetic appreciations” (ACE, 1937, p. 1).

In an analysis of the document The Student Personnel Point of View (1937), Evans and Reason (2001) outline several influences that shaped the need for the developing profession of student affairs. These included: faculty devoting less time to well-being of their students and focusing more on research endeavors, and an expanded role for higher education in terms of who was being served, reflecting a more diverse student body. Additionally, it had been a parental expectation since the days of colonial colleges that the university would provide appropriate oversight and care through provision of housing (Caple, 1998).
Twelve years later, *The Student Personnel Point of View II* (American Council on Education, 1949) report from the 1949 committee meeting of the American Council on Education which revised the 1937 ACE report included, “The concept of education is broadened to include attention to the student’s well rounded development – physically, socially, emotionally, and spiritually, as well as intellectually” (p. 2). Thus, we see at this time a continued commitment to and development of holistic concepts as well as the introduction of the specific term spirituality as one component of holistic development.

The field of student affairs has a variety of professional associations that support the work professionals do, in both broad and specific ways. The mission and vision statements of these organizations reflect conceptual alignment with the concept of holism and the valued role of holistic student development in student affairs. As an example, the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) includes in their vision statement: the commitment of student affairs to educating the whole student and integrating student life and learning ([http://www.naspa.org/about/default.cfm](http://www.naspa.org/about/default.cfm), accessed on September 7, 2009).

Clearly, holistic student development has been and continues to be a founding precept of the field of student affairs. The writings of many student affairs scholars and practitioners urge a return to a truly holistic educational approach, which includes concepts of religion and spirituality (Astin, 2004; Chickering, Dalton & Stamm, 2006; Jablonski, 2005; Sandeen, 2004).
Definitions of Religion, Spirituality, and Spiritual Development

Though religion and spirituality are increasingly described in very different terms, much of the literature base associates them very closely. The two are also inseparable in the minds of many educators, thus strengthening concern and avoidance of treating either subject in or out of class. Because the terms “religion” and “spirituality” are often used interchangeably, conceptual definitions to provide clarity follows.

The Dalai Lama recognized and articulated a difference between religion and spirituality as is evident in his comment that there are “strength-giving features of a spiritual life that are common to all religions…Involvement in any religious group can create a feeling of belonging, communal ties, a caring connection with fellow practitioners” (Dalai Lama & Cutler, 1998, p. 305). Christianity, for example, can “help govern one’s behavior and way of life” (p. 296) thus providing a framework by which to live. He goes on to express his belief that “even without a religious belief, we can still manage. In some cases, we can manage better” (p. 306). The Dalai Lama described another level of spirituality, beyond a belief in religion that includes “basic human qualities of goodness, kindness, compassion, caring” (p. 307). Since millions of people do not believe in a specific religion, he noted that “it becomes clear that cultivating these kinds of basic spiritual values becomes critical” (p. 307).

Religion

The term religion has a more commonly understood definition than spirituality. Nonetheless, confusion still exists with the term religion. Taylor (2004) wrote specifically of religious studies, pointing to confusion within the field. He indicated it is necessary to define
religion “in a way that allows interpreters to discern similarities and differences both within and among traditions” (p. B4). Bryant (2007) synthesized from extant literature of Hill et al. (2000), Knox, Langehough, Walters, & Rowley (1998), and Love (2001, 2002) and concluded that:

religion is typically associated with commitment to a supernatural power that is expressed through ritual and celebration both individually and within the context of a faith community. The term “religion” connotes a common belief system, a set of principles and practices, a code of conduct, and doctrine or dogma. (p. 835)

Tisdell (2003) pulled from the work of sociologist Martin Marty to share characteristics that are common of all religions. They include concepts of ultimate concern relating to meaning and purpose in life, community, behavioral injunctions of how to live, myth and symbol of ultimate truth, ritual and ceremony to celebrate in community, and important life transitions (Marty, as cited in Tisdell, 2003). Marty’s descriptors contain no reference to a supernatural power. This omission of a supernatural power tends to be the exception rather than the rule in regard to definitions of religion. Wulff (1996) wrote “religion is becoming reified into a fixed system of ideas or ideological commitments that ‘fail to represent the dynamic personal element in human piety’” (p. 46). Wulff recognizes the concept of a fixed set of beliefs with set parameters tends to be included within definitions of religion but not of spirituality.

Once dominant and homogenous in American higher education in the form of Protestantism, religious beliefs have a much broader and more heterogeneous scope in
today’s society. Though heterogeneous, they tend to be theistic, unlike many emerging concepts of spirituality and spiritual development.

**Spirituality and Spiritual Development**

A review of extant literature on definitions of spirituality and spiritual development demonstrates that some educators have written extensively about spirituality as a component of holistic student development (Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Cove & Love, 1996; Sandeen, 2004; Subbiondo, 2005), and about the value and characteristics of spirituality in non-theistic ways (Astin, 2002, 2004; Palmer, 2003; Parks, 2000; Stamm, 2007; Tisdell, 2007; Zajonc, 2003). What is not clear from the literature is a distinct and agreed upon definition of the difference between the concept of spirituality and the concept of spiritual development.

Scholars give a glimpse into the difficulties of articulating the concept of spirituality. Adult educator Tisdell (1999; 2003) considers spirituality an elusive term, difficult to define, and more easily defined through examples. She uses stories as a way of explaining these elusive concepts. Among the writings related to spirituality and spiritual development are a fair amount of descriptors of spirituality in relationship to religion. This seems to provide an avenue to make clear distinctions as well as to point out commonalities, as is demonstrated in the following definition provided by lay monk Wayne Teasdale (1999), who is anchored in the Catholic tradition:

Being religious connotes belonging to and practicing a religious tradition. Being spiritual suggests a personal commitment to a process of inner development that
engages us in our totality. Religion, of course, is one way many people are spiritual. Often, when authentic faith embodies an individual’s spirituality the religious and the spiritual will coincide. Still, not every religious person is spiritual (although they ought to be) and not every spiritual person is religious. Spirituality is a way of life that affects and includes every moment of existence. It is at once a contemplative attitude, a disposition to a life of depth, and the search for ultimate meaning, direction, and belonging. The spiritual person is committed to growth as an essential ongoing life goal. To be spiritual requires us to stand on our own two feet while being nurtured and supported by our tradition, if we are fortunate enough to have one.

(p. 17 – 18)

Teasdale uses descriptors that separate spirituality from religion, yet recognize the potential power and influence of each in an individual’s life. This recognition becomes an important distinction as student affairs professionals gain a broader view of the various ways that young adult students perceive and seek meaning in their lives. Parks (2008) also sees a difference between spirituality and religion, writing that “spirituality must be broadly defined, distinguished from religion” (p. 1), and that both concepts must be researched.

Love and Talbot (1999) and Estanek (2006) made significant contributions to furthering the understanding of spirituality. Love and Talbot reintroduced the formal discussion of spirituality in the student affairs field and within student affairs theory, proposing comprehensive definitions for guiding the discourse, while Estanek conducted a literature review that examined definitions of spirituality in higher education literature.
Because these are both significant contributions that help to illustrate the core challenges and issues associated with conceptual definitions of spirituality and spiritual development, they are addressed in some depth.

Love and Talbot (1999) developed and offered concepts of what spiritual development involves that are often cited in scholarly literature as a starting point for discussion of spirituality. As a point of context, they also explained three assumptions that underlie their concepts, which are: the quest for spiritual development as an innate aspect of human development; that spiritual development and spirituality are interchangeable concepts, representing a process; and that openness is a prerequisite to spiritual development. Love and Talbot’s concepts of spiritual development are:

1. Spiritual development involves an internal process of seeking personal authenticity, genuineness, and wholeness as an aspect of identity development.
2. Spiritual development involves the process of continually transcending one’s current locus of centricity.
3. Spiritual development involves developing a greater connectedness to self and others through relationships and union with community.
4. Spiritual development involves deriving meaning, purpose, and direction in one’s life.
5. Spiritual development involves an increasing openness to exploring a relationship with an intangible and pervasive power or essence that exists beyond human existence and rational human knowing. (p. 364-367)
Estanek’s (2006) literature review of spirituality found that “the new literature on spirituality can be considered a new discourse, and that no one definition of spirituality informs the emerging discourse” (p. 3). Though Estanek offers five themes regarding spirituality as a result of her literature review, she emphasizes the need for research focused on developing a common understanding of the term. These “five common non-redundant themes that identify the parameters of the understanding of spirituality” (p. 3), are:

1. Spirituality defined as spiritual development
2. Spirituality used as critique
3. Spirituality understood as an empty container for individual meaning
4. Spirituality understood as common ground or field
5. Spirituality as quasi-religion

From the examples of both Love and Talbot (1999) and Estanek (2006), it is clear that there are myriad ways in which individuals consider and understand the construct of spirituality. Some definitions and understandings are inclusive of religious concepts and some not.

Some scholars consider spirituality and spiritual development to be synonymous. Estanek’s (2006) literature review found that Love and Talbot (1999) and Tisdell (2003) equate spirituality with spiritual development. Fowler (1981) and Parks (2000) also see spirituality as a process of development. Estanek cautions against making this assumption based on her findings that there are understandings of spirituality that are not developmental.

Two common characteristics holding scholars’ attention are that spirituality is generally considered to be an important facet of human life, and at the same time, it is
difficult to define. Often seen as synonymous with religion, there are no universally accepted definitions of spirituality.

Spirituality is increasingly being considered and described as non-theistic. Moreover, there is no agreement on the differences between spirituality and spiritual development. For purposes of distinction, however, one might consider spirituality as a *way of being* as opposed to a *developmental journey*, which more appropriately characterizes spiritual development. Drawn together from the writings of several religious leaders and scholars, ideas that provide support for the concept of spirituality as a broadened, content fluid derivation of religion include: “qualities of goodness, kindness, compassion, and caring” (Dalai Lama & Cutler, 1998, p. 307), a contemplative attitude and disposition to a life of depth (Teasdale, 1999), the concept of how people make meaning of their lives based on their perspectives and values (Lauzon, 2001; Tisdell, 1999, 2003; Parks, 2000), being about the values and beliefs people hold most dear (Astin & Astin, 2006), and having neither requirement nor restriction of being theistic. The above descriptors provide a vision of this intangible concept of spirituality as a *way of being*.

Spiritual development, on the other hand, speaks of a *developmental journey* as opposed to a belief system. Spiritual development designates the way that people seek to further expand their spirituality, or *way of being*. Thus, an individual interested in spiritual development may take his or her spirituality or *way of being* and seek to further develop it.

An understanding of the challenges and distinctions among these terms is important if student affairs professionals are to effectively enter into the realm of student development
that includes attention to spirituality and spiritual development. As will be seen in a discussion of legalities, it is beyond the scope of public colleges and universities to teach one to follow a specific religion.

Clarification of Legalities, Justification and Support of Spirituality in Higher Education

A basic and challenging issue is the ongoing debate regarding whether attention to spirituality and spiritual development are within the domain of higher education. Literature increasingly supports spiritual integration as appropriate and valuable within higher education. Nonetheless, questions of legalities abound within this discussion. Confusion by educators over what is and is not legal and appropriate in the realm of religious and spiritual development has resulted in defaulting on the side of omission.

Clarification of Legalities in regard to Religion and Spirituality in Higher Education

It is common to hear student affairs professionals express concern regarding what they can and cannot legally include in their developmental efforts in regard to matters of religion or spirituality. The manner in which separation of church and state came about provides important contextual background, particularly when seeking to make sense of legalities as they positively and negatively impact the integration of religion and spirituality into higher education. “The American founders’ principal concern was to protect church affairs from state intrusion, the clergy from the magistry, church properties from state interference, ecclesiastical rules and rites from political coercion and control” (Witte, 2006, p. 29). These understandings also included concepts of protecting the state from church
interferences as well as the protection of “the individual’s liberty of conscience from intrusions of either church or state, or both conspiring together” (Witte, 2006, pp. 31&32). These understandings were reciprocal, seeking to protect all against corruption in the context of a predominantly Christian society.

A review of legal principles as they apply to religion and spirituality in higher education provides additional clarification. Clark (2001) explained that there are “two provisions of the First Amendment that apply to the issues of religion and spirituality; the establishment clause and the free-expression clause” (p. 39). Lowery (2005) writes that the “Constitution’s protection of the free exercise of religion and prohibition against the establishment of religion” (p. 15) requires courts to balance these two competing rights in deciding cases about education. Various scholars have shared rulings of related court cases and stressed the importance of faculty and staff familiarity with legal implications of religion and spirituality in higher education (Clark, 2001; Diamond, 2008; Lowery, 2005). Zajonc (2003) noted that legal barriers are not formidable, particularly if approached without specific faith traditions. In other words, as one searches for meaning free from the doctrine of religious traditions, there becomes less of a legal reason to exclude such inquiry from the academy.

Some have utilized the judicial system to hasten the suppression of religion while others have used the judicial system to assert the rights of religion. Mayrl (2007) points to the influences of religious conservatives into politics as one path by which religion has returned to education. Indeed, the legal system, at various levels, is one of the stages where these
shifts in power and values have been and continue to be played out. The Supreme Court has been utilized in the great struggle for the place of religion and spirituality both in and out of education.

Though not directed toward higher education, “The 1963 Abington Township v. Schempp case (374 U.S. 203) which banned organized school prayer and Bible reading in public schools marked the beginning of a social transformation of education” (Webb, 2002, 135 – 136). This case made a distinction between teaching “about” religion and teaching “of” religion, with the latter now considered unlawful in a public school setting. Practices within educational systems displayed remnants of their religious foundings, as symbolized by the common practice of prayer in the classroom well into the 20th century. This case was in line with the recent trends of moving religion out of the public arena, including education.

Fairly recent court cases have tended to support a more holistic view in regard to religion in the university. Widmar v. Vincent (1981) and Rosenberger v. Rector and Virginia of the University of Virginia (1995) both support a broader vision of students having access and support for expression of their religious beliefs. In the Widmar v. Vincent case, the Supreme Court ruled that public universities have to allow religious student organizations to hold prayer meetings on campus if other student organizations are able to use campus facilities. The Virginia case ruled that religious student organizations must be recognized if such support is provided for secular student organizations (Lee, 2008). These rulings touch on the court’s intent to enforce neutrality. At the same time, these rulings tend to discourage
individuals or groups whose purpose is to evangelize or lecture/sponsor content-specific programs.

In summary, the court system is being utilized as an arbiter in deciding what is and is not acceptable in society and in institutions of education in regard to the place of religion and spirituality. Court cases have made a distinction between teaching of and about religion, and it is becoming clear that teaching about religious and spiritual matters and supporting religious and spiritual programs is a lawful, and many would argue, important role for educators. This is a role in line with the intent of holistic student development in that it enables educators to engage students in important areas of their lives and identities, which most often include religious and/or spiritual matters.

Justification for Inclusion of Spirituality

Attention to concepts broadly defined as dealing with the human condition, meaning-making and purpose in life, and for many, belief in a Supreme Being, are moving from taboo to cautious legitimacy within higher education. These concepts take forms of religious pluralism, non-theistic and theistic spirituality, character development, and value development, to name a few. This longing for a holistic education and life are reflected by students and scholars. Students often characterize themselves as “I’m not religious, but I’m spiritual,” which Parks (2000) contends is representative of a deep seated need by young adults:

This turn to a recognition of spirituality and an acknowledgement of soul is rooted in a longing for ways of speaking of the human experience of depth, meaning, mystery,
moral purpose, transcendence, wholeness, intuition, vulnerability, tenderness, courage, the capacity to love, and the apprehension of spirit (or Spirit) as the animating essence at the core of life” (p. 16).

These “questions of ultimate meaning” as Strange (2000, p. 1) wrote, provide justification for attention at the academy, and in fact, a return to the practices of the early academy when education was not so specialized or fragmented.

Though the concept of holistic student development has been shown to be an accepted philosophical foundation of student affairs, other justifications are prevalent and timely. In tying together ethics, spirituality, and education, Bok (1986) noted that “one important purpose of education is to prepare people to contribute effectively to the common welfare” (p. 162). Further, he contended that higher education “serves broader social needs, such as learning how to make sound ethical choices or how to play a constructive role as citizens in a democracy” (p. 162). For example, theorists and scholars have begun to view religion and spirituality as a means to embrace society’s increasing diversity as a pathway toward promoting the common welfare (Nash, 2007). It is critical that graduated students-turned-citizens have the ability to realize that “We are all in the global community together” and that “our assumed common ground on some critical global issues – peace, protesting the ozone, stopping AIDS – is fragile, since even here there are conflicting interests” (Rachal, 1989, p. 13). Understanding one another’s values, including religion and spiritual values, has potential to connect people in personal and authentic ways and to help move people along this path of concern for one another and for common welfare.
Higher education has long held as a goal graduating students who are able to serve as productive citizens in our democracy (Bok, 1986; Gurin, Lehman, & Lewis, 2004). Graduating students into a pluralistic democracy calls for strengthening understanding of one another. Hurtado (2007) noted that key democratic skills include perspective-taking, which is the ability to see the world from another perspective, and a pluralistic orientation. Proponents of spirituality argue that the results of spiritual exploration result in life views that understand these connections.

Other scholars and practitioners (Roper, 2007; Tisdell, 2006, 2007) have written about the importance of diversity, cultural identity, values, and relationships. They have written about these topics in relationship to a more inclusive democracy and movement toward improving social justice. In his work, Roper differentiated between affect, the “emotional and psychological impact of the situation on community members” and effect, the “visible and invisible consequences of the behavior” (p. 1) to help college students understand how differing values create challenges to forming communities. Integral to his work is the importance of values, interactions of students with different world views and life situations, and perceived and real power differences. Roper offered conversation ground rules similar to what the Dalai Lama termed spiritual values, including compassion, kindness, goodness, care and concern, as noted in the definitions of religion, spirituality, and spiritual development section.

Justification is seen through the lens of scholars and practitioners for the increasing need to help forge connections and understandings among diverse groups of students.
Contributions by graduated students who have the capacity to understand a broad range of differing values and to contribute to increasingly diverse societies cannot be understated. Infusion of religious and spiritual topics that intentionally address broad and universal human aspects of being is one logical avenue through which to accomplish such ends. Attention to students’ inner development, and understanding that the values they hold most dear might be different from those of their roommates, classmates, or colleagues can be one way to move forward as a society. When viewed from this perspective, justification for inclusion of spirituality in higher education becomes less difficult.

**Support for Spirituality within Higher Education**

In spite of lingering concerns about treading on inappropriate territory in higher education, there is a growing movement of college and university presidents, administrators, faculty, staff, and students who recognize the validity of integrating spirituality into various aspects of higher education (Astin, 2002; Astin, Astin, Chambers, Chickering, Elsner, et al., 2002; Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006). Intentional efforts to introduce spirituality into higher education to create and sustain change are being led by higher education researchers and practitioners. A review of literature, including program reviews from attendance at international conferences and observation of trends in student affairs, describe this organized effort. These initiatives occur at both the organizational level and the individual level.

Subbiondo (2005) presented an overview of the beginning of the “movement in higher education that restores spirituality to academic life” (p. 19). National conferences on spirituality, co-sponsored by organizations including the American Association of Colleges
and Universities, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and California Institute of Integral Studies have been visible and important catalysts.

Drafted on Feb. 6, 2002 by Astin, et al., *A Position Statement from the Initiative for Authenticity and Spirituality in Higher Education* reflects an organizational effort toward spiritual integration. This statement outlined and defined spirituality; identified problems, obstacles, potential activities; and provided a conclusion, the heart of which was, “to have issues of purpose and meaning, authenticity and identity, spirituality and spiritual growth, become a regular part of higher education’s landscape” ([http://collegevalues.org/spirit.cfm?id=982&a=1](http://collegevalues.org/spirit.cfm?id=982&a=1)). Also included in the position statement is the notion of what can be done to further this goal individually and collectively. Examples included seeking out colleagues who share concerns, reading pertinent literature, writing and speaking about these issues in public settings, and undertaking systematic inquiry concerning our own institutions and units between espoused values and values in use. “Collectively, we can work with regional and national organizations to surface and explore these concerns…address the cultures of our graduate schools to help future professionals recognize the importance of addressing issues concerning purpose and meaning …spirituality and spiritual growth” (Astin, et al. 2002). Additional suggestions included creating publications, teleconferences and recruitment of high-profile presidents and administrative leaders to create inquiry and action for sustained effort on this topic.

Parks (2000) advocated “creating mentoring communities,” a concept that Love (2001) echoed, along with exploring “inclusion of spiritual development in higher education
master’s and doctoral programs” as a way of “preparing student affairs professionals to recognize elements of spiritual development in the experiences of their students” (p. 15). Student affairs preparation programs do not appear to be taking the lead in this regard (Rogers & Love, 2007); however, the research from this dissertation will shed additional light on graduate curriculum experiences of student affairs professionals related to this topic.

A series of other initiatives that involve holistic student development and spirituality include learning communities and service learning (Astin and Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, and Yee, 2000), outdoor adventure education and experiential learning (Lockton & Whalley, 2000; McGowan, 2000; Hill & Johnston, 2003), career counseling efforts (Bolles, 2001), and faculty and curricular initiatives (Jablonski, 2005; Kazanjian & Laurence, 2002; Zajonc, 2003).

Kazanjian and Laurence (2002) have made significant contributions to broader understandings of education that include religious and spiritual underpinnings. In Education as Transformation, they identify challenges facing leaders in higher education settings, provide insights to the ways major religious traditions view religious diversity and religious pluralism, and provide examples of how to take such ideas of religious pluralism and spirituality to colleges and universities. The incorporation of spirituality as a component of holistic student development has great promise for far-reaching positive societal effects.

Integration of spirituality into education provides a means to develop greater understanding among people and to make whole fragmented lives. Development of a holistic world view presents possibilities for improving lives individually and as a society. With an
increasingly diverse society, spiritual integration also provides opportunities to learn about values that are different from one’s own, as well as to explore and understand personal values more deeply. Further, it speaks to the notion of community and relationships, as Astin (2002) put it:

Perhaps the most important thing to keep in mind about spirituality is that it touches directly on our sense of community. More than anything else, giving spirituality a more central place in our institutions will serve to strengthen our sense of connectedness with each other, our students, and our institutions. This enrichment of our sense of community will not only go a long way toward overcoming the sense of fragmentation and alienation that so many of us now feel, but will also help our students to lead more meaningful lives as engaged citizens, loving partners and parents, and caring neighbors.

There are examples of educators who are working to integrate spirituality into higher education and specifically into student affairs work. Such efforts are broad-based and are gaining momentum. As this becomes a more diverse society, it becomes increasingly important that people understand and respect one another. The ability to solve problems and work effectively together often improves with such understanding of one another.

In summary, it appears that student affairs practitioners are on firm legal ground to integrate non-dogmatic concepts of religion and spirituality into their work and believe that students have the interest and expectation to engage in such discussions. It is also clear that such attention represents a way of strengthening inner development of our students.
Justification is sound for entrée into this realm of developing citizens who contribute to their communities. Moreover, there is evidence of support to do so from both the individual and organizational level in higher education. The methodology higher education uses to prepare professionals toward integrating concepts of spirituality as one component of holistic student development is an important consideration. How is it that young adult student affairs professionals learn to grapple with their own issues of meaning-making as they also prepare to help the students they advise grapple with important meaning-making issues and questions? What influences their practice with students in the realm of spirituality? Research is one way to better understand how graduate programs are preparing professionals to take on these responsibilities and how student affairs professionals operationalize the practice of spirituality into their work at this time.

Empirical Evidence: Findings Related to Spirituality

Across various disciplines such as nursing and psychology, there are a large number of studies in the area of holism and spirituality. This is not true of studies in the area of spirituality and student affairs, although research is clearly increasing in the general area of spirituality and higher education. Among the research in the area of spirituality, this review will focus on studies of spirituality in higher education. For reader clarity, these are organized by the categories of students, faculty, and student affairs professionals. Attention is also given to demographics as there is evidence that demographics impact spirituality.
Spirituality and College Students: Meaning-making

“A 1999 report by the Center for the Study of Religion and American Culture...found that an increasing number of college students identified themselves as ‘spiritual’ rather than ‘religious’” (Rooney, 2003, p. 31). This distinction made by students is somewhat of a phenomenon, noted Peter Laurence, director of the Education as Transformation Project. He further recognized that “Students have these big questions, and they are delighted to have the opportunity to talk about them with their peers” (Rooney, 2003, p. 31). This is consistent with Parks’s (2000) conception of the young adult stage, in which students want the opportunity to talk about matters of importance and meaning in their lives.

This concept of meaning-making is imbued in the study of college students and spirituality. Molasso (2006) used Crumbaugh and Maholick’s (1964) Purpose in Life Test (PIL) to explore Frankl’s purpose-in-life theory with college students. The essence of Frankl’s theory is that meaning or purpose-in-life are derived in one of the following ways: by creating a work or doing a deed, by experiencing another human being in his or her very uniqueness-by loving him/her, and/or when confronted with a hopeless situation (Frankl, 1984, pp. 115-116). Past research with this instrument has indicated that purpose in life leads to greater levels of happiness and contributes to “establishing positive characteristics, strong values, and healthy mental attitudes” (Molasso, 2006, p. 2). Molasso brought this exploration to the college student environment, and sampled 1,000 sophomore students at a large Midwestern university. Molasso found that “spending more time with friends, studying, exercising, attending parties and social events, working on campus, and interacting with
faculty outside of the classroom have a statistically positive relationship on a student’s sense of purpose” (p. 7). The concept of purpose or meaning-making is a common thread throughout empirical research about spirituality in higher education.

How student values have changed through the years provides an interesting perspective on students’ meaning-making, and their spiritual development processes. Astin (1998) found that college student values shift as a result of societal influences. Over the years, societal influences on values have resulted in cultures and norms that have alternatively welcomed and shunned religion and spirituality in higher education. Astin (1998) came to believe that one of the primary reasons for the large value shifts observed among entering first-year students during the time period from the 1960’s to the 1990’s is related to the introduction and saturation of television into the lives of generations of college students. While the feminist movement tended to move individuals toward values of social justice and equality, the introduction and wide-spread acceptance of the television into homes shifted future college students who grew up with television from “valuing a meaningful life” to “valuing striving for materialistic goals” (Astin, 1998).

Especially notable are changes in the importance given to two contrasting values: “developing a meaningful philosophy of life and “being very well off financially”. In the late 1960s, developing a meaningful philosophy of life was the top value, endorsed as an “essential” or “very important” goal by more than 80% of the entering freshmen. “Being very well-off financially,” on the other hand, lagged far behind,
ranking fifth or sixth on the list with less than 45% of the freshmen endorsing it as a very important or essential goal in life. (Astin, 1998, p. 124)

Astin noted that since that time in the late 1960s these two values have gradually traded places with one another. Since the late 1980s they reached and remained at opposite extremes. Astin noted that when the first study began with the late 1960s cohorts of college students, most did not have televisions in their homes as children. By the time the cohorts of the early 1970s came along, “American homes were fairly saturated with color television and many homes had several sets” (p. 125). According to Astin, television, with its commercial nature, does not promote “contemplation or reflection on the great questions of life” (p. 126).

Hurtado (2007) presented updated data from the 2005 First Year College Survey administered by the Higher Education Research Institute. In her presentation, she offered a more current perspective regarding student interest in “becoming very well-off financially” as “important or essential” and indicting “some or a major concern” about ability to pay for college, on which students from lower incomes scored higher. She suggested that students are not necessarily becoming more materialistic, but instead, additional perspectives and views are being incorporated into the data as college access and demographics have changed. Her perspective was somewhat more optimistic than was Astin’s in light of the context of the findings.

The most broad-based national study on students and spirituality was conducted through the Higher Education Research Institute, housed at The University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) and is titled “The Spiritual Life of College Students: A National Study
of College Students’ Search for Meaning and Purpose” (Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Szelényi, & Calderone, 2005), hereafter termed the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education student survey. A pilot study was conducted in 2003, followed by a comprehensive study involving 112,000 entering freshmen at nationally representative sample of colleges and universities in fall 2004. In spring 2007, a sub-sample of almost 15,000 of 2004 first-year students was surveyed to longitudinally assess spiritual development. Findings of this study confirm that college students have high levels of interest in the topic of spirituality. Many reported engagement in a spiritual quest and many explore concepts of meaning and purpose of life. Students are also involved in religion and active in religious practice. Specifically, in terms of indicators of their spirituality, students described themselves to some or a great extent as follows: 83% believe in the sacredness of life, over 80% have an interest in spirituality, 76% search for meaning/purpose in life, and 74% have discussions about the meaning of life with friends. Further, students “place great value on their college enhancing their self-understanding, helping them develop personal values, and encouraging their expression of spirituality” (accessed April 27, 2009, p. 5 at: http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/spirituality/reports/FINAL_REPORT.pdf). As they begin college, college students share high expectations that their institutions will play a role in their spiritual development. It is clear that students acknowledge the role of spirituality in their lives and are open to their institutions doing the same.

Though the full report is not available, several press releases about the 2007 follow-up survey have been published (accessed on May 26, 2009 at
http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/news/index.html). Results indicate that students experienced spiritual development from their freshmen to junior years. Growth is evident in many dimensions and scales of spirituality, including “integrating spirituality into my life” from 41.8% in 2004 to 50.4% in 2007. Spiritual engagement and growth is also evidenced in the scales: Spiritual Quest, Ethic of Caring, Equanimity, and Ecumenical Worldview. More complete information about the methodology for the 2007 study can be accessed at: (http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/CSBV07.Methodology.pdf, accessed on November 10, 2008).

**Spirituality and Demographic and Work Environment Characteristics**

Tisdell (2003) wrote that demographic factors such as culture and gender affect how we see our life purpose and ongoing development of our authentic identities. There is evidence that demographics influences religion and spirituality, from the perspective of gender (Bryant, 2007; Buchko, 2004; King, 1993, 1995) as well as of race and ethnicity (Sanchez, 2005; Stewart, 2009). A variety of studies of college students confirms this.

Bryant (2007) offered a comprehensive analysis of gender differences in spiritual development during the college years. This article noted the prevalent assumption that gender differences have been assumed a reality even before empirical research began to indicate this to be true. Bryant explored theoretical frameworks explaining these presumed differences, and gave particular attention to an exploration of whether women and men differ spiritually and not only religiously. Results from the analyses of data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey (2000) and College Students’ Beliefs and
Values (CSBV) Survey (2003), the actual survey from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education student study, indicated that there are gender differences in spiritual development and that they are associated with religious identity, peer relationships, and science exposure (Bryant, 2007).

Buchko’s (2004) study included 344 undergraduates at a private secular university in the Midwest. In this study, students’ religious beliefs and practices were assessed. Among the findings are that women and men differ significantly in the practice of prayer or religious meditation, with women integrating such practice as a regular part of life and men integrating prayer more during times of stress or need.

Race and ethnicity have also been studied in regard to differences in spirituality and spiritual development. Stewart (2009) conducted a qualitative study of 13 self-identified Black and African American college students and found that “for most students, spirituality was a lens through which they understood and interpreted their collective identities, giving rationality for the multiple aspects of self and creating synergy among them” (p. 260). In their study of African American college students, Sanchez and Carter (2005) found that “racial identity attitudes were predictive of religious orientation” (p. 280) and that gender “significantly impacted the relationships between these variables” (p. 280). Watt (2003) conducted qualitative research and found that “African American college women use spiritual understanding to cope, to resist, and to develop their identities” (p. 29).
Spirituality and Faculty

Faculty attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors were analyzed in the study titled Spirituality and the Professoriate: A National Study of Faculty Beliefs, Attitudes, and Behaviors, (Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Calderone, & Szelényi, 2006) a project of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, hereafter referred to as the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty study. This study involved surveying over 40,000 faculty members at 421 colleges and universities across the United States. “The survey was designed to discover how faculty view the intersections between spirituality and higher education and how their perspectives and practices may influence the spiritual development of students during their undergraduate years” (http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/spirit_professoriate.pdf, accessed on November 10, 2008).

Results of the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty survey indicated that a majority of faculty “consider themselves to be spiritual beings, but that faculty are divided on the questions of (a) whether undergraduate education should put a priority on students’ spiritual development and (b) what priority should be given to the spiritual dimension of faculty members’ lives” (p. 4). Specifically, only 30% of faculty believed that “colleges should be concerned with facilitating students’ spiritual development” (p. 9). When this question was examined as it relates to the faculty member’s field of specialty, there are notable differences. Findings indicate that faculty from health sciences and humanities report higher levels of belief that students’ spiritual development is an appropriate concern of colleges and universities, while faculty from biological, social, physical sciences, and
agriculture/forestry reported lower levels of belief that students’ spiritual development is an appropriate concern of colleges and universities.

Lindholm and Astin (2006) studied the interior life of faculty in order to understand the role that spirituality plays in their lives. Interior life was defined in this study as one’s subjective life, “as opposed to the objective domain of material objects that one can point to and measure” (p. 65). Connecting the concept of interior life with the spiritual domain, Lindholm and Astin contend that it is related to human consciousness, our qualitative and affective experiences more so than reasoning or logic.

Specifically, they studied “which variations exist based on personal demographics, professional and institutional characteristics, and affective experiences” (p. 64). Among the findings from this study were variations of level of spirituality as measured by gender, age, and ethnic/racial identities. Additionally, variations in professional characteristics were discovered, including higher levels of spirituality for faculty in the Health Sciences and Education as compared to faculty in the Physical Sciences and Math/Science. This study is counter to the trend of research on spirituality in higher education, where the focus was primarily on students and the experiences, attitudes, expectations, and behaviors of faculty were ignored. Importantly, the researchers recognized the importance of faculty ability to “create educational environments that maximize the personal and professional potential of students and faculty” (66-67). Similarly, student affairs professionals have this same ability to create educational environments for the students with whom they work.
Utilizing the data set from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty study, Lindholm and Astin (2008) studied the interior life of faculty and extended the literature base further. Their findings suggest that teaching methods faculty members choose are a reflection of who they are and what they believe. Specifically, Lindholm and Astin are interested in “faculty members’ preferred teaching practices as one aspect of their professional behavior that may reflect the spiritual dimension of their own lives” (p. 186). They seek to determine whether faculty who self-report as spiritual are more prone to embody practices that benefit students. The study by Lindholm and Astin was designed to answer these questions: “(a) What are the personal, professional, and organizational correlates of student-centered pedagogy among college and university faculty? (b) To what extent does the self-reported level of spirituality mediate faculty members’ use of student-centered pedagogy in undergraduate courses?” (p. 189). The main hypothesis of this study was that faculty spirituality will play a key role in the way they approach their teaching, and was based primarily on previous findings from research conducted by Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Calderone, & Szelényi (2006). The more spiritual a faculty member, as self-reported in the study, the more likely they are to use student-centered pedagogical teaching methods with their undergraduate students, independent of the faculty member’s personal characteristics, field of study, or institutional affiliation.

This study is of particular significance because it examines the relationship between spirituality and faculty practice, a concept comparable to the relationship between spirituality and student affairs practice. While the findings about faculty are not generalizeable to student
affairs professionals, the findings provide a conceptual equivalent to the purposes of this dissertation, which is to learn more about the impact of student affairs professionals’ spirituality on their practice.

**Spirituality and Student Affairs Administrators**


Dalton (2006) wanted to learn about trends and patterns in college student spirituality as observed by senior student affairs practitioners, and sought input from the voting delegates of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). This study examined trends in student behavior in regard to spirituality as perceived by senior student affairs officers, as opposed to practice of student affairs professionals. Congruent with literature on students in higher education, Dalton found that senior student affairs officers reported an increase in observed “student interest and involvement in spirituality activities over the past five years” (p. 156).

In a qualitative dissertation, Hanson (2005) studied five mid-level student affairs professionals’ perceptions of spirituality. Specifically, Hanson was interested to learn about: (a) the professionals’ personal constructions of spirituality, (b) the role of spirituality in the philosophy and practice of student affairs professionals, and (c) how student affairs professionals communicated their personal and professional constructions of spirituality to
students. Hanson developed a composite view to reflect the shared meanings of participants. Of interest is Hanson’s finding that participants believed that they had the ability to influence students’ spirituality through role modeling, spiritual interventions and serving as spiritual guides.

Moran and Curtis (2004) conducted a qualitative study and interviewed student affairs administrators from different types of institutions to learn what role religion and spirituality played in their professional lives. They found that student affairs administrators desire more freedom to express their religious and spiritual identity and believe it positively impacts their work with students and their relationships with each other. Regardless of the positive impact, however, administrators reported being reluctant and fearful to express this aspect of their identities. Some expressed a fear of doing so, while others expressed a need to avoid controversy or shared experiences of thwarted past attempts at sharing their spiritual identities. While college students increasingly distinguish religion and spirituality as concepts, Moran and Curtis found that student affairs administrators made little to no effort to distinguish the concepts of religion and spirituality from one another. This is an interesting finding and provides a glimpse into potential reasons why professionals may have been thwarted in their attempts to express their identities related to religion and spirituality.

Seifert, Harmon, Goodman, and Watt (2009), in a partnership with the Educational Leadership Foundation of the Association of College Personnel Administrators (ACPA), conducted a quantitative study titled “The Relationship between Life Purpose, Spiritual Well-being and Student Affairs Practice”. The researchers were “interested in learning what effect
spiritual well-being and life purpose had on practices in which student affairs professionals engage students” (p. 4). Seifert, Harmon, Goodman and Watt utilized two pre-existing instruments that had been in use for nearly 20 years. These two instruments were the Life Purpose Scale of Psychological Well Being (Ryff, 1989) and the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (Ellison, 1983). They developed an additional scale to measure the frequency with which student affairs practitioners integrate various practices with their students. The new survey questions were developed as part of a class titled “Spirituality and Student Affairs Practice,” and the questions were created based on previous research indicating a connection to students’ spiritual development. This study concluded that student affairs practitioners may best serve their students by refocusing on and committing to their own questioning and reflecting. In this way, they will have “the fullest capacity to be good company for students on their inner quest and journey” (p. 11). This study is perhaps the most closely related to the focus of this research.

Rogers and Love (2007) examined the role of spirituality from the perspective of student constructions of spirituality in their student affairs graduate preparation programs. Their qualitative study included interviews with graduate students and found that while students reported themes of authenticity, connectedness, purpose and transcendence in their programs, these themes were not identified as spiritual. Further, students did not make connections between this learning as preparation for them to work with undergraduate students in the area of spirituality. Thus, the conclusions of this study indicate a gap in preparing our profession for this undertaking. Rogers and Love also found that faculty
influenced graduate students’ exploration of spirituality, thus providing support to the notion of involvement by student affairs professionals in such realms of student life.

Summary of Empirical Research

This review of empirical research has illustrated that research with a focus on spirituality and the student affairs profession is extremely limited. Most of the research base has focused on student spirituality and development. Research on faculty is applicable to student affairs professionals because of the shared practices of working closely with students and goals of student development. Of the research to date, Seifert and Harmon (2009) present the most applicable quantitative research focused on student affairs professionals. The research reported in this document will expand current knowledge and provide more specificity regarding student affairs professionals’ spirituality and what predicts their practice in regard to spirituality.

Spirituality has been examined from the perspective of student constructions of spirituality from their student affairs graduate preparation programs (Rogers & Love, 2007) and graduate school culture (Wiese, 2006). Recent research has included student spiritual practices (Bryant, 2008a), student affairs staff spiritual practices (Hanson, 2005; Seifert, 2008, Seifert, Harmon, Goodman, & Watt, 2009), and spirituality as a predictor of faculty teaching practices (Lindholm & Astin, 2008). As a result of recent research efforts, more is known about this once missing component of holistic development in the realm of student development (Bryant, 2008a, 2008b). Through efforts made by Seifert (2008), and Seifert,
Harmon, Goodman & Watt (2009), we are beginning to learn more about the specific area of student affairs practice. This review makes evident that a few researchers are conducting the majority of the relevant research in regard to spirituality in higher education. Clearly, additional research is needed to inform the student affairs profession. Even with this expanding literature base, there is still much to learn regarding actual practice and effectiveness of such practice within the profession of student affairs. This research will take a step in the direction of seeking to learn what predicts the practice of integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development by student affairs professionals.

Student Development Theories and Spirituality

Theory helps guide the student development efforts of the student affairs profession. As Chickering and Reisser (1993) note:

We cannot easily discern what subtle mix of people, books, settings, or events promotes growth. Nor can we easily name changes in ways of thinking, feeling, or interpreting the world. But we can observe behavior and record words, both of which can reveal shifts from hunch to analysis, from simple to complex perceptions, from divisive bias to compassionate understanding. Theory can give us the lenses to see these changes and help them along (p. 43).

Student developmental theories are generally categorized as: psychosocial and identity development, cognitive-structural, typology, and person-environment interaction theories (Evans, Fornye and Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991).
Psychosocial theory deals with personal and interpersonal lives; cognitive-structural deals with changes not in what people think, but the way that they think; typologies examine differences among individuals in how people view and interact with the world (Evans, 1996, as cited in Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito, 1998); and person-environment theory examines the student and college environment, including the interaction of the student with the environment (Rodgers, 1990, as cited in Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito, 1998). All offer perspectives of how one might understand and manage this important task of student development, which so often takes place in the realm of student affairs work. Few delve into the realm of spirituality, though some tentatively touch on the fringes of this elusive yet important area of life.

A brief review of selected student development theories provides various lenses, though mostly obscured in terms of spirituality and spiritual development. While some student development theories touch upon spirituality (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Maslow, 1971), it has been largely ignored in terms of practice within the student affairs profession (Love, 2001). Acknowledgement, not to mention exploration or nurturing of the spiritual component particularly at state institutions of higher learning in the United States, has been glaringly absent from student affairs practice (Love & Talbot, 1999).

Those who prescribe to a strictly rational and cognitive framework are challenged to find validity and value in the concept of spirituality. Fowler (1981) introduced the concept of holism through his inclusion of affect in his theory. Kazanjian (1998) made specific note of the integration of thought and feeling, cognitive and affective, in his discussion of spirituality.
Parks (2000) emphasized the interrelatedness of cognitive development, affective states, and interpersonal, social, and cultural influences in her work. Dirkx (2005) made a similar point, valuing emotion as well as rational thought in learning. In other words, concepts of spirituality have been explored and written of in cognitive as well as affective contexts. This provides support for spirituality from other than affective perspectives, thus moving it into a more respectable place from a purely cognitive and positivist point of view. In American society and higher education settings, separation of cognitive and affective dimensions is reality, and is often adamantly protected. This is an important consideration, as spirituality moves us toward the practice of a broad, connected concept as opposed to a fractured or analytical concept, reflective of a scientific perspective.

While there are a range of theories and theorists in each of the student development categories, this discussion is limited to an overview of applicable components of the work of Abraham Maslow (1971) and Chickering and Reisser (1993), whose theories support notions of spiritual development but do not focus primarily on spirituality. Then this review will move to the work of James Fowler, Sharon Parks, and Elizabeth Tisdell, whose theories specifically address spiritual development.

Maslow (1971) approached the concept of spirituality more directly than others. He theorized that there is a hierarchy of needs and that the most basic of needs must first be met before one moves to more complex developmental stages, the ultimate goal of which is self-actualization. Maslow believed part of the human essence included spiritual life. Further, he believed that those who were able to function fully as transcendent self-actualizers possessed
the ability to view the world with a holistic perspective, which includes a stronger tendency toward cooperative action (Chandler, Holden, & Kolander, 1992).

A less direct approach was offered through the student development theory contribution of Chickering and Reisser (1993). In their theory on identity, they envisioned seven vectors of student development. According to Chickering and Reisser establishing identity, developing purpose, and establishing integrity are critical components of development. Each of these three vectors is briefly described below with connection to concepts of spirituality.

Establishing identity…includes reflecting on one’s family of origin and ethnic heritage, defining self as a part of a religion or cultural tradition, and seeing self within a social and historical context. It involves finding roles and styles at work, at play, and at home that are genuine expressions of self and that further sharpen self-definition. It involves gaining a sense of how one is seen and evaluated by others. It leads to clarity and stability and a feeling of warmth for this core self as capable, familiar, worthwhile (p. 50).

Developing purpose, the second component of development as theorized by Chickering and Reisser, involves the student intentionally shaping a variety of different goals into a larger vision, thereby developing a meaningful purpose that helps guide daily activities. Integrity, the third component of student development, involves a sequential and overlapping stage of learning to humanize and personalize values. As Chickering and Reisser write, developing integrity:
involves three sequential but overlapping stages: (1) humanizing values – shifting away from automatic application of uncompromising beliefs and using principled thinking in balancing one’s own self-interest with the interests of one’s fellow human beings, (2) personalizing values – consciously affirming core values and beliefs while respecting other points of view, and (3) developing congruence – matching personal values with socially responsible behavior (pp. 236-237).

While one can envision connections to meaning-making and purpose from these vectors, it is clear that concepts of spirituality are not the primary emphasis. At the conference of the Institute for College Student Values, in February, 2006 in Jacksonville, Florida, Chickering facilitated an open discussion workshop. In response to the question of spirituality in student development, he explained that he and Linda Reisser had recently discussed whether to add an eighth vector of spiritual development. Concurring with the importance and value of spiritual development, he noted that they decided it was sufficiently included in the other vectors (Personal communication at conference, February, 2006).

Fowler (1981) and Parks (1980, 2000) developed theories of faith formation that have helped to fill the void in student development theory and which offer ways to view spiritual development. Tisdell (2003) has written extensively about spirituality, student learning and identity development. Her work contains a special emphasis on how “spirituality can play a significant role in culturally relevant education” (p. 203). An overview of the most salient points of the theories of these three educators, Fowler, Parks, and Tisdell, follows.
Fowler (2004) believes one of the strengths of faith development theories is that they address both what faith is and what faith does, suggesting concepts of spirituality and spiritual development within his theory. His development theory seeks to extend the structural developmental traditions of Piaget, Kohlberg and others, in that it goes beyond cognitive perspectives into other ways of knowing. His work has also provided religious educators directions and methods for their work. Of his stage theory, Fowler (2004) notes “it should never be the primary goal of religious education simply to precipitate and encourage stage advancement” (p. 417). Fowler (1981) delineated six stages of faith development including a pre-stage. Of these, Fowler contends that most college students are at stages 3 and 4, condensed as follows:

Stage 3: Synthetic-Conventional Faith – The emergent strength in this stage consists of forming of a personal myth which is constructed by self from one’s past and anticipated future and is the story of one’s developing identity. There are two dangers in this stage. The first is that the expectations and evaluations of others can be too internalized, leading to a jeopardized future in terms of autonomy, judgment, and action. The second danger is that of interpersonal betrayals. Readiness to move to the next stage includes a breakdown of the stability of stage three. Contradictions between valued authority sources, experiences that cause one to question values and beliefs, and the experience of leaving home emotionally or physically are examples of
ways in which the individual begins to examine self and values in a way that prompts this transition.

Stage 4: Individuative-Reflective Faith – The emergent strength in this stage is related to its capacity for critical reflection on identity (self) and outlook (ideology). The danger of this stage is overconfidence in conscious mind and critical thought. The cues for movement to the next stage are related to restlessness with the self and one’s outlook as well as disillusionment with one’s compromises and the recognition that life is complex.

According to Fowler, development to stage five is rare for college students and young adults, often occurring at mid-life, and development to stage six is rare for anyone. The specific values that Fowler’s stages bring to this study are his recognition of a developmental process that is holistic and inclusive of both cognitive and affective dimensions, and the recognition that development progresses toward independence yet returns to valuing of community as an aspect of faith. In fact, Fowler’s most developed stage of faith, stage six, represents inclusiveness as opposed to an individualistic developmental phase. That such development occurs over a life span and is difficult to measure during the college years is a challenge for researchers.

Parks

Parks (2000) wrote about spirituality as a form of development and meaning-making. “Meaning-making is the activity of composing a sense of the connections among things: a sense of pattern, order, form and significance. To be human is to seek coherence and
correspondence” (Parks, 2000, p. 19). Her work is grounded in earlier works by theorists such as Perry (1968), Fowler (1981) and Kegan (1982), and she acknowledges the work of many others, notably, Kenneth Kenniston, who studied youth in the 1960’s and articulated the emergence of a previously unidentified stage of life which he defined as a stage between adolescence and adulthood. Of particular importance within Parks’s theory and illustrating the manner in which she extended Fowler’s theory, is the addition of and special attention given to the stage of the young adult.

Parks notes that the young adult stage often occurs around the age of 17. This is also the stage where student affairs professionals are likely to find traditional college students in terms of their development. The marker of the threshold of young adulthood is indicated by the capacity to take self-aware responsibility for choosing one’s path including one’s own knowing, becoming, and moral action. Parks notes that this stage occurs in the best way possible when “the emerging self is recognized and invited into a wider arena of participation by wise and trusted adults” (Parks, 2000, p. 8). Wise and trusted adults serve in the mentoring function for young adults.

Parks’s theory was developed by intertwining her knowledge of student development theories with personal observations and experiences of college students. Parks’s model of spiritual development includes three dimensions of development:

- Forms of Knowing - Cognitive aspects of faith development give access to how a person thinks in the composing of meaning at the level of faith.
• Forms of Dependence - Affective aspects of faith development give access to what a person feels in the composing of meaning at the level of faith.

• Forms of Community - Social aspects of faith development nourish the development of human life as one makes meaning at the level of faith.

For Parks, the most nurturing and powerful form of community is represented in the mentoring community. It is particularly important because it combines the emerging confidence of the young adult, though fragile, with the challenge and encouragement of a mentor. Parks believes that the mentoring community confirms for the young adult that there is, indeed, a place to belong. Further, Parks believes that mentoring is a particularly effective manner in which individuals in the young adult stage of development can be supported and nurtured in order to successfully move from developmental stages of fragile inner-dependence to confident inner-dependence. According to Parks, this move is characterized by an individual still subject to the strong influence of authority, though developed to the point where there is a recognition and valuing of self authority. Fragile inner-dependence is not weak, but is full of promise and potential. Hence, it represents a new inner strength that is nonetheless, in need of nurturing. Confident inner-dependence represents the individual who has met encouragement and confirmation, has a deepened capacity to shape his or her own sense of truth and values, and has established the trustworthiness of the inner self (p. 84-86).
Elizabeth Tisdell began her work in higher education as a chaplain in a Catholic college setting. Later, she earned her doctorate and began teaching adult education in higher education. Her work is important because it adds the dimension of one’s culture to the exploration of spirituality and spiritual development. She believes that an effective educator creates educational opportunities by drawing on both the cultural dimension of spirituality and the spiritual dimension of culture.

Tisdell (2003) offers a theory in progress in her book *Exploring Spirituality and Culture in Adult and Higher Education*, and believes that “spirituality can play a significant role in culturally relevant education” (p. 203). Tisdell notes differences in how transformative learning has been characterized. Of transformative learning, most often cited is the work of Jack Mezirow, “which emphasizes critical reflection on assumptions and changing behaviors as a result of a disorienting dilemma” (Tisdell, 2003, p. 205). Tisdell illustrates other theoretical contributions that have focused on consideration of asymmetrical power relations, diversity issues, and cross-cultural issues including understanding of “the other,” which have a focus on social action (Tisdell, 2003). Tisdell notes, however, that in such theories, there is little or no attention given to the role of spirituality in the transformative learning process. According to Tisdell and Tolliver (2003), students are more likely to have transformational experiences when they are “engaged on three levels of their individual being: the cognitive, the affective, and the symbolic or spiritual” (p. 13, 14). Tisdell and Tolliver also stress the importance of educators paying attention to socio-cultural
aspects of their being, acknowledging that these are an integral part of learners and shape their vision and identity.

Tisdell’s theory in progress offers “principles or elements of a spiritually-grounded and culturally relevant pedagogy for higher education classrooms that is potentially transformational” (p. 212). These principles offer holistic perspectives of learning and include:

1. An emphasis on authenticity (both spiritual and cultural);

2. An environment that allows for the exploration of:
   - The cognitive (through readings and discussion of ideas);
   - The affective and relational (through connection with other people and connection of ideas to life experience);
   - The symbolic (through art forms such as poetry, visual art, music, drama);

3. Readings that reflect the cultures of the members of the class, and the cultural pluralism of the geographic area relevant to the course content;

4. Exploration of individual and communal dimensions of cultural and other dimensions of identity;

5. Collaborative work that envisions and presents manifestations of multiple dimensions of learning and strategies for change;

6. Celebrations of learning and provision for closure to the course;

7. Recognition of the limitations of the higher education classroom, and that transformation is an ongoing process that takes time (pp. 212 – 213).
Tisdell (2003) shares stories in which individuals’ spirituality is a part of the transformative process they undergo as they move toward more authenticity in self identity and a more positive self-image. In this way, she believes that “spirituality can play a role in teaching for cultural relevance and social change” (p. 184). Her work reflects components of Fowler and Parks in the expansion from the cognitive aspect to inclusion of the affective aspect and adds an expressive avenue of the symbolic. She provides an important extension by considering how context and culture are components of identity and spiritual development. In this way, her work mirrors Chickering and Reisser’s (1993) identity vector and more fully extends it directly to students’ spiritual identity.

Comparison and Contrast of Fowler, Parks, and Tisdell’s Theories of Spiritual Development

Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003) each offer theories that support spiritual development. Fowler uses the terminology of faith development and faith formation. Parks uses both faith development and spirituality, while Tisdell uses the term spirituality, incorporating culture with a primary role in her theory in progress. All three utilize the terminology of meaning-making as integral to their theories.

Fowler (1981) provides the initial development of a theory related to the area of spiritual development (faith development and the quest for meaning) and introduces the value of the affective to the already accepted notion of cognitive, as worthy of consideration in research. Specifically, Fowler’s developmental theory was the first attempt to go distinctly beyond stages of cognition with which Piaget was involved and include affect. Parks and Tisdell both built on Fowler’s attention to the affective; Parks (2000), with her notion of
forms of dependence (access to how a person feels as well as interpersonal relationships) and Tisdell (2003), with her attention to creating an environment that honors the affective and relational, through connections with others and with life experience. Tisdell also gave attention to access to the affective through use of symbol, including stories, music, and drama. Many of Tisdell’s articles reflect this through incorporation of stories as a way of sharing her point in ways that blend cognitive and affective dimensions.

When considering these theories, concepts of individualism and sense of community are important. All three theories move beyond Western notions of individualism, connecting strongly with ideas of community. Fowler’s theory illustrates a departure from conventional notions of individuality as a sign of maturity. For example, his stages from pre-stage to Individuative-Reflective (stage four), move toward individuation. Stages five and six, however, illustrate the individual progressing toward a point that is more complex and inclusive, seeing her or himself as a part of the whole. This notion of the whole is one that both Parks and Tisdell build upon. Parks includes the value of community throughout her theory, with forms of dependence (inner-dependence as well as inter-dependence) and with forms of community (including mentoring community). Parks identifies the value of community and focuses on mentors in helping young adults transition from fragile to confident inner-dependence. Tisdell’s theory-in-progress is aligned with the importance of community, and expresses the importance of understanding and acknowledging the different types of community that exist. For her, identity is developed in a context of culture, and culture includes spirituality and a host of other influences.
The role of imagination is present in all three theories. Fowler’s (1981) assessment of Piaget’s cognitive development and Kohlberg’s moral development suggested that both were too limited in the attention they gave to imagination. Parks (2000) also values imagination, contending that it is integral to our knowledge construction. Tisdell (2003, 2006, 2007) connects spirituality with cultural imagination as a way of connecting people with their own cultural identity as well as developing an understanding of others. Tisdell sees this as the manifestation of the symbolic, as described in her theory-in-progress. Tisdell’s description offers ways in which educators can draw on cultural imagination in their teaching to help students look within and outward in their learning processes.

An area in which the theories diverge is that of stages. Fowler and Parks both include stages in their theories, as has been outlined earlier in this paper. Tisdell’s theory-in-progress does not include stages. Instead, Tisdell focuses on claiming identity and contends that doing so necessarily includes components of spirituality, and influences of one’s culture. Parks’s theory (2000) draws heavily on Fowler’s theory, and extends Fowler’s stages to include a “young adult” stage, providing specifics of the context in which student affairs professionals work. Her work embraces the concept of holistic student development, connecting more closely with a higher education setting than does the work of Fowler.

Tisdell (1999, 2003, 2006, 2007) does not include stages of development, but does add an important consideration in providing context to the concept of spiritual development. She adds the component of culture to the discussion of spirituality, and pays particular attention to the impact of cultural diversity and its influential role in the affective state of
student learning, suggesting that acknowledgment and honoring of these dimensions of life will enhance learning. Given the increasingly diverse student bodies, Tisdell offers an important connector when one considers effectiveness of holistic and inclusive learning environments. While Parks does touch upon culture, she does so in relationship with culture as mentor. She acknowledges the challenge that young adults face as they move into the world, and recognizes that “Culture mediates a people’s faith, ordering teaching, creating ‘how things are’ or ‘how life is’” (Parks, 2000, p. 207).

Perhaps the most cogent commonality of the work of these three scholars is that they all deal with the core of the human experience. Each provides perspectives regarding how such development takes place. Parks and Tisdell are more aligned with the higher education field, whereas Fowler has a specific interest in the role of religious educators in such development. All three provide respected and sound theoretical perspectives, supported with scholarly literature.

*Theoretical Framework for Exploring Spiritual Development*

The gap in knowledge between the espoused goal of holistic student development of the student affairs profession and actual practice of spiritual integration as a component of the work of the student affairs profession make evident the need for an extended knowledge base. The theories of Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003), together with efforts developed from staff of the Higher Education Research Institute and the Spirituality in Higher Education Project provide a strong theoretical foundation on which to develop this research. Once again, the theoretical framework is introduced in Figure 3.
Figure 3. Theoretical Framework Reintroduced

Fowler (1981) provides the initial theory that considers issues of faith development and meaning-making. Importantly, he introduces the concept of holism through his inclusion of affect in his theory. Fowler (1981) writes that he
could not accept the Piaget-Kohlberg assertion that cognition and the affections, though intertwining in behavior and choice, must be analytically separated in cognitive-structural research. Faith, I knew, involves rationality and passionality; it involves knowing, valuing and committing…we had to have a wider understanding of cognition than that with which Piaget worked. (p. 273)

Thus, Fowler provided two important foundations. The first is that he developed a theory to study faith development, thus elevating the importance of this part of life as worthy of scholarly attention, and the second is that he embraced the concept of holism by recognizing and honoring both cognitive and affective dimensions of development. These provide a strong connection to spirituality as a component of holistic student development within the field of student affairs.

Parks’s (2000) theory provides justification for studying student affairs professionals’ way of working with students in a non-theistic manner. Her attention to the depth and importance of how individuals make meaning provides a wide view that embraces deep aspects of being and becoming. Additionally, her attention to mentoring is aligned with the way that many student affairs professionals engage with their students as advisors in a variety of capacities. In particular, her work with college students has particular applicability. Her theory also provides a lens through which to study student affairs professionals’ spiritual development with the tested and mature adult stages.

Much of Tisdell’s work deals with development specifically in the classroom, which is a different domain from the majority of the work of the student affairs professional.
However, what is very applicable is the attention to the learning environments in which student affairs professionals work. Just as Tisdell (2003) contends that “it is possible to design a curriculum and a learning environment that attends to the symbolic domains of learning that are part of spirituality” (p. 212), so too are these concepts applicable to the learning environments designed by student affairs professionals. Tisdell also provides attention to our quickly changing world, with her focus on culture and identity. With changing demographics and increasing access to colleges, it is important for student affairs professionals to be aware of and understand cultures broader than their own. Tisdell’s work highlights this importance.

The extent to which student affairs professionals’ spirituality predicts practices promoting holistic student development is largely unknown. Concepts of holism and theories of spirituality within the contributions of Fowler, Parks, and Tisdell provide a foundation closely affiliated with the purposes of the work of student affairs. Together, these theories and empirical research results provide a theoretical foundation from which to move forward in the study of spirituality as a predictor of student affairs practices.

Summary of Literature Review

Religion and higher education in America began hand in hand. As values shifted, so did the role of religion within the academy, lessening the hold of a once predominantly Protestant manifestation of religion. Throughout the history of higher education, there has been conceptual support within the field of student affairs for holistic student development (ACE, 1949; Caple, 1998; Evans & Reason, 2001). Unlike the fading role of religion in the
academy, student affairs has continued to espouse this goal. There has been a gap, however, between the espoused concept of holistic student development within the student affairs field, and resulting practice. Specifically, this gap has ignored spirituality (Love & Talbot, 1999) as an appropriate topic or area for student development.

Though meanings of religion and spirituality blend together and are used interchangeably for many, an interesting perspective offered by college students is the relatively recent assertion of identity with being spiritual, but not religious. Scholars are challenged by the lack of a common understanding of these terms (Estanek, 2006; Love & Talbot, 1999), and while many have offered definitions, there is not universal agreement about what spirituality or spiritual development mean. Nonetheless, there is growing agreement that these are important conceptual areas worthy of inclusion in student affairs. For purposes of this research, appropriate descriptors are that spirituality is that which helps students to find and make meaning in their lives, (Parks, 2000); deals with inner development, the values they hold most dear, (Astin, 2004); includes the cognitive and affective (Fowler, 1981) and can, but does not need to have, theistic underpinnings (Parks, 2000; Teasdale, 1999; Tisdell, 1983).

As society became more pluralistic, challenges to religion in the public realm, including education, became more common. It has become clear as a result of court cases, that the courts consider unlawful the indoctrination or introduction of a specific religious dogma in public education, but are supportive of the right to teach about religions or religious ideas. As society becomes aware and acknowledges that religious and spiritual beliefs are a
large part of our students’ identity development, it becomes more clear that attention to this often hidden part of students’ lives is important. The more diverse society becomes, the more important it is for students to have an understanding of values other than those with which they were raised. Hence, though there has been controversy surrounding what is and is not appropriate in terms of religion or spirituality in the academy, students have what Parks’ (2000) termed big questions and want the opportunity to discuss matters of deep meaning. To exclude attention to such matters is to neglect responsibilities as educators to individual students and to society in general.

Beginning with articles of concept development and justification of spirituality as appropriate in higher education and moving toward empirical research, the literature base is clearly increasing from the perspectives of faculty who recognize developmental value and wish to incorporate spirituality into their classes (Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Diamond, 2008), to practitioners who support further emphasis on holistic student development (Allen & Cherry, 2000; Love & Talbot, 1999), to researchers whose studies contribute greatly to this area of inquiry (Astin, et al, 2005; Astin et al, 2006; Bryant, 2007, 2008a, 2008b; Lindholm and Astin, 2008; Seifert, 2008).

While there are significant efforts in research on spirituality in higher education, most prominent are studies related to the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education Project. These studies have tended to focus predominantly on students and secondarily on faculty. Fewer studies have been undertaken in regard to student affairs professionals. This profession,
because of its foundation aligned with holism and close working relationships with students, has great potential to support student development in this regard.

Student affairs theory is largely silent in regard to spiritual development. Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (1983) each have added significantly to the theory regarding spirituality and spiritual development. Integrating aspects of cognitive and affective, theistic and nontheistic, and connections with culture, identity and values, each of these scholar’s theories have been drawn upon to develop the theoretical framework for this study.

Within this literature review is an argument that acknowledges the context and influences of society on spirituality in higher education, provides attention to shifts in perspectives from a historical lens addressing changes in religion as well as legalities, and acknowledges the ongoing challenges that scholars and researchers face in clearly defining and delineating concepts of spirituality. Also illustrated is how little there is in either student development theory or empirical research in this area, particularly as compared with other fields. The recent surge of interest in spirituality as an appropriate role for educators coupled with the gap in the research base and student development theory have been examined. Together, these make evident the need for additional research in the role of student affairs professionals and their work with students.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Summary of Purpose

This study reports descriptive findings of how student affairs professionals perceive their spirituality, measured with factor scales derived from previous studies undertaken by the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty and student studies. Further, it tests if the spirituality of student affairs professionals is a predictor of their holistic, spiritually-infused practice. Practice is measured with the pre-existing factor scales Community Building, Modeling Authenticity, and Reflective Practice, from Seifert and Harmon (2009) scales and Focus on Students’ Personal Development, from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty study (2007). Because demographic characteristics are known to influence the lens through which individuals perceive the world (Bryant, 2007), this study also measures the mediating effects that demographics and work environment characteristics have in regard to the spirituality and practice of student affairs professionals. Moreover, this study examines the influence of graduate school curricula and mentoring experiences on the practice of student affairs professionals in regard to spirituality as a component of holistic student development. Graduate school curricula and mentoring experiences are measured through newly developed scales.

The three research questions for this study are:

1. How do student affairs professionals perceive their spirituality?
2. What are student affairs professionals’ practices in regard to integration of spirituality into their work?
3. To what extent do student affairs professionals’ demographics, spirituality, graduate preparation, and mentoring experiences predict the practice of integrating spirituality into their work?

Study Design

This study used a quantitative, non-experimental research design. The researcher chose to pursue a quantitative design for a variety of reasons. Two of the largest national studies about spirituality and higher education, the UCLA national faculty and student surveys, were quantitative studies. This study utilized several scales from those studies. Additionally, practices of student affairs professionals in regard to spirituality as a component of holistic student development could be more effectively measured using a quantitative design. The researcher was interested in measuring data from a higher number of participants than could be captured through a qualitative research design, and the research questions being measured were best suited for a quantitative design. The advantages of non-experimental designs are that they can be carried out in natural settings, and do not require experimentation. The disadvantages are that results lead only to conclusions about associations, and do not shed light on cause and effect (Sproull, 2002). The study reports descriptive and correlational findings. Descriptive data are used for summarizing large amounts of data, identifying major characteristics of the population, and describing the status quo (O’Rourke, Hatcher, & Stepanski, 2005). Correlational data help to explain connections and relationships, but not causation (O’Rourke, Hatcher, & Stepanski, 2005).
Population and Sample

The sample and population were the same and consisted of full-time student affairs professionals with masters or doctorate degrees who were members of the National Association of Campus Activities (NACA). Both undergraduate and graduate student members were deleted from the master NACA e-mail list used for this research. The mission of NACA is as follows:

NACA advances campus activities in higher education through a business and learning partnership, creating educational and business opportunities for its school and professional members. The Association's programs focus on program planning, risk management, multicultural education, concert management, student and professional leadership development, student government and more (accessed from www.naca.org on July 7, 2009).

During the 2008-2009 year, national institutional membership of NACA totaled 1,100. Many institutional memberships represent more than one student affairs professional staff member. According to John Ogle, Director of Education and Research for NACA, the number of individual student affairs professionals with e-mail addresses in the NACA database totaled about 1,450 individuals for the 2008-2009 year.

NACA membership represents a specialized component of student affairs because of the organizational focus on student and campus activities. This is an appropriate population for this study because these professionals are directly involved in ongoing advising roles with student leaders. These staff members have great potential to impact students through their
mentoring roles. Additionally, though NACA membership includes a span of career stages, the highest category per an association survey administered last year was comprised of professionals who have worked in the student affairs field between one and ten years. This represented a potential benefit in terms of gathering relatively recent data about the graduate school curricula and mentoring experiences of these new professionals. Unlike other student affairs associations including the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) (http://www.naspa.org) and the Association of College Student Personnel Administrators (ACPA) (http://www2.myacpa.org/), the membership of NACA had not been studied previously in regard to spirituality and student affairs practice. Results provide new data to this association as well as to the student affairs profession.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument for this research consisted of two parts. Part one included fourteen demographic and work environment questions. The demographics questions included age, racial/ethnic background, gender, religious affiliation of graduate institution, and stage of career questions including highest degree completed, level currently working, and years in profession. Work environment questions included religious affiliation of current institution of employment and degree to which religious affiliation influences the institution’s culture as well as type of institution employed, i.e. four year or two year, and public or private. In finalizing this survey, components and categories reflected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and general standards within the profession of student affairs were considered and explored. For example, for the variable gender,
language and concepts generally accepted within the profession of student affairs were employed.

Part two of the survey consisted of ten sections and included statements related to spirituality, graduate school curricula, mentoring experiences, and student affairs practice. The questions dealt with beliefs, personal goals, self-descriptions, self-ratings, and frequency of specific practices. Respondents were given an opportunity to share additional thoughts or concerns in an open-ended format at the end of the survey for the benefit of future research. A total of 18 participants responded to this option.

The instrument for this study was developed by combining factor scales of three existing surveys to measure demographics, spirituality, and practice and introducing newly developed items to measure graduate school curricula and mentoring experiences. The survey was piloted at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Region III Summer Symposium in the summer of 2009 for clarity of content. Following the pilot test, the survey was further refined as a result of pilot group feedback. Feedback from the pilot group informed changes to the survey including extending 3 and 4 point scales to 5 point scales, recoding the response choices to include numbers in addition to descriptors, clarifying survey language to specify personal or professional perspectives, and reworking the sections on graduate school curricula and mentoring experiences in order to improve and better organize the questions. The pilot group members also helped to consider how to use the demographic categories.
Pre-existing scales

The researcher gained author permission to use each of the pre-existing scales (See Appendices A and B for permissions). Two of the scales are from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education project conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). There are two separate UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education surveys from which scales have been borrowed. They are: Spirituality in Higher Education: A National Study of College Students’ Search for Meaning and Purpose (Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Szelényi, & Calderone, 2005), accessed on May 26, 2009 at: http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/spirituality/reports/FINAL_EXEC_SUMMARY.pdf); (See Appendix C) and Spirituality and the Professoriate: A National Study of Faculty Attitudes, Experiences, and Behaviors (Astin, et al; 2006), accessed on May 26, 2009 at: http://www.spirituality.ucla.edu/results/spirit_professoriate.pdf) (See Appendix D). The Relationship between Life Purpose, Spiritual Well-being and Student Affairs Practice (Seifert & Harmon, 2009) is the third survey from which this dissertation borrowed scales (See Appendix E).

The UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education student survey (College Students’ Beliefs and Values (CSBV) Survey) was piloted in 2003 and administered nationally in 2004 at 236 diverse colleges and universities to 112,232 first year students. The CSBV was administered as a two-page addendum to the UCLA Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) freshman survey. It contains 160 items related to students’ perspectives and practices with respect to spirituality and religion. It was again administered in 2007 as a follow-up to
15,000 of the original respondents. This survey is very applicable to the present study because it includes a variety of non-theistic spiritually-related factor scales that exhibit a high degree of internal consistency.

The UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty survey was initially administered at 511 institutions between fall 2004 and spring 2005. It was completed by 40,670 faculty from 421 colleges and universities. This survey is particularly relevant because it was developed specifically for use by educators in higher education. Though it was specifically targeted toward faculty, student affairs professionals are also engaged in student learning and development, thus it is relevant and applicable.

The third survey was developed as part of a doctoral seminar titled “Spirituality and Student Affairs Practice” in 2005 (Seifert & Harmon, 2009).¹ The Seifert and Harmon instrument measures the frequency with which student affairs professionals engage in a variety of practices with students. The survey was piloted at a state-wide conference in October 2005 and has been refined and re-tested since then. The researchers included practices such as conducting community-building exercises, incorporating service learning, using and discussing values clarification, and providing time to reflect and share during meetings in the survey, and based their choices on past research that suggested an association with students’ spiritual development.

¹: Per Seifert’s request in regard to citation for the development of the Seifert & Harmon (2009) survey, I acknowledge the following: Individual items for the scales were developed by students in a graduate course on spirituality in higher education taught by Dr. Sherry Watt at the University of Iowa in fall 2005. Tricia Seifert and Noel Harmon would like to acknowledge the contributions of Kelley Ashby, Kathy Goodman, Jacqueline Klein-McElvain, Adele Lozano, Marisela Rosas and Sherry Watt to the instrument’s development.
Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are critical in survey-based research. Reliability refers to the notion that the instrument will “provide consistent scores upon repeated administration by alternate forms” (O’Rourke, Hatcher, & Stepanski, 2005, p. 158) and over time. One of the general classes of reliability estimates that was used in this dissertation research is internal consistency reliability, used to assess the consistency of results across items within a survey. Nunnally (1970) indicates that .70 is an acceptable estimate of internal consistency. All of the pre-existing scales in this study met or exceeded Nunnally’s recommendation. To further clarify, the pre-existing scales were actually used as proposed scales. As a part of pre-data analysis, the pre-existing scales were assessed via confirmatory factor analysis and also by calculation of Cronbach’s alpha following data collection. After these procedures were conducted, a final decision was made in regard to which scales to retain for analysis.

Validity refers to the notion that an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Sproull, 2002). Because new items were measured as part of this study, and because the survey was introduced to a new, though related, population of student affairs administrators, it was necessary to document validity in several ways.

The pilot group included a majority of seasoned scholars/practitioners. The majority of the focus group members had earned doctorates and others were well into the doctoral research process. The purpose of the pilot group was to ascertain clarity of the survey. Pilot group feedback provided two levels of validity. The first was face validity in regard to the topic of spirituality. Content validity was the second type of validity enhanced by the pilot
group, largely because of members’ educational levels, statistical and survey design knowledge, and by virtue of the fact that they make their living in the profession of student affairs. While content validity is not able to be proven with statistics, “it provides a good foundation on which to build a methodologically rigorous assessment of a survey instrument’s validity” (Lizwin, 1995, p. 35).

The Higher Education Research Institute surveys (UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty and student surveys) were originally developed through collaboration between the HERI research team and the project’s Technical Advisory Panel (TAP), both comprised of a group of experts in the area of higher education and spirituality. The research team for the student survey went through an extensive development process. Beginning with an exploration of definitions of spirituality, the research team concluded that existing instruments’ limitations necessitated development of a new instrument. The pilot survey was consequently designed with the intent that any student could respond in a meaningful way regardless of theistic or non-theistic belief system. As the survey was developed and refined, the research team and TAP members served as judges, finalizing the questions on the basis of inter-judge reliability. Following the pilot test, the research team conducted factor analyses in order to develop potential scales. Following this, they correlated the proposed scales with other questions to explore if they correlated with other questions and scales in expected directions in order to demonstrate construct validity.
Data Collection

Data were collected via an online instrument. Upon approval by the North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) (See Appendix F for IRB) and dissertation committee, the researcher worked with the Director of Research for NACA and staff from Student Voice to implement the survey. NACA’s Advancing Research Program grants membership access to an approved research project for the purpose of research related to the field. This research proposal was submitted and approved by the Advancing Research program in July of 2009, which grants access to the membership for research purposes. Though NACA’s policy grants access to membership for research, it does not allow membership information access to an individual researcher. Because NACA and Student Voice have a business relationship, NACA allowed Student Voice direct access to the membership database for purposes of data collection. NACA staff created a database from their membership list that included, to the best of their ability and knowledge, only full-time professional staff members. Student Voice used this database to send the survey to all full-time student affairs staff members who have e-mail addresses registered with the NACA. The initial plan was to administer the survey twice.

In order to capture a larger sample, the researcher sought and gained NACA approval to send the survey out two additional times, and submitted an updated IRB request that included a $25 gift card drawing incentive for respondents. The updated IRB request was approved, and as a result, invitations were sent out a total of four times instead of the originally planned two times (See Appendix G for updated portion of IRB form).
Invitations were sent via e-mail on October 20, 27, November 9 and 16, 2009. There was a two week gap between the second and third invitations while the updated IRB process was being completed. The e-mail message included an invitation to participate in the study, the IRB form, and a link to the survey, all of which are included in the IRB form.

Participant privacy and confidentiality were of concern with regard to administration of this survey. Privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity of responses were assured to participants. Participation was voluntary and participants had the option of withdrawing from the study at any time. Participants also had the option to skip questions that they chose not to answer.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework as shown in Figure 4 provides an illustration of the variables and their proposed relationship to one another. This study sought to further the knowledge base regarding spirituality and what predicts holistic, spiritually-infused practices of student affairs professionals.

Demographic characteristics have been shown to influence spirituality (Bryant, 2007; Bryant, Choi, & Yasuno, 2003; Stewart, 2009). The conceptual framework acknowledges this finding and analyses also explored how spirituality mediates the influence of demographic characteristics on the practice of student affairs professionals.

Graduate school curricula were measured to determine if inclusion of courses and attention to spirituality within course content or pedagogy predict student affairs practice. Rogers and Love (2007) studied graduate school constructions of spirituality and concluded
that students did not make connections between their learning and their career preparation in regard to spirituality, thus additional research will provide further data on this topic. Parks (2000) has written extensively about the positive impact of mentoring on the young adult. This study also measured the impact of graduate school mentoring experiences to determine if mentoring is a predictor of spiritually infused practices of student affairs professionals. Each variable is more fully described below in terms of how it relates with and contributes to this study.

**Figure 4. Conceptual Framework Reintroduced**

**Independent Variables**

**Demographic and Work Environment Characteristics**

The demographic and work environment characteristics included in the analyses are stage of career, type of institution, institutional affiliation, primary area of responsibility,
gender, racial/ethnic background, and age. Stage of career includes number of years worked in the student affairs profession, highest degree completed, and level currently working. Type of institution includes information regarding type (two-or four-year institution) as well as control (public or private). Institutional affiliation reflects the religious heritage of the current institution of employment as well as graduate school and measures respondents’ perceptions of the degree to which the institutions’ religious affiliation (if any) influences the culture of the institutions. Primary area of responsibility was intended to provide distinction between those whose primary area of responsibility is other than campus activities. Gender, racial/ethnic background and age were also collected.

**Spirituality**

Spirituality, a multi-dimensional concept, originates from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty (2006) and student (2005) studies. The factor scales Spiritual Quest, Equanimity, Ethic of Caring, Ecumenical Worldview, and Compassionate Self-Concept derive from the student survey (2004/07), and the factor scale Spirituality derives from the national faculty survey (2004/05).

Because spirituality is a multi-dimensional concept, the various factors helped to measure differing but related aspects of the construct spirituality. Spiritual Quest measures the search for meaning-making and purpose in life, concepts discussed by Fowler (1981), Parks (2000), and Tisdell (2003). Equanimity is a scale that is more reflective of Parks’ concept of a tested or mature adult. In fact, Astin and Keen (2006) wrote that as they sought to define what a spiritually mature individual would “look like,” equanimity is the answer at
which they arrived. This scale deals with the ability to find peace and be centered during
times of hardship as well as feeling good about the direction one’s life is headed. The scale
Ethic of Caring illuminates the connectedness that Parks references with her vision of a
mentoring community, in which young adults are welcomed, cared for, and encouraged as
they mature. Compassionate Self-Concept and Spirituality scales provide additional
perspective into respondents’ self-perspectives. Generally, these scales are infused with
concepts that Parks references in her work including, but not limited to, the introduction of a
compassionate and caring environment where students can develop an inner authority that
will guide them. Ecumenical Worldview is closely aligned with Tisdell’s work on identity
and culture in regard to setting learning environments that reflect and respect various aspects
of student culture. This scale includes openness and interest in learning about different
religious traditions, connection to humanity, understanding of and accepting of others and
belief in the interconnectedness of life.

Tables 1 - 6 indicate factor name, Cronbach’s alpha as reported in the UCLA surveys,
items, and details regarding item response options.
Table 1
*Spiritual Quest (α = .82)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engaged in: Searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>a- 5-point scale: 1 = never to 5 = always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engaged in: Having discussions about the meaning of life with my friends</td>
<td>b- 5-point scale: 1 = none to 5 = all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Close friends: Are searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>c- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal goal: Finding answers to the mysteries of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal goal: Attaining inner harmony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal goal: Attaining wisdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal goal: Seeking beauty in my life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal goal: Developing a meaningful philosophy of life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personal goal: Becoming a more loving person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
*Equanimity (α = .72)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experience: Been able to find meaning in times of hardship</td>
<td>a- 5-point scale: 1 = never to 5 = always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience: Felt at peace/centered</td>
<td>b- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all an accurate description of myself to 5 = extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-description: Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed</td>
<td>b- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all an accurate description of myself to 5 = extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-description: Being thankful for all that has happened to me</td>
<td>b- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all an accurate description of myself to 5 = extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-description: Seeing each day, good or bad, as a gift</td>
<td>b- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all an accurate description of myself to 5 = extremely important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
*Ethic of Caring (α = .82)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engaged in: Trying to change things that are unfair in the world</td>
<td>a- 5-point scale: 1 = never to 5 = always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal goal: Helping others who are in difficulty</td>
<td>b- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal goal: Reducing pain and suffering in the world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal goal: Helping to promote racial understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal goal: Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal goal: Becoming a community leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal goal: Influencing social values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Personal goal: Influencing the political structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a*- 5-point scale: 1 = never to 5 = always

*b*- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important

*c*- 5-point scale: 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important
Table 4

*Ecumenical Worldview (α = .70)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-description: Having an interest in different religious traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-description: Believing in the goodness of all people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-description: Feeling a strong connection to all humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-rating: Understanding of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engaged in: Accepting others as they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal goal: Improving my understanding of other countries and cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal goal: Improving the human condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Belief: All life is interconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Belief: Love is at the root of all the great religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Belief: Non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Belief: We are all spiritual beings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Belief: Most people can grow spiritually without being religious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 5-point scale: 1 = *not at all an accurate description of myself* to 5 = *extremely accurate description of myself*
- 5-point scale: 1 = *lowest 10%* to 5 = *highest 10%*
- 5-point scale: 1 = *never* to 5 = *always*
- 5-point scale: 1 = *not at all important* to 5 = *extremely important*
- 5-point scale: 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*

Table 5

*Compassionate Self-Concept (α = .78)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-rating: Kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-rating: Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-rating: Forgiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-rating: Generosity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 5-point scale: 1 = *lowest 10%* to 5 = *highest 10%*
The majority of these pre-existing factor scales were retained for this study. Compa-
sonetic Self-concept was not retained, as is further explained in Chapter 4.

**Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences**

Independent variables pertaining to graduate school curricula and mentoring
experiences are measured through survey questions developed for the current study. These
questions were developed and refined through the pilot group process, which was held at a
regional association summer meeting of student affairs professionals, through discussions
with both this dissertation chair, Dr. Alyssa Bryant, and the methodology committee member
for this study, Dr. James Bartlett, and through revision of existing questions from both the
Seifert and Harmon (2009) survey and the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education College
Students’ Beliefs and Values (CSVB) 2007 follow-up survey.

Graduate school curricula responses were intended to provide data regarding the
extent to which spirituality topics were included in the student affairs professionals’ graduate
school curricula while they were graduate students. Table 7 reflects the items included in this
variable. Questions reflect spirituality as a content area in the curriculum (attended a class
related to spirituality, were assigned reading on spirituality) and as a pedagogy (were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th><em>Spirituality</em> (<em>α = .88</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal characteristic: Consider yourself a spiritual person</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal characteristic: Seek opportunities to grow spiritually</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal objective: Integrate spirituality into my life</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a - 5\text{-point scale}: 1 = \text{not at all an accurate description of myself} \text{ to } 5 = \text{extremely accurate description of myself} \]

\[ b - 5\text{-point scale}: 1 = \text{not at all important} \text{ to } 5 = \text{extremely important} \]
provided time to reflect and share, were provided time for written reflections). Several of the items included in this variable have been modified from Seifert and Harmon’s (2009) survey and from the UCLA College Beliefs and Values (CSBV) follow-up survey.

Table 7  
Graduate School Curricula  
| Item |  
|------|---|
| 1. Attended a graduate school class, workshop, or retreat on matters related to spirituality | a |
| 2. Took graduate course/s that dealt with searching for meaning/purpose in life, but did not make explicit connections with spirituality | a |
| 3. Were assigned reading on spirituality in a graduate course | a |
| 4. Took graduate courses that dealt with religious pluralism | a |
| 5. Studied student development theory that focused on spirituality as a graduate student | a |
| 6. Were provided time to reflect and share during graduate classes | a |
| 7. Were provided time for written reflections during graduate class or meetings | a |
| 8. Were exposed to community-building exercises during graduate school | a |

As with graduate school curricula, specific questions from Seifert and Harmon’s (2009) survey were modified to create certain questions for the independent variable, Mentoring Experiences. The questions were modified from a focus on mentoring practices of student affairs professionals to mentoring experienced by graduate students. Questions reflect the experiences of being mentored as a graduate student (were mentored as a graduate student) as opposed to the practice of mentoring as a student affairs professional (mentor students in their personal development). Mentoring Experiences is an independent variable. Mentoring Practices as a Student Affairs Professional is a component of the dependent variable. Table 8 lists each individual item in the independent variable mentoring.
Table 8
*Mentoring Experienced as a Graduate Student*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Were mentored as a graduate student a</td>
<td>2. Discussed life purpose with your mentor a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were encouraged by your mentor to develop intercultural competencies a</td>
<td>4. Shared personal experiences during conversations with your mentor a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussed being a contributing member of your community with your mentor a</td>
<td>6. Communicated and interacted with your mentor in authentic ways a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were mentored in your personal development a</td>
<td>8. Discussed career and future professional life with your mentor a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Discussed aspects of spirituality including searching for meaning and purpose in life with your mentor a</td>
<td>10. Received mentoring as a graduate student that prepared you for your role as a mentor to student leaders a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Believe mentoring roles that involve mentor supporting students’ searching for meaning and purpose in life are an appropriate role for student affairs professionals a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* - 5-point scale: 1 = *never* to 5 = *always*

**Dependent Variable: Holistic, Spiritually-Infused Practice**

The dependent variable, holistic, spiritually-infused practice, utilized three scales developed by Seifert and Harmon (2009) (Community Building, Modeling Authenticity, and Reflective Practice) and one scale developed in conjunction with the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education faculty survey (2007) (Focus on Students’ Personal Development).

The four scales provided a method to measure the practice of student affairs professionals in regard to integrating spirituality as a component of their work. The scale Focus on Students’ Personal Development is a measure of practice that is infused with concepts that resonate with Parks’s (1980, 2000) work including meaning/purpose in life, self-understanding, personal values, spiritual development, and moral character. The scales from the Seifert and Harmon (2009) survey measuring student affairs practices are similarly attuned to the emphasis of Parks.
Each of these factor scales is shown below in Tables 9 - 12, and indicate factor scale name, existing Cronbach’s alpha from the previous study, items, and details regarding response options.

Table 9
Community Building ($\alpha = .877$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Incorporate service learning into programming model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Create opportunities for intercultural interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use outdoor/wilderness environments as a learning tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct ally/social justice training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discuss rights and responsibilities of being a citizen in a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Create opportunities for social/political awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Include issues of social justice in programming model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conduct community-building exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provide opportunities for community service/volunteerism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- 7-point scale: 1 = Do not engage in this practice to 5 = Daily*

Table 10
Modeling Authenticity ($\alpha = .848$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Discuss life purpose with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Share relevant personal experiences during conversations with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss balance with your students, in terms of self care, stress management, conflict management, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communicate and interact with students in authentic ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seek to understand the unique individuality of each student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mentor students in their personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Discuss career and future professional life with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- 7-point scale: 1 = Do not engage in this practice to 5 = Daily*
Table 11
*Reflective Practices* (α = .732)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide time to reflect and share during class or meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide time for written reflections during class or meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use art, music, poetry, or film as learning tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use and discuss values clarification exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α*- 7-point scale: 1 = *Do not engage in this practice* to 5 = *Daily*

Table 12
*Focus on Students’ Personal Development* (α = .88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goal for undergraduates: Develop moral character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goal for undergraduates: Provide for students’ emotional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goal for undergraduates: Help students develop personal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goal for undergraduates: Enhance students’ self-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Goal for undergraduates: Enhance spiritual development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Goal for undergraduates: Facilitate search for meaning/ purpose in life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α*- 5-point scale: 1 = *not at all important* to 5 = *extremely important*

All of the pre-existing practice scales were retained for this study. Reflective Practice had a low Cronbach’s alpha score of .65. After consideration, it was retained because the researcher wanted the practice variable to be inclusive of various areas of practice, and maintaining this scale supported that goal. It is noted as a limitation of the study.

*Data Analysis*

All demographic data were dummy coded where appropriate with 0=no response and 1=response. Responses for years in profession were treated as integers and rounded up or down. Demographic data were examined graphically in the form of histograms for normal distribution. Histograms provide a graphical means to examine the distribution of single variables for normality. All demographic data with the exception of age and years in
profession were normally distributed. Both age and years in profession were positively skewed, meaning that participants were younger in age and had fewer years in the profession than would be expected in a normal distribution. The skewness for age was 1.229 and the skewness for years in profession was 1.498. This skewness is consistent with the organization through which the study was administered, as NACA staff members tend to be entry and mid-level, and consequently, younger with less years of experience in the field. This was further confirmed in that zero senior level professionals responded to this study.

Elimination of Ineligible and Incomplete Responders

Initially, the data were reviewed and ineligible and incomplete responders were eliminated. A total of 1441 e-mails were sent to NACA professional staff members. Of the 1441 sent, 109 of the messages were undeliverable. From the 1332 individuals who received the e-mail, 225 (16.89%) responded. Of the 225 respondents, 216 (96%) completed the survey. Of the respondents, 41 (18.22%) were eliminated because they did not have a master’s or doctorate degree. These participants were ineligible and eliminated from participation in the survey because two sections of the survey measured graduate school curricula and mentoring experienced as a graduate student. This left 184 eligible respondents, meaning they had completed a masters or doctorate degree.

As a condition of the institutional review board approval process, respondents were given the opportunity to skip questions. The remaining 184 surveys were reviewed for completeness. Seven additional survey responses were eliminated because the respondents did not answer the vast majority of the questions on the survey. This resulted in n=177.
For these remaining 177 surveys, the researcher dealt with non-response by replacing missing values for participants who were considered completers, meaning they completed the vast majority of the questions, with series means. Double response bias was removed through the reporting capabilities of StudentVoice.com.

The remaining data were checked for normality. Each of the summed scales, with the exception of graduate school curricula (.496) had a negative skewness, meaning the tail of the distribution points in the direction of the lower values. Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson and Tatham (2006) indicate the acceptable range for skewness is between <1 and >-1. All of the summed scales used, with the exception of Modeling Authenticity, are within this range. Modeling Authenticity had a skewness of -1.034. Even though Modeling Authenticity was .034 beyond the suggested skewness range, it was retained because it was so close and because it represented one aspect of practice that has been used in previous studies and was considered by the researcher to be important. This is listed as a limitation of the study.

Kurtosis of the data was also examined. Kurtosis for all of the main summed variables were within the acceptable range of <1 to >-1 as described by Haire, Black, Babin, Anderson and Tatham (2006).

Early and Late Respondents

Item response bias analysis revealed that there were few items that were not answered by participants, and there were not systematic non-response patterns observable. To examine non-response bias, early and late respondents were compared based on demographics (age, gender, racial/ethnic background, and years in profession) and the major variables of interest.
(spirituality, mentoring, graduate school curricula, and student affairs professionals’ practices). Spirituality summed is comprised of the five spirituality factor scales summed. Table 13 shows that there were no significant differences on demographics or main variables of interest.

Table 13
Comparison of Early and Late Responders Based on Demographics and Major Variables of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Early (n=162)</th>
<th>Late (n=15)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Variables of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality Summed</td>
<td>151.68</td>
<td>152.07</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>104.35</td>
<td>107.24</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing early and late respondents on gender ($\chi^2=110$, df=1, p=.741) there were no significant differences. Additionally, when examining racial/ethnic background ($\chi^2 = .152$, df=1, p=.696) there were no significant differences between early and late respondents.

Once the data were cleaned, confirmatory factor analysis was run, tests for internal consistency, or Cronbach’s alpha, were conducted on each of the proposed factor scales with the exception of demographic and work environment characteristics.

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with the SPSS 17 software program using the extraction method of principal component analysis. Based on the confirmatory analysis results, it was not necessary to revise or refine the proposed or pre-existing scales.
“Internal consistency is the extent to which the individual items that constitute a test correlate with one another or with the test total” (O’Rourke, Hatcher, Stepanski, 2005, p. 158). Reliability estimates range from 0-1 and there must be at least two questions to perform a reliability measure. The internal reliability estimates provided information regarding item redundancy and low internal consistency, both of which have the potential to be managed by modification of the final items to be included in each factor scale.

Frequencies and percentages as well as cross tabulations were utilized to provide a descriptive profile of student affairs professionals’ demographics and work environment, as well as their spirituality and practice. The use of the statistical tests of ANOVA and Pearson’s correlation were used to examine if relationships existed with spirituality and demographic or work environment characteristics. Multiple regression analysis was then used to explore the extent to which the independent variables of demographic and work environment characteristics, spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences predict the practice of student affairs professionals. A separate regression was run on each of the four practices scales. As illustrated in the conceptual framework, the study also explored how spirituality mediates the influence of demographic traits on practice.

Research Question One

How do student affairs professionals perceive their spirituality? The first research question was analyzed with the use of means and standard deviations, frequencies and percentages, and cross-tabulations. Means, standard deviations and Cronbach’s alpha are reported separately for the spirituality scales, including Spiritual Quest, Equanimity, Ethic of
Caring, Ecumenical Worldview, and Spirituality. Cross-tabulations are displayed as contingency tables and provide correlations (Pearson’s) and comparisons (ANOVA) in regard to how student affairs professionals self-reported their spirituality across various demographic and work environment characteristics. Correlations are reported for levels of spirituality, age, and years of work experience. Comparisons of groups within the sample are reported for levels of spirituality for each of the following variables: gender, racial/ethnic background, level of education, level currently working, public vs. private institution, two year vs. four year institution, religious affiliation of current institution of employment, and religious affiliation of graduate institution attended.

*Research Question Two*

What are student affairs professionals’ practices in regard to integration of spirituality into their work? Analysis of the second research question employed the use of means and standard deviations, frequencies and percentages to report the extent of student affairs professionals’ practices for items on each of the practice scales, which included Community Building, Modeling Authenticity, Reflective Practices, and Focus on Students Personal Development.

*Research Question Three*

To what extent do student affairs professionals’ demographics, spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences predict the practice of integrating spirituality into their work? The third research question was analyzed by use of multiple regression. Multiple regression is widely used in social sciences because of the complexity of dependent
variables in social phenomenon. For example, spirituality cannot be totally explained by one predictor variable, thus it becomes important to have a procedure that allows for measurement of predictive ability of multiple variables. There are many underlying assumptions for using multiple regression. One of the most basic assumptions for use of multiple regression (though there are exceptions) is that both the independent variables and the dependent variable be assessed at the interval or ratio level of measurement. This was the case with this research design, which made use of this procedure appropriate.

Multiple regression is also well-suited for studying the relationship between naturally occurring independent and dependent variables as opposed to variables manipulated by the researcher. It is helpful for determining if a set of variables is useful for predicting a dependent variable. It can determine whether or not the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable is statistically significant, how much variance in the dependent variable is accounted for by the predictors, and which are relatively important predictors of the dependent variable (O’Rourke, Hatcher, & Stepanski, 2005, p. 372). It does not, however, provide evidence of cause and effect relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The most important assumptions for multiple regression use involve “independent observations, measurement error, or specification errors (Pedhazur, 1982)” as cited in O’Rourke, Hatcher, and Stepanski, 2005, p. 427. Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) consider an acceptable rule of thumb for testing b coefficients is to have \( N \geq 104 + m \), where \( m \) = the number of independent variables. Even though the response was smaller than hoped for, it was large enough to meet Tabachnick and Fidell’s standard as outlined above.
The dependent variable, holistic, spiritually-infused practice, had four separate factor scales and a separate regression was run on each. The individual dependent variables that comprise the summed practice variable are: community building, modeling authenticity, reflective practices, and focus on students’ personal development.

Analysis was conducted by entering each independent variable separately into each model. Independent variables entered into the regression models included, in order of entry and by block: block one included age, race/ethnicity: White, gender: female, highest degree completed, level currently working, and years in profession; block two added religious affiliation of institution of employment and public institution; block three added each of the separate spirituality scales, which were spiritual quest summed, equanimity summed, ethic of caring summed, ecumenical worldview summed, and spirituality factor summed; block four added graduate school curricula summed, and block five added mentoring experiences summed. The regressions were run on each dependent variable factor scale as follows:

Regression 1: Community Building
Regression 2: Modeling Authenticity
Regression 3: Reflective Practices
Regression 4: Focus on Students’ Personal Development

In addition, the study also assessed the way that spirituality mediated the relationship between demographics and practice, as depicted in the conceptual framework. A variable is a mediator to the extent that it accounts for the relationship between the independent variable
and the dependent variable. Astin’s (1991) method for tracking beta coefficients was utilized for this analysis.

This chapter has provided a description of the methodology that was followed to implement, analyze, and report findings for this study. The processes for cleaning data were explained, and the statistical tests utilized for analyses were outlined. Processes to deal with elimination of incomplete responders, early and late respondents, as well as managing item response bias were explained.

This study utilized factor scales from past research and developed new factor scales for measurement of the independent variables graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences. The study design represented the potential to support patterns of past findings as well as to extend the knowledge base of relevant theory such as Parks’s contention of the value of mentoring on the development of young adults and Tisdell’s contention that educators have the ability to shape the environment for learners with an emphasis on culture and identity, both important aspects of spirituality. The findings are reported in Chapter 4.
Chapter Four: Findings

This study was conducted to examine the practices of student affairs professionals in regard to integration of spirituality as a component of holistic student development. The study addresses the specific questions: 1) How do student affairs professionals perceive their own spirituality?, 2) What are student affairs professionals’ practices in regard to integration of spirituality into their work?, and 3) To what extent do student affairs professionals’ demographics, spirituality, graduate preparation, and mentoring experiences predict the practice of integrating spirituality into their work?

Descriptive results for demographic data are reported, with use of means and standard deviations, frequencies and percentages. Pre-data analyses results including confirmatory factor scale analysis and Cronbach’s alpha tests for internal consistency are reported. Factor scales and correlations are described. Individual item factor loadings are also reported. This is followed by descriptions of student affairs perceptions of their own spirituality including key findings for each spirituality scale, and comparisons of levels of spirituality by demographic and work environment characteristics. The practices of student affairs professionals in regard to integration of spirituality into their work are then examined through use of means and standard deviations, frequencies and percentages. This is followed by an exploration of what predicts holistic, spiritually-infused practices of student affairs professionals, using multiple regression.
Descriptive Results

Descriptive data collected was comprised of two categories; demographic and work environment characteristics of the sample. The sample consisted of student affairs professionals who were members of the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA). Based on the data, the typical respondent was 35 years old, white, female, educated at the masters level, employed at a four-year institution with no religious affiliation, and had almost 11 years of experience working in the field of student activities.

The following section provides specific information about respondents’ demographic and work environment characteristics, including range, mean, and standard deviation for each characteristic. Table 14 provides an overview of the respondents’ demographic and work environment data, including years in profession and age. The respondents’ number of years in profession ranged from a minimum of 1 year to a maximum of 42 years. The youngest respondent was 23 and the oldest was 68.

Table 14
Minimum, Maximum, Mean and Standard Deviation of Respondents Years in Profession and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Demographics</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35.05</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 63% (n=111) of respondents were female and 37% (n=66) were male. Just over 83% (n=147) were White. After White, the next largest category of respondents was Black, non-Hispanic (n=15, 8.47%). The remaining race/ethnicities reported were:
Hispanic/Latino, (n=7, 3.95%) and Asian/Pacific Islander (n=4, 2.82%). Three responded “other” for racial/ethnic background. Of the three, one respondent was eliminated due to low item response, one responded Caribbean, and one responded Hawaiian. For purposes of further data analysis, the racial/ethnic background category was recoded to 1 = White and 0 = non-White. The racial/ethnic statistics were not able to be compared with the overall membership of NACA, as NACA does not maintain such information.

The masters degree was held by a majority (n=169, 95.48%) of the respondents. The highest level of education was the doctorate degree, held by only eight (4.52%) of respondents. A fairly even distribution of level of current position was reported between entry-level (n=82, 46.33%) and mid-level (n=95, 53.67%), with no senior level respondents. Three respondents originally selected “other” and were recoded to an appropriate category (two were assigned to mid-level and one to entry-level) based on their responses.

Primary area of responsibility provided two options, either “campus activities” or “other”. One hundred forty-five (81.92 %) responded “campus activities,” which was the expected response. Thirty-two (18.08%) responded “other” and were given the opportunity to provide a specific response. Those responses provided a range of responsibilities, all within student affairs roles and most with various components of campus activities such as leadership, student union, and so forth. Table 15 provides frequencies and percentages of the respondents’ categorical demographic data, including gender, race/ethnicity, education level, level of current position, and primary area of responsibility.
Table 15
Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents’ Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Highest Degree Completed, Level of Current Position, and Primary Area of Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>62.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>83.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>95.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>53.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Area of Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Activities</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>81.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 102 (57.63%) respondents worked at public institutions, while 75 (42.37%) respondents worked at private institutions. There were 30 (16.95%) missing responses for two-year or four-year institution. A total of 135 (76.27%) respondents worked at four-year institutions, and 12 (6.78%) respondents worked at two-year institutions.

While this study approached spirituality in a non-theistic manner, work environment data such as religious affiliation of institution where currently employed and the degree to which religious affiliation influences the culture of the institution were collected. One hundred thirty-three (75.14%) respondents reported working at institutions with no religious
affiliation. Of the 44 (24.86%) who were employed at institutions with a religious affiliation, 25 (56.82%) reported a Christian Protestant affiliation and 19 (43.18%) reported a Catholic affiliation. Participants were also asked if their graduate institution is religiously affiliated. One hundred fifty-two (85.88%) respondents reported attending a graduate institution with no religious affiliation, and 24 (13.56%) reported attending a graduate institution with a religious affiliation. Of the 24 (13.56%) who attended a graduate institution with a religious affiliation, eight (34.78%) reported a Christian Protestant affiliation and 15 (65.22%) reported a Catholic affiliation. Table 16 provides an overview of the respondents’ work environment data, including institution type, religious affiliation of current institution, and religious affiliation of graduate institution.
Respondents who were currently employed at an institution with a religious affiliation, or who attended an institution with a religious affiliation, rated the degree to which the religious affiliation influenced the culture of the institution on a 5-point Likert-type scale of 1 = no influence to 5 = strongly influenced. Results indicated a higher rate of influence on culture at the graduate institution than on culture of current institution of employment. Responses are reported in Table 17 for degree of influence on culture of current institution where employed and on culture of graduate institution attended.
Table 17

Degree to which Religious Affiliation Influences Culture of Current and Graduate Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Religious Affiliation Influences Current Institution</th>
<th>Respondents' Current Institutions</th>
<th>Respondents' Graduate Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Strongly influences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – No influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
For Current Institution n=44 (133 reported no institutional religious affiliation) (M=3.25, SD=.943).
For Graduate Institution: n = 24 (153 reported no institutional religious affiliation). (M=3.67, SD=1.05).

Factor Scales, Loadings, and Correlations

As noted earlier, the spirituality scales were used previously with the HERI (UCLA national faculty and student) studies. The Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences factor scales were developed conceptually on Parks’s and Tisdell’s theories and integrated items from various existing scales developed by Seifert and Harmon and HERI. Confirmatory factor analyses were run to test the hypothesized factor scale structure for the pre-existing spirituality and practice scales and to confirm that the newly developed Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences scales had appropriate levels of internal consistency.

Spirituality Factor Scales

As a result of the pre-data analysis, the majority of the pre-existing spirituality factor scales were maintained. One exception was the factor scale, Compassionate Self-Concept,
which was dropped. The test for internal consistency of this scale for this study resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of .67, which is below Nunnally’s (1970) recommended .70. A benefit of dropping the Compassionate Self-Concept factor scale was that the overall kurtosis of the summed spirituality scale was improved from a 1.031 to .982, which brought it within the range of <1 to be considered acceptable. Additionally, due to the relatively low response rate, it was of benefit to minimize the number of variables. The five retained scales were Spiritual Quest, Equanimity, Ethic of Caring, Ecumenical Worldview, and Spirituality.

Spiritual Quest includes concepts related to searching for and finding meaning/purpose in life, attaining inner harmony and wisdom, and developing a meaningful philosophy of life. Correlations exist at the 0.01 significance level between Spiritual Quest and all other variables except for the demographic and work environment characteristics.

Equanimity involves feeling at peace/centered, having the ability to find meaning in times of hardship, and having an optimistic view of one’s circumstances. Correlations were significant with Equanimity and each of the spirituality scales, the lowest being with Ethic of Caring (.189) and the highest being with Spirituality (.440). Equanimity was also correlated with the practice scales of Modeling Authenticity (.201) and Focus on Students’ Personal Development (.281).

Ethic of Caring measures personal goals related to helping others, reducing suffering, and involvement in ways that improve society. Ethic of Caring shared correlations with all of the independent variables with the exception of demographic and work environment characteristics. It was also correlated with each of the four practice dependent variables. The
range of correlations for Ethic of Caring was from .148 for Graduate School Curricula to .584 for Ecumenical Worldview.

Ecumenical Worldview measures an interest in broader understandings of religions, countries, cultures, and humanity. Ecumenical Worldview was correlated with each of the variables with the exception of demographic and work environment characteristics. The correlations for Ecumenical Worldview were relatively high with Spiritual Quest (.585) and Ethic of Caring (.584). The lowest correlation was with Reflective Practice (.176).

The single scale Spirituality measures the extent to which respondents consider themselves to be spiritual, seek opportunities to grow spiritually, and integrate spirituality into their lives. Spirituality was correlated at the 0.01 significance level with each of the other spirituality scales; however, it was not correlated with Graduate School Curricula or Mentoring Experiences. Spirituality was correlated with two of the four practice variables; Modeling Authenticity (.157) and Focus on Students’ Personal Development (.298).

Results for sums of each of the five retained spirituality scales are reported in Table 18. The spirituality factor scales had a five point response range, from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Following this table, the Cronbach’s alpha, factor loadings, and response options for each of the retained individual spirituality scales are reported in Table 19.
Table 18
Spirituality Scales: Items, Cronbach’s alpha, Minimum and Maximum Response Ranges, Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19
Spirituality Factor Loadings for Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Spiritual Quest</em> (α=.861)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a meaningful philosophy of life</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friends are searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discussions about meaning of life with my friends</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding answers to the mysteries of life</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues are searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discussions about meaning of life with my colleagues</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining inner harmony</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a more loving person</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining wisdom</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking beauty in my life</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Equanimity</em> (α=.721)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being thankful for all that has happened to me</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing each day, good or bad, as a gift</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt at peace/centered</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been able to find meaning in times of hardship</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ethic of Caring</em> (α=.811)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing pain and suffering in the world</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to promote racial understanding</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to change things that are unfair in the world</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>5-point scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a community leader (^b)</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing the political structure (^b)</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing social values (^b)</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others who are in difficulty (^b)</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview ((\alpha = .764))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All life is interconnected (^e)</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling a strong connection to all humanity (^d)</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing in the goodness of all people (^d)</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the human condition (^b)</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love is at the root of all the great religions (^e)</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an interest in different religious traditions (^d)</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are all spiritual beings (^e)</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my understanding of other countries and cultures (^b)</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting others as they are (^a)</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of others (^f)</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people can grow spiritually without being religious (^e)</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers (^e)</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality ((\alpha = .904))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek opportunities to grow spiritually (^a)</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider yourself a spiritual person (^a)</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate spirituality into my life (^b)</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) 5-point scale: 1 = never to 5 = always
\(^b\) 5-point scale: 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important
\(^c\) 5-point scale: 1 = none to 5 = always
\(^d\) 5-point scale: 1 = not at all an accurate description of myself to 5 = extremely accurate description of myself
\(^e\) 5-point scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree
\(^f\) 5-point scale: 1 = lowest 10% to 5 = highest 10%

Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences Factor Scales

Both of the newly developed factor scales were maintained as a result of the pre-data analyses. The factor scale Graduate School Curricula describes experiences of graduate students in regard to their curricular content with items such as attended a class, workshop, or
retreat on matters related to spirituality, were assigned a reading on spirituality in a graduate course, and studied student development theory on spirituality. It also includes pedagogical practices, such as having time to reflect and share during graduate classes. The factor scale Mentoring Experiences measures whether student affairs professionals were mentored as graduate students and the extent to which the mentoring dealt with items such as intercultural competencies, personal development, searching for meaning/purpose in life, and spirituality.

The Cronbach’s alphas for the newly developed factor scales Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences were .848 and .938, respectively. Based on the factor analysis results, the newly developed factor scales were retained and used. Table 20 shows the Cronbach’s alpha as well as number of items, range, means and standard deviations for the two scales. These two scales consisted of five point scales, ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 5. Following this, the Cronbach’s alpha, factor loadings, and response options for each item in Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences scales are reported in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school curricula</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Experiences</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor/Item</td>
<td>Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate School Curricula (α=.848)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were assigned reading on spirituality in a graduate course (^a)</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took graduate course/s that dealt with searching for meaning/purpose in life but did not make explicit connections with spirituality (^a)</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were provided time for written reflections during graduate class or meetings (^a)</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a graduate school class, workshop, or retreat on matters related to spirituality (^a)</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studied student development theory that focused on spirituality as a graduate student (^a)</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took graduate courses that dealt with religious pluralism (^a)</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were provided time to reflect and share during graduate classes (^a)</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were exposed to community-building exercises during graduate school (^a)</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring Experiences (α=.938)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated and interacted with your mentor in authentic ways (^a)</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were mentored in your personal development (^a)</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared personal experiences during conversations with your mentor (^a)</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed being a contributing member of your community with your mentor (^a)</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were mentored as a graduate student (^a)</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received mentoring as a graduate student that prepared you for your role as a mentor to student leaders (^a)</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed career and future professional life with your mentor (^a)</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were encouraged by your mentor to develop intercultural competencies (^a)</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed life purpose with your mentor (^a)</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed aspects of spirituality including searching for meaning and in life with your mentor (^a)</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe mentoring roles that involve mentor supporting students’ searching for meaning and purpose in life are an appropriate role for student affairs professionals (^a)</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) 5-point scale: 1 = never to 5 = always
Practices Factor Scales

Based on the pre-data analyses, the four practice scales Community Building, Modeling Authenticity, Reflective Practice, and Focus on Students’ Personal Development were all retained. As noted earlier, the scale Reflective Practice had a low Cronbach’s alpha (.65). It was retained because it provided a unique aspect of practice. This was listed as a limitation of the study. This section describes and provides the factor loadings and correlations for each scale.

Community Building includes concepts related to citizenship, social involvement, and justice. The Cronbach’s alpha for Community Building is .82. Community Building was correlated with Ethic of Caring, Spiritual Quest, Ecumenical Worldview, Mentoring Experiences, Graduate School Curricula, years in profession, and level currently working. The range of these correlations is from a low of .162 for years in profession to a high of .442 for Ethic of Caring. Community Building is also correlated with each of the other practice scales.

Modeling Authenticity deals with how individuals interact with others, such as communicating in authentic ways, mentoring students in their personal development, and discussing life purpose with students. Modeling Authenticity had a Cronbach’s alpha of .71. Modeling Authenticity is correlated with all five of the spirituality scales. Significant correlations also exist with the factor scales of Mentoring Experiences and Graduate School Curricula. No correlations exist between Modeling Authenticity and the demographic variables.
Reflective Practice was the smallest practice scale, with the lowest Cronbach’s alpha of .65. As noted earlier, the decision was made to retain this scale because it represents a unique aspect of practice, such as providing time for reflection and written reflections during class or meetings and the use of art, music, and such, as learning tools. Significant correlations for Reflective Practice were found with Ethic of Caring, Spiritual Quest, Ecumenical Worldview, Mentoring Experiences, Graduate School Curricula, and highest degree completed. The lowest correlation from above was with Ecumenical Worldview (.176) and the highest correlation was with Mentoring Experiences (.346). Reflective Practice was also significantly correlated to the other three practice scales.

Focus on Students’ Personal Development involves specific goals for staff who work with students that relate to development of character, emotional development, meaning/purpose in life, and spiritual development. This scale and Community Building both have Cronbach’s alphas of .82, as shown in Table 22. Correlations exist between Focus on Students’ Personal Development and all five spirituality scales, Graduate School Curricula, and Mentoring Experiences. The lowest correlation for the above correlations is .242 for Mentoring Experiences, and the highest is .406 for Ethic of Caring. No correlations exist with demographic or work environment characteristics. Focus on Students’ Personal Development is also correlated with each of the other practice scales.

Table 22 provides a summary of each of the practice factor scales. All practice scales with the exception of Focus on Students’ Personal Development have a seven point response range, from 1 being low or no frequency to 7 being high frequency. Focus on Students’
Personal Development has a five-point scale with 1 being low and 5 being high. Below are the number of items in each scale as well as the Cronbach’s alpha, minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation for each factor scale.

Table 22
*Practice Scales: Number of Items, Alpha, Minimum, Maximum, Mean, and Standard Deviation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>α</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling Authenticity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Students’ Personal Development</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loadings for the four practice scales are shown in Table 23. Each of the factors was retained based on the results of the confirmatory factor analysis and the Cronbach’s alpha test for internal consistency. The findings for the four practice variables are reported under research question number two.
Table 23

*Practice Factor Loadings for Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Building (α=.82)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include issues of social justice in programming model</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for social/political awareness</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct ally/social justice training</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate service learning into programming model</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for intercultural interactions</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for community service/volunteerism</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss rights and responsibilities of being a citizen in a community</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct community-building exercises</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use outdoor/wilderness environments as a learning tool</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modeling Authenticity (α=.71)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss career and future professional life with students</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor students in their personal development</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss balance with your students, in terms of self care, stress management, conflict management, etc.</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share relevant personal experiences during conversations with students</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek to understand the unique individuality of each student</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate and interact with students in authentic ways</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss life purpose with students</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflective Practice (α=.65)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide time to reflect and share during class or meeting</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide time for written reflections during class or meetings</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and discuss values clarification exercises</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use art, music, poetry, or film as learning tools</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on Students’ Personal Development (α=.82)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students develop personal values</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for students’ emotional development</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop moral character</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance students’ self-understanding</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate search for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance spiritual development</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a 7-point scale: 1 = Do not engage in this practice to 5 = Daily

b 5-point scale: 1 = not at all important to 5 = extremely important*
General Overview of Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences Findings

The two scales described below are important components of this research; however, they are not addressed by the research questions except as one component of question three, regarding prediction of practice. Therefore, they are addressed in more detail at this time.

*Graduate School Curricula*

Graduate School Curricula relates to integration of spirituality into coursework. It mirrors Tisdell’s (2006) contention that educators have the ability to shape the environment for learning with emphasis on culture and identity, which are important contributors to one’s spirituality. Responses for the Graduate School Curricula scale were the lowest for all of the scales, indicating that graduate school preparation programs do not typically include concepts related to spirituality. As Table 24 indicates, only 8% of graduate students report a high frequency for having attended a graduate school class, workshop, or retreat on matters related to spirituality. The absence of religious pluralism was even higher, with 86% reporting having never or rarely taken a graduate course that dealt with religious pluralism. The items that received the most frequent responses (very often and always) included: ‘were provided time to reflect and share during graduate classes’ at 56.9%, and ‘were exposed to community-building exercises during graduate school’ at 50.9%. Neither experience clearly centered on spirituality-related pedagogical practices. Table 24 shows the high end response percentages for each item in the Graduate School Curricula factor scale.
Table 24

Indicators of Graduate School Curricula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were provided time to reflect and share during graduate classes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were exposed to community-building exercises during graduate school&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were provided time for written reflections during graduate class or meetings&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studied student development theory that focused on spirituality as a graduate student&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took graduate course/s that dealt with searching for meaning/purpose in life, but did not make explicit connections with spirituality&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were assigned reading on spirituality in a graduate course&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a graduate school class, workshop, or retreat on matters related to spirituality&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took graduate courses that dealt with religious pluralism&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Very often or always

Mentoring Experiences

The Mentoring Experiences scale, much of which was pulled from the Modeling Authenticity and Community Building factor scale items, reflected the work of Sharon Daloz Parks (2000), who argued that mentoring is a critical support for helping a young adult become and reach his or her true potential. Results indicated that just over half of the respondents were mentored as a graduate student very often or always. A gap appears in the findings in terms of beliefs and practices. Seventy-nine percent of respondents believe mentoring roles that involve mentors supporting students’ searching for meaning/purpose in life are appropriate roles for student affairs professionals, yet only 17% actually discussed life purpose with their mentor with frequency. The second highest mentoring practice in terms of frequency was the more historical and traditional role of discussing career and future professional life with mentor (74%). From there, mentoring experiences dropped to 62% for
communicated and interacted with mentor in authentic ways, down to a low of 16% for discussed aspects of spirituality including searching for meaning and purpose in life with mentor. Table 25 shows percentages for the Mentoring Experiences scale with combined responses for very often and always.

Table 25
*Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Mentoring Experienced as Graduate Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believe mentoring roles that involve mentor supporting students’ searching for meaning and purpose in life are an appropriate role for student affairs professionals (^a)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed career and future professional life with mentor (^a)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated and interacted with mentor in authentic ways (^a)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared personal experiences during conversations with mentor (^a)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were mentored as a graduate student (^a)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received mentoring as a graduate student that prepared you for your role as a mentor to student leaders (^a)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were mentored in your personal development (^a)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were encouraged by your mentor to develop intercultural competencies (^a)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed being a contributing member of your community with your mentor (^a)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed life purpose with your mentor (^a)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed aspects of spirituality including searching for meaning and purpose in life with mentor (^a)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) *Very often or always*

**Summary**

The purpose of the above section was to provide the reader with a general overview of the study, including a characterization of the sample, factor scales, factor loadings, and correlations. Results of confirmatory factor analyses including factor loadings for all items, correlations among the factors, and Cronbach’s alphas for each scale have been reported.
In addition, this section provided insight into the findings for Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences of student affairs professionals while they were graduate students. Generally, the findings for the Graduate School Curricula and Mentoring Experiences scales indicate that graduate students receive negligible support in terms of spiritual development from their graduate courses or their mentoring experiences. These are important concepts that resurfaced within the study. The following sections answer the specific research questions for this dissertation.

Research Question One

*How do student affairs professionals perceive their own spirituality?*

To provide a perspective on how student affairs professionals perceive their own spirituality, this section provides, first, a general overview of how Student Affairs professionals self-reported on the five spirituality scales, supported by tables including percentage distributions for each spirituality scale. Next, levels of spirituality by demographic and work environment characteristics are compared.

*Overview of Responses on Spirituality Characteristics by Scales*

Results for each of the spirituality scales are reported below in order to give a portrayal of the self-reported spirituality of the sample. The five spirituality scales retained for the study included Spiritual Quest, Equanimity, Ethic of Caring, Ecumenical Worldview, and Spirituality.
**Spiritual Quest**

As might be expected of educators, over eight out of ten (82.0%) report ‘attaining wisdom’ as very or extremely important. The respondents also attach relatively high value to ‘becoming a more loving person’ (79.7%), and ‘developing a meaningful philosophy of life’ (63.3%).

In order to examine work relationships of student affairs professionals related to the search for meaning/purpose in life, two new items were added to the pre-existing factor scale Spiritual Quest. They are: ‘colleagues are searching for meaning/purpose in life,’ and ‘having discussions about the meaning of life with colleagues.’ Student affairs professionals’ responses to these items as compared with existing items indicate clear distinctions between their own, their close friends’, and their colleagues’ search for meaning/purpose in life. As shown in Table 26, half (50.3%) of student affairs professionals report being involved in ‘searching for meaning/purpose in life’ very often or always. Just three out of ten (32.8%) report that their close friends are ‘searching for meaning/purpose in life.’ When moving into their professional work life and asking the same question about their colleagues, only 14.7% report this to be true of all or most of their colleagues. Just 11.3% of respondents report having discussions about the meaning of life with their colleagues, as compared with 34% for their friends, indicating a gap between personal and professional life in terms of engagement in this regard.
Table 26  
*Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Spiritual Quest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attaining wisdom</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a more loving person</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining inner harmony</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a meaningful philosophy of life</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking beauty in my life</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discussions about the meaning of life with my friends</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friends are searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding answers to the mysteries of life</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues are searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discussions about the meaning of life with my colleagues</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Describes student affairs professionals very often or always  
*b* Most or all  
*c* Very or extremely important

**Equanimity**

As a group, Student Affairs professionals are optimistic and appreciative. Almost nine out of ten (87.6%) rate ‘being thankful for all that has happened to me’ as a very or extremely accurate description of self. They also report ‘feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed’ (72.9%). That they are optimistic does not equate with a strong sense of inner calmness, however, as only half (50.5%) report very often or always feeling at peace/centered, as is shown in Table 27.
Table 27
*Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Equanimity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being thankful for all that has happened to me&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing each day, good or bad, as a gift&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been able to find meaning in times of hardship&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt at peace/centered&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Very often or always  
<sup>b</sup> Very or extremely accurate description of myself

**Ethic of Caring**

Generally, student affairs professionals report a high level of caring. For example, from 68 percent to 92 percent of participants note that ‘helping others who are in difficulty,’ ‘helping to promote racial understanding,’ and ‘influencing social values’ are very or extremely important goals, as shown in Table 28. ‘Influencing the political structure’ had the lowest ranking with only 36.7% reporting it as very or extremely important. It also had the most responses from those who consider it only slightly or not at all important (not shown in table) at 20.4%.

Table 28
*Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Ethic of Caring*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others who are in difficulty&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to promote racial understanding&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing social values&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a community leader&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing pain and suffering in the world&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to change things that are unfair in the world&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing the political structure&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Very often or always  
<sup>b</sup> Very or extremely important
Ecumenical Worldview

Student affairs professionals’ views of others are optimistic and positive. For example, as shown in Table 29, seven out of ten (71.2%) report ‘believing in the goodness of all people’ as a very or extremely accurate description of themselves. Almost nine out of ten (86.9%) report very often or always ‘accepting others as they are,’ while 85.3% report themselves as being above average or in the highest 10% regarding their ‘understanding of others.’ Student Affairs professionals report high levels of the holistic view that ‘all life is interconnected’ (82.5%), yet only 57.6% report ‘feeling a strong connection to all humanity’ as a very or extremely accurate description of self.

As shown in Table 29, 91% of participants agree that ‘non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers,’ and 80.8% agree or strongly agree that ‘most people can grow spiritually without being religious.’ Respondents did not show a strong interest in knowledge of religious pluralism. When asked about religious beliefs only 35% report ‘having an interest in different religious traditions’ as a very or extremely accurate descriptor of themselves. As can be seen, this was the lowest response for the scale.
### Table 29

**Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Ecumenical Worldview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting others as they are</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of others</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All life is interconnected</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people can grow spiritually without being religious</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my understanding of other countries and cultures</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing in the goodness of all people</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the human condition</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are all spiritual beings</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love is at the root of all the great religions</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling a strong connection to all humanity</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an interest in different religious traditions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **a** Very or extremely accurate description of myself
- **b** Above average or highest 10%
- **c** Very often or always
- **d** Very or extremely important
- **e** Agree or strongly agree

**Spirituality**

When compared with the majority of the other self-rating items in the survey, student affairs professionals report less interest in and attached less value to the importance of spirituality in their lives. Even though 65.6% of student affairs professionals report ‘consider yourself a spiritual person’, as an accurate or extremely accurate self-descriptor, just over half (54.8%) consider the objective to ‘integrate spirituality into my life’ as very or extremely important. Approximately half (49%) of the respondents self-report seeking opportunities to grow as an accurate portrayal of themselves. This is the shortest spirituality scale and also is the most direct in language related to spirituality. While the majority of respondents appear
to care about spirituality when self-reporting, they have a relatively lower endorsement for spirituality when compared with other self-rating items.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider yourself a spiritual person</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate spirituality into my life</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek opportunities to grow spiritually</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Very or extremely accurate description of myself
b Very or extremely important

Summary for Spirituality Scales

In conclusion, over half of student affairs professionals self-report as optimistic and caring. Student affairs professionals rank themselves highly on items aligned with helping others and improving the world (though not in a political sense), and on the concept that non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers. The field of student affairs is often considered to be a helping profession, and respondents’ rankings mirror this view. Their self-perspectives for the item ‘understanding of others’ however, provide evidence that they might, in reality, be overrating their altruistic characteristics. Over 87% of the respondents feel that they are in the above average or top 10% of people for this item.

The way that student affairs professionals view their own spirituality is complex. Even though 66% identify themselves as spiritual beings, less report seeking opportunities to grow spiritually, and they tend not to rank themselves as highly on matters specifically related to spirituality as on other items. Student affairs professionals, while inclined to have
discussions with their close friends about matters of meaning/purpose in life, are much less inclined to have these same conversations with their colleagues, indicating a schism that has potential for minimizing a holistic approach for development of the students with whom they work. The next section provides a comparison of levels of spirituality across various demographic and work environment variables.

Comparisons of Levels of Spirituality by Demographic Characteristics

Pearson’s correlation was used as a measure of association to test the strength of the relationship between level of spirituality and age and level of spirituality and years of work experience. Table 31 shows that there is negligible to low association between these variables.

Table 31
Spirituality Scales: Relationships between Age and Years of Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Davis’s (1971) Descriptors are .01-.09 = negligible, .10-.29 = low association, .30-.49 = moderate association, .50-.69 = substantial association, .70 or higher = very strong association (Kotrlik & Williams, 2003).

ANOVA was used to test for significant differences in spirituality by participant characteristics. Table 32 reports findings for gender and shows that there are no significant differences between men and women on spirituality.
Table 32  
*Spirituality Scales: Comparisons by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Female (n=111)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male (n=66)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>37.82</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 reports findings for racial/ethnic background and shows that there are no significant differences on self-reported spirituality between White participants and participants of color.

Table 33  
*Spirituality Scales: Comparisons by Race/Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Non-White (n=30)</th>
<th></th>
<th>White (n=147)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>36.97</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>46.95</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education level required to participate in the study was master’s level or above. Table 34 compares levels of spirituality by education level and shows that for respondents with a doctorate degree, though each mean is higher and each standard deviation is lower, there are no significant differences between master’s and doctorate recipients on spirituality.
Table 34  
*Spirituality Scales: Comparisons by Education Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>38.38</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>2.073</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>29.54</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>2.569</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no senior level participants in this study and entry-level and mid-level respondents were fairly evenly divided, with slightly more mid-level respondents (n=95, 53.67%). Table 35 compares levels of spirituality by level currently working and shows that there are no significant differences on spirituality.

Table 35  
*Spirituality Scales: Comparisons by Level Currently Working*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Entry Level (n=82)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Middle Level (n=95)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>37.06</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.32</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.85</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More respondents were employed at public institutions (n=102, 57.63%) in this study. There were no significant differences in self-reported levels of spirituality by institutional control, as reported in Table 36.
Table 36  
**Spirituality Scales: Comparisons of Public and Private Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>Private (n=75)</th>
<th>Public (n=102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>1.862</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Spirituality Scales</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37 indicates that individuals employed at four-year institutions have a significantly higher ethic of caring than do those working at two-year institutions. This finding may be related to the relatively small n for two-year institutions, or it may be related to the environment at four-year institutions, where students have a longer time to engage with the university and staff, and where students are generally less burdened with outside responsibilities and challenges to their engagement.

Table 37  
**Spirituality Scales: Comparisons of Two Year and Four Year Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>Two Year (n=12)</th>
<th>Four Year (n=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>4.119</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no significant differences when comparing levels of spirituality by institutional religious affiliation for either current institution of employment or graduate institution of attendance. (see Tables 38 and 39).

Table 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation (n=44)</th>
<th>No Religious Affiliation (n=133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality Variables</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation (n=24)</th>
<th>No Religious Affiliation (n=152)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equanimity</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic of Caring</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary for Comparisons

When reviewing the comparisons above, it became clear that there were very few differences in levels of spirituality by demographic and work environment characteristics. This is not consistent with findings from other studies that have found differences in levels of
spirituality based on demographic characteristics. Demographic characteristics of the sample for this study are of a relatively young, predominantly White group of respondents. This may explain the lack of variance among some of these criteria. The findings suggest that demographic and work environment characteristics have little impact on spirituality within this sample.

The previous section has provided a view of the spirituality of student affairs professionals. The next research question explores the practices of student affairs professionals in regard to integration of spirituality into their work.

Research Question Two

_What are student affairs professionals’ practices in regard to integration of spirituality into their work?_

Four factor scales were used to describe holistic, spiritually-infused practice, the dependent variable for this study. This section includes narrative descriptions for each of the practice scale findings, and indicators of student affairs professionals’ practices in the form of tables. The tables indicate the extent to which student affairs professionals engage in the specific practices on a regular and frequent basis.

*Holistic, Spiritually-Infused Practice Scales*

*Community Building*

Long an accepted role of formal education in the United States, discussing the rights and responsibilities of being a citizen in a community was ranked as the highest practice, with 65 percent engaging in this practice on a daily or weekly basis. Another role that student
affairs professionals embraced, as shown in Table 40, was that of developing a sense of community (41.4%). In terms of frequency, the least common practices were quite specialized and included use of outdoor/wilderness environment as a learning tool, conducting ally/social justice training, and incorporating service learning into the programming model.

Table 40
Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Practices of Community Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss rights and responsibilities of being a citizen in a community&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct community-building exercises&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for social/political awareness&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for intercultural interactions&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes issues of social justice in programming model&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for community service/volunteerism&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate service learning into programming model&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct ally/social justice training&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use outdoor/wilderness environments as a learning tool&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Weekly or daily

**Modeling Authenticity**

Responses to this scale revealed the beginning of a pattern of lower frequency of response for items closely related to concepts of spirituality. For example, as shown in Table 41, responses of weekly or daily frequency for all items but one ranged from a low of 78% for ‘discuss balance with your students, in terms of self care, stress management, conflict management, etc.’ to a high of 94% for ‘seek to understand the unique individuality of each student’. The one item that was an outlier was ‘discuss life purpose with students’ reported by only 28.8%. Further, 26.4% of respondents either did not engage in this practice or
engaged in the practice only once a year (not shown in table). These findings portray important distinctions in terms of the topics that student affairs professionals discuss with their students and the ways in which they interact with them.

Table 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek to understand the unique individuality of each student&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate and interact with students in authentic ways&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor students in their personal development&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss career and future professional life with students&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share relevant personal experiences during conversations with students&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss balance with your students, in terms of self care, stress management, conflict management, etc.&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss life purpose with students&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Weekly or daily

**Reflective Practices**

Frequency of engaging in Reflective Practice was relatively low among respondents. As shown in Table 42, the practice with the highest frequency for weekly or daily practice was ‘provide time to reflect and share during class or meeting’ (60.4%). Seventeen percent of respondents reported ‘providing time for written reflections’ on a weekly basis, and none reported doing so on a daily basis, perhaps because the majority of student affairs professionals do their work outside of formal classroom settings. In general, this factor scale did not reflect a high level of endorsement by student affairs professionals in terms of frequent practice. The practices that were measured in this scale were also relatively specialized.
Table 42

*Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Practices of Reflective Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide time to reflect and share during class or meeting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use art, music, poetry, or film as learning tools&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide time for written reflections during class or meetings&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and discuss values clarification exercises&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a Weekly or daily</sup>

*Focus on Students’ Personal Development*

Responses to this scale clustered at the high end of the scale. As shown in Table 43, there was a wide gap between types of developmental engagement with students. For those items that dealt directly with meaning/purpose in life and spiritual development, the responses were the lowest (43%, 61%). For those items that dealt with general student development, the responses were much higher, ranging from 90% to 94%. Similarly, though not shown in the table, there was a great deal of variance at the low end of the scale. More student affairs professionals responded that they did not consider enhancing spiritual development to be at all or even slightly important when compared with responses for the other items.
Table 43

Indicators of Student Affairs Professionals’ Practices of Focus on Students Personal Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help students develop personal values&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance students’ self-understanding&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop moral character&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for students’ emotional development&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate search for meaning/purpose in life&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance spiritual development&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Very or extremely important

Summary for Question Two

A common pattern in the findings of the frequency of practices for student affairs professionals was a much lower frequency of practice for items specifically related to spirituality and development of life purpose. Responses to items in the practice scales dealing with what Astin (2004) considered inner development, but not specifically identified as spirituality or spiritual development, such as ‘mentor students in their personal development,’ ‘communicate and interact with students in authentic ways,’ and ‘help students develop personal values’ were ranked substantially higher than those items using the term spirituality, such as ‘enhance spiritual development,’ or ‘discuss life purpose with students’.

These findings support the notion that even though the student affairs profession espouses the goal of holistic student development, practitioners, at least in this sample, do not subscribe to integration of spirituality or support of spiritual development as a component of holistic student development to the same degree that they endorse integration of other practices. They do not appear either intentionally or by majority to integrate concepts of spiritual development into their practice. Thus, there is confirmation of the hypothesized gap.
between the espoused goal of holistic student development, and actual practice, as indicated by the responses to the practice scales of this survey.

Research Question Three

To what extent do student affairs professionals’ demographics, spirituality, graduate preparation, and mentoring experiences predict the practice of integrating spirituality into their work?

The dependent variable holistic, spiritually-infused practice was comprised of items from the four factor scales Community Building, Modeling Authenticity, Reflective Practices and Focus on Students’ Personal Development. A separate multiple regression analysis was run for each of these factors. Independent variables were entered into each regression one at a time in the following order: age, race: White, gender: female, highest degree completed: masters, level currently working: entry, years in profession, religious affiliation of institution where currently employed, public institution, spiritual quest, equanimity, ethic of caring, ecumenical worldview, spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences.

In addition to reporting regression results, mediation was assessed by tracking the beta coefficients, as outlined by Astin’s (1991) method. As explained by Astin, a “beta” coefficient is a regression coefficient that has been standardized so that comparisons can be made on variance between different variables. In this way, “different betas can be compared to assess the relative predictive power of each X variable” (p. 287). If the beta drops when a new variable is added to the regression block, it indicates a positive correlation between the two input variables. When there is a positive correlation between variables, they share
predictive power. Thus, the variable entering the equation is said to mediate the initial variable.

Suppressor effects were also observed in the results of regressions for this research. A suppressor effect can be observed when a beta gets larger as a new variable is added to the regression block. Astin uses “the term “suppressor” to indicate that one variable is suppressing the observed relationship between two other variables” (p. 289).

*Regression One- Community Building*

Community Building was the dependent variable for the first regression. After all variables were entered into the model, level currently working, Ethic of Caring, and Mentoring Experiences emerged as significant in the positive direction. As shown in Table 44, the results of this regression indicate that 31% of the variance as measured by the dependent variable Community Building can be explained by the linear relationship Community Building has with the significant variables: level currently working: entry-level (.164), Ethic of Caring (.397), and Mentoring Experiences (.182). These three variables are significant in the positive direction and are described and interpreted below in the order in which they entered the regression.

Level currently working was significant in the positive direction at the .05 level. Ethic of Caring was the next variable to enter the equation as significant. The final beta for Ethic of Caring was significant at the .01 level, making it the strongest predictor of the practice of Community Building of student affairs professionals in this regression. It displays a nearly perfect pattern of mediator effects, which indicates that each of the entering independent...
variables share predictive power with the variable immediately preceding it. The one exception to this pattern is when the variable Graduate School Curricula enters the regression, causing a slight rise in the beta as well as some loss in significance (from .01 to .05) for the model.

Mentoring Experiences was the third variable to enter the regression as significant in the positive direction at the .05 level. This means that Mentoring Experiences was also a significant predictor of the practice of Community Building. Interestingly, there was no drop when Graduate School Curricula entered the regression equation, which means that these two variables share no predictive power for the practice of Community Building.
Table 44  
Predicting Practice of Community Building of Student Affairs Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Simple ( r )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Beta after block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.183*</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gender, female</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highest degree Completed, masters</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Level currently Working, entry</td>
<td>.172*</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.164*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>.162*</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Religious affiliation current institution</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public institution</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R^2 = .313 \)

\* = significant at the 0.05 level, ** = significant at the 0.01 level.

Regression Two – Modeling Authenticity

After all variables were entered to regression two, there were no variables that were significant at either the .05 or .01 level. Even so, according to the \( R^2 \), 14% of this practice of Modeling Authenticity was accounted for by variables in this model. This is difficult to explain but is likely connected to mediator and suppressor effects and possibly to multicolinearity. As can be seen in Table 45, the blocks display both mediator and
suppressor effects. For example, the majority of the relationships of variables from block four to block five have beta values that decrease, indicating shared predictive power of entering variables.

Table 45
Predicting Practice of Modeling Authenticity of Student Affairs Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Beta after block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gender, female</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highest degree completed, masters</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Level currently working, entry</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Religious affiliation current institution</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public institution</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spiritual Quest sum</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.265**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Equanimity sum</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.225*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ethic of Caring sum</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.172*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview sum</td>
<td>.239**</td>
<td>.264**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spirituality sum</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>.160*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Graduate School Curriculum</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.196*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.192*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R² = .144
*=significant at the 0.05 level, **=significant at the 0.01 level.
Regression Three – Reflective Practice

For model three, variables entering the equation as significant were Mentoring Experiences (.275) and highest degree completed (.188). Table 46 shows that 25% of the variance in Reflective Practice is accounted for by these two variables.

Mentoring Experiences was significant at the .01 level in the positive direction. Mentoring Experiences had the strongest beta weight indicating a strong relationship between Reflective Practice as a professional and being mentored as a graduate student. This is an important indicator for influencing the field of student affairs because it provides one avenue through which to impact the practice of student affairs professionals, and hence, holistic student development.

Highest degree completed was significant at the .05 level in the positive direction. For highest degree completed, master’s degree was a predictor of Reflective Practice. This means that those who completed a master’s degree are more likely to engage in Reflective Practice than those who completed a doctorate degree.

Several of the spirituality scales including Spiritual Quest, Ethic of Caring, and Ecumenical Worldview had initial significance, but dropped out of significance as additional variables were added. This pattern means that the variables shared predictive power with other independent variables.
Table 46  
Predicting Reflective Practice of Student Affairs Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Simple $r$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demographics Age</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demographics White</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demographics Gender, female</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demographics Highest degree</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.229*</td>
<td>.226*</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>.183*</td>
<td>.188*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work Environment Level currently working, entry</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work Environment Years in Profession</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work Environment Religious affiliation current institution</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spirituality Scales Public institution</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spirituality Scales Spiritual Quest</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.277*</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spirituality Scales Equanimity sum</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Spirituality Scales Ethic of Caring sum</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.222*</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Spirituality Scales Ecumenical Worldview sum</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spirituality Scales Spirituality sum</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Graduate Scale Graduate School Curriculum Mentoring Scale Mentoring</td>
<td>.281**</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .250$

*=significant at the 0.05 level, **=significant at the 0.01 level.

Regression Four – Focus on Students’ Personal Development

As shown in Table 47, for the practice Focus on Students’ Personal Development, several variables entered the equation as significant. Almost 36% of the variance in Focus on Students’ Personal Development was accounted for by three of the summed spirituality scales. The final beta weights for these variables were: Spiritual Quest (.269), Equanimity, (.193), and Ethic of Caring (.307). Spiritual Quest and Equanimity were significant at the .05 level and Ethic of Caring was significant at the .01 level in predicting the practice of Focus
on Students’ Personal Development. As can be seen by examining these three beta patterns, each resulted in a big decrease when the spirituality scales entered the equation. This indicates that the spirituality scales are correlated with each of the respective independent variables and share predictive power in the model. There were no surprising patterns in the betas as the blocks were entered for these three variables.

A recurring pattern of sign reversals occurred in this regression as well as the others. Sign reversals mean that the independent variables are correlated and is evidence of their shared predictive power.

Interestingly, the scale Mentoring Experiences had a significant drop in beta from .268 in block two (Work Environment) to .098 in block three (Spirituality scales). Taken together, however, this change indicates that there was significant shared predictive power between Mentoring Experiences and the spirituality scales.
Table 47
Predicting Practice of Focus on Students’ Personal Development of Student Affairs Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta after block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gender, female</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highest degree completed, masters</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Level currently working, entry</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Religious affiliation current institution</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public institution</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.183*</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spirituality Scales</td>
<td>.455*</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.274*</td>
<td>.269*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Equanimity sum</td>
<td>.281**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>.325**</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.193*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ethic of Caring Sum</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.307**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ecumenical Worldview sum</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spirituality sum</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Graduate Scale</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R^2 = .358 \)
* = significant at the 0.05 level, ** = significant at the 0.01 level.

Summary for Regressions

Four separate multiple regressions were run on each of the dependent variables community building, modeling authenticity, reflective practice, and focus on students’ personal development. The highest amount of variance that can be accounted for by the independent variables was evident in the regression predicting Focus on Students’ Personal Development of Student Affairs Professionals.
Development (.358), followed by Community Building (.313), Reflective Practice, (.250), and Modeling Authenticity (.144).

Surprisingly, none of the demographic characteristics age, race/ethnic background, or gender entered the regressions as significant. The demographic characteristics that entered at least one regression were level currently working (entry level) for Community Building and highest degree completed (master’s degree) for Reflective Practice. Thus, it appears that the younger professionals in entry level positions were more inclined to engage in Community Building practices than were their more educated colleagues working in mid-level positions.

Two other scales, Spiritual Quest and Equanimity, also entered one regression each as significant. Spiritual Quest had initial significance in three of the models and dropped out of significance in all but the scale Focus on Students’ Personal Development. This indicates that Spiritual Quest shares predictive power with several of the other spirituality scales. Otherwise, it would have remained significant. Equanimity and Ethic of Caring were also significant in the Focus on Students’ Personal Development scale.

Two scales were significant predictors of practice in two models each. Ethic of Caring was significant in Community Building and Focus on Students’ Personal Development. Mentoring Experiences was significant in Community Building and Reflective Practice.

Summary for Research Questions

The above analyses have answered the three research questions posed for this dissertation. A snapshot view of student affairs professionals from this sample provided the
view of a fairly homogenous group of practitioners in terms of demographics and work environment characteristics. They ranked themselves highly on scales that reflect caring and positive outlooks such as becoming a more loving person (80%), being thankful for all that has happened to me (88%), helping others who are in difficulty (92%) being accepting of others as they are (87%), and being understanding of others (85%). Additionally, they reported fairly high and consistent views for items of non-religious people being able to lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers (92%), and the belief that most people can grow spiritually without being religious (81%). However, they indicated little interest in cultivating a strong religious knowledge base, as only 35% reported having an interest in different religious traditions. While these responses indicate a compassionate and caring group, they do not indicate a group that is vested in concepts closely related to spirituality.

Responses for the dependent variable, holistic, spiritually-infused practice were consistent with the responses for spirituality. Items specifically related to development of spirituality or closely related to concepts of spirituality were ranked substantially lower than were items closely related to supporting general student development. For example, items such as develop moral character (90%), provide for students’ emotional development (90%), and help students develop personal values (94%) were each ranked high.

Additionally, graduate preparation and mentoring experiences in the areas of spirituality and spiritual development also received low responses. Only 8% of respondents had frequent exposure to a graduate school class, workshop, or retreat on matters related to
spirituality and only 9% were frequently assigned reading on spirituality in a graduate course. An even smaller number took graduate courses that dealt with religious pluralism (5%). This may be related to the low interest reported by student affairs professionals in religious pluralism and spirituality.

The regression findings were somewhat surprising in that demographic characteristics were not of consequence. Though some of the variables possessed predictive power of integration of spirituality into the practice of student affairs professionals, the $R^2$ values for each model explained 35% or less, meaning that 65% of the variance or more remains unexplained for each regression. Key predictors in more than one regression were Mentoring Experiences and Ethic of Caring. Demographic and work environment predictors that were significant in at least one regression were level of working and highest degree. In addition to Ethic of Caring, the other individual spirituality scales that were significant in at least one regression were Equanimity and Spiritual Quest.

The findings in regard to Mentoring Experiences support Parks’s notion that the experience of being in a mentoring relationship can be very influential. Mentoring Experiences were significant in the positive direction for Community Building and Reflective Practice, meaning student affairs professionals who received mentoring were also more likely to be engaged in these two practices, both of which reflect attention to relationship building and attention to reflection on what is important in one’s learning. This was expected and validated findings in terms of support for the theoretical framework of this study, particularly as it related to the work of Parks.
The frequencies and percentages pointed to gaps in what our profession espouses and what our professionals believe, practice, and are prepared for in terms of their graduate programs and mentoring experiences. The regressions added some value toward understanding what predicts the integration of spirituality as a component of holistic student development into the practice of student affairs professionals. Following this summary of analysis is a section on discussion and the implications of these findings.
Chapter Five: Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study was to learn more about the spirituality and practice of student affairs professionals and their degree of commitment to integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development. Because student affairs functional areas are very different across institutions, the term “student affairs” as used in this research is reflective of the profession whose mission focuses on holistic student development. The research questions were developed to broaden understandings of how student affairs professionals view their own spirituality, what their practices are, and what predicts student affairs professionals’ integration of spirituality into their work. In this chapter the findings for each of the research questions are summarized, connections are made with related literature, and theoretical implications and implications for practice are discussed. Also provided are considerations for future research and concluding thoughts.

Summary of Research Question Findings

How do student affairs professionals perceive their own spirituality?

The first question is approached in two main ways. The first approach provided a descriptive snapshot of student affairs professionals’ self-reported spirituality. The second approach provided information about relationships among variables.

The findings for the first approach yielded an interesting picture. Student affairs professionals ranked themselves as understanding, caring, and appreciative, as evidenced by a high level of importance on items related to understanding and accepting of others, helping others who are in difficulty, and being thankful for all that has happened to them. However,
they ranked themselves much lower and were less supportive as a group when it came to items specifically related to searching for or having discussions about meaning/purpose in life. The lowest score on the spirituality scales was related to the concept of bringing discussions about meaning/purpose in life to the workplace with their colleagues. Though half of the respondents reported being frequently engaged in a search for meaning/purpose in life, only 11% had discussions with their colleagues on this topic on a frequent basis. Generally, respondents indicated relatively low interest in spirituality and spiritual development as compared to response patterns for other survey items not so specifically articulated or labeled as spiritual.

Though this research did not approach spirituality in an intentionally theistic manner, responses were somewhat consistent for the topics of spirituality and of religion. In other words, the lack of engagement on spiritual matters was also reflected by low interest in regard to learning about different religious traditions. Whether or not student affairs professionals in this study view spirituality and religion as the same, as Moran and Curtis (2004) found in their qualitative study of student affairs professionals, is not known. Regardless of whether they view religion and spirituality as two distinct concepts or as the same, they shared a lower interest in these two areas in terms of their self-rankings on the five spirituality scales.

Part two of the analysis, which compared levels of spirituality across various demographic and work environment characteristics, yielded little in the way of significant
relationships. Low to negligible associations were found between spirituality and age, and spirituality and years of experience in the field.

Individuals employed at four-year institutions had a significantly higher ethic of caring than did those working at two-year institutions. Recall that the \( n \) for two year institutions was only twelve. Whether this finding is truly representative or due to specific characteristics of those working at the two types of institutions is not known.

Past research has shown differences in levels of spirituality based on demographic characteristics of gender and race/ethnicity (Bryant, 2007, Stewart, 2009). This study did not corroborate those findings. For example, there were no discernible differences in results for level of spirituality by gender with this sample, 63% of whom were female. Due to past research, this was somewhat unexpected. One reason that may have accounted for a lack of variance in results was that the sample was homogenous in many other ways, as was reported in the descriptive findings section. Perhaps gender differences among higher education professionals are diminished in comparison to the general population or the college student population.

The survey results lacked the perspective of senior staff. In terms of highest degree completed, there was little variance, with the vast majority having a master’s degree. Perhaps a more diverse sample would have resulted in different findings. The practices of student affairs professionals will be discussed under question two.
What are student affairs professionals’ practices in regard to integration of spirituality into their work?

The question of practice was approached through the identification of four separate scales that measured levels of practice. Three of the scales were developed by Seifert and Harmon (2009) from items that had been developed in a doctoral graduate course taught by Dr. Sherry Watt in 2005, and the fourth scale was developed by Astin et al. (2006). In reviewing results for practice, it was interesting to note the pattern in response ranges across some of the questions most closely related to spirituality or spiritual practices. Those practice items that were distinctly related to spiritual development were consistently ranked lower than those practices that were not.

The scale Modeling Authenticity provides an example of the distinction between practices. For example, 78% to 94% of participants ‘shared personal relevant experiences during conversations with students’ and ‘sought to understand the unique individuality of each student’ either weekly or daily. By comparison, only 29% of participants ‘discussed life purpose with students’ weekly or daily. The item ‘discuss life purpose with students’ is imbued with Parks’s concept of the meaning-making challenge faced by young adults. Intentional, holistic mentoring practices can support exploration and development of life purpose as young adult college students transition into more mature developmental stages.

Consistent with student affairs professionals’ endorsement of more general developmental roles, 94% reported frequently helping students develop personal values. While it is true that all of the items on these scales represent concepts related in one sense or
another to spirituality, results showed that those items most specifically and clearly stated as spiritual in nature were those that consistently received the lowest endorsement.

These responses reflect concerns raised by scholars and practitioners who advocate for spirituality as a component of holistic student development. Further, the responses illustrate a gap between the espoused value of integration of spirituality as a component of holistic student development and actual practice. Such reticence by student affairs professionals to incorporate plainly stated spiritually-related discussions and activities were reflected in these findings and support the contention that spirituality and spiritual development are not valued or consistently practiced as a component of holistic student development. This was an expected finding, mainly based on scholarly literature related to this area of inquiry and on personal observances over the course of the researcher’s career. The responses from question one, regarding self-reported levels of spirituality, and question two, which examined practices of student affairs professionals, were consistent in that both sets of responses displayed lower scores for items that were closely related to spirituality or meaning/making.

*To what extent do student affairs professionals’ demographics, spirituality, graduate preparation, and mentoring experiences predict the practice of integrating spirituality into their work?*

This question was approached in a way that integrated demographics, self-reported spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences as possible predictors of the actual practices of student affairs professionals. The intent was to explore the impact of a
variety of potential influencers on holistic, spiritually infused practice, and identified demographics, self-reported spirituality, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences as most closely aligned with the theoretical framework and with past literature and research. As noted earlier, the demographic characteristics of gender and racial/ethnic background were not predictors of practice in this research. This was surprising given findings of other studies, yet may have been impacted by the homogeneity of the sample.

Additionally, the graduate school curriculum was not a predictor of holistic, spiritually-infused practice. In fact, the findings pointed out that very little in the way of spiritual topics were integrated into the courses of the respondents. An examination of frequencies and percentages indicated very low levels of graduate student preparation through classes, workshops, or retreats. This dearth of opportunity for graduate students going into the student affairs profession does not align with the mission stated so many years ago that included spiritual development as a component of the role of student affairs professionals (American Council on Education, 1949).

Several variables were found to have a significant effect on practice. After all four regression models had been run, two scales were found to be predictors in two of the four regressions. These scales were Ethic of Caring, one of the pre-existing spirituality scales, and Mentoring Experiences, one of the newly developed scales that reflected experiences of being mentored as a graduate student.
Ethic of Caring

Ethic of Caring is a descriptor of personal characteristics. Ethic of Caring was positively associated with the practices of Community Building and Focus on Students’ Personal Development. The Ethic of Caring scale measured personal goals related to helping others, reducing suffering, and working to improve society. Student affairs is known as a profession of individuals who care deeply about students and student development, which also mirrors the general perspectives of those in the field. The fact that student affairs professionals work closely with students in unstructured settings and work long hours supports this notion. The responses to items for the Ethic of Caring scale confirmed the strong degree to which student affairs professionals care.

The types of items contained within the scale Community Building are very relational and deal with serving students in ways that enhance relationships, societies, and environments through tasks such as service learning, social justice training, social/political awareness, and intercultural interactions. These each represent connections to something or someone beyond oneself and hence, appear to be well suited to concepts of community and community building. It is logical that student affairs professionals with high degrees of caring are more engaged in these types of activities. Such activities provide avenues through which characteristics of caring, professional and personal commitment, and energy toward such can be focused in meaningful ways.

The other practice for which Ethic of Caring was a significant positive predictor was Focus on Students’ Personal Development. The items on this scale also reflect characteristics
of individuals who care deeply about their students. For example, developing, providing, and enhancing moral, emotional, and spiritual values are among the practices within this scale. Staff members with high degrees of caring were more likely to engage in practices that were reflective of these broad facets of student development characterized by the Focus on Students’ Personal Development scale. Perhaps this is related to awareness by these student affairs professionals that the manner in which they can manifest their most caring tendencies involves engaging students in comprehensive and holistic student development.

The manner in which this prevalent characteristic of caring is intentionally developed is a complex topic worthy of more attention. One might argue that, in general, student affairs professionals possess the characteristic of caring that causes or influences them to be attracted to and effective in this type of work and may be among the reasons that many choose to enter the field of student affairs.

*Mentoring Experiences*

The second predictor that was significant in more than one regression was Mentoring Experiences. Mentoring was a positive predictor of Community Building and Reflective Practice. The essential role of mentoring young adults was a pivotal concept around which Parks’s theory was developed. This research found that the mentoring young professionals received while they were graduate students positively impacted their future practice. The mentoring scale included items that were revised from the practices scale, such as ‘discussed life purpose with your mentor,’ intended to gauge the mentoring experiences of graduate students in regard to spirituality. Additionally, ‘received mentoring as a graduate student that
prepared you for your role as a mentor to student leaders’ was included to provide a sense of how student affairs professionals perceived development of meaning and purpose in life as a part of the mentoring role.

As noted earlier, the Community Building scale has items that are very relational in nature. The act of having a mentor and being a mentee presupposes a relationship status. This experience of being mentored appears to further develop the relational type of practice of Community Building. Mentoring, as Parks (2000) envisioned, is about helping one find their place in the community, and about seeking to find ways to contribute one’s gifts to that community. When graduate students are mentored, they benefit not only from their relationship with professionals; they also have an opportunity to envision how they might interact with undergraduate students that they advise as they enter the realm of being a professional. This supports their transition beyond Parks’s (2000) young adulthood stage and it also supports their sense of belonging and being nurtured, as well as their process of becoming and contributing to their communities. Through these experiences, graduate students’ abilities to so engage their future students are enhanced.

Mentoring was also a significant positive predictor of Reflective Practice. This four item scale included use of reflection and sharing, written reflection, use of art, music, poetry as learning tools, and use of values clarification exercises. This was an interesting finding based on the relatively low overall endorsement in terms of frequency of practice for this scale. At closer look, however, a professional who was mentored as a graduate student would likely have developed a skill set to enhance such practices. Because the nature of mentoring
includes at minimum, sharing and some exploration of values, a graduate student so engaged learns first-hand what this means and is subsequently likely to be more able to integrate such practices.

*Additional Predictors of Practice*

In addition, four other variables were significant positive predictors of practice in one model each. Level currently working was a positive predictor of Community Building. Those who worked in entry-level positions were more likely to engage in the practice of community building. The sample was fairly evenly divided between entry-level positions and mid-level positions. Often, entry-level student affairs professionals have more direct day-to-day interaction with students and student leaders. Several of the items within this scale are likely to be key responsibilities of entry-level staff, perhaps more so than for mid-level professionals. This may account for the stronger inclination of entry-level staff to engage in this practice. Entry-level staff also tend to be younger than mid-level staff. It is possible that younger, entry-level staff have a higher identification with the language of the scale. For example, terminology such as ally, social justice, and service learning are relatively recent concepts and practices that may resonate more fully with entry-level professionals.

Regardless, level currently working, specifically entry-level, is a predictor of the practice of community building.

Highest degree completed was a significant positive predictor for Reflective Practice. Unlike the level currently working, in which the sample was fairly evenly divided, for highest degree completed, there were only eight responses for the choice of doctorate degree.
The vast majority of the sample was comprised of those with master’s degrees. The findings indicated that those with master’s degrees were more likely to engage in Reflective Practice. Given the nature of the distribution for this variable, this finding, while statistically significant, does not have great power. It is difficult to make meaning of this finding, however, it is possible that respondents with doctoral degrees work less closely with students and therefore engage in this practice less frequently. It is also possible that the nature of these affective practices is less attractive to those with more scholarly and possibly more cognitive based inclinations.

Spiritual Quest was a significant positive predictor for Focus on Students’ Personal Development. Conceptual similarities were apparent when comparing the items for Spiritual Quest with the items for Focus on Students’ Personal Development. Both scales deal with concepts of inner development. Spiritual Quest, for example, outlines concern with wisdom, meaningful philosophy of life, and meaning/purpose in life. Focus on Students’ Personal Development focuses on helping students to develop in important ways including moral, emotional, personal, and spiritual as well as facilitating their search for meaning/purpose in life. This finding supports the notion that student affairs professionals who are engaged in a spiritual quest are likely to encourage students’ spiritual development as a part of the work that they do.

Equanimity was a significant positive predictor for Focus on Students’ Personal Development. More than any of the other scales, Equanimity highlighted the positive perspective and high degree of optimism of student affairs professionals. Student affairs
professionals with high scores on Equanimity were positive about life, felt at peace/centered, and were able to find meaning in times of hardship. They were more likely to be engaged in this type of student development. The scale Equanimity describes a type of inner maturity that is not a common characteristic of all people. This characteristic is perhaps what motivates such individuals to work to enhance the spiritual development of the students with whom they work.

Connections to Related Literature

Several of the results from this study reflect or strengthen previous findings, while some diverge from previous findings. As noted in the literature review, there were not very many studies that approached the topic from a quantitative perspective. Moreover, very few studies have dealt specifically with spiritual development and the student affairs profession. This section makes connections between the findings of this research and related literature.

This research found that the some of the spirituality scales and the mentoring scale, some of which were closely linked with what Parks would call ‘big questions,’ were correlated with and were predictors of practice. This finding was related to a quantitative study undertaken by Seifert, Harmon, Goodman, and Watt (2009). Seifert, Harmon, Goodman, and Watt were “interested in learning what effect spiritual well-being and life purpose had on practices in which student affairs professionals engage students” (p. 4). They concluded that student affairs practitioners may best serve their students by refocusing on and committing to their own questioning and reflecting. One of the findings from this research was that student affairs professionals who were on a spiritual quest were more likely
to help their students develop spiritually. This supports Seifert, Harmon, Goodman, and Watt’s conclusion in regard to being better company. In other words, student affairs professionals on a spiritual quest are also able to better support, to be better company in the development of their students, because of their own commitment to questioning and reflecting.

Of the four practice scales, Focus on Students’ Personal Development is the one that was taken directly from the UCLA national faculty study (Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Calderone, et al., 2006). As reported in the findings, Spiritual Quest, Equanimity, and Ethic of Caring were predictors of the practice Focus on Students’ Personal Development. These findings are conceptually similar to the findings of Lindholm and Astin (2008) whose study also utilized the UCLA national faculty study scales. Specifically, Lindholm and Astin found that faculty who self-reported high levels of spirituality also reported high levels of student-centered pedagogy. The findings from this research mirror Lindholm and Astin’s findings that educators who self-reported higher levels of spirituality were likely to be more engaged in practices that support students’ spirituality and spiritual engagement. This similarity in research results is interesting because it crosses university organizational structure divisions and connects the potential impact of practices of faculty and student affairs professionals in regard to the spiritual development of students. Thus, the results of this research are similar in that student affairs professionals who self-reported high levels of spirituality, particularly the three scales Spiritual Quest, Equanimity, and Ethic of Caring, were more likely to be engaged in the practice of Focus on Students’ Personal Development.
In terms of preparation, results for Graduate School Curricula clearly showed that graduate students are not being intentionally or specifically prepared for their role in supporting spiritual development through their graduate academic experiences. The responses for the Graduate School Curricula scale reflected that respondents’ graduate preparation programs did not intentionally prepare them for a role of enhancing students’ spiritual development. A review of the responses indicated very low integration of topics related to spirituality into the graduate school curriculum. Rogers and Love (2007) studied the role of spirituality from the perspective of student constructions of spirituality in student affairs graduate preparation programs. They found that while spirituality may be a component of graduate school curricula, graduate students did not make connections between their learning and how they would practice once in the field. Thus, there is congruence with Rogers and Love’s finding that graduate preparation programs are not perceived by those enrolled as preparing them for a student development role regarding spirituality. The findings of this research indicated that emerging professionals are not prepared through their curricula for the role of spiritual development of their students. The need to “address the cultures of our graduate schools to help future professionals recognize the importance of addressing issues concerning purpose and meaning …spirituality and spiritual growth” has been suggested previously (Astin, et al. 2002).

In addition to not feeling well prepared through their graduate programs, the findings from this research also suggested that members of the student affairs profession may not be comfortable in the role of supporting students’ spiritual development. The results of this
study mirror the results of the UCLA national faculty study (Astin, Astin, Lindholm, Bryant, Calderone, et al., 2006). For the faculty study only 30% of respondents reported that facilitating students’ spiritual development is a role that colleges should assume. A similar, though slightly higher, proportion of student affairs professionals reported that in their practice they seek to enhance spiritual development of their students.

The question of appropriateness of role was discussed in the literature. Much of the literature supported the notion of integration of spirituality into the academy and into the practice of student affairs professionals as a component of student development. Many scholars and practitioners justified the need for inclusion of spirituality (Astin, 2002; Astin, 2004; Astin, Astin, Chambers, Chickering, Elsner, et al., 2002; Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Jablonski, 2005; Kazanjian and Laurence, 2002; Love, 2001; Parks, 2000; Sandeen, 2004). Regardless of these voices, as shown in the findings, there was disagreement about appropriateness of and comfort with the role of spiritual development as a component of student development.

One other interesting finding was the similarity in responses for items related to religion and items related to spirituality. As has been noted, both were consistently ranked lower in value by student affairs professionals. It was not clear if student affairs professionals distinguished these concepts from each other. As indicated in the literature review, genuine confusion remains about the meanings of and differences between the concepts of spirituality and religion (Bryant, 2007; Estanek, 2006; Love & Talbot, 1999; Zinnbauer, Pargament & Scott, 1999). For some, the terms religion and spirituality are interchangeable. Yet, for many
current students, and perhaps staff, there are significant differences; spirituality is often a self-composed way of looking at and living life (Astin & Astin, 2006; Lauzon, 2001; Parks, 2000; Tisdell, 1999, 2003) whereas religion is often considered more fixed and constant, a code of conduct accompanied by doctrine (Bryant, 2007). As the literature reflected, confusion between religion and spirituality may also be an underlying issue that affects progress in terms of related research (Estanek, 2006; Speck 2005). The full impact of research on spirituality is perhaps marred by this lack of a universal definition. Such confusion of terminology presents challenges to student affairs professionals in both institutional and professional association settings. The fact that the term spirituality means many things to many people impacts, both positively and negatively, perspectives and perceptions, and creates a more challenging environment in which to do this type of work.

Further, while professionals working at public institutions often face the challenge of strict interpretations of separation of church and state, professionals working at private, religiously affiliated institutions simultaneously face the challenge of denominational affiliations that shape the ways in which they are able to provide holistic, spiritual development (Caple, 1998). These various contexts add another layer to an already complex topic. Even our most visionary predecessors who included the terminology of spirituality in one of our most important documents, The Student Personnel Point of View II (American Council on Education, 1949), did not provide a cogent definition of the term spirituality. Thus, it continues to be a struggle to scholars and practitioners alike.
Theoretical Implications

The theoretical framework for this research was based on the theories of Fowler, Parks, and Tisdell. Each theorist contributed significantly to the importance and value of the study of spirituality. In this section, the connections between these theories and the findings of this study are presented.

Implications for Theory that Stem from Findings

Fowler

Fowler developed a theory to study faith development and embraced the concept of holism by recognizing and honoring both cognitive and affective dimensions of development. The notion that intellect and affect are intertwined was an important component of this theory, and supports the notion of viewing spirituality in a holistic sense. The findings indicated that student affairs professionals embrace both components in their belief systems and their practice. As has been noted, student affairs professionals perceived themselves as very caring and showed a high degree of interest in understanding and helping others. They also reported high levels of frequency in cognitive practices such as ‘discuss rights and responsibilities of being a citizen in a community.’ Yet, they showed a common pattern in belief systems and practice that minimized their involvement in matters of faith or spirituality. Thus, while it appears that student affairs professionals are comfortable in the realms of the affective and the cognitive, they do not appear to be comfortable with the intersection of these in the spiritual development realm. While not extending Fowler’s theory, the findings from this
research imply that a gap may exist between intellect and affect in the holistic, spiritually-infused practice of student affairs professionals.

*Parks*

Parks is most widely known for her addition of the stage ‘young adult’ to faith development theory and for her assertion of the importance of mentors in helping young adults transition into more mature stages of being. Parks’s work with college students and their development is foundational to her theory. Parks’s theory connected the concept of meaning-making and mentoring with spiritual development. This research found that mentoring experiences encourage holistic, spiritually-infused practice, and in this way, Parks’s theory is supported through the findings of this study.

The findings from this research support Parks’s notion that mentoring influences the development of young adults, which is the stage at which emerging student affairs professionals may receive mentoring while in graduate school. In order to maximize the impact of mentoring as Parks envisioned, mentoring topics must be inclusive and provide attention to concepts of inner development, meaning-making, and spiritual development. Student affairs professionals reported being mentored as graduate students; however, they did not appear to be mentored with frequency in the realm of spiritual development or meaning-making.

Specifically, the mentoring received by professionals when they were graduate students significantly influenced their practice as was shown in the Community Building and Reflective Practice regression models. However, the findings from this research also
indicated that student affairs professionals do not typically mentor their own students in a spiritual manner. As seen in the findings of this study, most student affairs professionals indicated they have mentoring roles with their students and reported interacting in authentic ways. The activities they engage in reflect a traditional type of mentoring that supports conversations of career and professional life, yet do not necessarily include roles that encourage or include conversations regarding the meaning of life or spiritual development.

While mentoring has gained popularity over the past several years, do the influences go as deep as Parks envisioned as she developed her theory? Parks’s theory in regard to mentoring was that college students would receive mentoring to help them, as she put it, to ask big questions and have worthy dreams. It might be argued that current mentoring practices do not venture into the territory of big questions and worthy dreams and instead dwell in smaller questions and practicalities. Parks was very clear in her writing about the importance of young adults having a place of belonging where they could ask important questions. It appears, however, that at least in this sample of the student affairs profession, what Parks envisioned has not transpired.

Regardless of the apparent disconnect between mentoring in the fullest perspective as envisioned by Parks and the actual experiences as reported by respondents in this survey, it is apparent that being mentored is a predictor of holistic, spiritually-infused practice of student affairs professionals. This practice has the potential to benefit holistic student development. Programs and patterns of mentoring hold great promise in terms of further development to enhance spiritual development as a component of holistic student development.
Tisdell’s work was seminal in that it elevated the importance and role of educators in intentionally setting the learning environment to be inclusive of learners’ spirituality. She believes that an effective educator creates educational opportunities by drawing on both the cultural dimension of spirituality and the spiritual dimension of culture. In other words, Tisdell recognizes that in holistic learning environments, beliefs, values, and spirituality cannot be stripped away from an individual’s identity. Her work considers how context and culture are components of identity and spiritual development.

Educators shape, either intentionally, or by omission, learning environments. Inclusion or exclusion reflects what is prioritized and valued. Responses to the Graduate School Curricula scale illustrated how spirituality was not included as an integral part of the graduate school curriculum. These findings reflected the gap between the type of holistic learning environment that Tisdell envisioned and the reality of the learning environment that students experienced.

Religious Pluralism

Institutionally, how graduate school programs are constructed in terms of what is included in the curriculum is an area for further study. Religious pluralism can be appropriately included in the graduate school curricula scale to broaden understandings of learning attained as well as to reflect and respect identities and cultures of learners. The conceptual framework for this research included graduate curricula as a potential predictor of holistic, spiritually-infused practice. Including items related to the degree of inclusion of
knowledge of world religions in the graduate curricula scale could add an interesting perspective to the findings.

The theoretical framework for this research included the theories of Fowler, Parks, and Tisdell, together with the concept of holistic student development. The approach for the research was non-theistic, with intent to be inclusive of all student affairs professionals, regardless of their belief systems. Because there is lingering confusion between concepts of religion and spirituality, and because religion appears to be a point of entry for discussions of meaning and purpose in life, another valuable addition to this research could be to integrate the concept of religion pluralism into the conceptual framework as an independent variable. Religious pluralism could be a measure of knowledge of differing systems of religious belief. It could differ from Ecumenical Worldview by measuring knowledge in different religious traditions as opposed to interest in different religious traditions.

The addition of religious pluralism could add to the knowledge base in regard to what predicts holistic, spiritually-infused practice, and perhaps further understandings on if and how student affairs professionals’ perspectives on religion and spirituality differ. While this addition does not necessitate altering the theoretical framework, it does require altering the conceptual framework. Thus, there would be five independent variables: demographics, spirituality, religious pluralism, graduate school curricula, and mentoring experiences.
Implications for Practice

Implications for Higher Education

How does the student affairs profession move forward with a better understanding of how to integrate spirituality as a component of holistic student development into their work? What does it include? What does it exclude? Do staff members differentiate their approach based on gender or racial/ethnic background or other demographic characteristics? The majority of evidence from studies related to spirituality concludes that personal characteristics (e.g., gender and race/ethnicity) do matter in regard to spirituality and spiritual development. As stated earlier, the findings for this research show little evidence of this. It is likely that the findings for this study are a function of the sample. If demographic characteristics play a minor role in the practices of student affairs professionals, as indicated in the results of this study, then efforts to shape professionals’ practice may be applicable to all professionals regardless of gender, racial/ethnic identity, or other demographic characteristics.

How then, are professional practices shaped that are inclusive of spiritual development as one component of an overall developmental objective? Several of the regression models for this research identified predictors of holistic, spiritually-infused practice. Of all the predictors, the one that appears to have the most potential to impact the integration of holistic, spiritually-infused practice is mentoring.
Mentoring Experiences

Mentoring Experiences reflects opportunities extended to student affairs professionals while they are in graduate school. According to Parks (2000) this life stage is a period of great potential and great vulnerability for young adults. As noted earlier, Mentoring Experiences was a significant positive predictor for Community Building and Reflective Practices. Mentoring appears to have impact to help emerging professionals develop spiritually, and by extension through their work as student affairs professionals, to consequently help college students in their own spiritual development. The forms that mentoring takes and the topics and matters of discussion that are included in such relationships have the potential to expand or retard opportunities for spiritual development. Individual practitioners and/or faculty members who support the concept of spiritual development as an appropriate role and who commit to a career of mentoring have potential for the type of influence that mirrors the manner in which Parks wrote about mentoring.

It is apparent that in order to attain the impact that Parks (2000) envisioned for mentoring benefits, student affairs professionals should broaden the scope of what is considered appropriate in regard to their mentoring roles. By broadening interactions with their graduate mentees to more consistently include issues of meaning-making and spiritually-related topics, student affairs professionals in turn have potential for far greater impact in the development of the students with whom they work. As seen in the findings of this research, student affairs professionals were less likely to engage in discussions about meaning in life with colleagues than with friends. The reality is that student affairs
professionals rarely engaged with one another in such a manner, and it appears, rarely engaged with their students in this manner either. Emerging student affairs professionals can benefit from such mentoring relationships, and through their experiences with seasoned professionals, can be better equipped to effectively mentor their own students.

Mentoring expectations and roles for student affairs professionals and faculty can be structured in ways that encourage holistic engagement, inclusive not only of more traditional topics such as skill development and career growth, but also of less prevalent topics such as meaning-making and spiritual development. By doing so, the profession role-models to graduate students a more holistic practice that engages and honors graduate student learning at all levels of their being. This, in turn, has greater potential to impact future student development, as these graduate students enter the profession and begin to make their contributions.

The findings indicated that 79% of graduate students reported a belief that ‘mentoring roles that involve the mentor supporting students’ searching for meaning and purpose in life are an appropriate role for student affairs professionals,’ yet practice results revealed that only 17% of graduate students discussed life purpose with their mentor very often or always. Thus there is a discrepancy and need for better congruence between views of appropriate roles and related practice. Undergraduate students want this type of mentoring and see the roles as being appropriate, yet student affairs professionals have not been prepared in their graduate programs to engage in this practice once in the field.
Parks (2000) wrote convincingly of the importance of mentoring in supporting young adults/college students. The results of this research support this notion of the value of mentoring, and, further, identify it as a significant predictor of holistic, spiritually-infused practice. Stronger institutional support is needed to develop the role of holistic mentoring on college and university campuses. Student affairs professionals need to be better prepared to embrace this role of broad-based mentoring, and emerging professionals need some type of educational foundation upon which to build this skill set.

A variety of potential avenues are evident through which to mentor graduate students. Formal mentoring programs exist that connect students to specific academic majors, or connect at-risk students with faculty or staff, as examples. These types of programs can be broadened to pair graduate students with their faculty members in more than a cursory manner. Expectations can be built into graduate programs that require such interactions with a formal mentor, whether faculty or administrator. Though these are not the ideal conditions in which to form such relationships, they do provide the benefit of regular contact, recognized as both a part of the faculty/administrator role as well as of the expectation of the graduate student in terms of graduation requirements. Mentoring relationships are more likely to develop, however, when students and staff experience deep levels of engagement, as often occur through experiences related to service learning, living learning communities, and outdoor education programs. These are further explored in the co-curricular section below.

In order to better facilitate mentoring partnerships between graduate students and potential mentors, student affairs professionals at graduate institutions can be called upon to
be active in such roles. Many graduate students have assistantships that are housed in student affairs departments, thus a ready avenue exists for these students to seek to create their own relationships. A more formal approach may be of benefit to students who do not have the inclination or personal characteristics to initiate such relationships. Regardless of the avenue through which mentoring relationships occur, they can be strengthened through holistic approaches, inclusive of support for spiritual development. This research found that graduate students who were mentored as they sought their degrees to work in student affairs were more likely to engage in holistic spiritually-infused practices. Therefore, the student affairs profession and graduate preparation programs have reason to direct effort and resources in this direction.

Graduate Preparation Programs

Though graduate school curricula was not a predictor of practice, graduate preparation programs provide an important potential avenue through which emerging student affairs professionals can receive an educational foundation that enables them to function in the type of broad-based mentoring roles discussed above. According to the findings, this foundation is not being provided. Because this is an area with such potential to influence practice, it is further discussed here.

Respondents reported that little effort was made to integrate religion or spirituality into the curriculum. Only 5% of participants reported that they had “very often” or “always” been introduced to issues of religious pluralism in their graduate school programs. Anecdotal evidence also supports this finding. As shared by a graduate student at a recent national
conference, his cohort members were discouraged from discussing spirituality with their
student leaders and had no spiritually-related curricula as a part of their program. Such
omissions and direction point to a profession with little awareness of how to support their
students in spiritual development, little reason for risking such engagement, and minimal
preparation for professionals entering the field.

Graduate preparation programs have potential to positively influence integration of
spirituality into the curriculum. As Tisdell (2006) argued, educators must recognize that what
students believe, and how they develop their identities, cannot be discounted as they develop
into mature adults. The reality, though, is that student affairs professionals do not shape or
influence the graduate school curricula environment as a major function of their work. This is
primarily the work of faculty. Regardless, there are many settings in which student affairs
professionals do set the learning environment, and it is in these realms that both the
profession and professionals have a great deal of potential influence.

There are ways in which such integration can be intentionally developed. As reported
in the findings, Ethic of Caring was found to be a predictor of holistic, spiritually-infused
practice. Ethic of Caring could be more intentionally fostered in graduate preparation
programs as well as into professional development opportunities for graduate students. In
fact, when reviewing the items in the Ethic of Caring scale, it is apparent that several of these
items have been integrated into the work of student affairs professionals as the profession has
evolved. Items such as helping to promote racial understanding, becoming involved in
programs to clean up the environment, and perhaps to a lesser extent, influencing social values, are reflective of the current work of many student affairs professionals.

Whether viewed as a restoration of spirituality to the academic life (Subbiondo, 2005) or as in the position statement “to have issues of purpose and meaning, authenticity and identity, spirituality and spiritual growth, become a regular part of higher education’s landscape” (Astin, et al., 2002), current literature takes many forms in supporting practical solutions for lasting impact. The literature review revealed many examples of efforts and strategies undertaken to move forward integration of spirituality in a range of higher education settings (Astin and Sax, 1998; Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999; Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, and Yee, 2000; Jablonski, 2005; Kazanjian and Laurence, 2002; Zajonc, 2003). Some less frequent student affairs practices, such as outdoor education, can also provide opportunities for deeper levels of engagement through graduate programs. Existing literature and the findings from this research support the need for a shift in graduate school preparation programs if they are to prepare graduate students for student development inclusive of spirituality. The primary area in which student affairs professionals have the ability to impact the higher education environment is through the co-curricular opportunities that are available to students. The next section describes co-curricular efforts related to spirituality and spiritual development.

Co-Curricular Efforts

Several examples of potential co-curricular practices follow. The first has to do with a combination of religious and spiritual perspectives. As was reported in this study, the interest
by student affairs professionals in learning about other religions was low (35%). Responses indicated that 65% of student affairs practitioners ‘discuss rights and responsibilities of being a citizen in a community’ with their students very often or always, yet they apparently do not make the connection that by virtue of our changing world, the effects of globalization, and of our increasingly diverse student bodies in settings of higher education, this concept of the responsibilities of citizenship may well necessitate learning about different religious traditions. In order to better serve our students and, consequently, our society, our profession should create opportunities to develop such knowledge.

One practical way to do this is to broaden the mission of offices of religious life. By expanding these operations to include spiritual life and broadening missions to include educational purposes of teaching about religions as opposed to primarily serving those affiliated with a particular religion, students are more comprehensively served. That is, there is a place for everyone with a broader mission that moves away from denominational affiliation as the precursor for engagement or service. Further, by broadening such offices to include spiritual life, many of today’s students who have claimed to be spiritual but not religious may be more open to engagement.

Another way that student affairs professionals can support holistic, spiritually-infused practices is to work within an expanded concept of diversity. This idea of broadening the definition of diversity to include religious diversity is becoming more prominent. Most student affairs divisions have a presence in the area of multicultural education, either by specific office, by divisional mission, or both. By including religious and spiritual life as a
component of diversity efforts, student affairs professionals position themselves to engage students on this topic. Student or staff-driven programs that educate about various religious and spiritual beliefs provide a non-intrusive manner in which students can learn about the values and beliefs of others.

Other options for integration of holistic, spiritually-infused practice include service learning and living learning communities. In the recent past, service learning has become a more integral part of the work of universities. Often a component of academic coursework, it is also often a fully co-curricular, or non-academic credit option. An important component of service learning is the reflection piece. Generally, students engage in service and upon completion, reflect on their learning and the meaning of the service. Living learning communities provide similar opportunities for deeper levels of engagement among students, who live and study together.

Finally, another avenue for integration of holistic, spiritually-infused practice is from outdoor education programs that are often within the realm of student affairs. Focusing on sustainability of the earth, concepts such as ‘leave no trace’ encourage students to consider their place in the universe and their role in stewardship of the environment. Though laden with higher levels of risk management responsibility, such programs are yet another avenue through which many universities are engaging with students at a level that has greater potential for long-lasting impact.

The above recommendations support student learning. Due to the absence of effective teaching about spirituality in graduate preparation programs, there is also a need for
education of professionals in regard to integration of religious pluralism and spirituality into their work. Scholars and practitioners have developed resources to support this need. Diamond’s (2008) *Encountering faith in the classroom: Turning difficult discussions into constructive engagement*, and Estanek, Meyer, Wankel, and Wright’s (2008) *Reading the signs: Using case studies to discuss student life issues at Catholic colleges and universities in the United States* are two of the more recent efforts. Diamond presents a theoretical justification as well as practical tools for intentionally introducing and thoughtfully managing classroom exploration of religious and spiritual values that are an inherent part of the makeup of college and university students. Recall that while the classroom is not the primary home of student affairs professionals, many do teach and most all are engaged in formal training in which such information is applicable. More directly targeted toward student affairs professionals, Estanek, Meyer, Wankel, and Wright’s book created opportunities for dialogue and reflection to help student affairs professionals become more effective in their roles at Catholic institutions. Though targeted to one particular faith, the overarching purpose of this effort provides a case study model through which student affairs professionals can engage student leaders in important conversations. These are examples of important resources that can improve the effectiveness of student affairs professionals in regard to enhancing student spiritual development.

*Implications for Society*

Implications of this topic reach beyond the arena of higher education institutions. Two of the potential contributions to society are greater understanding of one another in a
rapidly changing and increasingly diverse society, and balance of societal tendencies toward materialism and consumerism.

Implications for broader understanding of various cultures, of which spiritual beliefs/practices are a component, have become more pronounced as globalism has become more prevalent. Nash (2007) contends that our changing world requires competence in the knowledge of world religions in order to help us understand one another. While his scholarly approach is theistic in approach, and thus not identical to the direction of this research, it addresses the need for attention to important matters of identity that in the recent past have been considered taboo. Nash makes evident the importance of our becoming more knowledgeable or attuned to religious pluralism. We no longer live in an isolated society where one country’s norms prevail. Indeed, as our societies and institutions of higher education become increasingly diverse, our need to learn about other cultures, religious traditions and value systems becomes more pronounced. This is similar to the above notions of student and staff development in matters of religious pluralism and spiritual awareness. Nash makes connections between this societal need and religious and spiritual student development. Scale items such as ‘create opportunities for intercultural interactions,’ ‘improving my understanding of other countries and cultures,’ and ‘having an interest in different religious traditions’ support the notion of theses values.

Astin (1998) noted that college student values shifted as a result of the introduction and saturation of television into the lives of generations of college students. Astin further noted that this was accompanied by an increase in striving for materialistic goals that has
been evident in our society in the past several years. Concepts of inner development and searching for meaning/purpose in life provide balance from messages that elevate a consumerism mindset. Attention to matters of spirituality and spiritual development, inner development, religious pluralism, and a service mentality developed through structured service learning programs all offer alternative views to a consumerism mentality. Increased attention to spiritual development of students in realms of meaning-making, or almost any of the other items within the spirituality or practice scales has potential to balance this trend of consumerism and strengthen sense of community and contribution to community.

**Summary for Implications**

If mentors embrace this role of spiritual development inclusive of meaning-making (Parks, 2000) and culture and identity, (Tisdell, 2006) the potential impact of mentoring will be broadened. The fact that a minority of respondents in this study experienced inclusion of spirituality as a significant part of their curriculum, or experienced broad-based mentoring as a part of their mentoring experiences, gives a clear message to emerging professionals that student spiritual development is not an important consideration for their careers or for student development. Further, the fact that many respondents experienced mentoring, though did not report encouragement or discussion in areas of inner development and spiritual development, indicates that we are not encouraging our new professionals in a way that recognizes and communicates that spiritual development is a valid and valuable aspect of the profession. These three areas, mentoring experiences, graduate school curricula, and co-curricular
involvement, have great potential as methods through which to influence integration of spirituality.

Though this research is focused on student affairs professionals in higher education, this section also touched on societal impact. Social impact is important because the students with whom student affairs professionals interact and support through developmental stages become full members of society as they leave the realm of the academy. Their abilities to contribute to their communities and to create balance in their lives can be enhanced through their higher education experiences. In these ways, there is long-reaching societal impact of the work of student affairs professionals in regard to integration of holistic, spiritually-infused practices.

Future Research

Extending the literature base is of great interest to both novice and experienced scholars. This study has provided a snapshot of what is in terms of the spiritual perceptions and practices of student affairs professionals who are members of NACA. Future research can build upon this study in a variety of ways.

One continuing challenge to studying spirituality and spiritual development is that agreement on a universal definition of spirituality is lacking. As research in this area continues, this is an area ripe for contribution. As was shown in the findings of this research, items related to religious and spiritual life had similar response patterns. It is not clear, however, if that is because student affairs professionals see these as one and the same or differentiate these concepts. Though Love and Talbot (1999) sought to define these concepts
in the student affairs context, confusion still exists. Clarification in regard to terminology is a barrier and progress that can be made in this regard is an important potential contribution.

The relatively low response rate and limited variance of the sample represent areas that future researchers can work to improve. There are a variety of functional areas within the field of student affairs that can be sampled to ascertain if similar patterns emerge in findings. For example, staff of housing and residence life departments work closely with students in living and learning environments. They have a related national association, as do most of the specialty areas within student affairs. Data from other student affairs areas can deepen understandings of patterns among staff and even provide staff portraits of similar or dissimilar patterns in terms of self-reported spirituality, mentoring experiences, graduate school preparation, and practices.

Mentoring was found to be a significant predictor of practice, and this supports Parks’s (2000) theory of the importance of mentoring. To the best of this researcher’s knowledge, this is the first quantitative study that supports Parks’s contention of the important role of mentoring in faith formation. Parks’s (2000) theory centered on development from the young adult stage to the tested or mature adult stage. Because mentoring was found to be a predictor of practice in this research, a logical next step is to further explore the nature and impact of mentoring experiences in young professionals’ lives. A study of the impact of mentoring relationships between seasoned professionals and young student affairs professionals would be an important addition to the literature, since many of the emerging student affairs professionals are likely still in the young adult stage when they
enter the profession. According to Parks’s theory, young adult professionals need support to move successfully through the transition from young adulthood to tested or mature adulthood. In what ways are seasoned professionals supporting the development of young professionals and how does this support impact staff practices? Are young professional staff who are mentored beyond their graduate school programs more effective in their mentoring roles? Do they, in turn, serve as holistic mentors to the college students with whom they closely work? It would be interesting to learn if young student affairs professionals who are engaged in mentoring relationships with seasoned professionals have different patterns of practice as compared with those who do not have such a mentoring relationship. Further, it would provide additional understanding of the impacts of mentoring.

Additional research on the impact of graduate preparation programs and the resulting practices of their graduates as professionals is also an area in need of further research. The culture and impact of graduate preparation programs is just beginning to be understood (Rogers & Love, 2007; Wiese, 2006). From this research, it appears that little is intentionally integrated into the curriculum regarding spirituality. Research to determine what the national trends are in terms of curriculum revision or expansion in this regard is an area that could extend understanding. Is changing societal diversity impacting the curriculum? Are graduate students being provided opportunities to learn about religious pluralism or spirituality?

Concluding Thoughts

How is it that student affairs professionals and the profession, through professional organizations, articulate their work? Is there congruence in terms of what the profession
espouses and what professionals do? Results of this study would indicate a multi-faceted answer. Yes, a high concern for students is evident, and is expressed through many aspects of work such as authentic interactions with students. No, spirituality is not embraced as a foundational concept of the profession as indicated through low endorsement of most items closely related to spiritual beliefs and practices. Relationships with student leaders have traditionally focused on skill-building and career development, bolstered by the presence of strong foundations of caring and concern for students. Student affairs professionals have interacted with students authentically, yet perhaps not holistically.

This research strengthens the notion that even though the profession of student affairs espouses the goal of holistic student development, student affairs professionals do not consistently practice integration of spiritually-infused practice as a component of student affairs practice. This is indicated through consistently lower ranked scores on items specifically related to spirituality and illustrated through gaps between perceptions of appropriate roles and actual practices, as well as in perceptions by many that integration of spirituality is not an appropriate role.

Student affairs is a profession that is engaged in the primary mission of student development. Spiritual development (and religious development) is an important component of identity development (Nash, 2007; Parks, 2000, 2008; Tisdell, 2006) and a component of student development (American Council on Education, 1949). The growing complexity of the world calls for a wider understanding of values, whether they are theistic or non-theistic (Nash, 2007; Parks, 2000; Tisdell, 2006). Many educators and researchers have recognized
this and have worked to elevate the importance of spirituality in educational contexts (Astin, 2002, 2004; Chickering, Dalton, & Stamm, 2006; Kazanjian & Laurence, 2002; Parks, 2008). The reality of a lingering culture that calls for, and in fact, teaches our young professionals to be “hands-off” in this area of student development has an unintended effect. As new professionals emerge, they learn to omit this facet of development from their work, and a cycle of omission repeats itself. Increased recognition of the value of the role of spiritual development and its appropriateness in the overall mission of the academy, including student affairs, will likely follow from additional related research, of which this is one small contribution. The results of this research do appear to confirm the problem statement for this research that even though the profession of student affairs espouses the value of holistic student development, practitioners do not consistently include spirituality as a component of their practice.
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Appendix A

Permission to use Higher Education Research Institute Scales
Dear Marcia,

Following up on our phone conversation this morning, please accept this correspondence as confirmation that you are welcome to use the scales we developed as part of the Spirituality in Higher Education project for your dissertation work.

I'm sorry not to have had more time to visit with you this morning but will look forward to hearing more about the focus of your work and your findings!

Best wishes,
Jennifer

Jennifer A. Lindholm
Director
Spirituality in Higher Education Project University of California, Los Angeles

Quoting "Kiessling, Marcia" <mkkiessl@uncc.edu>:

Good morning Jennifer,
I am writing to seek permission to use scales to develop my survey for my dissertation. I am hopeful to be able to convene a June 6 summer conference focus group.

Dr. Alyssa Bryant has directed me to gain permission from you before moving forward. Please let me know if this is acceptable. I am forwarding an email that I sent on May 18, which outlines my specific request.

I look forward to hearing from you, and will also call later in case that is a better way to reach you. Thank you very much. Marcia

Marcia Kennard Kiessling

From: Kiessling, Marcia
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 9:02 PM
To: jlindhol@ucla.edu
> Subject: request for use of scales

Hello Dr. Lindholm,

My name is Marcia Kennard Kiessling and I am a doctoral student at North Carolina State University. Dr. Alyssa Bryant is my dissertation chair. I am interested in using several of the scales from the UCLA Spirituality in Higher Education Project, from both the faculty survey and the student survey for my study. My study will examine the spirituality and practice of
student affairs professionals in regard to their degree of commitment to integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development into their work.

I am writing to seek permission to use the following scales:

spirituality
spiritual quest
equanimitiy
ethic of caring
ecumenical worldview
compassionate self-concept
focus on student personal development

I will give appropriate acknowledgement for use of the scales. I hope to have a focus group in June, and Dr. Bryant has directed me to gain permission to use these scales before moving forward with my plan. Thank you very much for your consideration. I reviewed the website and wasn't able to ascertain where to send this request.

Please let me know if I may move forward with plans to develop my survey and convene my focus group.

With appreciation,

Marcia

Marcia Kennard Kiessling
(704) 687 2521 (work) (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)
Appendix B

Permission to use Seifert and Harmon Scale
Hello Marcia,

I'm just thinking about the best way to cite the instrument. My colleague, Noel Harmon, and I developed the actual scales from the items as part of our article Seifert & Harmon, 2009. That said, the individual items came out of a class on spirituality and higher education taught by Dr. Sherry Watt in Fall 2005. Those students who contributed to the individual item development included: myself, Noel Harmon, Kathy Goodman, Adele Lozano, Jacqueline Klein-McElvain, Marisela Rosas, and Kelley Ashby along with Dr. Watt. I would ask that you acknowledge their contribution to the instrument development in your dissertation.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Best wishes,
Tricia Seifert

Postdoctoral Research Scholar
Center for Research on Undergraduate Education University of Iowa N438C Lindquist Center (physical address)
N491 Lindquist Center (mailing address)
Iowa City, IA 52242
319-335-5377

From: Kiessling, Marcia [mkiessl@uncc.edu]
Sent: Friday, May 08, 2009 2:52 PM
To: Seifert, Tricia A
Subject: following up regarding your study

Good afternoon Tricia,

I appreciate your forwarding me your report and the survey instruments that you used for the study titled: The Relationship between Spiritual Well-being, Purpose in Life, and Student Affairs Practice.

As you know, Dr. Bryant is my dissertation chair and she originally suggested that I explore your work and scales. At this time, I am writing to officially request the use of the student affairs practice scales that you developed as a part of my study.

I, too, am studying practice of student affairs professionals and am very hopeful that I can use this scale as a part of my dissertation. Please let me know if this is acceptable to you. Thank you very much.

Marcia Kennard Kiessling
(704) 687 2521 (work)
Appendix C

Higher Education Research Institute Student Survey
2007 COLLEGE STUDENTS' BELIEFS AND VALUES FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

MARKING DIRECTIONS
- Please use a black or blue ink pen or a pencil.
- Fill in the oval completely.
- Make no stray marks of any kind.
- Do not fold, tear, or mutilate this survey.

CORRECT MARK  INCORRECT MARKS

1. How many years of undergraduate education have you completed so far?
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4 or more

2. Please specify your undergraduate major:

3. Please specify your probable career/occupation:

4. Mark the one oval that best describes your undergraduate grade average so far.
   - A (3.9-4.0)
   - A- (3.5-3.8)
   - B+ (2.75-3.24)
   - B (2.5-2.75)
   - C+ (1.75-2.25)
   - C (0.0-1.75)
   - C or less (below 1.75)

5. Please indicate the highest degree you plan to complete eventually at any institution. (Mark one)
   - None
   - Bachelor’s degree (B.A., B.S., etc.)
   - Master’s degree (M.A., M.S., etc.)
   - Ph.D. or Ed.D.
   - M.D., D.O., D.M.D. or D.V.M.
   - J.D. (Law)
   - B.D. or M.Div. (Divinity)
   - Other

6. Since entering college have you: (Mark all that apply)
   - Joined a social fraternity or sorority
   - Had a part-time job on campus
   - Had a part-time job off campus
   - Worked full-time while attending school
   - Had a romantic relationship
   - Experienced personal injury or serious illness
   - Had your parents divorce or separate
   - Had a close friend or family member die
   - Converted to another religion
   - Gone on a religious mission trip
   - Participated in
     - Student government
     - Campus religious organization
     - Study abroad program
     - Leadership training
     - Intercollegiate football or basketball
     - Other intercollegiate sport
     - ROTC
     - Exhibited art
     - Acted in a play
     - Performed music

7. During the past year, how much time did you spend during a typical week doing the following activities? (Mark one for each item)
   - Hours per week:
     - Studying/homework
     - Socializing with friends
     - Talking with faculty outside of class
     - Exercise or sports
     - Partying
     - Working (for pay)
     - Volunteer work
     - Student club/groups
     - Watching TV
     - Reading for pleasure
     - Playing video/computer games
     - Praying/meditation
     - Using a computer
     - Commuting
     - Shopping

8. For the activities listed below, please indicate how often you engaged in each since entering college. (Mark one for each item)
   - Not At All
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently

   - Attended a religious service
   - Was bored in class
   - Participated in organized demonstrations
   - Was a guest in a professor’s home
   - Smoked cigarettes
   - Drank beer
   - Drank wine or liquor
   - Felt overwhelmed by all I had to do
   - Felt depressed
   - Discussed politics
   - Socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group
   - Came late to class
   - Performed community service as part of a class
   - Discussed religion/spirituality:
     - In class
     - With friends
     - With family
     - With professors
     - With college staff
   - Worked on a local, state, or national political campaign
   - Maintained a healthy diet
   - Stayed up all night
   - Witnessed racism because of your race
   - Slept in or overslept
   - Worked or volunteered at a soup kitchen or shelter
   - Sought personal counseling
   - Took interdisciplinary courses

9. Compared with when you first started college, how would you now describe your: (Mark one for each item)
   - Much Weaker
   - Walker
   - No Change
   - Stronger
   - Much Stronger

   - Ability to get along with people of different races/cultures
   - Understanding of social problems facing our nation
   - Understanding of global issues
   - Acceptance of people with different religious/spiritual beliefs
   - Religiousness
   - Spirituality
   - Critical thinking
10. Current religious preference: (Mark one)
- Baptist
- Lutheran
- Presbyterian
- Church of Christ
- Roman Catholic
- Eastern Orthodox
- Seventh Day Adventist
- Hindu
- UCC/Congregational
- Other Christian
- Jewish
- Other Religion
- LDS (Mormon)
- None
- Other: ________________

11. Do you consider yourself an evangelical Christian?
- Yes
- No

12. Please indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following: (Mark one for each item)

- Net Important
- Somewhat Important
- Not Important
- Very Important
- Essential

- Becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts (acting, dancing, etc.)
- Influencing political structure
- Influencing social values
- Raising a family
- Being very well off financially
- Helping others who are in difficulty
- Making a theoretical contribution to science
- Writing original works (poems, novels, short stories, etc.)
- Creating artistic works (painting, sculpture, dancing, etc.)
- Becoming successful in a business of my own
- Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment
- Developing a meaningful philosophy of life
- Participating in a community action program
- Helping to promote racial understanding
- Keeping up to date with political affairs
- Becoming a community leader
- Integrating spirituality into my life
- Improving my understanding of other countries and cultures

13. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements: (Mark one for each item)

- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Agree Somewhat
- Somewhat Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

14. For me, the relationship between science and religion is one of:

- Conflict; I consider myself to be on the side of religion.
- Conflict; I consider myself to be on the side of science.
- Independence; they refer to different aspects of reality.
- Collaboration; each can be used to help support the other.

15. Do you pray?
- Yes
- No (Skip to #17)

16. If yes, why do you pray? (Mark one for each item)

- For help in solving problems
- To be in communion with God
- To express gratitude
- For emotional strength
- For forgiveness
- To relieve the suffering of rejection
- For loved ones
- For wisdom
- To praise God

17. How often do you engage in the following activities?
- Mark one for each item

- Self-reflection
- Prayer
- Meditation
- Yoga, Tai Chi, or similar practice
- Religious singing/chanting
- Reading sacred texts
- Other reading on religion/spirituality

18. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following describes you: (Mark one for each item)

- Having an interest in spirituality
- Believing in the sacredness of life
- Feeling unsettled about spiritual and religious matters
- Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed
- Feeling a sense of connection with God/Higher Power that transcends my personal self
- Feeling a strong connection to all humanity
- Feeling disillusioned with my religious upbringing
- Having an interest in different religious traditions
- Being committed to introducing people to my faith
- Believing in the goodness of all people
- Being thankful for all that has happened in my life
- Feeling life after death is
- Feeling obligated to follow my parents' religious practices
- Being on a spiritual quest
- Being an ethical person

19. How would you characterize your political views? (Mark one)

- Far left
- Liberal
- Middle-of-the-road
- Conservative
- Far right
20. Which of the following best characterizes your conception of or experience with God? (Mark all that apply)
- Universal spirit
- Loving
- Father-figure
- Mother-figure
- Teacher
- Part of me
- None of the above

21. Do you believe in God?
- Yes
- Not sure
- No

22. Please indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following: (Mark one for each item)
- Somewhat important
- Very important
- Essential
- Not important

23. Have you ever had a spiritual experience while:
- In a house of worship
- Listening to beautiful music
- Viewed a great work of art
- Participated in a musical or artistic performance
- Engaged in athletics
- Witnessed the beauty and harmony of nature
- In a loving relationship
- Reading sacred texts
- Other:

24. Since you entered college, please indicate how often you have:
- Not at all
- Occasionally
- Frequently

25. How would you describe your current views about spiritual/religious matters? (Mark all that apply)
- Confused
- Secular
- Doubting
- Seeking
- Not interested

26. How many of your close friends:
- None
- Some
- Most
- All

27. Please indicate the extent to which you engage in the following activities: (Mark one for each item)
- Not at all
- To some extent
- To a great extent

28. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements: (Mark one for each item)
- Disagree strongly
- Agree somewhat
- Agree strongly

29. Since you entered college, which of the following experiences has changed your religious/spiritual beliefs?
- Not applicable
- Weakened
- No effect
- Strengthened
30. Mark one for each item:

Disagree Strongly
Disagree Somewhat
Agree Somewhat
Agree Strongly

There is too much concern in the courts for the
rights of criminals. ............................................. 1 1 1 1 1
Abortion should be legal .................................... 1 1 1 1 1
The death penalty should be abolished ............... 1 1 1 1 1
Marijuana should be legalized .............................. 1 1 1 1 1
It is important to have laws prohibiting homosexual
relationships .................................................. 1 1 1 1 1
Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem
in America ..................................................... 1 1 1 1 1
Realistically, an individual can do little to bring
about changes in our society ......................... 1 1 1 1 1
Weaving people should pay a larger share of taxes
than they now ............................................... 1 1 1 1 1
Colleges should prohibit racist/bias speech on
campus .......................................................... 1 1 1 1 1
Same-sex couples should have the right to legal
marital status ................................................. 1 1 1 1 1
Affirmative action in college admissions should be
abolished ....................................................... 1 1 1 1 1
The activities of married women are best confined
to the home and family ................................... 1 1 1 1 1
The federal government should do more to control
the sale of handguns ....................................... 1 1 1 1 1
There should be a distinct separation between
church and state ............................................. 1 1 1 1 1

32. In how many of the course(s) that you have taken have your
prosents used each of the following teaching methods?
(Mark one for each item)

Community service as part of coursework ............ 1 1 1 1 1
Cooperative learning (small groups) .................... 1 1 1 1 1
Group discussions ......................................... 1 1 1 1 1
Extensive lecturing ........................................... 1 1 1 1 1
Reflective writing/journaling ............................. 1 1 1 1 1
Student evaluations of each other's work .............. 1 1 1 1 1
Student evaluations of their own work ............... 1 1 1 1 1
Prayer ............................................................. 1 1 1 1 1
Contemplation/meditation .................................. 1 1 1 1 1

33. How often have professors at your current college:
(Mark one for each item)

Not At All
Occasionally
Frequently

Encouraged exploration of questions of meaning
and purpose .................................................. 1 1 1 1 1
Assisted you in your career decisions ................. 1 1 1 1 1
Encouraged you to pursue post-graduate study ....... 1 1 1 1 1
Enhanced your self-understanding ...................... 1 1 1 1 1
Taken an interest in your personal welfare .......... 1 1 1 1 1
Encouraged discussion of religious/spiritual matters 1 1 1 1 1
Encouraged personal expression of spirituality ...... 1 1 1 1 1
Encouraged discussion of ethical issues .............. 1 1 1 1 1
Acted as a spiritual model for you ..................... 1 1 1 1 1

34. Please rate your satisfaction with your current college on each
of the aspects of campus life listed below.
(Mark one for each item)

Very Dissatisfied
Somewhat Dissatisfied
Somewhat Satisfied
Very Satisfied

Relevance of coursework to everyday life ............ 1 1 1 1 1
Sense of community on campus ....................... 1 1 1 1 1
Opportunities for religious/spiritual reflection ... 1 1 1 1 1
Career counseling and advising ....................... 1 1 1 1 1
Amount of contact with faculty ....................... 1 1 1 1 1
Interaction with other students ....................... 1 1 1 1 1
Respect for diverse spiritual/religious beliefs ....... 1 1 1 1 1
Overall college experience ........................... 1 1 1 1 1

THANK YOU!

© Prepared by the Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90095-1521
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Appendix D

Higher Education Research Institute Faculty Survey
2004 Faculty Survey
Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA

MARKING DIRECTIONS
Your responses will be read by an optical mark reader. Please,
• Use a pencil or black or blue pen.
• Fill the oval completely.
• Erase clearly any marks you wish to change or "X" out mark if in pen.
CORRECT MARK INCORRECT MARKS
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

1. What is your principal activity in your current position at this institution? (Mark one)
☐ Administration  ☐ Services to clients
☐ Teaching and patients  ☐ Research  ☐ Other

2. Are you considered a full-time employee of your institution for at least nine months of the current academic year? (Mark one)
☐ Yes  ☐ No

3. Your sex:  ☐ Male  ☐ Female

4. What is your present academic rank?
☐ Professor  ☐ Lecturer  ☐ Associate Professor  ☐ Instructor
☐ Assistant Professor  ☐ Other

5. What is your tenure status at this institution? (Mark one)
☐ Tenured  ☐ On tenured track, but not tenured
☐ Not on tenured track, but institution has tenure system  ☐ Institution has no tenure system

6. Are you currently serving in an administrative position as: (Mark all that apply)
Department chair  ☐ Dean  ☐ Other

7. Are you currently: (Mark one)
☐ Married  ☐ Single  ☐ Unmarried, living with partner

8. Have you ever been: (Mark all that apply)
☐ Divorced  ☐ Widowed  ☐ Separated

9. Racial/Ethnic group: (Mark all that apply)
☐ White/Caucasian  ☐ African American/Black  ☐ American Indian/Alaska Native
☐ Asian American/Asian  ☐ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  ☐ Mexican American/Chicano
☐ Puerto Rican  ☐ Other Latino  ☐ Other

10. How many children do you have in the following age ranges?
☐ Under 18 years old  ☐ 18 years or older

11. Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or research?
☐ Very heavily in research  ☐ In both, but leaning toward research
☐ In both, but leaning toward teaching  ☐ Very heavily in teaching

12. On the following list, please mark one in each column:
Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.)  ☐
Master's (M.A., M.S., M.F.A., M.B.A., etc.)  ☐
LL.B., J.D.  ☐
M.D., D.O. (or equivalent)  ☐
Other first professional degree beyond B.A.
(e.g., D.D., D.V.M.)  ☐
Ed.D.  ☐
Ph.D.  ☐
Other degree  ☐
None  ☐

13. During the past two years, have you engaged in any of the following activities? (Mark one for each item)
☐ Taught an honors course  ☐ Taught an interdisciplinary course  ☐ Taught an ethnic studies course
☐ Taught a women's studies course  ☐ Team-taught a course  ☐ Taught a service learning course
☐ Worked with undergraduates on a research project  ☐ Placed or collected assignments on the Internet
☐ Taught a course exclusively on the Internet  ☐ Participated in a faculty development program
☐ Advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work  ☐ Collaborated with the local community in research
teaching  ☐ Developed a new course  ☐ Conducted research or writing focused on:
International/global issues  ☐ Racial or ethnic minorities  ☐ Women and gender issues
☐ Taught a first-year seminar  ☐

14. In the two sets of ovals shown below, please mark the most appropriate code from the fields listed on the back of the accompanying letter. (Please see example on back of accompanying letter.)

Major of highest degree held

Department of current faculty appointment

15. In the set of ovals to the right, please mark the dollar value of your base institutional salary, rounded to the nearest $1,000. (Note: Amounts above $195,000 should be marked "199")

The above salary is based on:
☐ 0-10 months  ☐ 11/2 months

16. In the four sets of ovals below, please mark the last two digits of the year of each of the following:

Year of birth  Year of highest degree held

Year of appointment at present institution  Year tenure was awarded
NOTE: If you are between terms, on leave, or in an interim term, please answer questions 17 and 18 as they apply to the full term most recently completed at this institution.

17. During the present term, how many hours per week on the average do you actually spend on each of the following activities? (Mark one for each activity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled teaching (given actual, not credit hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising and counseling of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee work and meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and scholarly writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other creative products/performances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with clients/patients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or public service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consulting/freelance work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household/household duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating via email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For questions 21 to 23, mark only one response for each question.

21. How many of the following have you published?

- Articles in academic or professional journals
- Chapters in edited volumes
- Books, manuals, or monographs
- Other, such as patents or computer software products

22. How many exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts have you presented?

23. How many of your professional writings have been published or accepted for publication in the last ten years?

24. For each of the following items, please mark either Yes or No:

- Have you ever held an academic administrative post?
- Have you ever received an award for outstanding teaching?
- Do you commute a long distance to work?
- Is your spouse/partner employed in the same/related field?
- Are your undergraduate credit courses
- Are you a U.S. citizen?
- Have you been sexually harassed at this institution?
- Are you a member of a faculty union?
- Do you use your scholarship to address local community needs?
- Have you published op-ed pieces or editorials?

During the past two years, have you:

- Received at least one firm job offer?
- Considered early retirement?
- Considered leaving academia for another path?
- Considered leaving this institution for another institution?
- Changed academic institutions?
- Taught courses at more than one institution during the same term?
- Requested/taken an early promotion?
- Engaged in paid consulting outside of your institution?
- Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay?
- Received funding for your work from:
  - Foundations?
  - State or federal government?
  - Business or industry?

25. Indicate how well each of the following describes your college or university: (Mark one for each item)

- It is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours
- Faculty here respect each other
- Most students are treated like "numbers in a book"
- Social activities are overemphasized
- Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers
- There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs
- Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology
- Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students
26. Please indicate the extent to which you:
(Mark one for each item)

Engage in academic work that spans multiple disciplines ........... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Feel that the training you received in graduate school
prepared you well for your role as a faculty mentor ........... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Experience joy in your work ........................................ [ ] [ ] [ ]
Feel good about the direction in which your life is headed .......... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Engage in self-reflection ........................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Achieve a healthy balance between your personal
life and your professional life .................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
Feel that your work adds meaning to your life .................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Consider yourself a religious person ................................ [ ] [ ] [ ]
Consider yourself a spiritual person ................................ [ ] [ ] [ ]
Engage in regular exercise ........................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Eat a well-balanced diet ............................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Get adequate amounts of sleep ..................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Engage in prayer/meditation ........................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Experience close alignment between your work and
your personal values ...................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Seek opportunities to grow spiritually ............................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
Feel that you have to work harder than your colleagues to be
perceived as a legitimate scholar .................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]

27. Below are some statements about your
college or university. Indicate the extent
to which you agree or disagree with each of
the following:
(Mark one for each item)

Faculty are interested in students' personal problems ........... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly
reflected in the curriculum .................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically .... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Faculty here are strongly interested in the academic
problems of undergraduates .................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
There is a lot of campus racial conflict here ....................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Most students are strongly committed to community service ... [ ] [ ] [ ]
My research is valued by faculty in my department ............... [ ] [ ] [ ]
My teaching is valued by faculty in my department ............ [ ] [ ] [ ]
My department does a good job of mentoring new faculty .... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making ... [ ] [ ] [ ]
My values are congruent with the dominant institutional values [ ] [ ] [ ]
There is adequate support for integrating technology
in my teaching ....................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
This institution takes responsibility for educating
underprepared students ........................................ [ ] [ ] [ ]
The criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear [ ] [ ] [ ]
Most of the students I teach lack the basic skills for
college level work .............................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
My department has difficulty recruiting faculty .............. [ ] [ ] [ ]
My department has difficulty retaining faculty ............. [ ] [ ] [ ]
There is adequate support for faculty development .......... [ ] [ ] [ ]
This institution should not offer remedial/developmental
education ......................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]

28. Indicate how important you believe
each priority listed below is
at your college or university:
(Mark one for each activity)

To promote the intellectual development of students ........ [ ] [ ] [ ]
To develop a sense of community among students
and faculty ......................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
To develop leadership ability among students ............. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To help students learn how to bring about
change in American society .................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To increase or maintain institutional prestige .............. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To hire faculty "stars" ........................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
To recruit more minority students ............................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To enhance the institution's national image .................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment .... [ ] [ ] [ ]
To mentor new faculty .......................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
To promote gender equity among faculty ................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To provide resources for faculty to engage in
community-based teaching or research .................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To create and sustain partnerships with surrounding
communities .................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
To pursue extramural funding ................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
To increase the representation of minorities in the
faculty and administration .................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
To increase the representation of women in the faculty
and administration ........................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]

29. If you were to begin your career again, would you still want
to be a college professor?
☐ Definitely yes  ☐ Not sure  ☐ Probably no
☐ Probably yes  ☐ Definitely no

30. Please indicate your agreement with each of
the following statements:
(Mark one for each item)

Western civilization and culture should be the foundation
of the undergraduate curriculum ............................ [ ] [ ] [ ]
College officials have the right to ban persons with
extreme views from speaking on campus .................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
The chief benefit of a college education is that it increases
one's earning power ............................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
Promoting diversity leads to the admission of too many
underprepared students ....................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Colleges should be actively involved in solving social
problems ........................................................ [ ] [ ] [ ]
Tenure is an outdated concept ................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Colleges should encourage students to be involved in
community service activities ................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Tenure is essential to attract the best minds to academia .... [ ] [ ] [ ]
A racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the
educational experience of all students ....................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about
changes in society .............................................. [ ] [ ] [ ]
Colleges should be concerned with facilitating
undergraduate students' spiritual development .......... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Colleges have a responsibility to work with their
surrounding communities to address local issues .......... [ ] [ ] [ ]
The spiritual dimension of faculty members' lives has no
place in the academy ......................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
Including community service as part of a course is a
poor use of resources ......................................... [ ] [ ] [ ]
31. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of stress for you during the last two years: (Mark one for each item)

- Managing household responsibilities
- Child care
- Care of elderly parent
- Poor physical health
- Health of spouse/partner
- Review/promotion process
- Subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism)
- Personal finances
- Committee work
- Faculty meetings
- Research or publishing demands
- Institutional procedures and "red tape"
- Teaching load
- Children's problems
- Marital friction
- Lack of personal time
- Keeping up with information technology
- Job security
- Being part of a dual career couple
- Self-imposed high expectations
- Change in work responsibilities
- Working with underprepared students

32. In how many of the courses that you teach do you use each of the following? (Mark one for each item)

- Class discussion
- Community service as part of coursework
- Cooperative learning (small groups)
- Essay/mid-term and/or final exams
- Extensive lecturing
- Grading on a curve
- Group projects
- Multiple-choice mid-term and/or final exams
- Multiple drafts of written work
- On-line instruction
- Readings on racial and ethnic issues
- Readings on women and gender issues
- Recitations/Demonstrations
- Reflective writing/journaling
- Short-answer mid-term and/or final exams
- Student evaluations of each other's work
- Student evaluations of instructor's work
- Student presentations
- Student-selected topics for course content
- Teaching assistants
- Term/paper research papers

33. How would you characterize your political views? (Mark one)

- Far Left
- Middle of the Road
- Conservative
- Liberal
- Far Right

34. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? (Mark one for each item)

- Salary and fringe benefits
- Opportunity for scholarly pursuits
- Teaching load
- Quality of students
- Office space
- Autonomy and independence
- Professional relationships with other faculty
- Social relationships with other faculty
- Competency of colleagues
- Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations
- Relationship with administration
- Overall job satisfaction
- Opportunity to develop new ideas
- Availability of child care at this institution
- Prospects for career advancement
- Clerical/administrative support

35. Indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following: (Mark one for each item)

- Receiving salary and fringe benefits
- Influencing the political structure
- Influencing social values
- Raising a family
- Being very well off financially
- Helping others who are in difficulty
- Involvement in programs to clean up the environment
- Developing a meaningful philosophy of life
- Helping to promote racial understanding
- Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my special field
- Integrating spiritually into my life
- Being a good citizen
- Being a good teacher
- Achieving congruence between my own values and institutional values
- Serving as a role model to students

36. Do you give the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) permission to retain your contact information for possible follow-up research? HERI will not release your identifying information and has secured a NIH Certificate of Confidentiality to protect identifiable research data from forced disclosure. [ ] Yes  [ ] No

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS: If you received additional questions, mark answers below:

37. [ ] 38. [ ] 39. [ ] 40. [ ] 41. [ ] 42. [ ] 43. [ ] 44. [ ] 45. [ ] 46. [ ] 47. [ ] 48. [ ] 49. [ ] 50. [ ] 51. [ ] 52. [ ] 53. [ ] 54. [ ] 55. [ ] 56. [ ] 57. [ ]

Please return your completed questionnaire in the postage-paid envelope to: Higher Education Research Institute, c/o Quester Data Systems, P.O. Box 6761, St. Paul, MN 55164

THANK YOU!
Appendix E

Seifert et al Survey
Spiritual Well-Being, Purpose in Life, and Student Affairs Practice Survey

Purpose
The purpose of this survey is twofold. The first aim is to gain an understanding of your personal sense of spiritual well-being and life purpose. The second objective is to inquire as to what practices you engage in as a student affairs professional. Your participation in this research study is important, but also voluntary. While we encourage you to answer every question, you may skip questions that you feel uncomfortable answering. We will keep the information you supply on this survey confidential. Thank you for your participation and contribution to this study.

Section I
The following set of statements deals with how you might feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are neither right nor wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel good when I think of what I’ve done in the past and what I hope to do in the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I live life one day at a time and don’t really think about the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I tend to focus on the present, because the future nearly always brings me problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have a sense of direction and purpose in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I don’t have a good sense of what it is I’m trying to accomplish in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I used to set goals for myself but that now seems like a waste of time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I sometime feel as if I’ve done all there is to do in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. My aims in life have been more a source of satisfaction than frustration to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6

13. I find it satisfying to think about what I have accomplished in life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6

14. In the final analysis, I’m not so sure that my life adds up to much. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6

Section II

For each of the following statements mark the choice that best indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement as it describes your personal experience. Again, please remember that there are neither right nor wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I don’t find much satisfaction in private prayer with God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I don’t know who I am, where I came from, or where I’m going.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I believe that God loves me and cares about me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I feel that life is a positive experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I believe that God is impersonal and not interested in my daily situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel unsettled about my future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have a personally meaningful relationship with God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I feel very fulfilled and satisfied with life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I don’t get much personal strength and support from my God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel a sense of well-being about the direction my life is headed in.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Used with author permission.
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I believe that God is concerned about my problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I don’t enjoy much about life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I don’t have a personally satisfying relationship with God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I feel good about my future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My relationship with God helps me not to feel lonely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I feel that life is full of conflict and unhappiness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel most fulfilled when I’m in close community with God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Life doesn’t have much meaning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My relation with God contributes to my sense of well-being.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I believe there is some real purpose for my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III: Student Affairs Practices

For each student affairs practice listed below, please indicate how often you engage in that practice with students in a typical academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do not engage in this practice</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Once a semester</th>
<th>Twice a semester</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Provide time to reflect and share during class or meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Provide time for written reflections during class or meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Incorporate service-learning into programming model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Use art, music, poetry, or film as learning tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Use and discuss values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Used with author permission.
| 6. | Discuss life purpose with students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | Create opportunities for intercultural interactions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | Use outdoor/wilderness environments as a learning tool | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. | Share relevant personal experiences during conversations with students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | Conduct ally/social justice training | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | Discuss rights and responsibilities of being a citizen of a community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. | Discuss balance with your students, in terms of self-care, stress management, conflict management, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. | Create opportunities for social/political awareness | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. | Include issues of social justice in programming model | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. | Communicate and interact with students in sincere and genuine ways | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | Seek to understand the unique individuality of each student | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. | Conduct community-building exercises | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. | Provide opportunities for community service/volunteerism | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. | Mentor students in their personal development | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. | Discuss career and future professional life with students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Section IV: Demographics**

1. Including graduate study, how many years have you worked in the student affairs profession?
   Less than a year-3 years
2. What is the highest degree you have completed?
- Associates
- Bachelors
- Masters
- Ph.D.
- Postdoctoral

3. Do you have a graduate degree in Higher Education or Student Affairs?
- No
- Yes

4. In what type of institution do you work?
- 2-Year Private/Public/Community College
- 4-Year Public college or university
- 4-Year Private college or university
- 2- or 4-year For-profit

5. Is your current institution religiously affiliated?
- No
- Yes

If answer is yes, respondent is directed to 5a.

5a. What is the religious affiliation of your institution?
- Catholic
- Jewish
- Protestant
- Evangelical
- Mormon
- Other: ________________

5b. If yes, to what degree does that affiliation influence the culture of the institution?
- No influence 1 2 3 4 5 (Strongly influences)

6. At what level are you currently working in student affairs?
- Graduate Student
- Entry Level (ex. Coordinator, Assistant Director)
- Mid Level (ex. Director/Associate Dean)
- Senior Level (ex. Dean/Vice President)

If response is graduate student, respondent is directed to 6a.

6a. Masters or Ph.D.

7. What is your primary area of responsibility?
8. What is your gender?
Male
Female
Transgender

9. What is your racial/ethnic background? Check all that apply
African American/Black
American Indian/Alaskan Native
Asian/Pacific Islander
Caucasian
Hispanic/Latino
Multiracial
Other

If respondent marks “other”, respondent is directed to
9a. Other: Write in ______________

10. What is your age?
21-25
26-30
31-35
36-40
41-45
46-50
51 or older

11. Do you identify as the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered (LGBT) community?
12. Are you involved in an organized religion?
   No
   Yes

If yes to Q12, respondents are directed to
12a. How often do you participate in religiously-affiliated activities?
   A few times per year
   Monthly
   Weekly
   Daily

13. How would you describe your religious orientation, regardless of whether you currently participate in organized religion?
   Agnostic
   Atheist
   Buddhist
   Catholic
   Evangelical
   Humanist
   Hindu
   Jehovah’s Witness
   Jewish
   Mormon
   Muslim
   Pagan
   Protestant
   Quaker
   Seventh Day Adventist
   Sikh
   Wiccan
   Other

If respondent marks “other”, respondent is directed to:
13a. Other: Write in __________________________

14. If you have any lingering thoughts or concerns that you would like to share, please do so.

Thank you for your time and effort in completing this survey. We greatly appreciate your willingness to contribute to this research study and to our understanding of student affairs professionals’ spiritual well-being, sense of life purpose, and professional practices.
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4. Explain any sampling procedure that might exclude specific populations.
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D. POTENTIAL RISKS
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   arrangements have been made for handling an emotional reaction from the subject.

   In the unlikely event that participants do feel stress or anxiety, participants will be able to 
   discontinue the survey or to pass on any of the questions or items under discussion.

3. How will data be recorded and stored?
   The data will be recorded and stored with Student Voice. Once the data collection is completed, 
   the data will be given to the researcher in an Excel spreadsheet. The researcher will store the data 
   in a locked filing cabinet in 251H Student Union and on a computer that is password protected.

   a. How will identifiers be used in study notes and other materials?
      The researcher will not have or keep a list of the individuals names who participated in 
      this survey.

   b. How will reports will be written, in aggregate terms, or will individual responses be 
      described?

      The report will be written in aggregate terms.

4. If audio or videotaping is done how will the tapes be stored and how/when will the tapes be 
   destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

   Neither audio or videotaping will be done.

5. Is there any deception of the human subjects involved in this study? If yes, please describe why it 
   is necessary and describe the debriefing procedures that have been arranged.

   There is no plan or intent for any type of deception in this study.

E. POTENTIAL BENEFITS
   This does not include any form of compensation for participation.

   1. What, if any, direct benefit is to be gained by the subject? If no direct benefit is expected, but 
      indirect benefit may be expected (knowledge may be gained that could help others), please explain.

      Participants may benefit from having the opportunity to spend time thinking about this 
      component of holistic student development, which is foundational to the work of student affairs. 
      The researcher believes that indirect benefits will result from learning more about this area of 
      student affairs practice. This study will aid students and student affairs professionals. The 
      findings from this study may be used to develop policy and training for student affairs 
      professionals.

F. COMPENSATION
   Please keep in mind that the logistics of providing compensation to your subjects (e.g., if your business 
   office requires names of subjects who received compensation) may compromise anonymity or 
   complicate confidentiality protections. If, while arranging for subject compensation, you must make
changes to the anonymity or confidentiality provisions for your research, you must contact the IRB office prior to implementing those changes.

1. Describe compensation
   There is no compensation for participating in this study.

2. Explain compensation provisions if the subject withdraws prior to completion of the study.
   n/a

3. If class credit will be given, list the amount and alternative ways to earn the same amount of credit.
   n/a

G COLLABORATORS
1. If you anticipate that additional investigators (other than those named on Cover Page) may be involved in this research, list them here indicating their institution, department and phone number.
   n/a

2. Will anyone besides the PI or the research team have access to the data (including completed surveys) from the moment they are collected until they are destroyed.
   With the exception of Student Voice staff members who have responsibility for administering the survey, the researcher and the professors on her dissertation committee will be the only individuals who have access to this data.

H. CONFLICT OF INTEREST
1. Do you have a significant financial interest or other conflict of interest in the sponsor of this project? ______
   NO

2. Does your current conflicts of interest management plan include this relationship and is it being properly followed? ______

I. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
1. If a questionnaire, survey or interview instrument is to be used, attach a copy to this proposal.
   a. The survey is attached at Appendix B.

2. Attach a copy of the informed consent form to this proposal.
   a. The consent form is attached as Appendix A.

3. Please provide any additional materials that may aid the IRB in making its decision.
   a. The email and follow up email are attached as Appendices C and D.

J. HUMAN SUBJECT ETHICS TRAINING
*Please consider taking the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI), a free, comprehensive ethics training program for researchers conducting research with human subjects. Just click on the underlined link.
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Informed Consent Form for Research
Title of Study: Spirituality as a Component of Holistic Student Development in the Practice of Student Affairs Professionals  
Principal Investigator:  
Marcia Kennard Kiessling, Doctoral Candidate  
North Carolina State University, Department of Adult and Community College Education  
mkkiessl@uncc.edu  
(704) 687 7133 (work)

What are some general things you should know about research studies?  
You are being asked to take part in a study for dissertation research that seeks to explore the relationship between spirituality and the practice of student affairs professionals. The survey will be used to collect data for my dissertation. Your participation is voluntary. You may elect to not participate or to stop participating at any time without penalty. This consent form provides specific details about the research in which you are being asked to participate.

What is the purpose of this study?  
The profession of student affairs espouses the goal of holistic student development (American Council on Education, 1949; Love, 2001; Sandeen, 2001), however, little research has been conducted regarding the spirituality of student affairs professionals or their practice in terms of integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development (Love & Talbot, 1999). Because holistic student development is foundational to the practice of student affairs, and spirituality is one component of holistic student development, it is important to address and learn more about the spirituality and practice of student affairs professionals and their degree of commitment to integrating spirituality as a component of holistic student development.

What will happen if you take part in the study?  
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an on-line survey. It is anticipated the survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Risks  
There are no anticipated risks related to participation in this focus group. If any of the questions cause anxiety or stress, the participant may choose to not answer.

Benefits  
This study will lead to a better understanding of the spirituality and integration of spirituality as a component of holistic student development into the practice of student affairs professionals. The findings from the study may be used to develop policy and training for student affairs professionals. This study is supported by the National Association of Campus Activities (NACA) Advancing Research Project. As such, the survey is being sent to NACA professional staff members.

Confidentiality  
You will not be asked to write your name on the survey. Findings will be reported in aggregate.
**Compensation**
There is no compensation for participation in this survey.

**Questions or Concerns**
If you have questions at any time following the focus group about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Marcia Kennard Kiessling at the Student Union, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, (704) 687 7133 (direct line, work).

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated while taking this survey, you may contact Deb Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/515-4514).

**Consent To Participate**

“I have read and understand the above information.

By clicking on ‘next’, you signify that you have read and accepted the conditions of this study.

(To survey link)
Appendix F.2

Title of Survey: Spirituality and the Student Affairs Profession
Title of Survey: Spirituality and the Student Affairs Profession

The purpose of this survey is to learn about spirituality and the practices of student affairs professionals. To participate in this study, you must be a student affairs professional who has earned a master’s or doctoral degree. Your participation in this survey is important, but also voluntary. All information gathered from this survey will be confidential in terms of your individual survey responses. This study is for a dissertation and is also a part of NACA’s Advancing Research Program. Thank you for participating in this study.

Section 1. Demographic and Work Environment Questions. Please indicate with a check (√) or complete the answers

1.1 Including graduate study, how many years have you worked in the student affairs profession? ____ (yrs)

1.2 What is the highest degree you have completed?
   ____ Masters  ____ Doctorate

1.3 Indicate the type of institution you work for? (Mark all that apply)
   __ Public  __4 Year
   __ Private  __2 Year

1.4 Is your current institution religiously affiliated? __ Yes __ No
   If yes:
   1.4a. What is the religious affiliation_______________________
   1.4b. Please check the number that describes the degree to which the religious affiliation influences the culture of the institution (5 indicates “strongly influences” and 1 indicates “no influence”).

   5  4  3  2  1

1.5 Was your graduate institution religiously affiliated? __ Yes __ No
   If yes:
   1.5a. What is the religious affiliation________________________
   1.5b. Please check the number that describes the degree to which the religious affiliation influenced the culture of the institution while you were a student (5 indicates “strongly influenced” and 1 indicates “no influence”).

   5  4  3  2  1

1.6 At what level are you currently working in student affairs?
Entry Level (ex. Coordinator, Assistant Director)
Mid Level (ex. Director/Associate Dean)
Senior Level (ex. Dean/Vice President)
Other _______________________ (please specify)

1.7 Please check (√) your primary area of responsibility.

__ Campus Activities
__ Other ______________________ (please specify)

1.8 Please indicate your gender.  __ Female  __ Male  __Another gender identity

1.9 What is your racial/ethnic background? Check all that apply

__ White, non-Hispanic  __ Asian/Pacific Islander
__ Black, non-Hispanic  __ Native American/Alaska Native
__ Hispanic/Latino  __ Other ______________________ (please specify)

1.10 What is your age?  _ _ (Drop down)

Section 2.
Please indicate the extent to which each of the following describes you:
(Select one number to describe each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed</th>
<th>Extremely accurate description of myself</th>
<th>Very accurate description of myself</th>
<th>Moderately accurate description of myself</th>
<th>Slightly accurate description of myself</th>
<th>Not at all an accurate description of myself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling good about the direction in which my life is headed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an interest in different religious traditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing in the goodness of all people</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being thankful for all that has happened to me</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing each day, good or bad, as a gift</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling a strong connection to all humanity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider myself a spiritual person</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking opportunities to grow spiritually</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3.
Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age. We want the most accurate estimate of how you see yourself. (Select one number to describe each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compassion</th>
<th>Highest 10%</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Lowest 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generosity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Searching for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting others as they are</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discussions about the meaning of life with my friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having discussions about the meaning of life with my colleagues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to change things that are unfair in the world</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Close friends are searching for meaning/purpose in life?</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>About half</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleagues are searching for meaning/purpose in life?</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>About half</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love is at the root of all the great religions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All life is interconnected</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are all spiritual beings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people can grow spiritually without being religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe mentoring roles that involve mentor supporting students’ searching for meaning and purpose in life are an appropriate role for student affairs professionals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping others who are in difficulty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing social values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing pain and suffering in the world</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to promote racial understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a community leader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my understanding of other countries and</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing the political structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a meaningful philosophy of life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining inner harmony</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining wisdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking beauty in my life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding answers to the mysteries of life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a more loving person</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the human condition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating spirituality into my life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 8.**

Since you became a Student Affairs professional, please indicate how often you have: (Select one number to describe each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been able to find meaning in times of hardship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt at peace/centered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 9.**

This section of questions is in reference to your graduate school experiences. Please indicate the extent to which you: (Select one number to describe each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were mentored as a graduate student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed life purpose with your mentor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were encouraged by your mentor to develop intercultural competencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared personal experiences during conversations with your mentor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed being a contributing member of your community with your mentor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated and interacted with your mentor in authentic ways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were mentored in your personal development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed career and future professional life with your mentor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed aspects of spirituality including searching for meaning and purpose in life with your mentor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received mentoring as a graduate student that prepared you for your role as a mentor to student leaders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a graduate class, workshop, or retreat on matters related to religion/spirituality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took graduate course/s that dealt with searching for meaning/purpose in life, but did not make explicit connections with spirituality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were assigned reading on religion/spirituality in a graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Took graduate courses that dealt with religious pluralism | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1  
Studied student development theory that focused on spirituality as a graduate student | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1  
Were provided time to reflect and share during graduate classes | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1  
Were provided time for written reflections during graduate class or meetings | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1  
Were exposed to community-building exercises during graduate school | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1  

### Section 10.

For each student affairs practice listed below, please indicate how often you engage in that practice with students in a typical academic year. (Select one to describe each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Twice a semester</th>
<th>Once a semester</th>
<th>Once a year</th>
<th>Do not engage in this practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide time to reflect and share during class or meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide time for written reflections during class or meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate service-learning into programming model</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use art, music, poetry, or film as learning tools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and discuss values clarification exercises</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss life purpose with students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for students to develop intercultural competencies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use outdoor/wilderness environments as a learning tool</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share personal experiences during conversations with students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct ally/social justice training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss being a contributing member of a community with students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss balance with your students, in terms of self-care, stress management, conflict management, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities for social/political awareness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include issues of social justice in programming model</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate and interact with students in authentic ways</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek to understand the unique individuality of each student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct community-building exercises</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for community service/volunteerism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor students in their personal development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss career and future professional life with students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a mentor for student leaders in your current position</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 11.
Please indicate the importance to you as a student affairs professional of each of the following education goals for undergraduate students: (Select one letter to describe each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop students' moral character</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for students' emotional development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students develop personal values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance students' self-understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance students' spiritual development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate students' search for meaning/purpose in life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any additional thoughts or concerns for future research ideas that you would like to share, please do so below.

Thank you for your time and effort in completing this survey.
Appendix F.3

Initial E-mail
Subject Line: Spirituality and Student Affairs Practice Survey

As a member of the National Association for Campus Activities, you are being asked to participate in a research study that is a part of NACA’s Advancing Research Program. Thank you, in advance, for participating in this survey, which is being conducted with approval from the Institutional Review Board from North Carolina State University in Raleigh, North Carolina.

The section below describes the study and process. At the end of the section, you will be given the opportunity to select “next” and in so doing, indicate your willingness to participate in the study. When you select “next” you will be taken to a link where you will be able to access the survey, which is being administered by StudentVoice.

My name is Marcia Kennard Kiessling and I am the investigator. The project is part of my dissertation study and I thank you for your participation. Some of the survey items were derived from Seifert and Harmon’s (2009) survey titled: Student Affairs Practices, and the Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA surveys titled: 2004-05 Faculty Survey, and 2007 College Students’ Beliefs and Values Follow-up Survey. These scales are used with permission.

Then: to Appendix A.
Appendix F.4

Follow up Email to be Sent One Week Following Initial Email
Subject Line: Follow-up Request: NACA Advancing Research Project on Spirituality and Student Affairs Practice

Approximately one week ago, you should have received an email requesting your participation in a research study. I am writing to ask you again to consider becoming a part of this study by responding to the survey, which will take you approximately 10 – 15 minutes to complete. This research has been approved as a part of the NACA Advancing Research Program and will be administered through a link with StudentVoice.

Below, you will see the informed consent paperwork, required by the Institutional Review Board of North Carolina State University to conduct this study. At the end of the section, you have the opportunity to click on “next”, which indicates that you have reviewed and are willing to be forwarded to the link in order to take the survey.

It is critical to have a large enough sample for this research to be viable and therefore, I request and truly appreciate your participation. Thank you, in advance, for sharing your perspectives on this study.

Some of the survey items were derived from Seifert and Harmon’s (2009) survey titled: Student Affairs Practices, and the Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA surveys titled: 2004-05 Faculty Survey, and 2007 College Students’ Beliefs and Values Follow-up Survey. These scales are used with permission.
Appendix F.5

Research Proposal Approval Exemption Letter
From: Debra Paxton, IRB Administrator
North Carolina State University
Institutional Review Board

Date: October 16, 2009

Project Title: Spirituality as a Component of Holistic Student Development in the Practice of Student Affairs Professionals

IRB#: 1144-09-10

Dear Ms. Kiessling,

The research proposal named above has received administrative review and has been approved as exempt from the policy as outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations (Exemption: 46.101. b.2). Provided that the only participation of the subjects is as described in the proposal narrative, this project is exempt from further review.

NOTE:

1. This committee complies with requirements found in Title 45 part 46 of The Code of Federal Regulations. For NCSU projects, the Assurance Number is: FWA00003429

2. Any changes to the research must be submitted and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

3. If any unanticipated problems occur, they must be reported to the IRB office within 5 business days.

Please provide your faculty advisor with a copy of this letter. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debra Paxton
NCSU IRB
Appendix G

Portion of Updated IRB Form
North Carolina State University
Institutional Review Board for the Use of Human Subjects in Research
Submission for New Studies

GENERAL INFORMATION

14. Date Submitted: 10/30/2009
1a. Revised Date: ______

15. Title of Project: Spirituality as a Component of Holistic Student Development in the Practice of Student Affairs Professionals

16. Principal Investigator: Marcia Kennard Kiessling
17. Department: Adult and Community College Education/Charlotte cohort
18. Campus Box Number: n/a
19. Email: pkkiessling@carolina.rr.com (home) mkkiessl@uncc.edu (work)
20. Phone Number: (704) 687 7133 (work)
21. Fax Number: (704) 687 7648 (work)
22. Faculty Sponsor Name and Email Address if Student Submission: Dr. Alyssa Bryant
alyssa_bryant@ncsu.edu

23. Source of Funding? (required information): personal funds
24. Is this research receiving federal funding?: no
25. If Externally funded, include sponsor name and university account number: n/a

26. RANK:
   □ Faculty
   ☑ Student: □ Undergraduate; □ Masters; or □ PhD
   ☑ Other (specify): Ed.D.

As the principal investigator, my signature testifies that I have read and understood the University Policy and Procedures for the Use of Human Subjects in Research. I assure the Committee that all procedures performed under this project will be conducted exactly as outlined in the Proposal Narrative and that any modification to this protocol will be submitted to the Committee in the form of an amendment for its approval prior to implementation.

Principal Investigator:

Marcia Kennard Kiessling ................................. * 10/02/09
(typed/printed name) (signature) (date)

As the faculty sponsor, my signature testifies that I have reviewed this application thoroughly and will oversee the research in its entirety. I hereby acknowledge my role as the principal investigator of record.

Faculty Sponsor:

Dr. Alyssa Bryant ........................................ *
(typed/printed name) (signature) (date)

*Electronic submissions to the IRB are considered signed via an electronic signature. For student submissions this means that the faculty sponsor has reviewed the proposal prior to it being submitted and is copied on the submission.
Please complete this application and email as an attachment to: debra_paxton@ncsu.edu or send by mail to: Institutional Review Board, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (Administrative Services III). Please include consent forms and other study documents with your application and submit as one document.

G. COMPENSATION

Please keep in mind that the logistics of providing compensation to your subjects (e.g., if your business office requires names of subjects who received compensation) may compromise anonymity or complicate confidentiality protections. If, while arranging for subject compensation, you must make changes to the anonymity or confidentiality provisions for your research, you must contact the IRB office prior to implementing those changes.

4. Describe compensation
   Participants may elect to be entered in a drawing for a $25 Amazon gift card.

5. Explain compensation provisions if the subject withdraws prior to completion of the study.
   n/a

6. If class credit will be given, list the amount and alternative ways to earn the same amount of credit.
   n/a