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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to understand the organizational functions of student-affairs at Indiana University and to understand the nature of the conflict between student-affairs and the larger organization. This study utilized the case-study research design. Much of the data collected and analyzed during this case study were of a historical nature. Both primary and secondary sources were utilized. The conceptual framework that informed this study and that this study served to advance is drawn from classic organization theory, specifically contingency theory, which argues that there is no one best way to organize (Galbraith, 1973; Parsons, 1960; Scott, 2003; Thompson, 2004;).

The study sought to answer two primary questions:

1. What is the nature of the conflict between student-affairs and the organization?
2. What are the organizational functions of student-affairs at Indiana University?

Student-affairs at Indiana University emerged as a set of managerial activities in response to various conflicts and environmental demands over time. These activities emerged to provide four key functions for the organization: To privatize conflict, to maintain, to buffer the technical activities from environmental influences, and to provide symbolic reassurance to the cultural environment. Student-affairs functions emerged at Indiana University as responses to various environmental demands. The function of student-affairs was historically to engage in the managerial activities of privatizing conflict, buffering the institution’s technical activities, providing symbolic reassurance to the cultural environment, and securing legitimacy in the institutional environment through various isomorphic activities.
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Statement of the Problem

This study is the result of my own professional frustration with Indiana University and what I perceived to be the dearth of support it provided to student-affairs functions as they sought to align with the academic mission of the institution. I believed the institution was behaving in a manner that was illogical and that marginalized student-affairs functions and the professionals who carried out these functions.

Purposes

The purpose of this study was three-fold. First, as a scholar practitioner, I sought to use this study as a mechanism for informing my ability to provide effective leadership and decision-making in student-affairs. Second, I sought to use this study as a mechanism for understanding the logic of a system, in this case, Indiana University. In doing so, I sought to advance professional knowledge in student-affairs and academic knowledge in both higher education and organizational theory. Last, I sought to use this study as a mechanism to develop myself as an individual, as a professional and as a scholar.

Conceptual Framework

To build an appropriate conceptual framework for this study, I drew largely from political science literature pertaining to conflict (Schattschneider, 1983) and political symbolism (Edelman, 1967) organizational theory literature pertaining to contingency theory (Galbraith, 1973; Parsons, 1960; Scott, 2003; Thompson, 1967).

Research Tradition

The research paradigm applied during this study is best described as constructivist or interpretive, which seeks to subjectively understand the construction of reality by interacting
with a phenomenon socially and/or historically (Crotty, 1998). I believe the social world exists to be understood. I also believe that understanding the nature of reality in an organization is a prerequisite to being able to lead an organization or to effect change in it. From the constructivist/interpretive perspective, accurate understanding and explanation is the primary goal. As such, accurate understanding and explanation of the phenomenon were my primary intentions during this study.

**Research Methods**

**Unit of Analysis.** To specify the unit of analysis, I utilized the concept of the organizational set (Blau & Scott, 1962; Evan, 1966) as a means of understanding Indiana University and its interactions with various environments. Scott (2003) states that the organizational set approach “views the environment from the standpoint of a specific (focal) organization” (p. 126).

**Case Study.** This study utilized the case-study research design. The case-study design prescribes that the researcher investigates a phenomenon during a given period of time (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1989).

**Data Collection.** Much of the data collected and analyzed during this case-study was of a historical nature. “Historical analysis is…a method of discovering, from records and accounts, what happened in the past” (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 89). Both primary and secondary sources were utilized. Primary sources included reports, letters, podcasts of interviews and various other documents collected from the Indiana University archives, archival websites and from Division of Student Affairs files. When possible, I photocopied documents for additional analysis. When it was not possible to photocopy a document, I analyzed the document, making detailed notes to be analyzed further. Secondary sources
included various historical works that explored Indiana University, higher education, the State of Indiana, religious denominations, etc. As I explored these texts, I made descriptive notes and recorded initial observations.

**Data Analysis.** During this study, the process of data analysis was not a task that was performed independent of the process of data collection. As Coffey and Atkinson (1996) stated, “We should never collect data without substantial analysis going on simultaneously” (p. 2). As such, the phases in the data-analysis process were ongoing and repeated rather than systematic and chronological. The first phase of data analysis required that I familiarize myself with the data. The second phase required me to organize the data. The third phase of data analysis required me to generate categories, themes and patterns from notes and data (Marshall & Rossman, 1995) and group them accordingly. The final phase of data analysis required me to utilize the aforementioned conceptual framework to make sense of the categories, themes and patterns that emerged from the data.

**Significance of the Study**

This study is significant because of its focus on the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. Indiana University one of the largest public institutions in the United States and is commonly associated with early developments in both the study of and administration of student-affairs. As such, understanding the historical antecedents to the both the institution’s development and student-affairs’ development will provide a window through which to view the development of student-affairs organizations on other campuses as well as the development of student-affairs functions generally. Additionally, this study is significant because it has the capacity to initiate a new conversation in the study of student-affairs. Much of the extant student-affairs literature focuses on individual college
student growth and development. While emerging student-affairs literature provides a
glimpse into the various organizational structures of student-affairs, there is relatively little
that assists student-affairs professionals in understanding the nature of the development of a
student-affairs organization from the perspective of conflict.

Definitions of Relevant Terms

Listed below are a number of frequently applied terms that will assist the reader in
understanding the context and intent of various statements. These definitions are offered for
the purpose of this study only and are not intended to serve any purpose beyond that.

Conflict. Conflict serves as a major organizing concept for this study. For the
purposes of this study, conflict is conceived as a mismatch between values, structures,
purposes or people. From this perspective, shifting tectonic plates would be a more useful
metaphor for conflict than would be a war or a cage fight.

Cultural Environment. The cultural environment is composed of the values and
beliefs of the environment that are associated with the organization’s right to exist. In the
case of Indiana University, the cultural environment is and has been composed primarily of
the people of the state of Indiana. Often combined with the institutional environment in the
literature, this study builds on previous work (Muwonge, 2012) to begin to distinguish the
cultural environment as a separate environment informed by different elements, which
combine to exert unique pressures on the institution.

Indiana University. This is the general term used to refer to the entity that has been
known as the Indiana Seminary, Indiana College, Indiana University and Indiana University
Bloomington. It is also frequently referred to as the institution and the university during the
narrative that follows.
Institutional Activities. Institutional activities are concerned with mediation between the technical level and the various (cultural and institutional) environments (Thompson, 1967). These are the activities that secure an organization’s legitimacy (Scott, 2003) and its right to exist through alignment with the institutional and cultural environments.

Institutional Environment. Where the task environment represents an organization’s ability to exist, the institutional environment represents an organization’s right to exist or its source of legitimacy. “Organizations receive support and legitimacy to the extent that they conform to contemporary norms – as determined by professional and scientific authorities – concerning the ‘appropriate’ way to organize” (Scott, 2003, p.137). Values, regulations (codified values) and culture are all components of the institutional environment. The institutional environment is relatively resistant to change (Jepperson, 1991) and is maintained and reproduced throughout generations (Zucker, 1977). At Indiana University Bloomington, the institutional environment is composed of various external entities (AAU, NCAA, accrediting agencies, state policies, etc.) that inform the university’s isomorphism with other universities and that prescribe its relationship with the state of Indiana.

Managerial Activities. Managerial activities are those spanning the boundary between technical activities and the task environment (Thompson, 1967). It is the function of these activities to secure resources (human, physical and capital) for the production of outputs, thus providing the institution with its ability to exist. At Indiana University, managerial activities consist of a number of administrative and maintenance functions, including those associated with student-affairs.

Student Affairs. This is the general term used to refer to various non-academic activities, processes and services. Often referred to as student-affairs functions in this
document, Student Affairs is also the name of a suborganizational unit at Indiana University that has also been referred to as the division of student affairs, division of student personnel, division of campus life and the dean of students office. In this narrative, this unit is referred to generically as the student-affairs division.

**Task Environment.** Also known as the resource environment, Dill (1958) defines the task environment as being composed of those facets of the environment that are “potentially relevant to goal setting and goal attainment” (p. 410). The features of the environment that compose the task environment are those that provide sources for inputs into an organization, markets for the outputs of an organization and that organization’s competitors and regulators (Scott, 2003). Managing the task environment helps to secure an organization’s ability to exist.

**Technical Activities.** Technical activities are those associated with the transformation of organizational inputs into organizational outputs. At Indiana University, the academic faculty exists at this level, imparting some type of knowledge among students (inputs) entering the institution and thus working with the inputs to create a particular product upon that input’s exit or graduation from the institution. Additionally, Indiana University’s technical activities are concerned with the creation of knowledge through research activities.

**Organization of the Document**

Chapter 1 serves as the introductory chapter, outlining the problem statement, the study’s purpose and its conduct. Additionally, chapter 1 includes a glossary of frequently applied terms that will assist the reader in understanding the context and intent of various statements included in this study. Chapter 2 offers a review of literature pertaining to the
emergence of the student-affairs profession and its formalization. Additionally included is brief mention of literature pertaining to student-affairs organizing structures and philosophies. In addition to student-affairs literature, Chapter 2 offers a review of the literature used to build the conceptual framework employed during this study. Chapter 3 includes a narrative that outlines the basic assumptions I carried into this study in addition to reflections on ethical conduct, research methodology, validity of the study and its limitations. The data gathered during this study are included in Chapter 4. Each section is summarized individually and do not necessarily flow chronologically. The document concludes with Chapter 5, which provides a summary of the findings, as well as conclusions, implications and recommendations for further study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Student Affairs Literature

Because of this study’s focus on the development of student-affairs at Indiana University, it was necessary to familiarize myself with the literature pertaining to the history of the emergence of student-affairs as a profession. This body of literature served the dual purpose of establishing a basis of professional knowledge related to student-affairs while simultaneously serving as a barometer for the validity of information I encountered as I studied Indiana University specifically. Second, it was necessary for me to develop an awareness of the literature that provided an account of the various organizing philosophies of student-affairs structures. Understanding which student-affairs structures have emerged and how scholars have described them served as a useful guide as I sought to discover, describe, and explain the factors leading to the emergence of student-affairs structures at Indiana University.

Emergence of Student Affairs as a Profession. The genesis of higher education in America can be traced to the 1636 founding of Harvard University. Between the date of Harvard’s founding and the commencement of the American Revolution, eight other colonial colleges were founded. The dual purpose of each of these institutions was to prepare leaders for our young nation and to train men as ministers of the gospel to ensure moral fortitude and righteous living among its citizenry (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Lucas, 1994; Rudolph, F. 1962).

During colonial times, college presidents and professors assumed the strict, authoritarian regulation of every facet of a student’s life on campus. This method of regulation is commonly referenced as in loco parentis, which literally means “in place of the
parent.” Due in part to the relative youth of college students during this period (Rudolph, F. 1962), parents sent their progeny off to college with the reassurance that students would be attentively supervised and well-disciplined by faculty (Lucas, 1994).

By the end of the Revolutionary War, college students were increasingly intent on identifying activities that would serve to combat the rigid structure and strict disciplinary standards of the colonial college. The first such developments were in the form of student literary and debate societies (Geiger, 2000). Students’ appetites for casual stimulation outside the confines of the formal curriculum increased with each passing year. Greek-letter organizations materialized on college campuses during the early to mid 1800s, much to the chagrin of college officials (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Lucas, 1994; Rudolph, F., 1962) who were said to have spoken of these organizations as if they were “evil” and “of the devil” (Lucas, 1994, p. 131). Intramural sports clubs also emerged on campus in the early 1800s setting the stage for the ascendance of intercollegiate athletics during the middle part of the century. None of these activities was associated with the formal curriculum, and hence they were therefore considered to be extracurricular in nature. At that time, there was no additional attention paid to these activities in the form of specialized staff who provided supervision or additional services.

During the years following the Civil War, it was increasingly difficult for university presidents and faculty members to fulfill their expected responsibilities related to providing expected structure and discipline for college students (Caple, 1998). On-campus residence began to wane as views among college presidents liberalized with regard to student control (Gibson, 1964). One result of the decrease in students living on campus was an associated increase in the number of students living in fraternity and sorority houses. It was also during
this time when faculty began to shift their primary focus from classroom instruction to research activities. Also adding to the changing dynamics was the influx of female students as a result of decreased male population (Lucas, 1994) and from an increased demand for teachers. Though the presence of women on campus was far from being universally celebrated (Nidiffer, 2000), their arrival on campus coupled with the aforementioned events served as factors that led to the first student-affairs professionals being appointed to fulfill the various non-academic tasks related to the student experience outside the classroom (Leonard, 1956; Rudolph, F. 1962).

During the first several decades, such functions were specifically assigned to specialized staff members, who were initially primarily responsible for responding to disciplinary matters (ACE, 1937), but were soon charged with other non-academic tasks such as admissions, registration, record-keeping, and matters related to student health (Leonard, 1956; Rudolph, F., 1962). The emergence of an elective curriculum (Rudolph, F., 1962) created the additional demand for more extensive academic-advising services for students; tasks that did not interest members of the faculty.

The waning years of the 1880s saw the emergence of the dean of men on college campuses. The purpose of this new role was to provide assistance to students outside the classroom, to provide structure for immature students, and to relieve some of the growing administrative burden caused by housing and other student services necessary to serve a growing student population (Dinniman, 1977). This designation of responsibilities for student-affairs-related tasks at Harvard in the late 1800s suggests theirs as one of the first known student-affairs positions (Caple, 1998).
Deans of Women also became prominent on campus following the Civil War and during the early years of the 20th century as the number of female students increased and as issues related to their presence on campus emerged. The introduction of Dean of Women positions to campuses was the impetus for the gradual movement of student-affairs staffers toward professionalism (Nidiffer, 2000). The Conference of Deans and Advisors of Women in State Universities met as early as 1903 (Nidiffer) and the Conference of Deans and Advisors of Men (which later became NASPA) met for the first time in 1919 (Nuss, 2003). Appleton, Briggs, and Rhatigan (1978) state that it was a combination of the dean of men, dean of women, and the personnel worker positions that ultimately served as the sources for the student-affairs profession. Appleton, Briggs, and Rhatigan observed: “the early deans’ position emerged as they worked…the field developed from the campus up, not from the theory down” (p. 14). This is to suggest that the student-affairs profession did not develop from a philosophical purpose, a long-term vision, or well-articulated organizational plans but instead was developed according to what was necessary for a campus to address at the time. This sentiment was certainly affirmed during the course of this study.

In 1907 President Woodrow Wilson, who was then serving as the President of Princeton University, made a case for the combination of academic activities with those which were occurring outside the classroom, stating that “The only way in which the social life of the undergraduates can be prevented from fatally disordering, and perhaps even strangling the academic life of the University is by the actual absorption of the social life into the academic” (Norris, 1917, p. 249). Brubacher and Rudy (1976) state that “…in the years following 1918 the student-personnel movement gained national recognition and professional
stature; it was becoming self-conscious, confident and widely influential” (p. 336). In contrast, others argued that the profession was not viewed with a high degree of admiration.

Even during the early years of its development, the student-affairs profession was not held in high esteem on college campuses. Early professionals were not integral players in the university decision-making apparatus. Referring to the relative level of prominence of early student-affairs professionals on campus, Hirt (2006) states that “The focus on intellectual development of students left them operating in a state of benign neglect” (p. 7). In reference to the early days of the student-affairs profession, Caple (1998) said of the student-affairs profession: “…it was expected to be seen and not heard by the rest of higher education” (p. 47). While some of this perceived marginalization relative to the academic community eroded over time, this “less than” view of the student-affairs profession persists in higher-education conversations today and served as a motivating factor for this study. Several contemporary scholars have written about this dynamic (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978; Fenske, 1980; Penney, 1972). Kuh, Whitt, and Shedd (1987) state that

The worth and status of student-affairs are judged within the framework of the conventional positivist belief system, a dualistic view that values cognition rather than affect, facts rather than values, academic pursuit rather than nonacademic; positivism precludes equal partnership in the academy for student-affairs. (p. 34)

This suggests that the very design of the student-affairs structures relative to their associated academic enterprises ensures that the student-affairs profession is destined to remain separate and unequal in the academic universe.
Student Affairs Units Formalized. The first formalized student-affairs organizations began to emerge after World War I (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). During the 1920s, functions such as career-placement services, student-health services and psychological services began to emerge on college campuses (Nuss, 2003). However, the years following World War II was the time when the student-affairs profession came into its own (Hirt, 2006, p. 7). Nuss offers a variety of reasons for this period of growth and development, including: “…increased federal support and involvement in higher education, landmark legal challenges resulting in the end of in loco parentis and changing relationships between students and institutions, the beginning of student-development research and theory, and the development of professional standards” (p. 32). Additionally, the introduction of the G.I. Bill in 1944 and its associated influx of veteran students to campuses affected higher education to a great extent. The psychological needs of veterans arriving on college campuses began to indicate a need for counseling functions, which were formerly associated with student personnel functions, to move toward a higher degree of specialization (Caple, 1998). “As counseling sought a clearer definition of its role by greater specialization and identity with an academic discipline, college student personnel continued in the progressive spirit to broaden and expand its role but with great uncertainty about where it was leading and what it should mean” (p. 84).

The 1960s ushered in significant changes in the student-affairs profession that were parallel to changes occurring elsewhere in higher education. To this point, the roles of personnel deans were generally understood to focus on “keeping the order on campus” (Caple, 1998; p. 111). It was during this time, however, that the role of the dean as an enforcer of in loco parentis began its decline (Caple, 1998) as a new era of rights and
responsibilities began to emerge (Nuss, 2003). The separation of the functions of Dean of Men and Dean of Women also began to dissipate during the 1960s (Manning, Kinzie & Schuh, 2006) as was the case at Indiana University. Professors who were no longer interested in advising duties or in responsibilities related to student behavior embraced the emergence of student-affairs professionals on campus (Sandeen, 2001). Faculty members were glad to shift the responsibility for dealing with non-academic issues to another entity. During the 1960s, student-affairs professional organizations also began to grow in prominence while the amount and quality of specific student-affairs research and scholarship increased. Student-affairs emerged as a “real” profession during this time. It would soon seek to legitimize itself as such in the academic environment.

Caple (1998) states that beginning in the 1970s, “College student-affairs entered a new stage in its symbiotic relationship with higher education” (p. 187). As higher education’s role in society changed, so too did the role of student-affairs, which had incidentally revised its self-identification from “college student personnel” to “college student-affairs.” Thelin (2011) termed the 1970s and 1980s as “an era of adjustment and accountability” in higher education (p. 16) due to an increased federal presence in decisions related to a number of issues. Likewise, Levine (2004) pointed out that higher education was now being treated in a manner that was in line with the way the federal government tends to treat a mature industry as opposed to the way it treats a growth industry. Levine further stated that colleges and universities had not yet been successful in responding to this new level of scrutiny (p. 32).

**Organization of Student Affairs.** There have been numerous efforts to describe models of academic organization (Baldridge, 1971; Berquist & Pawlak, 2008; Bess & Dee,
2008a, 2008b; Birnbaum, 1988; Cohen & March, 1974; Millett, 1962; Stroup, 1966). As Kuk, Banning and Amey (2010) point out in their comprehensive treatment of student-affairs through an organizational lens, most higher education analyses have stopped short of providing a thorough treatment of student-affairs from an organizational perspective. Kuk, Banning and Amey further point out that such analysis is important for the profession:

At the same time, student-affairs units are part of a greater institutional system and operate as an organization within an organization. These units are managed, influenced, and at times controlled by the greater organization. The conflicts between and among cultures and the misunderstandings that arise create organizational tensions that are likely to contribute to some of the unique features of organizational behavior in student-affairs. As a result, these rather unique organizational dimensions provide an important and often neglected area of organizational study. (p. 10)

Their work invites scholars to view student-affairs from an organizational perspective as a mechanism for achieving organizational effectiveness. This serves to underscore the importance and purpose of the present study.

In terms of the organization of student-affairs functions, March and Simon (1958) remind us that there is no one right way to organize, and in fact, there is disagreement even among organizational theorists as to the most effective organizational structures. For instance, university housing is typically a unit organized either in the student-affairs division or in a number of other units (Upcraft, 1993). Additionally, as Manning, Kinzie and Schuh (2006) point out, other units including enrollment management, campus recreation,
intercollegiate athletics and international programs are commonly located in student-affairs divisions, but are just as often found in other administrative divisions (p. 5).

Manning, Kinzie and Schuh (2006) present a comprehensive effort to classify different models of student-affairs organizations. Their study offers 11 unique models for the organization of student-affairs entities. The so-called “traditional” models were developed through a review of student-affairs literature while the models classified as “innovative” were a product of a comprehensive research project that examined high-performing student-affairs units. These models present various degrees of organizational coupling (Cyert & March, 1963; Weick, 1976) within student-affairs organizations and also between student-affairs organizations and the larger organizations within which they are situated. While this framework falls short of offering a precise classification for the structures and functions of every possible student-affairs unit, it presents a set of concepts that is useful in understanding the administration of student-affairs functions and their various formal incarnations.

Discussion of the formal organization of student-affairs units began with the 1937 Student Personnel Point of View (ACE, 1937) and the 1949 Student Personnel Point of View (ACE, 1949), which are considered to be the foundational documents of the student-affairs profession (Hirt, 2006; Manning, Kinzie & Schuh, 2006; Nuss, 2003). The 1937 document articulated a context, a philosophy and label for what was initially known as the “student personnel” profession. Additionally, it outlined the scope and functions of the profession but stopped short of recommending an ideal organizational structure stating instead that while student personnel (student-affairs) work ought to be coordinated, formal structure was not necessary. In addition to updates concerning student growth and development and essential elements of a student-personnel program, the 1949 revision of the Student-Personnel Point of
View (ACE) recommended a formal administrative structure for student personnel units characterized by a number of generalizations:

1. Everyone on campus (from students to the president) is involved in the student-personnel program. Campus resources are interrelated.

2. The administrative structure should allow for the organization of specialized functions.

3. Process and administrative structures should be given equal attention.

4. Both students and student affairs staff should be provided access to the policy-making mechanism.

5. Both men and women should work in all student affairs departments.

6. A significant amount of time should be devoted to program evaluation.

7. Effectiveness in student affairs is partially determined by institutional setting (pp. 17-35).

Mueller (1961) advocated for a structure that would “reach the largest number of students directly” (p. 143). To this end, she believed it was necessary to reach a balance between centralization and decentralization of various functions. While some functions such as activities, student government, discipline, and records would be housed in the personnel division, other functions such as orientation, housing, student health, and admissions were organized into other divisions. The student-personnel administrators worked very closely with these functions but did not have responsibility for them (p. 139). Chandler (1986) furthered the case for formal organization of student-affairs structures by asserting that it ought to be “one of the major components of the university organization” (p. 338) and that the leader of the student-affairs division should be a vice president.
Manning, Kinzie and Schuh (2006) offered that over the years there had emerged “at least three different approaches to student affairs work that also affect the organization of student affairs…” (p. 13). Blimling and Whitt (1998) echo this notion, and Evans and Reason (2001) articulate similar categories for the functions of student-affairs work based on an analysis of foundational student-affairs documents. These three approaches have been labeled: student services, student development, and student learning (Manning, Kinzie & Schuh, 2006):

1. Student Services – This approach is a bit of an a’ la carte version of student-affairs. It contains a number of loosely coordinated services that students may choose to utilize as needed. It could be argued, “…that they could be scattered around the administrative landscape without much effect on their performance.

2. Student Development – This approach is necessarily likely to be organized into a division of student-affairs. The units contained in such a model “…work together to provide a coherent, cohesive, out-of-class learning experience for students.”

3. Student Learning – This approach is comprehensive and ranges from the admissions phase throughout a student’s time on campus. Student-affairs staff and faculty have a shared responsibility for student learning. Programs are designed to further student learning.

Many have offered criticism for the various conceptions of student-affairs organizations. Most notably, Bloland, Stamatakos and Rogers (1994) offered a critique of the student development perspective related to student-affairs practice. They believed this view made an unnecessary distinction between classroom learning and outside the classroom learning.

Further, they indicated a concern that such a view would hasten the philosophical movement
of student-affairs further from the academic core of the higher education. There were others who criticized the student-services approach:

Most student affairs staff are motivated by a desire to help, support, and educate students, not just to offer services to customers. The student services approach did not ring true for these staff members, who saw themselves as educators, not as service providers. Further, curricula in student-affairs graduate programs tend to emphasize student development theory, counseling, and the philosophical foundations of student affairs, not principles of management. And like the student development approach, a student-services orientation reinforced the position of student-affairs work as marginal to the central mission of higher education—teaching and learning. (Blimling & Whitt, 1998, p. 12)

Scholars believed that “Student affairs organizations are dynamic, not static, and should be flexible and responsive to the changing needs of both students and the institution. Even though a current administrative arrangement may be comfortable to the staff, student affairs leaders should not assume that any given structure is permanent” (Sandeen, 2001, p. 203). Clearly, student-affairs organizations evolve, change, and respond for a number of reasons. As such, a number of various configurations for structuring student-affairs divisions have developed during the past several decades.

**Conceptual Literature**

In addition to the literature specifically exploring the history and organization of student-affairs, it was necessary to familiarize myself with literature that provided a conceptual framework for understanding the emergence of student-affairs at Indiana
University. Though political and organizational literature are not commonly employed as frameworks for understanding the student-affairs profession, I found their thorough exploration to be fundamental in developing a unique perspective regarding a phenomenon that is often limited to inquiry via psychological, historical or cognitive frameworks.

**Political Concepts.** This study draws largely from a political framework as a mechanism for viewing the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. Bolman and Deal (2003) refer to the political frame as one that “…views organizations as living, screaming political arenas that host a complex web of individual and group interests” (p. 186). Two bodies of political literature were useful for building the conceptual framework mobilized during the course of this study: literature related to political conflict and literature related to political symbols.

**Political Conflict.** There are multiple conceptions of conflict. Scholars have described it as a dysfunctional phenomenon (Lundberg, 1939), an illness (Parsons, 1949), and a unifying element (Coser, 1956), among others. Schattschneider’s (1983) perspective pertaining to conflict largely informed my understanding of the concept during this study.

Citing examples of both physical violence such as fighting and symbolic conflicts such as political campaigns, town meetings, labor strikes, trials, and other such events, Schattschneider (1983) describes political conflict by drawing heavily from the metaphor of a fight. As he quickly points out, “Nothing attracts a crowd so quickly as a fight” (p. 1). It is for this reason that much of the development of student-affairs functions at Indiana University can be linked to various conflicts or “fights.” Conflict is so inherent in the organization that it was accepted as the norm. There is no evidence that conflict was ever
considered to be a major causal factor in the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University.

Schattschneider (1983) identifies the two parts inherent in any fight: The first being the individuals who are actively engaged in the fight (or conflict), and the other being the audience. Schattschneider (1983) offers that the outcome of a conflict depends on its scope. Conflict is not static in that each change in its scope is likely to play a decisive factor in the ultimate outcome. Scope has to do with numbers and positions of participants in the conflict; therefore, each addition or subtraction of participants changes the balance of the forces involved in it. The main point of this is to say that “If a fight starts, watch the crowd, because the crowd plays the decisive role” (p. 3).

The identities of the participants and the identities of the crowd take on immense importance in an analysis of conflict because “…nearly all theories about politics have something to do with the question of who can get into the fight and who is to be excluded” (p. 20). Schattschneider (1983) also mentions the “…longstanding struggle between the conflicting tendencies toward the privatization and socialization of conflict” (p. 7) as mechanisms for either controlling a conflict through exclusion or containment or inviting new participants into it by making the conflict known or by using language to determine the terms of a conflict such that the audience becomes invested in it.

“What happens in politics depends on the way in which people are divided into factions, parties, groups, classes, etc.” (Schattschneider, 1983, p. 60). There are a number of ways in which any conflict can be divided and defined (see Figure 1). Further, over time, conflicts are likely to change or be redefined, which causes those who are involved to choose
among new conflicts (Schattschneider, 1983, p. 60). This redefinition of conflicts pertaining to Indiana University was a key finding during this particular study.

![Figure 1. Political Conflict.](image)

In addition to understanding the dynamics of conflict, it is also worth noting that conflict as a force has a great deal of utility in the development and maintenance of an organization. Iannaccone and Lutz (1970) propose that periodic conflict serves as a primary means through which democratic control is maintained. Such conflict is a result of divergent interests and is quelled by realignment (or symbolic realignment) with the dominant values of the audience or environment.

**Political Symbols.** Meaning is constructed and reinforced through the use of symbols and symbolic language. Speaking of the assumptions of the symbolic frame, Bolman and Deal (2003) offer that what happens in an organization is less important than what organizational events mean to observers. Bolman and Deal (2003) further point out that “In the face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction and anchor hope and faith” (p. 242). Morgan (2006) speaks of the use of theater, gamesmanship and imagery to define the reality of observers. Pfeffer (1992) further emphasizes the role of political language, symbols,
ceremonies, and settings in exercising influence. Edelman (1967) points out that people are more likely to respond to symbols than they are to respond to facts. As such, symbols are often deployed as a tactic for achieving some end that facts, in and of themselves, might be unable to achieve alone: “The highlighting of evocative political symbols is likely to confuse assumptions and beliefs about facts, values and blame and to do so in a way that maintains support for the status quo” (Edelman, 2001, p. 95). In addition to the use of political symbols toward an end, they are also evoked to define the reality of participants and are quite effective at doing so because of their ability to communicate meaning in a way that facts are not often able to achieve:

Symbols become that facet of experiencing the material world that gives it a specific meaning. The language, rituals, and objects to which people respond are not abstract ideas. If they matter at all, it is because they are accepted as basic to the quality of life. (Edelman, 1988, p. 8)

While such language concerning political symbols might errantly lead one to believe they are something other than tactics or metaphors for ideas and beliefs, Edelman (1967) reminds us:

This is not to suggest that signs or symbols in themselves have any magical force as narcotics. They are, rather, the only means by which groups not in a position to analyze a complex situation rationally may adjust themselves to it, through stereotypization, oversimplification and reassurance. (p. 40)

One of the most useful applications for political symbols is toward the purpose of reassurance in the face of actual or perceived threats. Bolman and Deal (2003) describe the symbolic frame as one that “…views structures and processes as secular theater – drama that
expresses our fears, joys, and expectations. Drama arouses emotions and kindles our spirit. It reduces uncertainty and soothes bewilderment” (p. 271). Edelman (1967) explains that, The threat that is feared is not based on observable conditions; and the goal, like all political goals is a normative category and not a specific empirical state of affairs. Tangible action or benefits therefore cannot bring satisfaction. On the contrary, everything that happens is perceived by the vigilantes as further confirmation of their initial assumptions and of the continued and growing reality of the threat. Symbolic reassurance, periodically renewed and legitimized, may eventually produce quiescence…. (p. 168)

To be sure, this study will not consider the plight of vigilantes nor their fears, but Edelman’s (1967) overarching point regarding the nature of threats and the symbolic reassurance that necessarily allays them is widely applicable. Throughout the history of Indiana University, there are numerous examples of perceived threats in the cultural environment that required symbolic reassurance. While the mechanisms did not always necessarily “solve” the problem of the perceived threats, the reassurance they provided satisfied the organizational need to quell potential conflicts that might arise had the perceived threats been ignored.

Organizational Theory Concepts. Scott (2003) offers three distinct views of organization: rational systems, natural systems, and open systems. Though each deserves brief mention, the combination of the perspectives in a unified view served as the most useful tool for analyzing the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University.

Rational Systems. Throughout the years, scholars have offered various definitions of organizations that align with the rational systems perspective (Barnard, 1938; Blau & Scott, 1962; Etzioni, 1964; March & Simon, 1958), each of which suggests purposefulness and
formality as being central to distinguishing organizations from other types of collectives. Further, there have been a number of distinct schools of thought in this vein (Fayol, 1949; March & Simon, 1958; Simon, 1997; Taylor, 1911; Weber, 1947). By no means do these works constitute a unified theory per se, but they are generally understood as being philosophically related as perspectives on rational systems (Scott, 2003).

To summarize these divergent, but related perspectives of organizations as rational systems, Scott (2003) offers that “Organizations are collectivities oriented to the pursuit of relatively specific goals and exhibiting relatively highly formalized social structures” (p. 27). The rational systems perspective is useful for defining formal structures of the organization but fails to take into account the human element or the environment in which the organization exists. This perspective, in the end, is highly mechanistic (Morgan, 2006).

Natural Systems. In contrast with the rational perspective that is concerned with formal structures and processes, the natural perspective introduces the human element into the analysis of organizations and further considers it to be of tremendous importance. Scott (2003) defines organizations from the natural system perspective as

…collectivities whose participants are pursuing multiple interests, both disparate and common, but who recognize the value of perpetuating the organization as an important resource. The informal structure of relations that develop among participants is more influential in guiding the behavior of participants than is the formal structure. (p. 28)

The relationships between participants and the informal structures inherent in human collectives are considered to be as, if not more, important than the formal structures of an organization in the final analysis. Selznick (1966) contends that these informal structures and
lines of communication are where the field of sociology will concentrate its efforts. This is a notable advancement in conceiving of organizations because as Perrow (1970) spartanly points out, ultimately, “Organizations are people” (p. 2).

As is the case with the rational perspective, the natural perspective is a collection of distinctive and similar schools of thought more than it is any semblance of a unified theory. Within this perspective, there are two major divisions of scholars whose work aligns with either the social consensus subtype (Barnard, 1938; Mayo, 1945; Parsons, 1951; Selznick, 1948, 1996) or the social conflict subtype (Coser, 1956; Gouldner, 1954; Marx, 1954). While some concepts drawn from this perspective are abundantly helpful in understanding human relationships within the organization to be studied, it falls short as a discreet perspective because of its failure to take into account the external environment.

**Open Systems.** The third perspective for viewing organizations is that of the open system. Scott (2003) states: “Organizations are congeries of interdependent flows and activities linking shifting coalitions of participants embedded in wider material-resource and institutional environments” (p. 29). Unlike the rational and natural systems, which are essentially closed system perspectives, the open system perspective takes into account an organization’s relevant environment(s). As Buckley (1967) observes, a system is not considered open simply because it happens to interact with its environment; a system is considered open because its survival depends on interaction with the environment. Clearly, the environment is more than just an interesting consideration in the matter. The systems-design school (Carzo & Yanouzas, 1967; Huber & Glick, 1993; Mintzberg, 1979; Sternman, 1994), contingency-theory school (Galbraith, 1973; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967) and the
social-psychology school (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Weick, 1969, 1974, 1995) present three distinct but related ways of viewing the open-system perspective.

Combining the Systems Perspectives. According to Thompson (1967), it is not necessary to choose among the three views of the organization. He argues that they can be most meaningful when used together to make sense of different sets of organizational activities. Galbraith (1973) further offers that there is not a best way to conceive of an organization. Viewing an organization from multiple perspectives at different times is necessary to achieve an informed and accurate rendering of reality.

Thompson (1967) postulates that the rational perspective is useful for organizational analysis of technical activities, due to the fact that technical activities seek to minimize uncertainty. Conversely, regarding institutional activities, interaction with the environment is not a matter of choice but a matter of survival. The organization is, in many ways, at the mercy of this environment, which creates uncertainty. Therefore, it is useful to analyze institutional activities from an open-systems perspective. Between the technical and institutional activities lies the set of managerial activities whose role is to mediate between the two extremes. Because the nature of the functions of these activities is fairly structurally informal, highly political, and potentially changing, the natural-systems perspective is useful for analyzing such activities.

During this study, it was useful to consider the interplay among these perspectives depending on the particular piece of empirical data I was attempting to understand at the time. Parsons (1960) identifies the sets of activities that Thompson (1967) speaks of as technical activities, managerial activities, and institutional activities. In addition to these perspectives, Muwonge (2012) offers that a fourth level of organizational activities is necessary in order to
fully acknowledge the perspectives inherent in an organization of this type. This fourth level is concerned with cultural activities (see Figure 2).

*Figure 2. Levels of Organizational Activities. Adapted from Parsons (1960); Muwonge (2012)*

**Technical Activities.** Technical activities (see Figure 3) are those associated with the transformation of inputs into outputs. Because these activities are concerned with performing tasks related to the purpose of the organization (Thompson, 1967), they give the institution a *reason to exist*. At Indiana University, the academic faculty exists to engage in these activities, imparting some type of knowledge among students (inputs) entering the institution and thus working with the inputs to create a particular product upon that input’s exit or graduation from the institution. Further, these activities exist to create and disseminate knowledge through the scholarly process at Indiana University.

*Figure 3. Technical Activities.*
**Managerial Activities.** Managerial activities are those spanning the boundary between technical activities and the task environment (Thompson, 1967) while serving as a buffer for the technical level (see Figure 4). These are the activities whereby institutional managers attempt to manage the institution’s environments through “boundary-spanning, boundary-setting, bridging, buffering,” and other strategies (Thompson, 1967, pp. 20-21). It is the function of these activities to secure resources (human, physical and capital) for the production of outputs, thus providing the institution with its *ability to exist*. As is discussed in this study, it is also this level that privatizes conflicts that emerge from the cultural environment while simultaneously reassuring the cultural environment in the presence of perceived threats. At Indiana University, managerial activities consist of a number of administrative and maintenance functions including those associated with student-affairs.

*Figure 4. Managerial Activities.*

**Buffering.** Buffering mechanisms serve to insulate the core from outside influence. There are a number of buffering mechanisms that might be deployed in an organization. Coding is one such technique that classifies inputs before inserting them into the technical core (Scott, 2003).
**Bridging.** While buffering mechanisms serve to insulate the technical activities, bridging mechanisms are those that interact with various exchange partners in the various environments. Associations, government interface and isomorphism are examples of buffering mechanisms that are relevant to this study.

**Institutional Activities.** The third and final set of activities Parsons (1960) described are institutional activities, which are concerned with mediation between the technical level and the various institutional environments (Thompson, 1967) (see Figure 5).

![Figure 5. Institutional Activities.](image)

These are the activities that secure an organization’s legitimacy (Scott, 2003) through alignment with those environments. These activities are often concerned with compliance and with isomorphic structures.

**Cultural Activities.** During his study of divergent cultural groups in the American Catholic Church, Muwonge (2012) points out a distinction between the cultural and institutional environments that is not well established in the literature:

Data showed that institutional and cultural demands on the organizations were not necessarily the same and, in some cases, institutional and cultural
demands stood in contradiction. To survive, organizations had to attend to the demands of one without compromising the other. (p. 371)

Cultural activities are concerned with maintaining the organization’s “right to exist” as determined in the cultural environment (see Figure 6). While a cultural environment is not necessarily limited by proximity to the organization, it is certainly true for Indiana University.

Figure 6. Cultural Activities.

**Coupling.** Birnbaum (1988) stated that “In order to understand how the various subsystems and elements within a system interact with each other, we must consider how they are connected or coupled” (p. 35). Cyert and March (1963) describe organizational activities and structures as a dynamic flow of interests and activities. Therefore it is difficult to apply logic that flows in a simple “if this, then that” pattern. Weick (1976) points out that organizations are loosely coupled with their environments, which keeps them from having to respond to each small change as it occurs in the environment (p.6). However, since organizations must ultimately respond, it is important to understand how they do so.

**Environments.** Scott (2003) states that “…one cannot understand the structure or behavior of an organization without understanding the context within which it operates” (p. 118). This is the perspective pursued by resource dependency theorists (Pfeffer & Salancik,
The focus of this type of analysis is on a single organization and its exchange partners. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003), in describing the resource-dependency approach to studying organizations, point out that most approaches to organizational theory discuss the operation of organizations, whereas the resource-dependency perspective is concerned with how organizations manage to survive considering that survival is never fully certain. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) further communicate the vitality of considering the organization’s environment in an analysis, stating that “…the organization comes to match the environmental requirements, or else it fails” (p. 229). Though it is vital that organizations match their environments, Weick (1976) points out that organizations are loosely coupled with their environments, which keeps them from having to respond to each small change as it occurs in the environment (p. 6).

Institutional theory assumes that organizations are open systems, but also that there are cognitive controls at work in addition to the efficiency-based forces (Scott, 2003). Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983) have offered frameworks for considering this perspective. This approach takes into consideration those cultural forces that can easily be ignored by other approaches.

*Task Environment.* During the course of this study, it was important to understand the different environments that influenced the development of Indiana University and thus the student-affairs functions that emerged as subunits. The first of these is the task environment (Dill, 1958; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Thompson, 1967). Dill defines the task environment as being composed of those facets of the environment that are “potentially relevant to goal setting and goal attainment” (p. 410). The features of the environment that compose the task environment are those that provide sources for inputs into an organization, markets for the
outputs of an organization, and that organization’s competitors and regulators (Scott, 2003). Managing the task environment helps to secure an organization’s “ability to exist.”

**Institutional Environment.** The second conception of the environment is that of the institutional environment. Scott (2001) defines the concept of an institution as being “…composed of cultural cognitive, normative and regulative elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life” (p. 48). He goes on to say that institutions are multifaceted, durable social structures, made up of symbolic elements, social activities, and material resources. Where the task environment represents an organization’s ability to exist, the institutional environment represents an organization’s right to exist or its source of legitimacy. “Organizations receive support and legitimacy to the extent that they conform to contemporary norms – as determined by professional and scientific authorities – concerning the ‘appropriate’ way to organize” (Scott, 2003, p. 137). Values, regulations (codified values), and culture are all components of the institutional environment. The institutional environment is relatively resistant to change (Jepperson, 1991) and is maintained and reproduced throughout generations (Zucker, 1977). At Indiana University, the institutional environment is composed of various external entities (AAU, NCAA, accrediting agencies, state policies, etc.) that inform the University’s isomorphism with other universities and that prescribe its relationship with Indiana.

**Cultural Environment.** The cultural environment is composed of the values and beliefs of the environment that are associated with the institution’s right to exist. In the case of Indiana University, the cultural environment is and has been composed primarily of the people of the state of Indiana. Often combined with the institutional environment in the literature, this study builds on previous work (Muwonge, 2012) to begin to distinguish the
cultural environment as a separate environment informed by different elements, which
combine to exert unique pressures on the institution.

**Isomorphism.** DiMaggio and Powell (1983) state that “Isomorphism is a constraining
process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of
environmental conditions” (p. 149). They offer three isomorphic mechanisms that were
particularly useful considerations during this study.

*Coercive Isomorphism.* Coercive isomorphism describes situations when an
organization behaves in a certain manner because it is compelled to do so. It is common for
institutions of higher education to maintain a degree of coercive isomorphism with their
cultural environment in order to retain their *right to exist*.

*Normative Isomorphism.* Normative isomorphism describes situations when an
organization behaves in a certain manner because it believes doing so assists in achieving an
advanced level of prestige. The findings of this study outline a number of instances where
Indiana University maintained a degree of normative isomorphism with its institutional
environment.

*Mimetic Isomorphism.* Mimetic isomorphism describes an organization’s imitation of
another organization, especially in times of uncertainty. The findings of this study outline a
number of instances where Indiana University maintained a degree of mimetic isomorphism
with its task environment.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) offer that organizations are often more concerned with
the legitimacy that certain practices connote than the effectiveness of these practices. “New
practices become infused with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at
hand…As innovation spreads, a threshold is reached beyond which adoption provides
legitimacy rather than improves performance” (p. 142). In the case of Indiana University, there are organizational structures that would be deemed largely ineffective if judged solely on their effectiveness. However, they serve as powerful symbols of the University’s isomorphism with other similar organizations.

To the extent that organizational effectiveness is enhanced, the reason will often be that organizations are rewarded for being similar to other organizations in their fields. This similarity can make it easier for organizations to transact with other organizations, to attract career-minded staff, to be acknowledged as legitimate and reputable, and to fit into administrative categories that define eligibility for public and private grants and contracts. (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 153)

Summary of the Literature

**Emergence of Student-Affairs.** Much is known about the development of student-affairs from a historical perspective. From the initial period of faculty engagement in student-affairs functions to the emergence of specialized personnel charged with student-affairs functions to the ultimate emergence and establishment of formalized student-affairs structures, the documentation of this progression is thorough. This study is well grounded in this history and is validated by the findings of higher education and student-affairs historians as they have documented the emergence of the profession at other universities.

**Organization of Student-Affairs.** Through the years, there have been many studies that explored the configuration and grouping of student-affairs structures. These studies have presented models of organization, offered rationales for various configurations, and debated the extent to which the profession is served by the various viewpoints. As descriptions of
student-affairs structures, these discussions are useful for lending perspective, providing conceptual language, and promoting debate. However, they fall short of exploring the organizational dynamics of student-affairs units from an organizational perspective that is rooted in political, sociological, and organizational literature. Kuk, Banning and Amey (2010) have recently moved the discussion in this direction. This study offers an additional perspective as student-affairs professionals seek to augment a body of professional literature that offers a richness of historical, psychological, and normative literature with a perspective that considers the organizational, cultural, and political dynamics that are imbedded in the DNA of the student-affairs profession.

**Conceptual Literature.** The study of organizations is well-documented, thoroughly studied, and challenging to augment. The combination of literature pertaining to conflict (Schattschneider, 1983) and contingency theory (Galbraith, 1973; Parsons, 1960; Scott, 2003; Thompson, 2004) has served as a useful and important framework for many of the studies that have been conducted at Eastern Michigan University during the past decade. As indicated briefly above, it is apparent that the literature itself has ill-considered the presence of the cultural environment as differentiated from the institutional environment. Muwonge (2012) offered this perspective in a recent doctoral dissertation. Additionally, the findings of this study will also serve to make the case that the institutional and cultural environments behave differently and affect the organization in unique ways. This is an important and notable advancement in the body of organizational literature.
Chapter 3: Research Methods

Introduction

This study explored the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. Using a framework derived from political science and organizational theory, the study explored the political, symbolic, and organizational uses of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. This chapter explores the study’s background, offers a statement of the problem, provides the purposes of the study, presents the research questions, explores the applicable research traditions informing the study, articulates the “self as instrument” dynamic, considers ethical questions, outlines the research design, attends to maintenance of validity, and acknowledges the study’s limitations.

Background of the Study

My interest in conducting this study coincided with the rollercoaster of events during 2006 and 2007 that saw the uniting of student-affairs functions at Indiana University under a single Division of Student-affairs and its subsequent disbandment the following year.

Division of Student Affairs Restructured in 2006. Following years of uncertainty and disconnectedness, the Indiana University Division of Student Affairs was restructured during the summer of 2006. This large-scale change signaled the consolidation of long-separated but related functional areas under the umbrella of a single unit:

The narrative of the Division of Student Affairs changed dramatically in 2006. When President Herbert announced the restructuring of campus administration last spring, Student Affairs moved substantially toward the “significant consolidation of long-fragmented and diffused campus activities and services affecting student-life” that we had called for in the materials supporting the
Division’s 2006 budget presentation. The merger of Auxiliary Services and Programs into Student Affairs brought together in a single Division many, though not all, of the campus’s student-life programs and auxiliary functions.

In a single act, the President created the opportunity for the ‘greater collaboration and cross-functionality’ and ‘efficiencies and synergies’ we had long argued were both possible and necessary. (Division of Student Affairs, 2007)

This new structure evoked a renewed sense of optimism for the future among student-affairs professionals at Indiana University. For the first time in decades, there was an organizational acknowledgement that a united student-affairs division could accomplish great things on behalf of Indiana University students:

This is an exciting time for Student Affairs on the Bloomington campus, filled with wonderful prospects. But it is also a time of great challenge and risk. How we manage in the coming year to take advantage of new opportunities this consolidation affords us, even as we meet the distinct challenges we face, will largely determine our success in creating for students the out-of-classroom experiences they require. Much of what we seek to accomplish can be done on our own, using only our Division’s resources, energy and will. But support from the broader Campus and University administrative and academic leadership is necessary, too. (Division of Student Affairs, 2007, p. 1)
The restructured division also prompted a sense of pride (and poetry) in describing the diverse set of roles student-affairs could fill on campus following years of limited scope:

The merger of Auxiliary Services and Programs into Student Affairs created a large and diverse operation. Our activities range from dispensing food in the residence halls (Residential Programs & Services) to dispensing drugs at our pharmacy (Health Center); from advising student leaders in the Student Activities Office to advising troubled students in the Student Advocates Office; from discipline (Student Ethics) to diversity (Commission on Multicultural Understanding); from disability (Disability Services for Students) to delivery (Mail Service and Campus Bus); from personal and intellectual enrichment (Conferences) to richly caffeinated drinks (Starbucks and various campus kiosks).

We manage parking (Parking Operations) and encourage walking (Health and Wellness and the Briscoe Wellness Center). We are the campus living room and movie theater, its bowling alley and hair salon (Indiana Memorial Union). We are its bookstores and Varsity Shops (IU Bookstores), its employment broker (Career Development Center and Student Employment Office), its students’ law firm (Student Legal Services), and its Broadway shows (Auditorium). We arm the military with new opportunities (Veterans Support Services) and give a leg up to deserving students (Development Office / Student Affairs Gift Agreement Scholarships) and the traditions and communities our students come from (Parents Association). We combat
persistent threat (Alcohol-Drug Information Center) and vexing ignorance (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Support Services). We promote (Student Affairs Marketing Services) and propel (Motor Pool). We guide (Counseling & Psychological Services), identify (ID Cards), and care (Sexual Assault Crisis Service). We even publish and process (Printing and Photographic Services). And now we have a place to hide (Warehouses).

(Division of Student Affairs, 2007, pp. 1-2)

The newly configured division was organized into three distinct portfolios of like programs and services. The first of these portfolios was Student Life, combining the entities that served to promote student development and/or to create a vibrant campus culture. The second portfolio was Student Support, encompassing the programs and services related to promoting student success and augmenting the academic experience. The third portfolio was Campus and Support Services, a collection of auxiliary entities that represented revenue streams (e.g., Bookstores, Conferences) and campus infrastructure (e.g., Transportation Services). Additionally, a new mission statement was adopted in June 2006 to accompany the new iteration of the Division of Student Affairs:

The Division of Student Affairs supports the academic mission of Indiana University by encouraging, engaging and empowering students in their learning and development through our programs’ services, facilities, and collaborations. While serving the entire University community, we educate students to undertake roles of leadership and productive citizenship in a culturally diverse and changing world. (Division of Student Affairs, 2007)
While the massively expanded Division of Student Affairs portfolio “…produced a merging of resources that encouraged exciting new possibilities for enhanced collaboration and cooperation among a more comprehensive array of services and programs most central to student life” (Division of Student Affairs, 2007), some of the historical challenges of staffing and funding for vital resources remained. Discussions regarding the proper role of campus funding to support the Memorial Union and Auditorium were ongoing as was a conversation regarding the need to update and expand residence-hall offerings. The ratio of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff to serve students with disabilities continued to lag far behind peer institutions (Division of Student Affairs, 2007) while the division’s ability to combat high-risk drinking was limited. Also lacking was the wherewithal to keep pace with the technological demands of college students. Each of these issues would demand immediate attention, even as the future of the division’s structure and ability to support itself appeared brighter than ever.

Organizationally, the Division of Student Affairs was promoted in the Indiana University organizational structure, as the senior student-affairs officer, Dr. Richard N. McKaig, was promoted to Dean of Students and Vice President for Student Affairs, Bloomington. Reporting directly to President Adam Herbert, this structure signaled that the Division of Student Affairs was once again an equal partner in charting the future of Indiana University. Following decades of being under funded, under staffed, and under appreciated, student-affairs professionals could now rest assured that their efforts were valued, their voices were heard and their work was an essential part of the Indiana University student experience.
Division of Student Affairs Returned to Form in 2007. Following a massive restructuring of the Division of Student Affairs by then President Adam Herbert, new President, Michael McRobbie “…uncoupled that arrangement on July 1, returning Student Affairs to the current and considerably smaller portfolio of units it now embraces” (Division of Student Affairs, 2007, p.1). The new structure prescribed that the senior student-affairs officer relinquish the title of Vice President while retaining the title of Dean of Students. The Dean of Students henceforth reported to the Provost, rather than the President, and, therefore, was not included among Indiana University’s senior administrators.

Returning to the basic organizational structure and operating philosophy that had long characterized the division reintroduced the same historical challenges. As had been the case prior to the original restructuring, the “…need to involve multiple parties cutting across various administrative boundaries to find solutions imposes unnecessary and unreasonable transaction costs on all involved,” which was particularly troubling at a time when resources for such work were “…extremely limited…” (Division of Student Affairs, 2005, p. 8). Gone was the optimism that the work of student-affairs could be accomplished within existing funding models. Also gone was the belief that student-affairs was a valuable partner in the education of Indiana University students. Replacing these sentiments was the frustration and hopelessness associated with working in an entity that struggled to survive on available funds and within existing structures.

Dean of Students, Richard N. Mckaig, offered this perspective as the leader of a battle-weary division in an impassioned letter to Provost Karen Hanson:

It is hard to know whether the Campus is as weary as we are for our long-running annual appeal for substantive attention to Student Affairs’ essential funding woes. To
its credit, the Campus administration has often responded with new one-time or occasional base funding. But the aggregate effect of these additions, when coupled with various set asides, reversions and partially funded mandates, has been a steady erosion of financial support for the essential services and programs we represent, many of which have been cut to the bone and beyond. We lack the staff and other resources to do what we expect of ourselves and what others should expect from us (McKaig, 2008, para. 1).

Specifically, McKaig outlined six factors that were the results of years of insufficient funding for student-affairs at Indiana University:

1. No non-compensation funding increase in 17 years;
2. Only partial funding for mandated salary & benefits increases in the past decade;
3. No IT or web development staff: cannot afford life-cycle funding;
4. 1.5 or fewer professional FTE in each of four units (Student Ethics, Student Advocates, Veterans Affairs, Alcohol-Drug Information Center);
5. The smallest staffs supporting student activities, fraternity and sorority affairs, campus discipline, disability services, veterans affairs and the chief student-affairs office in the Big Ten; and
6. 11 distinct locations for 12 offices spread from one side of the campus to the other, further complicating the search for efficiency and convenient service (p. 2).

Following a year that presented a glimmer of hope, the division had once again “…reached the point where we claim to offer services and programs that we cannot with confidence be certain we can support” (Division of Student Affairs, 2006, p. 2). This had implications for me and other staff members as it was noted that the failure of the university
to keep pace with staffing requirements was potentially contributing to “…staff stress and disaffection, if not student frustration” (Division of Student Affairs, 2006, p. 2). The concern was that “…efforts to resolve student problems, to mentor students, to spark creativity, service, leadership and engagement among them, to protect their rights and enforce their responsibilities, to keep them well, and to help them find jobs have been seriously jeopardized” (p. 2) as a result of the longstanding student-affairs staffing philosophy.

At the same time, various units found it difficult to match outside offers and operate within existing salary guidelines as they sought to recruit and retain staff. Despite having never been a well-funded division, the Division of Student Affairs was unable to keep pace with its peers or to remain a competitive and viable option for attracting top staff:

What peer campuses accomplish with the aid of a half-dozen FTE, we attempt with one or two. We are challenged by salaries that are no longer competitive with our peers, yet we ask ourselves and are asked by others to do as much or more than our peers. Student expectations outstrip our ability to keep pace. Where colleagues in other units respond with efficiency and dispatch by way of expanding services and programs, our distinction has increasingly become our earnestness and good intentions. Yet even earnestness and good intentions become frayed when staff are stretched beyond realistic capacity.

The final victim is campus climate, jeopardized with becoming far less than the welcoming, accessible and responsive atmosphere we have long proclaimed. (Division of Student Affairs, 2005, p. 2)

An example of this disparity was demonstrated using student-to-staff ratio for the support of students with disabilities, which is a necessary service. Indiana University had a ratio of
300:1, while the University of Iowa, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), Michigan State University, and the University of Michigan boasted ratios of 125:1, 117:1, 79:1, and 78:1 respectively (Division of Student Affairs, 2006, p. 4). To further illustrate the decreasing ability to compete for staff, it was noted that “We no longer compete with our Big Ten counterparts for the best staff. We cannot even compete with Western Michigan, which pays associate directors more than we pay directors” (Division of Student Affairs, 2005, p. 8).

**Student-Affairs as a Marginal Entity.** As a staff member, it was easy for me to bemoan what I perceived to be marginal treatment of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. Everyone at the university would be remiss in believing their particular functional area to be anything other than woefully underfunded, unappreciated, and marginalized. Despite this, my colleagues and I had reason to believe these things to be particularly true of the student-affairs division. After all, the marginality of student-affairs and student-affairs functions was even evident to Indiana University students as they conducted a comprehensive 2007-2008 audit of student perspectives. In it, they noted the undesirable conditions of the office inhabited by the second-in-command staff member in the division, as well as the campus-wide distribution of student-affairs offices:

Currently, the Office of the Division of Student Affairs is located on the second floor in the interior of Franklin Hall. To be clear, the office in charge of student life and satisfaction outside of the classroom is set in an office with no windows, on the second floor of a rarely visited building. In fact, the former Associate Dean of Students Damon Sims resided in a retrofitted closet without any air management until lured to Penn State. Further, the various
offices under the direction of Student Affairs are located in eleven different buildings around campus. (Indiana University - Bloomington, 2008)

It was also evident to Indiana University staff members that there was very little interest in improving even the least desirable facilities or in providing what we believed to be more sensible and centralized structures for the administration of student-affairs functions. Aside from being scattered across multiple campus locations, the facilities themselves were often insufficient or inappropriate for serving their intended purposes:

At 705 E. Seventh Street are found Student Ethics & Anti-Harassment Programs, the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Support Services, the Alcohol-Drug Information Center and the Commission on Multicultural Understanding. The first issue this space presents is overcrowding; the more pressing issues are health and safety. The house is old and in disrepair. Like Venice, its floors and walls are sinking, but it lacks Venice’s charm. Environmental Health and Safety has recommended that we limit the number of people occupying the second floor at one time because it may not support their weight…The situation is no longer tolerable. (Division of Student Affairs, 2003, p. 7)

This particular space had been referred to as being “…a dilapidated building…that serves as both office space and occasional wildlife refuge” (Division of Student Affairs, 2004, p. 7).

In 2005, the space was described as follows:

Anyone who believes life is fair need only visit our offices at 705 E. Seventh to be put off that misplaced notion. Imagine footage taken with night-vision cameras in the streets of Baghdad as Marines move through abandoned buildings in search of their
The restructuring, de-structuring, stagnant funding levels, and inadequate resources would coalesce to serve as powerful symbols of the marginality of the student-affairs division at Indiana University. This would have a significant impact on student-affairs staff, myself included.

**Summary: Background of the Study.** Following a period of jubilation and optimism in the wake of the restructuring of the Indiana University Division of Student Affairs, the division was returned to its original configuration, resources, and stature within the organization. For other staff and me, this was nonsensical, irrational, unwarranted, and shortsighted. My frustration with the plight of student-affairs functions led me to simply ask the question: “Why?” That question was the reason for this study. While I know now that “Why” was never the appropriate question, I do believe this study is a step toward answering “What” and “How,” which, in my opinion, are both useful answers for leaders in student-affairs administration.

**Statement of the Problem**

As an individual whose professional life is generally guided by logic, I was disconcerted during my tenure at Indiana University because of what I perceived to be illogical organization decisions (and non-decisions) regarding the student-affairs division. It seemed that even as student-affairs professionals attempted to align their work with the academic mission of the institution, the institution was not interested in promoting or supporting such work. I believed that at best, this stance represented a blatant disregard for
student-affairs functions at the institution and, at worst, it represented a concerted effort to marginalize student-affairs functions and the committed professionals who carried them out. My frustration and that of my colleagues compromised my belief in my chosen profession as I developed a sense of hostility toward an institution that I believed to be capable of accomplishing monumental achievements on behalf of its students. I was stuck, hopeless, and frustrated due to what I believed was an illogical view of student-affairs at Indiana University. In an effort to understand the logic of the system, I pursued this study that focused on the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. Even if the logic of the system turned out to be unpalatable, it would still be useful to understand it and to use that understanding to inform decision-making and alignment with institutional goals.

Further, as an individual who chose student-affairs administration as my profession, I recognized that effective leadership required more of me than simply being able to recite the time-tested and oft-celebrated student-development theories that serve as guideposts for decision-making and prompts for professional discourse in our field. The nature and context of our profession’s emergence is not well-known and is generally rooted in a “glass-half-full” mentality that can serve to perpetuate the myths and misplaced realities that prevent us from achieving the level of knowledge we ought to have and the legitimacy we assume is due us. My desire to travel a different path coupled with my frustration with my professional situation combined to prompt this study.

**Purposes of the Study**

**Inform Effective Leadership and Decision-Making.** As it turns out, the primary purpose of this study was to inform my practice as a leader in the field of higher education and student-affairs. Prior to the commencement of this research project, I operated from
assumptions about universities as complex organizations that have proven to be deficient in their ability to explain the nature and purpose of my work within the broader context of higher education. Further, I operated from the assumption that student-affairs could exist as an indispensable island unto itself in the university organizational structure. This study informed my thinking and therefore my actions as a leader.

As an emerging leader in my field, it is incumbent on me to understand the nature of my work at a fundamental level. Doing that requires me to understand where we have been as a profession and how that is related to where we are today. I believe that understanding the logic of a system is a prerequisite to practicing effective leadership and decision-making within it. While I am no longer an employee of Indiana University, I believe this study helped to shape my understanding of higher education and the role of student-affairs functions within it to the extent that I am now able to make sense of an organization on its own terms…not mine. This, I believe, will be indispensable to me as I continue to serve as a student-affairs practitioner and leader.

Advancement of Professional and Academic Knowledge. Though there are many byproducts of this study, a primary purpose for the exploration was simply to make sense of a phenomenon that did not make sense to me. I had come to believe that Indiana University was organized in an illogical manner that marginalized student-affairs functions and the professionals who carried out these functions. In an effort to understand the logic of the system, I pursued this study that focused on the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University.

Understanding the logic of this particular system additionally advances knowledge in the profession of student-affairs. It was my desire that scholars, administrators, and student-
affairs practitioners alike will utilize the findings of this study in combination with the conceptual framework that guided this study as a means of understanding the organizational uses of student-affairs functions. I believe that doing so will assist them in successfully and proactively aligning student-affairs functions with the dominant values of the environment and institution in a manner which ensures that co-curricular programs and services are able to maintain relevance to the higher-education enterprise.

I also believe this study advances an emergent conceptual framework that has shaped my knowledge and understanding of organizational theory and the role of conflict and symbolism in organizational life. I owe much to those scholars, mentors, and colleagues whose work has informed this study. I can think of no greater way to express my gratitude than to see that their work is further developed. Achievement of this purpose made achieving the other purposes of the study possible.

**Development of Self.** The final purpose of this study was to develop myself as a scholar, as a professional, and as an individual. Though I have seen far too many sunsets since I originally began this journey, I do not believe I would have chosen a different path given the opportunity to do so. I have often said of this process that it requires a person to acknowledge whatever they find challenging and face it head-on. This process is not only a display of intelligence, nor is it only a display of stamina, discipline, insight, courage, commitment, self-awareness, or anything else. It is a display of all of those things. Completion of this project serves as proof of my competency and of my ability to hold all of these things together toward the completion of a project…if only for an instant.
Research Questions

The nature of this study was to develop an understanding of a phenomenon for which there existed no relevant framework, no well-worn literature, no assumptions, and no hypotheses. The reasons for conceiving this study were largely affective and the result of my own confusion regarding the culture of my chosen profession and that of the institution where I worked. Despite my ignorance regarding the “why” of the matter, my studies had taught me that there was in fact an underlying logic to the system that was waiting to be uncovered through scholarly inquiry. The findings did not emerge through incisive questions that I conceived from the beginning or through testing hypotheses developed through other scholarly exercises, but instead through an inductive process that relied on available data to inform the questions that needed to be asked. My initial question was simply, “Why?” However, over time as the phenomenon revealed itself more fully through exploration, the following two questions became the guide for the study:

1. What are the organizational functions of student-affairs at Indiana University?
2. What is the nature of the conflict between student-affairs and the organization?

To answer these primary questions, it was necessary to first answer these secondary questions:

a. What were the dominant conflicts during the emergence of Indiana University? How were they related?

b. How did managerial activities develop at Indiana University?

c. How did student-affairs functions develop at Indiana University?

d. What factors led to the formalization of student-affairs functions at Indiana University?
Research Tradition

My particular paradigm is best described as constructivist or interpretive. This paradigm seeks to subjectively understand the construction of reality by interacting with a phenomenon socially and/or historically (Crotty, 1998). I believe the social world exists to be understood. I also believe that understanding the nature of reality in an organization is a prerequisite to being able to lead an organization or to effect change within it. As a result, evaluation and critique of socially constructed relationships and institutions is not of interest to me and was therefore not addressed during this study. Instead, this study explores the development of student-affairs functions over time.

This type of analysis lent itself agreeably to the constructivist or interpretive paradigm. From these perspectives, accurate understanding and explanation were the primary goals. During the course of this study, accurate understanding and explanation were my primary intentions. There are a number of assumptions inherent in the constructivist or interpretive paradigm, which are illustrated in Table 1.1.
Table 1.1.

Constructivist / Interpretive Paradigm Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Constructivist / Interpretive Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Aim</td>
<td>Understanding; reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Knowledge</td>
<td>Individual reconstructions coalescing around consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Accumulation</td>
<td>Informed and sophisticated reconstructions; vicarious experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Criteria</td>
<td>Trustworthiness and authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Included – formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Intrinsic; process tilt toward revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Passionate participant as a facilitator of multi-voice reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Resocialization; qualitative and quantitative history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This study focused solely on the development of a particular set of organizational activities over time. When studying the organization, it was instructive not to think of it as a “thing” but rather as a system of relationships among groups of people mobilizing toward a given purpose, because ultimately, as Perrow (1970) suggests, “Organizations are people” (p. 2). While researching “things” is often something that can be accomplished with a “clean,” formulaic approach, the nature of researching organizations is an undertaking that necessarily lends itself to a certain degree of imperfection relative to researching other phenomena that behave in naturally predictable ways.
The scientific venture is definitely not a perfect endeavor, nor is it particularly efficient. All research, regardless of a researcher’s particular paradigm, is based on a set of assumptions that will always serve to shape the conceptualization, collection, analysis and presentation of his or her research. As a result, I was explicit in making my own assumptions concerning ontology, epistemology, methodology, and causality known at the commencement of this research project. I will review these briefly below.

In making explicit my assumptions about the nature of reality, the nature of knowing, the nature of causality, and corresponding research methodologies for this undertaking, it was not my intention to impose any particular label on my approach, but instead to be candid about the character of my research and the methodological and philosophical assumptions that informed the study. As Hawking (1993) asserts, “If you can attach a label to my approach, you don’t have to say what is wrong with it” (p. 42). Hawking (1993) further points out that it is not likely that Einstein, Heisenberg, and Dirac cared very much about the labels that might be attached to them, but that “They were simply concerned that the existing theories didn’t fit together” (p. 42). In that same spirit, I acknowledge the fact that this study does not fit nicely into an existing body of student-affairs literature or organizational theory literature. However, I do believe this approach was useful in connecting concepts that do not fit neatly together.

During the conduct of this study, I was not interested in nor capable of proposing immutable truth. Related to the phenomena at hand, “No construction is or can be incontrovertibly right; advocates of any particular construction must rely on persuasiveness and utility rather than proof in arguing their position” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108). Now
begins the lifelong process of using the information derived from this study as a persuasive tool for furthering knowledge of leadership in student-affairs.

During the course of this study, I was concerned with making sense of the development of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. In doing so, I was not attempting to use the findings to advocate for a particular cause, nor was I seeking to validate, legitimize, or criticize ways of conducting business in the university or in the division of student-affairs. The accurate description and explanation of the development of student-affairs functions at Indiana University was my lone objective. This objective demanded that I adopt a particular paradigm. A paradigm, in this sense is simply a worldview from which I operate as a researcher. Guba and Lincoln (1994) describe paradigms as basic belief systems that are based on ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions (p. 107). Understanding and being explicit about one’s own paradigm is vital because, without it, meaningful discourse about the phenomenon or findings is difficult and potentially fraught with confusion.

**Ontological Position.** Ontology refers to one’s belief about the nature of reality. Ontologically, my beliefs are most accurately described as nominalistic or relativistic. This ontological orientation assumes that the social world is constantly emerging and dependent on the ability of the individual to utilize concepts and labels as tools to make sense of it and to negotiate it. In describing and explaining these socially constructed relationships, informed and accurate description, rather than claims of absolute truth, is the measure of the merit of findings. This contrasts with the realist who assumes a lesser distinction between the construction of the social and physical worlds. For the realist, social reality exists despite
one’s ability to recognize it or understand it conceptually. In this view, arriving at some sort of “truth” is the aim of social research.

I believe that an immutable physical universe exists outside the limits of my own mind. In my view, neurons and mere perceptions of consciousness cannot alone be responsible for the creation and continuous re-invention of the physical world as it exists. The fact that physical objects, chemical reactions, and biological processes exist without my knowledge or approval is not in dispute. However, the nature of the social relationships among human beings is something altogether different from purely physical relationships between and among matter, vegetables, and other physical objects. Therefore, they must be understood and explained as such. This study required me to accurately describe the relevant events as they presented themselves in archival data, various texts, and documents. I did not propose to arrive at an unalterable truth and I have not done so. I simply hoped to accurately understand, describe, and explain a particular phenomenon on its own terms. This I have accomplished.

**Epistemological Position.** Epistemology refers to the nature of the relationship between knowledge and the “knower” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Epistemologically, my assumptions can be best described as anti-positivist or subjectivist. I believe that organizations are most accurately understood by seeking to make sense of the various meanings associated with events, symbols, conflicts, etc. While systematic and objective ways of knowing are useful for understanding the nature of chemical reactions and physical phenomena, generalizations about organizations and their adherence to incontrovertible universal truths are, in my estimation, lacking in their facility to tell us anything about organizational relationships and associated phenomena. Further, I believe that testing
various hypotheses are not alone useful in the construction of knowledge about the social world. I believe that to offer such might cause us to stray from the path of discovery. Knowledge is constantly created and re-created in social settings. As a researcher, it was my duty to accurately describe the nature of reality as it unfolds, despite any hypotheses (assumptions about outcomes) that I might have brought into the study.

**Assumptions of Causality.** In terms of causality, my assumptions are aligned with the voluntarist or the symbolic interactionist. Blumer (1969) identifies three premises which demonstrate the symbolic interactionist position:

1) Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them;
2) The meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one’s fellows; and
3) These meanings are handled in, and modified through an interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things that he encounters. (p. 2)

Thus, as Blumer (1969) points out, “…symbolic interactionism views meanings as social products, as creations that are formed in and through the defining activities of people as they interact.”

I believe that human beings have free will and can thus be expected to relate to others in ways that cannot always be successfully predicted on an individual basis or through the use of quantitative methods. Conversely, the determinalist assumes that human beings are subject to the same “stimulus yields response” mechanism that is characteristic of physical objects. Humans, in this view, are subject to environment and circumstance. In my view,
human beings do not simply respond to the stimulus but instead to the meaning that the
particular stimulus holds at a precise moment in a given context (see Figure 7).

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 7. Humans Respond to the Meaning of Stimuli.*

Guba and Lincoln (1994) agree: “Human behavior, unlike that of physical objects, cannot be understood without reference to the meanings and purposes attached by human actors to their activities” (p. 106). The same stimulus could conceivably yield any number of responses depending on the meaning that the individual holds for it in his or her own mind. This meaning differs by person, context, situation, and whim; therefore, understanding “what” and “how” is of overriding importance.

**Methodological Position.** Methodology refers to the process whereby a “would-be knower” proceeds in uncovering the knowledge he or she believes can become known (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Inherent in the methodological assumptions are ontological, epistemological, and assumptions of causality and of human nature, which necessarily shape the way one proceeds to answer questions regarding the phenomenon being studied. Both Guba and Lincoln (1994) and Burrell and Morgan (1979) characterize the constructivist or interpretive methodology as being one of interaction between the researcher and the phenomenon being studied. This methodology is one of subjective construction based on personal interaction with the phenomenon coupled with historical and contextual knowledge of the phenomenon. From this view, it is not possible to understand a phenomenon from a
distance. To understand the phenomenon, it is important to interact with its culture and history. In describing the symbolic interactionist methodology, Blumer (1969) states:

Symbolic interactionism is a down-to-earth approach to the scientific study of human group life and human conduct. Its empirical world is the natural world of such group life and conduct. It lodges its problems in this natural world, conducts its studies in it, and derives its interpretations from such naturalistic studies. If it wishes to study religious cult behavior it will go to the actual religious cults and observe them carefully as they carry on their lives. If it wishes to study social movements it will trace carefully the career, the history, and the life experiences of actual movements. If it wishes to study drug use among adolescents it will go to the actual life of such adolescents to observe and analyze such use. And similarly with respect to other matters that engage its attention. (p. 47)

From this perspective, it is vital to view the phenomenon up close and in context in order to gain full understanding of that phenomenon. This is precisely what I was able to accomplish during this study. Having been a staff member at Indiana University for five years was useful in making sense of findings while placing them in their proper context. Additionally, having chosen the field of student-affairs as my life’s work, I remained close to the phenomenon because of my ardent desire to inform my leadership by understanding the phenomenon more fully.

**Self as a Research Instrument**

Because of the nature of this study, I served as the primary instrument of research (Creswell, 2003; Marshall & Rossman, 1995). As the primary research instrument in this
study, it was incumbent on me to achieve clarity regarding my intentions, hopes, biases, and reasons for conducting this study. Schram (2003) states: “It is important that you take into account your purpose at this personal level and acknowledge how they (it) may be shaping your inquiry” (p. 23). My personal motivations for choosing to carry out a study of this nature were rooted in my decision to pursue a career in student-affairs administration. My fascination with the work coupled with the inexorable belief that I could foster “revolutionary change” in the profession, led me to pursue graduate studies in higher education and ultimately a career as a student-affairs practitioner. Early in my career, I was fascinated by the complexity of universities and the relationships that gave them life. Even at this period of relative naiveté, I had developed an awareness of the complex nature of student-affairs organizations, but I lacked the language to make sense of them or to explain their functions in a meaningful way.

My initial graduate studies in higher education provided me with a professional language and a broad understanding of the nature of higher education, but it was not until I was able to live and breathe the organizational and political realities of higher education from the perspective of a student-affairs practitioner on a daily basis that I began to ask the sophisticated questions that would ultimately leave me without the clear answers that I ardently desired. For the first several years of my career in student-affairs, I was exceedingly troubled by the norms and basic assumptions that persisted virtually unfettered by any semblance of empirical knowledge or a sincere desire to challenge assumptions or to create substantive change. At the time, it was challenging for me to refrain from taking personally the undesirable outcomes of basic, organizational structures and cultural forces. Stated simply, I did not like what I perceived to be the plight of the student-affairs profession.
Following a time of personal reflection and intense study of the nature of complex organizations, I began to understand the underlying logic of the systems in question. I recognized that just because I struggled to make sense of them at the time did not mean they were nonsensical. The logic existed all along, and I simply lacked the requisite knowledge and appropriate language to understand and discuss it. The memory of my initial inability to fully make sense of the nature of my work, coupled with the desire to understand the dynamics that exist outside our well-worn professional instinct, led me to this particular study. Further, it was my hope that by heightening my own awareness regarding the development of student-affairs functions at Indiana University, I would become better equipped to create an informed awareness among colleagues, supervisors and students alike, so that we are able to more effectively advance our work in the service of our institutions and in the service of college student development.

This study was meaningful to me because I was seeking to make sense of the development of the field that has become my life’s work. As a result, emotional distance from the subject was something I was unable to achieve. Lofland and Lofland (1995) state that “Unless you are emotionally engaged in your work, the inevitable boredom, confusion and frustration of rigorous scholarship will endanger even the completion—not to speak of the quality of the project” (p. 15). Ely et al. (1991) further point to the necessity of the researcher being fully invested not only in the research itself but also in the spirit and meaning of the research:

We are convinced that if practitioners of interpretive research are concerned solely with the technical aspects, they will miss the essentials of this type of
research. We believe that qualitative study is forged in the transaction among what is done and learned and felt by the researcher. (p. 2)

I believe that my proximity to the phenomenon served as a catalyst for the completion of a study for which there was no template or even a comparable study to provide a benchmark. Also, the unconventional nature of this study coupled with my own aversion to convention provided meaning, direction, and excitement even when the data were less cooperative. As a result, I believe this to be scholarship of a high caliber, which will serve as the impetus for future work that I believe will contribute significantly to the study and practice of student-affairs.

Some might be inclined to question the objectivity of the research given my status as a former employee of Indiana University. I have no intention of offering an impassioned defense of my objectivity on the subject. I believe that to do so would constitute a profound ethical problem on my part. Lofland and Lofland (1995) have pointed out that “So-called objectivity and distance vis-a'-vis the field setting will usually result in a failure to collect any data that are worth analyzing” (p. 17). Ely et al. (1991) further assert that “…being too familiar is less a function of our actual involvement in the setting than it is of the research stance we are able to adopt within it” (p. 16).

Both proximity and distance present challenges that should be considered by a competent researcher. In this or any study, methodological “trade-offs” will inevitably exist. This is simply the nature of the scientific venture. It was my duty as a researcher to fully understand the diverse options available and to structure the study in such a way as to maximize accuracy. Objectivity in this or any other study is a myth. I cannot feign objectivity any more seriously than I can feign the ability to breathe under water. It is simply
not in human nature to assume a position of mechanical objectivity. However, in light of this, it is vital for me to present my biases and assumptions throughout this document so that consumers of study are aware of the boundaries of my objectivity. Ultimately, my objective in completing this study was accuracy of understanding and description.

**Ethical Considerations**

**Doing Right.** I believe that as a researcher it is important to contribute to the extension of knowledge as opposed to simply contributing to the extension of personal goals. This, in my estimation, is a cornerstone of my ethical stance in that I believe that ethics are essentially an active process of doing “right” rather than simply avoiding doing wrong while accomplishing very little of substance in the process. This notion of doing right includes the extension and advancement of knowledge, which I believe is an ultimate consequence of this study.

While my intense desire to understand the phenomenon provided the fuel for this study, it was important for me to identify and adhere to certain ethical standards as a boundary for it. With myself acting as the primary instrument of research during this study, it was incumbent on me to conduct it in a manner that exemplified integrity and ethical behavior. Unfortunately, there is no universal checklist for conducting research in an ethical manner. As such, a plan for doing right is the result of a thorough consideration of multiple perspectives.

**Ethical Standards.** Lincoln (1990) points out that even professional codes and federal laws ultimately “assume the posture that researchers are in the best position to determine, within certain guidelines, what constitutes ethicality in social-science research” (p. 290). Therefore, it was important for me to inform myself to the extent that I was prepared to
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make ethical choices during this study. It was further necessary for me to make explicit my own ethical stance.

To ground the study in appropriate ethical frameworks, I chose to adopt two distinct codes of ethics representing both disciplinary and professional values and standards for ethical practices in conducting research. The disciplinary code of ethics that guided the research is set forth by the American Historical Association’s (2011) Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct. The Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE Principles of Ethical Conduct, 2003) prescribed the professional code of ethics observed during the course of this study. It was my intention that the incorporation of both disciplinary and professional ethical standards into the study would aid in the development of a cohesive piece of research, conducted with the highest degree of ethical consideration.

**Ethical Theories.** In determining and making explicit my ethical stance, I studied five unique ethical theories that provided useful language for its articulation (Deyhle, Hess, & LeCompte, 1992; May, 1980). The teleological ethic, the utilitarian ethic, the categorical imperative, critical theory and advocacy, and the covenantal ethic represent distinct, useful frameworks for describing one’s own assumptions related to ethical principles. Because the purpose of this particular research is to accurately describe the development of a set of organizational activities over time, the teleological ethic served as the most useful and relevant ethical guide.

In describing the teleological ethic, May (1980) offers that “Knowledge is a fundamental good in that it is so basic to the human enterprise that it does not have to be justified by virtue of its contribution to some other good” (p. 358). In other words, it was not necessary for me to pursue knowledge in this study for any reason except for the pursuit of
knowledge itself. The fact that this study might very well contribute to some other good by furthering professional knowledge is an additional benefit. Truth is a central goal of the teleological ethic and the pursuit of said truth is both the end and the means. However, as Deyhle, Hess & LeCompte (1992) assert, research in the field of education, unlike that which is generally conducted in the disciplines, is not necessarily seeking truth per se. They argue that “research in education, whether quantitative or qualitative is primarily applied research” (p. 610).

The discovery and communication of an immutable truth was not necessarily the goal of this research. Instead, I sought to describe and explain the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University by developing an accurate understanding based on historical and organizational realities. Given this, I believe this study satisfies the spirit of the teleological ethic’s pursuit of truth. In this case, truth is analogous with accuracy of understanding.

**Ethical Presentation of Findings.** In conducting this research, it was not my intention to campaign for a particular cause or to manipulate information in any manner for the sole purpose of advocating for a particular perspective, practice, or set of assumptions regarding the nature of student-affairs functions at Indiana University or at another university. I believe that doing so would be incongruent with the teleological ethic and with the aforementioned professional and disciplinary ethical codes. Deceptive means for acquiring knowledge are not permissible in pursuit of the truth or, in the case of this study, accuracy (May, 1980). Similarly, I believe that deceptive or selective presentation of the facts is not permissible in the pursuit of accurate understanding, description, or explanation.
**Unobtrusive Measures.** Because this study relied solely on unobtrusive measures (Marshall & Rossman, 1995), it did not require me to collect any information directly from human subjects or human informants. All data informing this study was derived from archival materials, library holdings, publicly available records, etc., and my own observations derived from a five-year period of employment in the Division of Student Affairs at Indiana University. Because of the unobtrusive nature of this study, I applied for and was granted an exemption by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Eastern Michigan University.

The unobtrusive nature of this study did not absolve me from potential ethical considerations. Glesne (1999) discusses a debate among researchers as to the ethicality of unobtrusive methods in qualitative research (p. 118). One school of thought suggests that social scientists should be afforded the same privilege to observe behavior in public places as the ordinary person on the street. Conversely, it is often argued that the social scientist’s observations are anything but ordinary because of their intentional and systematic nature. Glesne (1999) indicates that “In the process of doing research, researchers often acquire information that is potentially dangerous to some people” (p. 114). As the researcher, it was my responsibility to understand the potential for such information coming to light and to be prepared to act ethically in the event that it did. During the course of this study, I encountered no ethically ambiguous situations, nor did I encounter information that might be considered to be damaging to anyone involved. As such, I am confident in the integrity and ethical foundation of this study.
Research Design

Unit of Analysis. It was important to determine a unit of analysis, or a “case” prior to initiating this study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A case is defined as “a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (p. 25). To initiate a study without an understanding of the unit of analysis, or case, would present difficulty in studying “anything” in the pursuit of studying “everything.”

Because the purpose of this study is to understand the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University, I utilized the concept of the organizational set (Blau & Scott, 1962; Evan, 1966) as a means of understanding Indiana University and its interactions with various environments. Scott (2003) states that the organizational set approach “views the environment from the standpoint of a specific (focal) organization” (p. 126). The organizational set is particularly useful in analyzing organizations from the population ecology and resource dependency perspectives (Scott, 2003). Thompson (1967) discusses a concept related to the organizational set, to which he refers as an organizational domain. Merton’s (1957) concept of the role-set was an early forerunner to the contemporary conception of the organizational set. Merton, in discussing the role-set, utilized the metaphor of a mother’s various responsibilities and relationships. In like manner, the university exists at the intersection of environments that may or may not be related to one another absent their shared connection with the university but are related in some way to the university as a focal point.

Case Study. This study utilized the case-study research design. The case-study design prescribes that the researcher investigates a phenomenon during a given period of time (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1989). Several classic studies in the field of higher
education (Baldridge, 1971; B.R. Clark, 1960, 1970; Selznick, 1966;) initially piqued my interest in this type of approach and have since informed my understanding and use of the case-study design. Unlike many case studies that develop an understanding of a phenomenon in real time, this study considered Indiana University primarily from a historical perspective. However, because this study nonetheless investigated a single organization over a finite period of time, the case-study design proved to be a useful and appropriate framework for making meaning of this particular phenomenon because it presented “...a way of organizing social data so as to preserve the unitary character of the social subject being studied” (Goode & Hart, 1952, p. 331).

The case-study design proved to be a natural complement to my aforementioned constructivist or interpretive paradigm, which has its roots in German idealistic thought. According to Burrell and Morgan (1979), “Its foundations were laid in the work of Kant and reflect a social philosophy which emphasizes the essentially spiritual nature of the social world” (p. 31). More recently, scholars of the “Chicago School” of sociology have assembled a body of work that served as the “jumping off” point for the description of my own paradigm. George Herbert Mead (1934) was foremost in the development of this mode of thought. His students, Herbert Blumer and Everett Hughes, and their students, Howard Becker and Blanche Geer, have been instrumental in furthering work in and understanding of the interactionist paradigm. Guba and Lincoln (1994) describe the constructivist paradigm as being ontologically relativist, epistemologically subjectivist, and transactional and methodologically hermeneutical and dialectical (pp. 110-111). Yanow (2000), in her discussion of methods for conducting interpretive policy analysis, further describes
interpretive methods as being “…based on the presupposition that we live in a social world characterized by the possibilities of multiple interpretations” (p. 5).

**Data Collection.** Much of the data collected and analyzed during this case study was of a historical nature. “Historical analysis is…a method of discovering, from records and accounts, what happened in the past” (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 89). Both primary and secondary sources were utilized. Primary sources included reports, letters, podcasts of interviews along with various other documents collected from the Indiana University archives, archival websites and from the division of student-affairs files. When possible, I photocopied documents for additional analysis. When it was not possible to photocopy a document, I analyzed the document, making detailed notes to be analyzed further. Secondary sources included various historical works that explored Indiana University, higher education, the state of Indiana, religious denominations, etc. As I explored these texts, I made descriptive notes and recorded initial observations.

In conducting a study of this nature, it was important for me to be ever mindful of the richness of the data (Lofland & Lofland, 1995), accuracy of the documents, and of my interpretation of them (Marshall & Rossman, 1995) to maximize validity of analysis and accuracy of description. Accuracy of description will prove to be the primary determinant of the value of this study.

**Data Analysis.** During this study, the process of data analysis was not a task that was performed independently of the data-collection process. As Coffey and Atkinson (1996) stated, “We should never collect data without substantial analysis going on simultaneously” (p. 2). Creswell (2003) also offers that data analysis is “…an ongoing process involving continual reflection about the data, asking analytic questions, and writing memos throughout
the study. It is not sharply divided from the other activities in the process, such as collecting
data or formulating research questions” (p. 190). As such, the phases in the data-analysis
process were ongoing and repeated rather than systematic and chronological.

**Data Analysis Phase 1.** As Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) point out, the first phase
of data analysis was simply to read various primary and secondary sources as I collected
them, making initial notes about ideas, categories, and relationships (Maxwell, 2005).
Because data collection and data analysis were ongoing, constant, and related processes
during the study, analysis of existing data would often lead to the collection of additional
data that would assist in the advanced exploration of a concept or that would assist in the
confirmation or disconfirmation of a particular tentative finding.

**Data Analysis Phase 2.** The second phase of data analysis is dedicated to organizing
the data (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). During the course of this study, it was initially useful
to organize data chronologically. This organizing technique assisted in developing a working
narrative, the purpose of which was simply to **tell the story** of the emergence of student-
affairs functions at Indiana University. With the narrative as a guide, the data collection
became more informed and the data analysis became clearer, more refined, and more focused.
As a result, a conceptual organization technique replaced the chronological organization
 technique as a more useful and relevant organizing method.

**Data Analysis Phase 3.** The third phase of data analysis was dedicated to conducting
a thorough review of data and associated research notes to generate categories, themes, and
patterns (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). These categories, themes, and patterns were identified
and grouped accordingly for further analysis and in preparation for discussion. At this point,
it was also useful to identify any data that was not useful or relevant. These data would then be coded and filed for later review or discarded altogether if they were not relevant.

**Data Analysis Phase 4.** The fourth phase of data analysis pertained to employing the conceptual framework to make sense of the categories, themes, and patterns that emerged from the data. This sense-making process assisted in combining related data and in informing my discovery of conceptual connections between data that would have been difficult to identify absent the use of the conceptual framework as a map.

**Validity**

Ensuring a valid set of results was a significant consideration during the conduct of this study. Unlike quantitative studies where the validity of a study rests largely on the research instrument, this study depended on the researcher as the instrument. Therefore, a different conception of validity applies. As Maxwell (2005) states, validity “…depends on the relationship of your conclusions to reality” (p. 105). Ultimately, the validity of this study is linked to the extent that it corresponds with reality. This study does not achieve ultimate truth and, thankfully, that is not a requirement for it to be useful or believable (Maxwell, 2005).

**Triangulation.** During this study, I utilized various primary sources, secondary sources, and observations to build a narrative that described the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. The secondary sources that described Indiana, Indiana University, and the related religious dynamics that existed in Indiana at various times generally mirrored historians’ accounts of the development of other universities in other states. As such, Indiana University’s development, while technically unique, was generally unremarkable relative to that of other universities. While many of the primary sources were
unique to Indiana University, the narrative they created mirrored knowledge I developed as a staff member at the university. Further, the data derived from primary sources were generally consistent with data derived from secondary sources, where applicable.

**Peer Debriefing.** Creswell (2003) suggests the technique of peer debriefing to enhance the accuracy of an account. In doing so, I participated in regular meetings with my doctoral program chair during the data-collection and data-analysis phases of this study. During these meetings, we would discuss findings, their relevance, my interpretation of the findings, and their connection to the study’s conceptual framework. This assisted me in developing coherent, narrative descriptions and accurate interpretations of the findings.

**Subjectivity and Bias.** To ensure a high degree of reliability, it is important for the researcher to clarify his or her bias related to the study (Creswell, 2003). As such, it is important to note that during this study I explored the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. This is a university in which I invested much as a former employee, as a student-affairs professional, and as a member of the Bloomington, Indiana, community. I recognize that the validity of this study’s findings will be filtered through a prism of assumed subjectivity. Though I offer no rebuttal to a charge of subjectivity, I do offer that the validity of this study is partially because of my subjectivity, not despite it.

Lofland and Lofland (1995) argue that the researcher’s proximity to the organization that he or she studies presents a potentially fruitful situation for research “…starting where you are may cause methodological and ethical difficulties. We believe, however, that any such difficulties are a small price to pay for the very creative wellsprings of the naturalistic approach” (p. 15). My hope is that this study benefitted from being conducted from a close proximity as opposed to being conducted from an emotional and/or
physical distance or from outside the institution altogether. I understood the landscape of Indiana University. I understood the culture that had emerged in student-affairs at Indiana University. I was aware of the myths and legends surrounding many of the figures encountered during the study. Most importantly, I genuinely desire nothing but success for the institution and for the countless, committed student-affairs professionals who give more time than for what they are paid, because they believe in the profession and care deeply for the Indiana University students.

Disconfirming Evidence. Throughout this study I have searched for evidence to disconfirm what I believe to be true. Further, I have searched for evidence that might disprove my findings or conclusions. I believe this has resulted in a superior product. It is important to note that the findings of this study are very different from what I would have expected to find or what I would have hoped to find. While they are consistent with the conceptual framework and seem obvious to me as I complete the study, the findings are even different from what I thought I was studying in the beginning.

What I hoped to find was some measure of validation for my own thoughts and feelings related to what I long perceived to be the unfair treatment of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. What I found was a logical explanation for why things are the way they are. I am under no obligation to feel better about this dynamic than I did when I began, but I am obligated to acknowledge the organizational history and current realities that make it so. This study has disconfirmed many assumptions, many previous interpretations of findings and many antiquated frameworks for understanding my work as a student-affairs professional.

External Validity. External validity is concerned with the extent to which the findings
of this study are generalizable to other universities. Because the purpose of this research was to gain an understanding of the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University, I am unable to generalize the specific findings to other universities. However, as Yin (1989) suggests, there is a measure of analytic generalizability between theory and evidence. In other words, the conceptual framework that was used and informed during this study can be applied as a mechanism for understanding a similar phenomenon at other universities. I believe this to be one of the most important results of this particular study.

Limitations

As is true with any research, this particular study had limitations. The data and findings pertain to the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. As such, they are not generalizable to other student-affairs units, other universities, or other units or functions at Indiana University. Despite this, the conceptual framework utilized and advanced during this study has a degree of analytic generalizability.

A second limitation of this study is the fact that I served as the primary research instrument. I was steadfast in my commitment to behave ethically during the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. I was also fastidious in my attempts to guard against threats to the validity of the study. However, it is important to acknowledge my presence as the research instrument as a limitation.

The third limitation of the study is the use of unobtrusive measures to construct a narrative explaining the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. While I sincerely believe I was able to assemble an accurate narrative, I also believe there to be available documents that I either was not able to access or of which I remained unaware during the data-collection process.
Finally, this study is limited by my own understanding of the conceptual framework I employed. While I believe this study advanced the framework to a great extent, I know that future scholars will identify ways of using it that did not occur to me at the time. This represents my best effort with the knowledge I have.

Despite these limitations, I believe this study to represent scholarship of a high caliber that will advance knowledge in the study of higher education and student-affairs as well as in the study of organizational theory.
Chapter 4: Findings

The Founding of Indiana University

A Seminary in the Wilderness. At the time of Indiana University’s founding as the Indiana State Seminary, the entire population of the United States of America barely exceeded that of contemporary Indiana and more than 15% of its population was comprised of slaves. Indiana was largely a wild, uninhabited, impoverished, and illiterate area whose white population numbered fewer than 65,000. Even as recent as the Civil War era, Indiana had “…the highest rate of illiteracy of any northern state – a point about which political leaders showed great sensitivity, and one of the reasons why the terms ‘Hoosier’ and Indiana connoted ignorance and backwardness” (Thornbrough, 1989, pp. 461-462). While the majority of present-day Indiana was unsettled, Woodburn (1891) described the settled parts of the state as being

…confined to a narrow fringe of territory extending down the Ohio border from Fort Wayne to the Ohio River, down that stream to the Wabash, and up the Wabash to Vincennes. A great part of southern Indiana, nearly all of central and all of northern Indiana was a wilderness…Schools were few and far between. There were no public funds, no public schoolhouses and but few teachers; and the teachers who had wandered from the East or South into this wilderness were usually ill qualified for service. (p. 75) (see Figure 8)

Esarey’s (1915) description of the land and peoples that would later become the State of Indiana are extensive but are not necessary to review in detail for this project.
For the sake of context, it is important to note the general mood of the country during the time when Indiana University was founded. It was a time when the “bitterness of feeling with regard to everything English had not altogether subsided…” (Wylie, T.A. 1890, p. 47). The Revolutionary War had been fought fewer than 50 years prior and the wounds from the War of 1812 were still very fresh in the minds of Americans. This anti-English sentiment is indirectly referenced in the college’s 1828 charge: “That there shall be and hereby is, created and established a college…for the education of youth in the American learned and foreign languages…” (p. 47). The mood was decidedly provincial, which is an indication of how the local environment’s preferences regarding Indiana University’s development. This historical context of the attitudes and feeling of the time is instructive for understanding the relative youth of the American culture and its still-emerging system of postsecondary education.
The concept of a state seminary for Indiana was initially proposed prior to Indiana’s formal admission on December 11, 1816, to the United States of America. On June 29, 1816, delegates to the constitutional convention, held in Corydon, Indiana, adopted the Indiana state constitution, along with its provision for an expansive educational system. The language outlining the general-education philosophy for Indiana was very similar to and thus appears to have been adapted from the 1772 New Hampshire State Constitution (T. Clark, 1977).

The legislative actions that led to the establishment of Indiana University occurred during a relatively short span of time. On December 7, 1819, Indiana Governor Jonathan Jennings asked the Indiana General Assembly to consider legislation that would lead to the establishment of public schools (Phillips, 1968) and a state seminary (T. Clark, 1977). In response, the general assembly passed a law on January 19, 1820, appointing trustees for the institution in addition to providing for the acquisition of land, the construction of a facility, and the administration of a budget for the Indiana State Seminary. The governor signed the law (Laws of the State of Indiana, 4th session, 1819) on the following day.

Though the Indiana Seminary was founded in 1820, the actual opening date has been the subject of some debate (T. Clark, 1977). While May 1, 1824, has often been accepted as the opening date for the Indiana Seminary, T. Clark suggests that statements from the Vincennes Western Sun (February 19, 1825 & August 4, 1825) lead him to believe that “…evidence is substantial enough to accept April 3, 1825, as the opening date” (p. 5). Thus began the seminary in the woods that grew to a population of 40,000 students fewer than 200 years later (see Figure 9).
Summary: The Founding of Indiana University. Indiana University was established during a time when public higher education had not yet established itself as a mainstay in American culture. Further, Indiana was a barely settled state and mostly unable to support a state university at the time. As was often the case for institutions of higher education during the early to mid 1800s, Indiana University was originally founded as a non-sectarian seminary. The fact that the institution was originally founded as a state seminary is indicative of the pervasive influence that Protestant theology wielded in the realm of public affairs during this time. While the seminary was intended to be non-sectarian in nature, its initial purpose was, nonetheless, to educate men to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ.

The function of training clergymen was aligned with the cultural values of the largely unlearned Indiana citizenry and was also aligned with the early role of higher education in America. As such, Indiana University’s cultural environment, task environment and institutional environment were more or less aligned in the beginning. The alignment of these
three environments (see Figure 10) dictated the young institution’s technical activities and prescribed the incorporation of Protestant values into the fabric of Indiana University at the onset. These Protestant values persisted for decades hence.
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***Figure 10.*** Task, Institutional and Cultural Environments in Alignment.

**From Non-Sectarian to Godless**

**The Pervasive Influence of Religion in Public Affairs.** During the first half of the 19th century, the United States experienced a period of revived Christian fundamentalism typified by the Protestant denominations that were prevalent during that time. “On campuses across the country throughout the first half of the nineteenth century there were periodic religious revival strongly reminiscent of those stimulated by the Great Awakening half a century earlier” (Lucas, 1994, p. 129). During the mid 1800s there were three major Protestant denominations in the state of Indiana: Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian, which according to the 1850 census (The seventh census of the United States: 1850, 1853) collectively accounted for nearly three-fourths of the state’s Protestant congregations (see Figure 11).
Whereas the Methodist and Baptist churches appealed to the frontier lifestyle of Hoosier citizens because of a practical focus, emphasis on the grace of God, revival meetings and general distrust of educated clergy (Madison, 1986), the Presbyterian church and its educated clergy were more academic in their theological approach. Said Madison of a prominent Presbyterian minister, “…he was dismayed by the pioneer preference for sermons that appeared to come from divine inspiration rather than study and preparation” (p. 103).

While often divergent in belief and practice, the various Protestant denominations not only provided guidance for the eternal souls of their flocks but also served as arbiters of righteous and moral behavior for the rural community. According to Madison (1986), it was common for a congregation’s reach to extend beyond the church walls to discipline members for engaging in untoward behaviors, ranging from dancing, to alcohol use, to foul language. Wielding its authority, “…the church continued to emphasize a strict code of personal
morality and regularly issued condemnations of dancing, card playing, the desecration of the Sabbath, tobacco, and especially intoxicating liquid” (Phillips, 1968, p. 445).

In addition to reaching into the private lives of church members, the influence of religion during this time regularly encroached into the realm of public affairs. For example, in 1855 Protestant denominations influenced the general assembly to do its part in preserving the Sabbath by prohibiting activities such as hunting, fishing, or unnecessary work on Sunday. Ten years later, they would encourage the prohibition of the sale of liquor on Sunday (Madison, 1986), a law that Indiana still enforces today. This vestige of a theocratic past is a persistent reminder of the power the cultural environment holds to shape values and norms through the years.

Though there are numerous examples where religious denominations sought to wield direct influence in public matters, the more powerful influence was indirect, implicit, and deeply embedded in a theocratic-minded culture. In his famous observations of the American experiment, Alexis De Tocqueville (2007) offers an incisive observation regarding the role and power of religion in the United States during the time when Indiana University emerged:

In the United States the sovereign authority is religious, and consequently hypocrisy must be common; but there is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America; and there can be no greater proof of its utility, and of its conformity to human nature, than that its influence is most powerfully felt over the most enlightened and free nation of the earth…In the United States religion exercises but little influence upon the laws and upon the details of public opinion, but it directs the manners of the community, and by regulating
domestic life it regulates the State… Religion in America takes no direct part in the government of society, but it must nevertheless be regarded as the foremost of the political institutions in that country… (pp. 220-221)

As De Tocqueville (2007) suggested in his observations of American government, colleges were also subject to the indirect and implicit influence of Protestant theology, as the primary driver of the cultural environment. “Higher education, developed from the first under the supervision of Presbyterian and Congregationalist ministers, centered increasingly around religion, not that the popular sects undertook a larger role” (Smith, 1965, p. 36).

In the context of a pervasive theocratic culture, secular education was not yet a distant possibility, and non-sectarianism was still a difficult concept for the citizenry to fully understand given their biases and assumptions regarding the role and function of higher education. Certainly there was a distinction to be made between secular and non-sectarian, but that distinction proved to be unconvincing for a number of decades hence. To be sure, the emerging institution was a religious one but without the singular denominational affiliation that was so common in the early years of American higher education (Rudolph, F., 1962).

Who Will Own Indiana University? During the formative years of Indiana University, each of the major Protestant denominations in Indiana vied for control of the state university. As was the case in many states during this era, sectarian bickering provided the backdrop for the emergence of higher education in America (Lucas, 1994; Rudolph, F., 1962). To be able to boast an essentially state-endorsed set of values would provide a great deal of legitimacy to any Protestant denomination. While the purpose of the state university was incongruent with maintaining a singular denominational affiliation, that fact alone did
not allay the desire of the faithful to have the university represent a singular set of beliefs through its leadership and faculty.

To an extent, the promise of a non-sectarian institution pacified the major denominations because regardless of the non-specificity of the institution’s affiliation, there was no intention for the university to function as anything other than a Protestant institution. Even non-sectarianism had its limitations as there is no indication of any earnest consideration of incorporating non-Protestant people and their beliefs into Indiana University, and there is certainly no indication of a desire to include non-Christian ideals. In this context, non-sectarianism was a severely limited view of the reality of the situation.

A significant indicator of the decidedly Protestant orientation of Indiana University during the early years of its existence was the fact that six clergymen of varying Protestant affiliations would hold its presidency for the first 65 years. This was not so much a coincidence as it was an implicit expectation among the faithful Indiana citizens. In their minds, to place the leadership of Indiana University in the hands of someone other than a clergyman was to subject college students to a learning environment that compromised their salvation. Regardless of the fact that ministers of the gospel exclusively served as leaders for the young university, various elements of the citizenry continued to criticize it depending on the leadership’s affiliation at any given time (see Figure 12). “Criticism of the leadership of the University was chiefly denominational. Whatever church membership the President might hold…the attitude of all other denominations was critical and often hostile” (Myers, 1952, p. 123).
Figure 12. Dominant Conflict: Denominational Control of Indiana University.

The conflicts over who would own Indiana University continued for decades, eventually resulting in denominations that believed they were losing the battle for ownership of the institution establishing their own colleges in Indiana as direct competitors with the state university. The Baptists established Franklin College in Franklin, Indiana, and the Methodists established Indiana Asbury University, now known as DePauw University, in Greencastle, Indiana:

The intense religious feeling of the times interfered with any united effort in higher education. Hardly had the State University been organized when a clerical quarrel began over its control…Feeling that they were not fairly represented on the board or the faculty of the State University, the Methodists withdrew their support and by 1840 Indiana Asbury University was open for students. (Esarey, 1915, p. 292)

Indiana University’s first president was Andrew Wylie, a Presbyterian minister who fervently believed in providing public higher education for all Indiana citizens regardless of their denominational affiliation. “That view, staunchly defended by the university’s earliest
leaders in the face of much opposition, has rarely been noted and is largely forgotten” (Williams, 2003, p. 4). President Wylie was so committed to the principle of non-sectarianism for the university that he authored a book titled *Sectarianism Is Heresy: In Three Parts in Which Are Shewn Its Nature, Evils and Remedy* (Wylie A., 1840). In it he described a situation during which he declined to name a certain professorship after a prominent figure in the Methodist Church on the grounds that it would be improper for a non-sectarian institution to adopt any symbol that might be perceived as showing a preference for any one denomination:

…I objected to the name, not because of any antipathy I might be supposed to have either to Wesley, or that numerous and powerful sect which he was the founder, but simply because it was a sectarian name. I would have had the same objection to the name of Calvin, or to the name of any other man with which the bitter feelings and atrocious prejudices of sect had become associated. I had a still stronger reason for my opposition: By accepting the place which I held in the Institution I had virtually pledged myself to the public to keep it clear of sectarianism: and to consent to call any professorship by the name of Wesley, would be to give to his followers a pledge inconsistent with the former: so that, in the one case or the other, I must prove unfaithful – a predicament in which I could not consent to be placed…. (p. 122)

Despite his stated belief that no one denomination should own Indiana University, A. Wylie (1840) still believed that it was proper for the university to seek professors who were trained ministers: “I was indeed desirous that the Professorship should be created and that a
gentleman, who was spoken of for that purpose, a preacher of some distinction in that church should be the person to occupy it” (p. 121). There is no indication that Wylie intended for Indiana University to venture far from its Protestant (and therefore decidedly sectarian) orientation. Indiana University was a religious institution in practice, even if not in name or affiliation.

During Wylie’s presidency many, including some early trustees of the institution, criticized Wylie for what they perceived to be a bias in favor of Presbyterianism. At one point, a Methodist member of the board of trustees introduced formal charges against President Wylie, claiming he was using his position at the university to promote his own denomination (Williams, 2003). Students and other trustees alike came to his defense, fervently challenging and seeking to disprove what they believed was a false accusation. Despite the charges of Presbyterian bias essentially falling on deaf ears, there were Indiana citizens and leaders who would nonetheless take the criticism a step further by questioning whether Wylie was even religious enough to serve as president of the so-called non-sectarian institution, thus foreshadowing a new element to the ongoing sectarian conflict: one that suggested that the institution itself could not be trusted to provide care and spiritual guidance for the souls of its students.

In 1875, the trustees unceremoniously dismissed president Cyrus Nutt, who had served as Indiana University’s fifth president since 1860. While the exact reason for Nutt’s dismissal is unknown, “Available records suggest that both political and religious forces were at work. If the latter they were surely not of Methodist origin because within ten days after his removal, the ex-president was unanimously elected minister of the Bloomington church…” (T. Clark, 1970, p. 128). Some suggested other reasons for his dismissal, while
others believed that it was another battle in a larger denominational conflict. At any rate, Nutt’s successor was Lemuel Moss, who was a Baptist minister and had previously served as President of what is now known as the University of Chicago.

By the turn of the century, Indiana University was well on its way toward becoming the state’s primary university, but conflicts persisted among denominational elements and between public and private colleges shortly after the turn of the century. Indiana University President William Lowe Bryan was finally successful in diffusing much of this interdenominational ill will due to his willingness to frame the ongoing conflict in terms of something other than an adversarial and competitive relationship between the state university and its denominational counterparts. In his view, Indiana would maximally benefit from a reliance on both public and private education to satisfy the educational needs of its citizenry. Certainly, it was easier for Indiana University to be fully cooperative as the victor of the longstanding sectarian battle for the mantle of the leading higher education institution in Indiana.

Regardless of the conflict du jour, it was clear that the young institution, while working diligently to maintain its non-sectarianism, was not a secular one nor was there any serious intention for it to be secular. The ongoing conflict over which religion would “own” Indiana University serves as a compelling indicator that the prevailing thought of the day was that religious values of some brand ought to be embedded into the fabric of the university. Indiana University was established as a Protestant institution and was unashamedly committed to that goal during its formative years:

Whatever else the student did he was to remember that one of the major objectives of the university was to cultivate the moral and religious man.
Every school day opened with chapel exercises at 8:00 or 8:30 in the morning. In the chapel the president read a passage of scripture and offered up a prayer…Once the songs and scriptures were concluded the president turned to the everyday affairs of the university. (T. Clark, 1970, p. 158)

It is clear that its culture, expectations, and foci were far from being secular and thus analogous to those of a religious institution. However, there is evidence of the emergence of progressive thinking among Indiana University faculty between the years of its founding and the turn of the century that would prompt the incorporation of the sectarian conflict into a new, but related conflict centered on charges of a godless institution.

**A “Godless” Institution.** While some questioned the denominational alignment of Indiana University, they could take solace in the fact that men of God were leading the institution. Indiana University did not have a layman appointed to the presidency until 1885 when David Starr Jordan was called to serve at the helm. Unlike the clergymen who came before him, Jordan was a trained scientist and elite academician with an earned Ph.D. who brought an academic and scientific worldview into his role as president. Jordan was openly critical of the academic credentials of many of his predecessors, none of whom had earned a Ph.D.: “While the college had from the beginning some eminent teachers, its presidents, chosen from the clergy of different religious denominations, were as a rule neither scholarly nor progressive” (Jordan, 1922, p. 187).

It is likely that the Indiana citizenry would have found fault with any man appointed to lead the state university who was not also a member of the clergy, but Jordan’s appointment had more far-reaching implications than that of simply being a layman. Stoking the fears and apprehensions of the citizenry even further was the fact that Jordan was a
scientist and an evolutionist. This fact caused much dissent among ministers and members of Indiana churches because, “They were unable to believe that an evolutionist could have a religious influence on a student body and feared young people were being led astray” (Myers, 1952, p. 104). The citizens of Indiana perceived the role of the president as first and foremost to ensure the continued spiritual growth of students. For a president to view his role otherwise would quickly call into question the justification for state-supported higher education among the Indiana citizenry:

Even more deleterious to its welfare than its location in its first thirty years of existence was the opposition of church-going Hoosiers who not only preferred to send their children to denominational colleges but also protested against paying taxes to support a state college. (Wilson, 1966, p. 198)

President Jordan was quite aware of the thoughts and feelings that existed among the citizenry and the extent to which they were incongruent with the direction of Indiana University. Quoting a former president of the institution, Jordan (1922) said of the citizenry of Indiana that “…the people want to be humbugged; it’s our duty to give them what they want” (p. 187). His statement suggests that though the institution was non-sectarian, (or secular, as Jordan would call it) that it was nonetheless important to maintain certain appearances to guard against the persistent charges that Indiana University was a godless institution. With so much competition from sectarian colleges, Indiana University could not afford to alienate the Hoosier people of faith, whose influence in the relevant cultural and task environments was undeniable.

Following President Jordan’s departure, Indiana University continued on the secular/scientific trajectory that Jordan’s appointment had originally ushered in. John Merle
Coulter, a professor of botany, served as president at Indiana University from 1891 until 1893. Joseph Swain, a professor of biology and mathematics, served as President from 1893 until 1902 when William Lowe Bryan, a psychologist, assumed and retained the presidency at Indiana University for nearly four decades. Gone were the days when ministers provided guidance for the state’s university. Henceforth, men of science and academic credentials would lead the institution.

Because of intermittent failures, non-clergy leadership, and something other than Protestant answers to all questions, the fear and belief among many Hoosier people of faith was that Indiana University was in fact a “godless” institution (Myers, 1944, p. 132), as further evidenced by the perception of blasphemous teachings and the ungodly behavior of its students. As such, there were organized attempts to stop the institution in its tracks early on. “In the Constitutional Convention of 1850 – 1851 proposals were made to abolish it entirely and to compel the legislature to sell its property and use the proceeds for common schools” (Thornbrough, 1989, p. 506). The reality that many of the early non-clergymen presidents and faculty members practiced the Protestant religion did little to mitigate the citizenry’s distrust of the institution. Further, “To substitute for a clergyman president a non-cleric evolutionist, like Jordan or Coulter, was to thousands of good churchmen nothing short of blasting at the foundations of Christianity” (Myers, 1952, p. 123). Many faithful Hoosiers believed the university had become a threat, but were not successful in their efforts to slow Indiana University’s growth:

Indiana had survived the efforts of those who wanted to abolish it completely.

While it remained small and struggling, it had begun to receive regular
appropriations from the legislature and in 1880 stood on the threshold of a period of significant growth. (Thornbrough, 1989, pp. 534-535)

For decades on end, the fear of education as a threat to religion was alive and well in Indiana. It was said of President Coulter that “His influence tended to allay an unwarranted alarm in some quarters lest the spirit of scientific inquiry at the University might have a detrimental effect on the religious belief of the young people” (Harding, 1904, p. 25). As recent as 1914 in a speech to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, President William Lowe Bryan, in an attempt to quell fears that higher education was an evil enterprise, invited those who sincerely believed that higher education was a threat to the Protestant faith to “…deal with the university itself as the most important mission field in the world,” (p. 128), thus inviting them and their influence into the walls of the university to save young college students’ souls. He further sought to reassure the citizenry that Indiana University was still a willing partner in the endeavor to protect the souls of its students.

As time passed, the culture and expectations regarding the incorporation of religion on college campuses would change. This is due, in part to a decline in the membership of the rural Protestant Church in Indiana at the turn of the century (Phillips, 1968). While conflict continued to play a role in the ongoing emergence of Indiana University, the dominant conflict pertaining to institution was becoming less a function of the denominational envy of the past and more a function of a citizenry who still believed the university to be out of touch with their desires and the state’s needs. For many of them, this was partially evidenced by the presence of progressive beliefs among its faculty who were less representative of the clergy than they had been in the past.
No longer did faculty readily adopt the puritanical approach that typified many of their predecessors. “They were not averse to visiting a speakeasy, many condoned liberal social, sexual political and economic attitudes. They often condemned bigotry, and even discussed with students the failures of state and church to meet their social responsibilities” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 268). In short, the faculty was losing its desire to simply be non-sectarian and had moved the institution in a far more obvious secular direction. This was displeasing to the citizens of Indiana who, despite living in a state that had seen the influence of Protestant religious values subside to a degree, nonetheless retained vestiges of the desire for their institutions to serve as unwavering reflections of their personal faith (see Figure 13).
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**Figure 13.** Dominant conflict: Indiana University as a Secular or a Godly Force.

**Reassuring a Faithful Citizenry.** As was the case with most institutions at the time, it was expected that the values and practices of Indiana University would be in concert with and reflective of the cultural values and practices of the Protestant community in order to maintain legitimacy as an institution of learning in the cultural environment. Citizens desired reassurance that Indiana University was a place that was committed to maintaining a high degree of moral behavior in its student body.
To reassure Hoosier families of faith that Indiana University was a godly institution, it was organized in a manner that communicated its commitment to maintaining a godly environment for students. As such, Protestant values and beliefs were intentionally incorporated into the policies, practices, and expectations of the emerging Indiana University, including a specific requirement for the religious observance of its students. Under the heading of “Religious Services,” the 1865 catalogue outlined the expectation that Indiana University students were active consumers of their faith:

1. The duties of each day, during term time; commence with religious services which all are required to attend.
2. Every Sabbath at 3 o’clock p.m. a lecture on some moral or religious subject is delivered in the university chapel, and it is expected that all the students will attend. It is also recommended by the faculty that the student attend some other place of public worship on Sabbath morning according to the direction or preference of his parents or guardian.
3. At all chapel exercises, students are expected to be in their seats when the bell stops tolling. (University Catalogue, 1865 in Atwater, 1905, p. 143)

Not only did the university recommend church attendance, it additionally provided chapel services for its students each day in addition to a religious lecture on the Sabbath. Certainly, an institution so committed to the spiritual lives of its students was more difficult for critics to accuse of being godless and out of touch with the needs and desires of Indiana citizens.

The university’s early position on discipline was reflective of standards of right and moral behavior, stating immorality as sufficient grounds for dismissal. This position further
suggested that the university’s moral influence was necessary in arming its students against evil influences:

The discipline is intended to be strictly parental, and to accomplish its effect, by appealing to the better principles of the heart, avoiding, if possible, severe and disgraceful punishment. It is designed to be preventive rather than penal. But, if it should appear that the student is not susceptible of the influence of such discipline, he will be returned to his friends, in the hope that under other circumstances he may yet form an estimable character.

Immoral, disorderly, or dishonorable conduct, or habitual negligence of duty or want of preparation, is always sufficient reason for directing a student to leave the university.

The faculty will not, except in extraordinary cases, grant letters of dismissal, or give leave of absence, until the close of the session, nor until the student applying for such letter, or for leave of absence, shall have sustained his examination with his class.

The absence of a student, even for a few days, in term-time, exerts on his progress an evil influence, which is seldom fully appreciated by parents or guardians; hence no apology but that of sickness, or other unavoidable accident, is sufficient to excuse a student from a regular attendance at recitation.

As teachers and scholars come together in a University with objects and interests which are identical, we hold that they should always regard themselves as co-workers and endeared friends.
It is our cherished desire that the Faculty and students of this University should always, as at present constitute an undivided, harmonious family, among whom the feelings most appropriate to parents and children shall constitute the paramount and characteristic relation.

Our system of government may be understood by its name: “The Parental.” (Indiana University, 1855, pp. 22-24)

President Wylie believed that students should be disciplined as if they were living in a strict Presbyterian home (T. Clark, 1970). Behaviors such as cursing, visiting saloons or prostitutes, or causing mischief in the community would run counter to this godly standard.

Behavior that was incongruent with Indiana University’s stated moral expectations would be dealt with swiftly, the process of which was on occasion recorded in significant detail. The following is the transcript of a hearing for a student who was charged with disrespect, disorder, and disobedience in his Latin recitation. At the end of the process, the final censure would be read aloud during a chapel service, further linking the disciplinary process with Protestant ideals of right and moral behavior. T. Clark (1970) points out that, “some of these sessions were little more than oral castigations of students” (p. 158):

[Prof. Boisen charges Mr. J.W. Jefferson on 10 Jan 1872 with “gross disrespect, disorder, and disobedience” in Latin recitation (p. 204). Had meetings with witness over a period of four days. Concluded trial on 12 Jan. (excerpt from that meeting’s minutes):]

On motion it was agreed to hear what Prof. Boisen and Mr. Jefferson might wish to say in concluding the trial. Each then made brief remarks
reviewing the case after which they retired. The charges were taken up, and
the following decision was reached.

1st That Mr. Jefferson was guilty of too persistent criticism in Latin recitation
on the 10th inst.

2nd That the 2d Specification, That he approached his Prof demanding apology
is not substantiated by the testimony, the Faculty deeming that a
misapprehension of language was possible.

3d That the 3d Specification – that of disobedience in not leaving the room
when ordered is sustained.

4th That the 4th Specification – that of disrespectful language toward his Prof.
is sustained.

From these Specifications Mr. Jefferson is proved guilty of
disobedience, disrespect and disorder. It being after twelve O’clock Faculty
Adjourned.

A. Atwater, Sec’y

Faculty met at 3 P.M. Prof Boisen absent.

After a discussion of the resolutions of punishment in the case of Mr.
Jefferson, it was resolved to invite Prof. Boisen to be present before the
resolutions should be passed After he had come in the following resolutions
were adopted.

Resolved 1st. That Mr. Jefferson be reproved in the presence of the
Faculty for disobedience in not leaving the room when directed to do so by his
professor and for using disrespectful language toward him. And that he
further be admonished that in general he should avoid wasting the time of
class with unnecessary questions, and that he should also be more careful to
avoid factious criticisms in the future. The Faculty are thus lenient in view of
the fact that Mr. J - . has avowed that, at the time, he was not aware that a
professor has the right of sending a student from his room, and had he known
this, he would have obeyed.

And since there was entire absence of testimony in regard to the words
used by Mr. Jefferson at the stand, the Faculty – while sustaining the
Professor – give to the student the benefit of a possible misapprehension of
language.

Resolved further, That Mr. Jefferson be required to give satisfactory
assurances to the Faculty of future respect to the rules of recitation room and
the instructions of his Professor.

On motion, it was determined that the foregoing resolutions of censure
should be read in Chapel.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote,
Resolution. In reference to the late unhappy occurrence in Prof. Boisen’s
room and the decisions reached by the Faculty respecting Mr. Jefferson we
wish also to say that we appreciate highly Prof. Boisen’s qualification, zeal
and success, and know well his popularity as a teacher and we hope he will
not permit these occurrences to discourage him, that he will continue to
maintain the discipline of his class room with all interest and good nature, and
endeavor to receive Mr. Jefferson, reproved and admonished as he has been, with all kindness and treat him with all forbearance.

On motion at a late hour Fac. Adjourned. A. Atwater Sec’y.

(Faculty Minutes, October, 1865 – June 1872, pp. 209-212)

During the earliest iterations of Indiana University, the faculty members were responsible for carrying out the aforementioned disciplinary process. According to Myers (1952), “For one hundred years, the faculty, in addition to its function as an instructional body, was also a disciplinary body…In that early day, and indeed for many years later, the faculty as a whole considered breaches of good conduct” (p. 761). T. Clark (1970) also mentions that “Throughout the university’s early history the faculty dealt with such disciplinary lapses as drinking, uttering profane oaths, drawing pocket knives in anger, fighting, threats of duels, insubordination, pranks and general rowdiness” (p. 149). T. Clark continues:

They set a stern pattern of decorum which was not changed appreciably until the administration of David Starr Jordan. As much emphasis was placed upon discipline as upon learning, and both required constant humdrum drill.

Backwoods lads arrived in Bloomington with one set of social mores, and the seminary professors had another. (p. 149)

In the beginning there was really no other way to address disciplinary issues than for the faculty to assume an active role. Prior to 1900, the student body was relatively small, as evidenced by the number of degrees conferred during the 1800s, and its curriculum fairly prescribed. Faculty members were few and had not yet fully started down the path that would eventually lead to an elite academic institution. During this time, individual faculty and
faculty committees would monitor conduct and ensure compliance with university policies and adherence to moral behavior.

The practice of having faculty committees assemble to consider disciplinary matters would continue on an ad-hoc basis until 1891. At that time, President Coulter announced the appointment of a committee on discipline, the purpose of which was to alleviate some of the faculty’s growing disciplinary responsibilities so they could focus on the primary teaching responsibilities associated with the emerging academic stature of the institution.

**Summary: From Non-Sectarian to Godless.** The cultural environment was the major influence on Indiana University during its early development. Specifically, the three major Protestant sects prevalent in Indiana during the first several decades of its existence wielded tremendous influence at the institution for several decades (see Figure 14).

![Figure 14. Indiana Cultural Environment Circa 1850.](image)

During its formative years, Indiana University balanced its alignment with the institutional environment *vis-à-vis* its delivery of higher education with demands from the citizens of Indiana. Specifically, they desired that the institution demonstrate proper guardianship of the eternal souls of its students by providing a godly learning environment.
As was their belief regarding many public entities, the Indiana citizenry who comprised the cultural environment expected Indiana University to reflect the ideals, beliefs, and practices associated with contemporary Protestant theology. As such, the cultural environment was embedded into the institution when Protestant ministers exclusively served as president for more than a half-century (see Figure 15). Further, many of the university’s early faculty members were clergymen. Such was the theocratic tendency of the cultural environment during the first several decades of Indiana University’s existence.

Figure 15. Cultural Environment Influences Technical Activities.

Though Indiana University was founded as a non-sectarian state seminary, there was a great deal of conflict pertaining to denominational control of the institution. In practice, the term non-sectarian initially did not literally mean *not sectarian*. Instead, it was simply an indication that no single denomination was to be formally recognized as being associated with the university. Despite the non-sectarian brand, Indiana University’s Protestant orientation was still decidedly sectarian from a strict definition of the term.
At times, each of the three major Protestant denominations (Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian) positioned themselves to be the denomination of primary influence and thus the de-facto “owner” of Indiana University. While all three entities were similar in their Protestant denominational orientation, the Presbyterian theology and values were more closely aligned with the elite academic direction of other colleges and universities. However, the Baptist and Methodist theologies and values were more closely aligned with the theology and cultural values of the Indiana citizenry. Therefore, while the Methodists and Baptists desired to control Indiana University, it was also likely that they were interested in scenarios that prevented the Presbyterians from controlling the institution. As such, there was much consternation related to what was perceived as a Presbyterian Bias in the institution. Symbolic measures would be undertaken to reassure the citizenry in the presence of the perceived threat of Presbyterian bias (see Table 2).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Symbolic Reassurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Bias</td>
<td>1. Faculty and presidential leadership chosen from multiple faith traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Refusal to align with denomination specific language or affiliate with denomination-specific icons (e.g., Wesley, Calvin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Try as they might to have their influence imbedded into the fabric of Indiana University, the Baptists and Methodists were largely unsuccessful in doing so. Over time, the values and foci of Indiana University aligned more closely with the Presbyterian Church.
than either the Methodist or Baptist Churches. Because Presbyterian ministers were usually scholars, their academic leanings of the Presbyterian Church were aligned with the institutional environment to a greater degree than the Methodist or Baptist Churches that typically relied on uneducated ministers. The Methodist and Baptist churches, however, were representative of the cultural environment.

The alignment of technical activities with the institutional environment occurred despite the fact that the Methodist and Baptist churches together represented a greater number of Indiana citizens and thus likely a greater share of both the task environment and cultural environment. One result of this was the founding of other denominational colleges in Indiana that aligned more closely with the Indiana cultural environment. The founding of these colleges increased competition in the task environment and served as the foundation for denominational conflict over higher education in Indiana for decades to come.

The Presbyterians essentially won the initial battle over denominational ownership of Indiana University as evidenced by the institution’s movement toward greater alignment with the more progressive academic values and practices that were more characteristic of the institutional environment than the cultural environment (see Figure 16).
Figure 16. Technical Core Shifts Toward Institutional Environment.

As Indiana University’s technical activities continued on their trajectory toward isomorphism with the institutional environment, elements in the cultural environment vocally questioned the godliness of the institution. Alignment with the cultural environment demanded a more theocratic mission for Indiana University. Essentially, the original denominational conflict was redefined as something far more menacing and problematic for the cultural environment. Though the conflict was redefined as one that divided those who believed Indiana University was for theocratic from those who believed it to be for secular/scientific purposes, it nonetheless retained the same properties that had characterized the former denominational conflict (see Figure 17).
Organizationally, the conflict between values in the institutional environment and values in the cultural environment required Indiana University to be mindful of the problem of maintaining access to the task environment. Because the relevant task environment was largely coupled with a cultural environment where godlessness was not tolerated, it was necessary for the institution to adopt various managerial activities and provide symbolic reassurance to parents and citizens alike that despite an increasing alignment with the academic values of the institutional environment, Indiana University was still committed to maintaining a godly learning environment for the college men of Indiana (see Figure 18).
In an effort to maintain legitimacy in the cultural environment and thus broad access to the task environment, Indiana University first and foremost required that students attend chapel on campus each day. Further, it required Sunday attendance at either a worship service of their chosen denomination or a religious lecture offered on campus. These requirements served as powerful symbols that provided a measure of reassurance to parents and citizens who were concerned with the threat of eternal damnation of their loved ones (see Table. 3).

Table 3.

*Threat and Reassurance: A Godless University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Symbolic Reassurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A “Godless” University</td>
<td>1. Mandatory Chapel Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Campus Religious Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Recommended Attendance at Denominational Worship Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, it was necessary for Indiana University to communicate to parents and citizens that the campus did not stand for immoral behavior and that students who came to Bloomington were expected to uphold a strict code of moral standards and demonstrate a firm adherence to good behavior. President Wylie believed that students should be disciplined as if they were living in a strict Presbyterian home (T. Clark, 1970). Certainly, citizens of godly inclination felt more comfortable sending their students to Indiana University if there were some level of reassurance that they would be disciplined in a manner similar to what they might expect at their own home. As such, behavioral expectations were
prescribed with accountability being enforced via a disciplinary process that included undesirable consequences for wayward behavior. The disciplinary process and its consequences were reinforced when the student in question was publicly castigated and reprimanded for his sins (see Table 4).

Table 4.

*Threat and Reassurance: Student Immorality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Symbolic Reassurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Immorality</td>
<td>1. Disciplinary Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Public Castigation &amp; Reprimand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first several decades of Indiana University’s existence there were no specialized staff dedicated to the activities associated with managing the expectations in the cultural environment and thus managing access to a broader task environment. Faculty members were primarily responsible for carrying out the activities that provided symbolic reassurance to the citizens of Indiana and parents of students who would otherwise be threatened by what they perceived to be a vein of godlessness running through the institution.

**Indiana University’s Emergence**

**The Evolving Technical Core.** Unfortunately, no official record of the courses offered or students enrolled in them exists for the period of the Indiana Seminary (Banta, 1890); however, historians have documented the academic subjects (see Figure 19). During the first year of the institution, there was but one faculty member who taught only Greek and Latin (Woodburn, 1891). “It was resolved by the board sometime during the second year that in addition to the Greek and Latin languages heretofore taught in the State Seminary, there shall be taught by the said Hall English Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Geography, Moral
and Natural Philosophy and Euclid’s Elements of Geometry” (p. 79). Despite this resolution, the curriculum did not advance beyond that of the first year until additional faculty could be hired. Upon the hiring of additional faculty, mathematics and pure and applied sciences would emerge as part of the curriculum (Banta, 1890).

Figure 19. The Evolving Technical Core

When President Wylie arrived in 1828, there were a total of three instructors, including himself, teaching a core of liberal arts courses. At this time, there were no departments, nor were there separate courses of study (Harding, 1904), but only a fairly prescribed and methodical curriculum. As Woodburn (1891) states, “It was a favorite idea of President Wylie that the student should study ‘one thing at a time.’ He should complete his languages, then his mathematics, then his philosophy. Dr. Wylie’s thought was to make broad and well-disciplined minds by requiring a special study of various essential subjects ‘in their turn’ ” (p. 81).
A preparatory department existed beginning in 1830, “...but this was never an integral part of the ‘College proper,’ as the main institution came to be called” (Harding, 1904, p. 36). A Law School was established in 1842, Normal and Agricultural Departments emerged in 1852, a Department of Military Science was founded in 1868, and a Medical Department was added in 1871. The initial curriculum evolved during three distinct periods (see Table 5)

Table 5.

*Periods of Curriculum Evolution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1831 – 1840</td>
<td>One uniform course of instruction for four years, leading to Bachelor of Arts Degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841 - 1878</td>
<td>Expectation that a student pursue a breadth of subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878 -</td>
<td>Specialization in a focus area supplemented with a breadth of subjects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Harding, 1904

Conflict existed between the academic values of Indiana University and the Indiana citizenry from the very beginning. What the Indiana citizenry intended for the university differed early on from the faculty’s teachings. President Wylie was criticized for his lack of understanding of Indiana’s common people and for his ignorance of the possibility of a public university (Madison, 1986, p. 111). Critics further pointed out the irrelevance of “…a classical curriculum of ancient philosophies and languages” (p. 111) to the needs and conditions of the west.

Until the administration of David Starr Jordan (1885-1891), Indiana University’s curriculum, though emergent, was still fairly static and prescribed. Each student was subject
to the same curriculum, rooted heavily in the study of Greek and Latin, that required that each course was taken at a given point during one’s college career.

During the 1850s there had been some talk of establishing an agricultural school at Bloomington and also a school of engineering, but these plans did not materialize. A normal school for teacher training was operated for a short time in 1852-1853 but was soon abandoned. Thus at the end of the 1870’s the course of study included only those subjects which today would be classified as belonging to the liberal arts. There were no professional schools. In a report to the university trustees in 1879, President Moss said that the courses were of “general, liberal discipline, and not of special or professional training” (Woodburn (1891) pp.118, 280, 324; Thornbrough, 1989, p. 509).

Jordan introduced the department system and the elective system to provide for an educational structure that would serve as the beginning of modern-day Indiana University (Myers, 1951). Of the elective system of education, Jordan’s successor, John Coulter, stated that “The whole effect of a University should be to make men think for themselves…When the University abandoned the old patchwork curriculum and substituted for it elective courses of study, it changed from a false to a true theory of education” (Myers, 1952, p. 472).

The 1870s were also a period when professors were beginning to specialize in their subjects. “The day of the professor who taught any and everything was passing, and science was receiving more attention. In 1873 a science building was erected, which it was claimed, included the most complete chemical laboratory in the West” (Thornbrough, 1989, p. 508). As professors began to identify with their chosen disciplines, they became less interested in
dealing with the issues of discipline and morality that faculty had historically addressed in the formative years of the university.

Even by the turn of the 20th century, there existed a notion of what it meant for Indiana University to be among the elite institutions of higher education in America. The university would enter the Association of American Universities in 1909. Myers (1952) described the responsibility of selecting a new president in 1902 as a potential choice between a leader under whom Indiana University would become a “sleepy little college in a sleepy little town” or one under whom Indiana would become a “real university with additional schools and broadened educational opportunities…for Hoosier boys and girls” (p. 2). At the time, “Indiana people and their public officials were at least an academic generation behind in their willingness to support a modern public university or to comprehend its value to the state” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 44). This dichotomy was alive in the minds of those who sought to frame the purposes and future of the emerging state university. It served as a point of contention in the years to come, as Indiana University defined its course as required by the changing needs, culture, and politics of the state of Indiana.

In 1902, there were few competing interests among academic units at Indiana University, largely because there were very few structural opportunities for conflict. At this point, IU was a relatively large liberal arts college with a small law program. The moniker “Indiana University” was not an indication of an extensive state-supported, progressive academic structure, but instead, a name only. Many of the more influential members of the faculty were content to proceed with this limited set of functions into the future. They feared additional academic programs would divert scarce resources into new areas, thus serving to compromise the existing liberal arts core (Myers, 1952). “William Lowe Bryan and his
colleagues, no doubt, if left to their own desires, would have preferred to continue to live in the humanistic world, but the impact of national and world changes denied them the privilege” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 46). However, there were others who believed that the role of the state university was to respond to the growing needs of the state by providing as many educational opportunities as possible for the citizens of Indiana.

After 1900 professors functioned largely in an age when looms, windmills, and locomotives gave way to more sophisticated machines. Indiana University’s records from this period are filled with ample evidence of the searchings for directions in the area of the applied sciences and social studies. (p. 46)

Indiana University’s status as an elite university was augmented when it joined the Association of American Universities (AAU), a distinction that remains a powerful indicator of an institution’s academic might even today.

During the years between 1902 and 1937 (the William Lowe Bryan Presidency), Indiana University saw its number of degrees conferred grow exponentially (see Figure 20). In response to meet the growing needs of Indiana and its students, the university increased the number of faculty at an even more accelerated rate during this time. In an effort to diversify academic offerings, there were added six academic colleges, a separate graduate college, and an extension division. To accommodate these increases in students and university personnel, President Bryan presided over nearly 40 purchases, remolds, or new construction projects during his tenure.
President Bryan found himself at a junction between these opposing sets of values, priorities, and intentions for the future of the university. In his inaugural address, he stated:

> What the people need and demand is that their children shall have a chance – as good a chance as any other children in the world – to make the most of themselves, to rise in any and every occupation, including those occupations which require the most thorough training. What the people want is open paths from every corner of the State through the schools to the highest and best things which men can achieve. To make such paths, to make them open to the poorest and make them lead to the highest, is the mission of democracy.

(Myers, 1952, p. 22)

While Bryan believed that Indiana University should broadly prepare the people of Indiana for complex roles in the 20th century (T. Clark, 1973, p. 45), he also acknowledged the necessity of good quality graduate programs in fortifying the academic legitimacy of the growing institution (p. 51). Referencing the importance of being included in the Association of American Universities, Bryan outlined for the trustees the importance of extending its

---

**Figure 20.** Degrees Conferred at Indiana University: 1830 – 1900.
graduate studies to maintain this elite status saying, “We must meet these conditions…as a matter of self-preservation” (p. 51). At an early stage in Indiana University’s history, it found itself engaged in a conflict between the cultural environment as represented by the vocational desires of the state’s citizens and the elite educational values of the institutional environment. This conflict both reflected previous conflicts and foreshadowed the ongoing paradox of the uses and functions of the state university (see Figure 21).

Figure 21. Conflict Between Vocational Education and Elite Academics.

**Managerial Activities Formalized.** The earliest iteration of the institution’s administration was isomorphic with that of other young universities. The faculty was charged with carrying out many of the still few administrative responsibilities that existed. In fact, until President Jordan’s tenure began in 1885, there had been only two university officers whose work was focused on administrative tasks; the president and the librarian. Until 1890, the librarian was also charged with the duties that would become associated with the newly created role of the registrar. As the institution grew, there was a need for additional staff to aid in registrar duties. In 1899, an assistant registrar was hired to fulfill this role.
The turn of the century saw Indiana University transforming from a makeshift, rural university with little specialization of administrative responsibilities into an organization whose increasingly complex structure began to show evidence of an emerging resemblance to the modern-day Indiana University (see Table 4.5). Though the student population increased significantly during these years, “The increasing complexity of administration during the Bryan presidency was due not so much to increase in size of schools existing in 1902 as to the organization of new schools” (Myers, 1952, p. 762). As the complexity of the academic enterprise increased, so did the structure that would be necessary to support it.

Table 6.

*Administrative Responsibilities 1902*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Responsibilities - 1902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Lowe Bryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Louis Reinhard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Addison Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bidwell Breed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Judson Aley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Eigenmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cravens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulysses Howe Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Porter Foley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*also held academic appointment*

No longer could the increasingly specialized and discipline-focused faculty be asked to provide administrative oversight over an institution that was increasing in complexity by the year. Practices that President Bryan originally instituted during the early years of his administration quickly became impractical, if not wholly impossible, as various academic and non-academic structures were added. Myers (1952) recalls Bryan’s thoughts on the budgeting process early in his tenure: “…When you need something, come and see me and we will talk it over” (p. 763). Clearly, the rapid addition of colleges could not for long
support this informal mechanism of allocating funds. Similarly, it would call for a more formal administrative structure of non-academic functions to support the academic structure.

During this same time period, the summer session was formalized under a divisional director; student healthcare, publicity and publications were formalized; and athletics was first organized as a self-supporting entity, a move which would signal the coming emergence of intercollegiate athletics as fiscally, philosophically, and physically separate from the core of the institution. “As the university expanded, many administrative duties were delegated to deans of schools or directors of divisions…” (Myers, 1952, p. 437). Similarly, many tasks related to student life were delegated first to specialized committees and later to staff members with a specific focus on student life.

**The Changing Environments.** For the first quarter century of Indiana University’s existence, its graduates’ prospects for work were limited mostly to farming, the ministry, crafts and trades, law, and teaching. They were the products of a backwoods culture whose goal was often simply to have a roof overhead and food on the table. Adherence to strict religious doctrine was deeply embedded into the consciousness of the frontier culture. Conversely, the post Civil War student body was in the midst of a transition from compliance to liberation. “The gradual emergence of a more secular society and a consequent erosion of religious influence served in the view of some critics to make institutions that were chiefly preoccupied with the training of clergymen seem atavistic and outmoded” (Lucas, 1994, p. 142). Previous notions of the nature of freedom, religion, economics, and moral behavior were being challenged and openly discussed. While legislators were writing bills such as the one which would regulate the length of a woman’s dress “at a point between the instep and first tendon” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 266), the college woman “…shortened her dresses, rolled her
stockings, painted her face, discarded the bustle, sought more public employment, smoked, drank and engaged in many other forms of free social intercourse” (p. 267).

In navigating this changing time, T. Clark (1973) points out that “William Lowe Bryan and his older colleagues had to meet the challenges of a free-swinging jazz-crazed America with the limited experiences of a cloistered rural university for doing so” (p. 269). It was a new era to be sure and the new demands placed on public universities “…meant they largely had to ignore the academic traditions of higher learning of an earlier agrarian-theocratic society” (p. 4).

Post-Civil War Indiana was different in other ways than it had been prior to the Civil War. Industry was now dominant in areas once solely reliant on an agrarian economy. Indianapolis was becoming a major commercial and financial center. The northern Indiana counties were experiencing unprecedented changes in its demographic, fueled by immigration and the rapid growth of industry. The emerging auto industry and organized labor caused government to respond to myriad different issues than those to which it had become accustomed. Dynamics in the task environment and cultural environment were changing rapidly:

Between 1850 and 1880 the number of cities and factories in the state increased, farm mechanization accelerated, labor unions started to form, and a broadening railroad network connected Indiana to regional and national markets. Black migrants from the South and immigrants from Europe established their own presence in some towns and cities, resisting racist and nativist hostility with varying degrees of success. These changes, along with those generated by a growing population, prompted some expansion of
governmental services and support in areas such as education, though public-
school improvements came slowly and unevenly. All these transitions
occurred within a state whose citizens continued to prize the character and
values of a rural and small-town society. (Glen, 1996, p. 255)

At the same time the Ku Klux Klan was gaining a foothold in the state and seeking influence in university decision-making (T. Clark, 1973, p. 272).

All of these things were meaningful and relevant to Indiana University in that they were considerations that had to be acknowledged in order to keep pace with its rapidly changing environment. Indiana University found itself in a world the likes of which had not existed when it was founded just a few decades prior.

**The Elite Academic Culture.** The persistent conflict over which religious denomination would control the state university would serve as a precursor to a notable cultural conflict between elite academic values and the culture of the Indiana citizenry. The conflict between the educated elite and the largely uneducated citizenry of Indiana closely paralleled the ongoing denominational conflict that had essentially been won by the Presbyterians. While outnumbered, especially in rural Indiana, Presbyterians represented the educated elite, especially among those citizens who were neither educated nor elite:

There were fewer Presbyterians than Methodists in early Indiana, partly because Presbyterians insisted on an educated clergy, while Methodists accepted lay ministers…Lay ministers contributed to the spread of the Methodist faith in Indiana, but at a time when college presidents were typically members of the clergy, the Presbyterians held a distinct advantage over the Methodists in the field of education. (Williams, 2003, p. 18)
L. Rudolph (1963) provides a thorough account of the religious environment and its cultural implications, especially as it pertains to the Presbyterian presence in Indiana during this time. “These Presbyterians viewed themselves as especial guardians and patrons of education, indeed the only competent educators of the people. Other religious groups, notably the Methodists, protested this Presbyterian monopoly but were cavalierly treated” (p. 180). Because the majority of the people in the surrounding area were neither Presbyterian nor well-educated, concerns emerged related to the fact that “The first four professors of the state school were Presbyterian…To the hypersensitive frontiersmen this spelled aristocracy and the union of church and state” (L. Rudolph, 1963, p. 180). The citizens of Indiana were reluctant to adopt the elite academic values, and the wishes and desires of the Presbyterian clergy. In later years, they criticized the progressive academic direction of Indiana University that resulted from the Presbyterian victory in the battle to control the institution.

The desire for a more vocational approach to education among the common people of Indiana proved to be incongruent with the desires of the emerging university and its faculty. The faculty did not see themselves as loyal servants of the Indiana citizenry and their farmhand children. Instead, they believed they belonged to an emerging academic elite on a par with some of the finest colleges and universities in the country. Their values, foci, and activities continued to reflect this trajectory, much to the chagrin of the people of Indiana.

This dichotomy was well known and acknowledged among other Indiana colleges and among politicians:

Though Governor Thomas Marshall and the presidents of the Indiana colleges gave their blessings to Indiana University and its drive to develop graduate education to the highest possible level, they reminded the institution of its
original mission of serving the public-education system of the state. As important as doctors and lawyers were teachers trained in the modern techniques of their craft. (T. Clark, 1973, p. 101)

On campuses across the United States, the movement toward elite higher education was evident in the years between the Civil War and the turn of the century. No longer was it enough to simply serve the needs of the local citizenry; if a university was to maintain a measure of legitimacy, it must be inclined toward constant forward movement:

The developing universities revealed an appetite for expansion, gluttony for work, a passion for growth which constituted one of their most fundamental characteristics. Because there was no agreed-upon idea of what an American university was or might be, there were no theoretical or philosophical limits which the university developers might place on themselves. Only the lack of funds might keep them in harness… (Rudolph, F., 1962, p. 343)

As had been the case throughout Indiana University’s history, conflict between opposing ideologies and uses for Indiana University required the institution to respond in kind by adopting mechanisms for negotiating disparate environments while remaining financially solvent. A conflict that originally developed as sectarian bickering had manifested in different iterations through the years, but was now an abstraction of its former self as a conflict between Indiana University’s cultural environment and its institutional environment (see Figure 22).
Figure 22. Dominant Conflict: Cultural Environment vs. Institutional Environment.

**Student-Affairs Functions Emerge.** As society changed and as the role and focus of Indiana University and its faculty continued to evolve, their interests related to student discipline began to wane. It is likely that Coulter’s creation of a mechanism for enforcing the religious standards the citizenry expected was a response to faculty discontent with their role in the disciplinary process. This mirrored what was happening on campuses across the country. As Lucas (1994) wrote, “Faculty, for their part, were inclined to resent being cast as disciplinarians and felt frustrated when their efforts to maintain order failed” (p. 124). However, President Coulter did his diligence to ensure that resulting conflict would be minimal. “With diplomatic skill he harmonized some differences which had arisen within the Faculty” (Harding, 1904, p. 25).

Coulter’s presidency (1891-1893) would be short-lived. He was replaced by Indiana University graduate, Dr. Joseph Swain, in 1893. During his first year as president, Swain announced the Committee on Student Affairs. Despite a somewhat Orwellian change in name from the original Committee on Student Discipline, the Committee on Student Affairs essentially fulfilled the same role but, as the name change suggested, it reflected a shift in mindset that was evident in the emerging academic culture. The faculty was less concerned...
with the discipline of students and likely more concerned with the interface between students and the emerging academic culture, as evidenced by their shifting language (see Table 7).

Table 7.

*Symbolic Language Pertaining to Student Discipline*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Organizational Outcome</th>
<th>Symbolic Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Control</td>
<td>Committee on Student Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering the Academic Core</td>
<td>Committee on Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was further reflected in the culture emerging at peer institutions. Harvard historian Samuel Eliot spoke eloquently of the diminishing role of the faculty in disciplinary matters:

> Gentlemen almost exclusively engaged in the instruction and discipline of youth are not, usually, in the best condition to acquire that experience in affairs, and acquaintance with men, which, to say the least, are extremely desirable in the management of the exterior concerns of a large literary institution…Arrangements for instruction must be adapted to the state of the times, and to that of the world around, as well as of that within, the college walls; and of this state men engaged in the active business of life are likely to be better judges than the literary man. (as cited in Lucas, 1994, p. 125)

The committee on student affairs was composed of three high-ranking members of the administration and faculty and enjoyed a level of prominence in the institution: “The personnel of this committee is indicative of the high importance attached to it” (Myers, 1952, p. 761). The committee’s role was to consider breaches of conduct and to offer
recommendations to the faculty, who retained the final decision-making authority (see Table 8).

Table 8.

*Committee on Student Affairs as a Mechanism for Conflict Privatization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict Privatization Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Misbehavior</td>
<td>Committee on Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though well-intentioned and rational, this arrangement did not result in the hoped for savings of time and energy for faculty members who were increasingly desirous of a singular focus on academic pursuits. Instead, they were still heavily involved in the time-intensive process of reaching a final decision in disciplinary matters.

Faculty meetings were held frequently and the major business on many occasions was the discussion of the report of the committee on student affairs.

There were always faculty members who would impose harsh penalties.

Others advocated penalties so light that they had no disciplinary value. Much time was consumed finding a mid-course between these extremes. (Myers, 1952, p.761)

**Summary: Indiana University’s Emergence.** Initially, Indiana University’s technical activities were limited to a relatively meager core of liberal arts courses. As the task environment expanded and additional resources became available, more faculty members were hired and the subjects of study were augmented as technical activities became more extensive and diverse. Even during the early stages of its development, the university was criticized for offering a curriculum that was inconsistent with the desires of a cultural
environment that was primarily concerned with the immediate vocational needs of the Indiana citizenry. President Jordan continued to align Indiana University’s academic trajectory with the other elite higher-education institutions that comprised the institutional environment by introducing the elective system. During this time, students and faculty alike became more aligned with the academic focus of the institutional environment, which was focused on the work of learning and the creation of knowledge, and the perspective that higher education’s role was to teach men to think for themselves. This innovation further represents Indiana University’s technical activities continuing to shift further from their original alignment with the values of the cultural environment (see Figure 23).

Figure 23. Technical Core Shifts Further.

By the turn of the century, it was evident that while Indiana University existed in a cultural environment that was described as being “…at least an academic generation behind in their willingness to support a modern public university or to comprehend its value to the state” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 44), it was increasingly aware of the curricular evolution of the emerging elite academic culture that comprised its institutional environment. While Indiana University’s technical activities still consisted of a relatively large liberal arts college with a
small law program, it was evident that the changing world and the progress afoot in the world of elite academia necessitated a broader view of what the university could become.

Though professors had succeeded in executing various managerial activities in addition to technical activities during the first several decades of Indiana University’s existence, its rapid growth and increasing complexity necessitated the development of a non-academic structure charged with carrying out managerial activities and maintaining access to the task environment. The establishment of new academic units, the emergence of more complicated budget processes, the provision of basic services, and the materialization of intercollegiate athletics were all factors contributing to this new reality. Additionally, as the work of faculty became more specialized, there was growing organizational impetus to develop specialized non-faculty positions that buffered Indiana University’s technical core while managing the cultural and task environments.

Also contributing to rapid changes at Indiana University was the fact that the world was literally shifting under the institution’s feet. The university’s task environment was in a state of flux as Indiana’s economy was transitioning from agrarian to industrial. The cultural environment was also changing as Indiana’s population became more urban and the pervasive theocratic influences of the past subsided. Indiana University’s choices at the turn of the century were vital in determining its continued value to the cultural environment and its continued relevance in the institutional environment.

The fact that Presbyterians, who were largely aligned with the institutional environment, essentially won the original sectarian conflict became evident when the institution aligned with elite academic values present in the institutional environment as opposed to those of the Indiana citizenry in the cultural environment. Indiana University
existed in a rural community with rural values and students from rural backgrounds.

Simultaneously, it was hastily transitioning from a sleepy college in the wilderness to one that was more focused on scientific studies and graduate and professional programs. As such, faculty members gained notoriety as leaders in their fields. They had little interest in serving the vocational needs of the community or in serving as moral stewards for students.

The conflict between vocational education and elite academics emerged as dominant. As was the case during the sectarian conflict and the conflict between theocratic or secular/scientific uses of Indiana University, vocational/elite conflict once again emerged along the cleavage between the institutional environment and the cultural environment. Eventually the dominant conflict was most aptly described as one between Indiana University’s cultural environment and its institutional environment. Though the conflicts were defined differently at different junctures, they each retained the properties and tension of the conflict that preceded it. Essentially the vestiges of each conflict were absorbed into each subsequent conflict. As such, the original sectarian conflict was organized into Indiana University from the beginning, where it persisted through the institution’s history (see Figure 24).

*Figure 24. Conflicts Redefined and Absorbed.*
Despite the technical core’s alignment with the institutional environment, the behaviors and attitudes present in the cultural environment were nonetheless transmitted into Indiana University each fall as a new cohort of Hoosiers arrived from the hills and the farms to earn a degree. As such, it was necessary to develop managerial activities that served to buffer the technical core from unwanted influence (see Figure 25). The Committee on Student Affairs was one such buffer. Though faculty members served as the final arbiters of student behavior upon the recommendation of the committee, many were content to surrender their responsibility for managerial activities, such as student discipline, in favor of a singular focus on elite academic pursuits.

Figure 25. Managerial Activities Buffer the Technical Core.

The Hoosier Student

**Hoosiers Go to College.** Baynard R. Hall, a Presbyterian minister, was appointed as the first professor and superintendent of the State Seminary of Indiana. He had been educated at Union College and at Princeton Theological Seminary. In describing Professor Hall, the Seminary Trustees called him “...a gentleman whose classical attainments are perhaps not inferior to any in the western country; and whose acquaintance with the most
approved methods of instruction in some of the best universities in the U. States, and whose morals, manners and address render him every way qualified to give dignity and character to the institution” (State Seminary, 1825).

His extensive classical education greatly exceeded that of most of the people in the immediate community. Hall believed this educational gap to be a source of conflict. He believed that the early animosity toward the Indiana Seminary “reflected primarily the alienation of the local community from educated people and was not merely the result of a bias against Presbyterians” (Williams, 2003, p. 7). Hall’s sentiments echo this study’s aforementioned findings of multiple different but related conflicts that served to shape Indiana University over time. It was said that the people of the area “…set no value on learning” (Carlton, 1916, p. 328). An account of this is recorded by Carlton (1916): “Daddy says he doesn’t see no sort a use in the high larn’d things – and he wants me to larn Inglish only, and bookkeeping, and surveyin, so as to tend store and run a line” (p. 324).

Professor T.A. Wiley described the students of early Indiana University as having been

…brought up on farms and used to hard work. They came to Bloomington, generally on their own resources, depending on money they had earned or borrowed. It was not unusual for students to attend to their studies for a year and then absent themselves for the same length of time in order to earn money by teaching or otherwise, and return to complete their college course. Out of this kind of material have many of the graduates been made, who have done honor to their alma mater and their country. (Rawles, 1904, p. 8)
By the turn of the century, Indiana University was well on its way to standing among the elite universities in the United States. Despite a faculty that desperately wanted to become leaders in their field and known the world over for rigorous academic standards, Indiana University would remain situated in rural Indiana. As such, its students still tended to hail from rural Indiana and would therefore often reflect the mindset and behavior that one might associate with such an upbringing. T. Clark (1973) describes the turn-of-the-century, state-university student as one who

…reflected a rural-small town background and attitude. He has little urban sophistication and demonstrated a remarkable lack of independence in asserting his will and his views. This is not to say, however, that he was incapable of expressing himself in his rowdy pranks, head-breaking class contests, resistance to parental university rules and various other forms of sinning…While the president and professors struggled during the early Bryan years to reorganize the university, students continued to act like academy boys. Indiana students reflected the conditions of society in the state; in fact the university’s student body was a microcosm of much of the Roosevelt era’s Midwestern life itself. (p. 140)

He also describes the first Indiana University students as wearing crude floppy hats and cow skin shoes while armed with man-sized pocket knives (T. Clark, 1970, p. 148). As such, Indiana University students did not arrive on campus with a thirst for knowledge and propensity for culture that paralleled that of the faculty.

The earliest students to present themselves in Bloomington were Lincolnesque in background and experience. They made their laborious ways to the town
hoping to study the “three R’s,” although only three of them had been exposed to more than the most elementary schooling. A dispute developed at the outset between students and Baynard Rush Hall over what they were to be taught. (T. Clark, 1970, p. 147)

**Boredom Begets Bad Behavior.** The setting for Indiana University was not a conducive venue for promoting productive ways for its students to spend their time when not studying. Idle time was far from being the best medicine for an orderly and scholarly campus community:

There was no place on the campus where students could gather for relaxation and recreation, and no place outside classrooms and the chapel in which to conduct their various organizational affairs. Thrown upon the meager resources of the town they had to create their own social life without much positive guidance from anyone including the university and local churches. (T. Clark, 1973, pp. 125-126)

Resulting was a number of student behavioral issues that proved to be taxing both for faculty administrators and Bloomington residents alike. Not only were they undesirable, but they further detracted from the serious academic values of the Indiana University faculty. During one such November evening,

…as a result of a clash between students and police two students were jailed.

The “celebration” honored the end of an unusually successful football season. Students in all states of dress and undress flocked into the square that evening, built a bonfire, made inflammatory speeches about nothing, and otherwise held the cottagers at bay. They rushed the southside theater sending the actor-
villain to the wings in fright where he demanded police protection. The theater manager rushed into the street and demanded immediate silence. For an instant there was silence, and then came an unsettling yell urging these self-appointed warriors to charge four men in blue. The policemen clubbed down a boy, two students were jailed and the night ended with Bloomington nerves frayed. (T. Clark, 1973, p. 144)

Though the university had instituted the Committee on Student Affairs and its associated protocols for responding to student behavior when they ran afoul of expectations, they had not done as much to proactively foster an environment where students were kept busy and satisfied so as not to run afoul of the expectations of the academic community. “That students sometimes proved unruly and difficult of management was as much a reflection of failures of the university to provide for them as it was a state of lingering adolescent willfulness” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 125). “There was little more a student could do in Bloomington except go to church, sneak into a saloon, and play pranks on townspeople” (T. Clark, 1970, p. 176). Some of these same townspeople argued that the university was delinquent in its efforts to monitor and control the behavior of its students:

It was said, partly in jest, that Indiana University had no rules governing the personal behavior of its students. This was only partially true. The word of William Lowe Bryan and his appointed faculty committees made the rules as the need for discipline arose. (T. Clark, 1973, p. 143)

The Indiana University administration was keenly aware that the behavior of its students was having an ill effect on its image in the community (p. 145). However, some, including
Professor Ernest H. Lindley, pointed out that the Bloomington townspeople shared as much of the responsibility as Indiana University:

It has been said…that what happens between 6 o’clock in the evening and 6 o’clock in the morning has more influence over a student’s life than anything that happens in the classroom so you people of the town have as much to do with shaping the future lives of students as we instructors at the University do. (T. Clark, 1973, pp. 145-146)

It was clear that faculty in those days did not exhibit the same enthusiasm for being responsible for student behavior as they once did. Citizens in college communities throughout the nation disagreed with the faculty abdication of their responsibility to control college students:

Unnerved by the “benign neglect” of students in their extracurricular activities outside the classroom, and the seemingly desultory fashion in which university officials superintended student life, conservatives argued vigorously on behalf of the pattern of minute student surveillance and regulation of conduct typical of the past. (Lucas, 1994, p. 168)

Whether they were driving stolen skeletons through the streets of Bloomington in a sleigh, randomly milking unsuspecting range cows, or fighting with knives in local churches (T. Clark, 1970, p. 151), the behavior of Indiana University students did not amuse the Bloomington citizens who were vocally critical of the university because of the uncontrolled behavior of its students.

The post-Civil War era ushered in a new set of challenges that contributed to the pervasive boredom of the Indiana University student. Many of the students had served as
soldiers. As a result, they had become accustomed to a level of entertainment, excitement, and freedom that neither Indiana University nor Bloomington, Indiana, could match. The changing nature of expectations among Indiana University students was noticed.

**Student Activities as a Solution.** As the era of strict discipline rooted in a Protestant ethic dissipated, the Indiana University students did not immediately become the committed scholars and pillars of society that faculty might have hoped they would be. Instead, they were often bored because of a dearth of options for spending their time productively. To be sure, there were *some* student activities during the early years of Indiana University, but they would remain “under the strict administrative thumb” (T. Clark, 1977, p. 75). President Wylie believed that “So long as students could be kept on campus, they could be reasonably well-controlled” (T. Clark, 1970, p. 151). As a result, various activities began to emerge as conflict-privatization mechanisms. Often the activities themselves would be regulated by students with the assistance of administrators.

Another early and enduring attempt to maintain order among the student body was the formation of the Indiana Union:

One of the most promising movements that has been started for years at a state institution is the formation of the Indiana Union: which is to take the place of a University club…The club proposes to become a network, which will draw students of the state institution into a closer web of friendship, giving them a place to append their leisure time with their fellows, and form a bond of unity, which will keep the interests of Indiana graduates riveted to their alma mater after leaving college (T. Clark, 1973, p. 153).
The Union as an outlet outside the formal classroom setting was not embraced by faculty: “…a committee of professors was to complain in a formal report that the Union was too popular. They, like the local billiard parlor keepers and barbers of Bloomington eyed this competition with jaundiced eyes” (p. 153). The irony of the attitudes of the faculty members is that activities deemed too popular were the same activities that were often successful in exerting a manner of control over student behavior, and therefore buffering that behavior from the academic core of Indiana University.

Another attempt to redirect student behavior was by altering what had become a troubling tradition of burning various books in proximity to Abraham Lincoln’s birthday. “For Bryan and his colleagues this affair proved to be an annual horror…” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 141). The attempt to create a track meet and a more controlled bonfire in its place only resulted in additional unforeseen consequences. While this attempt proved to be unsuccessful, the introduction of some student activities was successful in mitigating the culture of misbehavior among college students, men in particular, relative to what it had been in the past. Atwater (1905) speaks to this sentiment in a reflection on his 40-year relationship with IU, saying:

I think that mischief was more common forty years ago than now. It would be idle to attempt to mention the various forms of trickery by which the restless student amused himself and annoyed the authorities of college and town. If there has been a change for the better, how has it been brought about? The general growth of the college away from crude and boyish conditions and its development into a higher University life has been, we may say, the chief general cause. (p. 144)
The aforementioned committee on student affairs’ role extended beyond classroom disruptions and other individual breaches of student conduct. On occasion, the committee considered matters related to the collective behavior of students. One such instance involved Indiana University students engaging in behaviors in the Bloomington community that were not well-received by local business owners. As a result, the committee made a recommendation to the faculty for corrective action that served the multiple purposes of putting students on notice, providing the faculty with considerable leeway in allocating penalties for further breaches, and mandating that celebrations following athletic events would no longer be spontaneous but instead directed by specific student committees, which were no doubt under the watchful eye of faculty and staff:

It is the sense of the Faculty that the method of celebrating athletic victories by students entering place of business or amusement in a body, and in effect, coercing the proprietors or managers to contribute goods or furnish amusement without price is unlawful, unjust to the business men, and unworthy of students. This practice tends to dull the student’s sense of the personal and property rights of individuals, and if unrestrained, may lead to violence and disorder. If students desire to rejoice over a victory they ought to be willing to pay for the celebration themselves and ought not to force merchants to foot the bill. The Faculty are constrained to believe that most students who have participated in this practice in the past have done so out of pure thoughtlessness and that a little straight thinking would lead them to see that such conduct is clearly unlawful.
Be it resolved, therefore, by the Faculty, that any student found guilty of participating in such disorder shall be subject to such penalty as may be deemed fitting.

Further, it is recommended that a committee of students, such as the “Booster Club,” assume the direction of all student celebrations and conduct them in a manner which will not bring discredit upon the student body or upon the University. Faculty Minutes, 1913-1915, p. 15. (Recommended by the Student Affairs Committee and adopted by the faculty on May 31, 1915 (p.146)

T. Clark (1973) references a similar conversation:

That fall a first step was taken in the organization of the governing council when the faculty athletic committee…endorsed the idea of instituting a corps of student marshals to police public assemblies and athletic events, and maybe to corral the tobacco chewers. The first proposal was that the student body should be represented by four men who would be entitled to vote on questions of athletic management and student behavior. (p. 150)

In doing so, Indiana University was able to effectively mitigate the conflicts (and the criticism that followed them) between the university and local merchants that developed as a result of students behaving irresponsibly, though certainly not maliciously, during their celebratory visits to town after the game. Further, the committee mandated that a student group take responsibility for ensuring that the good name of the university was maintained. This was a brilliant move in that it provided an identifiable group of students who could be held accountable for transgressions of the whole. As a result, it is likely that the group had a
“cooling effect” on the behavior of their peers. Identifying and labeling students made it more possible for them to be monitored and controlled.

**Summary: The Hoosier Student.** Indiana University emerged from humble beginnings as a state seminary in a sleepy town in the wilderness. During that period of transition, there were a number of dominant conflicts that helped to shape the structures, processes, and beliefs of the institution. Having been redefined multiple times, the dominant conflict that necessitated the development of various managerial functions was one between the cultural environment and the institutional environment. (see Figure. 22 from page 120).

Because of the student demographic and because Bloomington was located far from the bright lights of the big city, there was a great deal of mischief and tomfoolery among Indiana University students. Such untoward behavior was problematic for both the local community who remained suspicious of the university and for the emerging academic community. The typical student did not arrive on campus as the product of learned parents and elite boarding schools. Instead, he was a reflection of the rural Indiana cultural environment much to the chagrin of professors and some Bloomington townspeople. In short, students found very few social or recreational outlets in sleepy, rural Bloomington, Indiana. As such, the oft-mischievous students would occupy their time in a manner that incited conflicts between the townspeople and the university faculty and staff. Each party believed the other to be responsible for controlling student behavior when they were outside the classroom. Student misbehavior presented challenges not only for the townspeople but also for the burgeoning academic core that sought to minimize conflicts that would divert energies and resources from technical activities.
In response to student misbehavior, a number of managerial activities emerged to privatize the various conflicts while buffering the technical activities from cultural environment influence (see Figure 26). The purpose of these was to occupy students’ time in a manner that was university sanctioned and in concert with behavioral expectations.

*Figure 26. Managerial Activities Limit Influence of Cultural Environment.*

One mechanism prescribed that students be segregated into identifiable groups with peer leaders serving as symbolic proxies for university officials. The result of holding a small number of students accountable for the behavior of the whole was improved student behavior. While this did not eliminate all problems, it provided mechanisms for privatizing conflicts that otherwise affected both the Bloomington community and the Indiana University technical core.

In total, several managerial activities were devised to manage the various conflicts related to student behavior on campus (see Table 9).
Table 9.

*Conflict Management Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Managerial Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unruly athletic celebrations</td>
<td>Athletic Booster Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Disorderly off-campus behavior</td>
<td>1. Indiana Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Off-campus alcohol use</td>
<td>2. Student Clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pranks in the community</td>
<td>3. Campus Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vandalism</td>
<td>1. Planned Athletic Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous / Uncontrolled Activities</td>
<td>2. Structured Student Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women Go to College**

**Indiana University: The Glass Ceiling.** For many years on either side of the turn of the century, coeducation was a new concept in higher education for which there existed a great deal of opposition in the external community (T. Clark, 1973, p. 23) and thus in the cultural environment. The resistance was deeply woven into the fabric of the local culture and associated heavily with Protestant theology. Critics sincerely believed the education of men and women together to be “…an abomination before God” (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 26). “Indeed, people often found themselves hard pressed to explain why good families, pillars of the church, not known for any particular foolishness in the past, were sending their daughters off to the female colleges” (Rudolph, 1962, p. 313).
Writing under the pseudonym of Sola, Olive San Louie Anderson (1878) authored a novel that provided context for the experiences of women at a state university, the University of Michigan in this case, during the early years of coeducation. As Nidiffer (2000) points out, “Although Michigan was regarded as one of the better universities in terms of providing opportunities for women, Anderson’s story unmask any pretense that women’s admission to a university implied equal opportunity” (p. 20). At some colleges, women were unable to participate in extracurricular activities, were not permitted to attend chapel services, and were expected to remain standing in the classroom until all males had taken their seats (Lucas, 1994). Thus, the historical record disputes assertions that the experience of women on campuses was equal to that of men.

The first mention of coeducation at Indiana University occurred in 1852 when the Board of Trustees recommended a Normal Seminary with separate departments for men and women (Myers, 1952). Despite this passing consideration, coeducation did not arrive at Indiana University for a number of years when a confluence of circumstances would make it necessary for the institution to move in this bold, new direction. T.A. Wylie (1890) described Indiana University’s process of seriously considering an allowance for coeducation:

…Mr Jenkinson…a member of the Board of Trustees, offered a resolution to admit females to the same studies and standing as the males. For some time before this, the subject, “the coeducation of the sexes,” had been agitated in various educational conventions, and Mr. Jenkinson was a strong advocate in its favor…The other members of the University Board were not prepared for the innovation; no member but himself approved of the resolution presented. 
At a subsequent meeting, Judge Rhoads offered a substitute for this resolution of Mr. Jenkinson, proposing to admit females to partial rights and privileges, but this was not agreed to by the Board. The original resolution was then pressed, and about the same time a petition was presented by Miss Sarah P. Morrison, asking that the law of the University should be so changed that females, with regard to their studies and privileges, should be put on the same footing as the males. This request of Miss Morrison, coming when the question was before the Board, had, without a doubt, influence in the Board’s deciding in favor of Mr. Jenkinson’s resolution. The motion, however, was carried only by a majority of one; four in favor, three against it. Miss Morrison, who knew nothing of the agitation of this question by the Board, received a reply to her petition that the laws of the University with regard to this matter required no change, and that its doors, with all its rights and privileges, were open to females. Miss Morrison then entered the Sophomore Class at the beginning of the next year, 1868-9, and about nine weeks after a number of young ladies entered the Freshman Class, and before the end of the second term there were twelve female students. (pp. 74-75)

Indiana University was a pioneer among state universities in that women were admitted to the institution as early as 1867. Though there is some dispute as to which universities were the first to adopt coeducational admissions policies (Newcomer, 1959), it is accepted that Indiana University was among the first state schools to adopt a formal policy that allowed for coeducation. These state colleges were preceded in admitting women as
students by a few private institutions such as Antioch, Oberlin, and Fort Wayne Colleges (Harding, 1904).

Sarah Parke Morrison was the first woman admitted to Indiana University in 1867. Morrison was the daughter of a former professor and president of the Indiana University Board of Trustees. She later reflected on the relative novelty of the concept of women attending college during the time when she was considering attending Indiana University:

The date of my entry in the State University was twenty years after that of my brother Robert’s, though I was two years his senior.

I possibly had a dim perception that I ought to go first but nothing more, if that, for the idea of women entering men’s colleges had not then dawned upon the average feminine mind, much less upon the male intellect, except perhaps in some sporadic cases which wouldn’t have been considered decent to mention to the public ear. (Morrison, 1919, p. 529)

Morrison (1919) also recounted the mental fortitude and certainty of purpose necessary for women to overcome the pervasive cultural barriers to stepping into roles that had not historically been available to them:

Lucy Stone and Susan B. Anthony were also chief among the powerful influences in forming conviction in plastic minds, but their position was too newly peculiar, too audacious to be received, wholly by such as had no courage and a rather sensitive imagination respecting mobs, sneers, hisses, mud slinging and rotten eggs, though their genius for the martyrdom of years commanded secret respect. Nerves had to be toughened and reasoning
strengthened, conscience and duty awakened, and the soul centered in
foundation principles before it could risk itself for others and itself. (p. 530)

Despite having such a heroic approach and a pioneering spirit, Morrison (1919), and other women pursuing higher education, did not find the desired encouragement even among her own family who were reluctant to support a woman attending a man’s college, even if it was one of their own. “When the decision was finally announced, no one in the family encouraged it. This was more than they bargained for” (p. 532). Certainly, a woman would need to overcome significant obstacles if she were to succeed in an environment that was neither organized to accommodate her nor was one that expected her to succeed. The pressure for women to measure up to men on campus was significant. Morrison (1919) wrote that a “…woman must come up to the mark, must be careful to establish no precedent injurious to her interests…To fail would be worse than not to try. Whoever undertook that job must stick to it and triumph at the end” (p. 531). Such was the pressure of being the first woman to attend Indiana University in the 1860s.

Objections to Coeducation. During the dawn of coeducation on college campuses, there were numerous reasons articulated for why women should not attend college with men. Because of the pervasive theocratic cultural environment that existed in Indiana (and in fact, the nation) during this time, Protestant theology, which articulate the subservient role of women (Genesis 3:16; 1 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Corinthians 14:34; Ephesians 5:22) and the cultural desirability of women who demonstrated piety, obedience, and domesticity (Solomon, 1985, p. 25) would be foundational in defining beliefs about women in higher education. Nidiffer (2000) and Lucas (1994) both offer outlines of additional arguments that were routinely employed to criticize women on campus. Included in these were biological
claims and arguments that expressed belief that higher education might make women more masculine and that women might simultaneously feminize higher education. It was also common in those days to fear that women attending might eventually lead to the eradication of the preferred (white) race, due to the lower birth rates among college-educated women. Such were the popular arguments that sought to preserve higher education as an exclusive domain for men.

The well-known and readily accessible, biological argument of Dr. Edward H. Clarke would embolden critics of coeducation largely due to the scientific credibility of a former faculty member at the Harvard Medical School. In his book, *Sex in Education: Or, a Fair Chance for the Girls*, Clarke (1873) outlined a biological case against coeducation. Despite his basic assumption that “Man is not superior to woman nor woman to man” (p. 13), he nonetheless presented a number of arguments that suggested that the sexes ought to be trained differently and thus not be subjected to coeducation. Speaking of women being educated as men, Clarke (1873) stated:

> But it is not true that she can do all this, and retain uninjured health and a future secure from neuralgia, uterine disease, hysteria and other derangements of the nervous system, if she follows the same method that boys are trained in. Boys must study and work in a boy’s way, and girls in a girl’s way. They may study the same books, and attain an equal result, but should not follow the same method. (p. 18)

Clarke (1873) further argued that there were unfortunate and unintended consequences associated with subjecting women to the same rigorous study as men. Such study practices could be injurious to the female reproductive system:
Girls, between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, must have sleep, not only for repair and growth, like boys, but for the additional task of constructing, or, more properly speaking, of developing and perfecting then, a reproductive system – the engine within an engine. The bearing of this physiological fact upon education is obvious. Work of the school is work of the brain. Work of the brain eats the brain away. (pp. 50-60)

Clarke (1873) went on to recommend four conditions that would provide girls with a fair chance to receive an education:

…first, a sufficient supply of appropriate nutriment; secondly, a normal management of the catamenial (menstrual) functions, including the building of the reproductive apparatus; thirdly, mental and physical work so apportioned, that repair shall exceed waste, and a margin be left for general and sexual development; and fourthly, sufficient sleep. (p. 60)

Though ridiculed in some corners, Clarke’s work left an imprint in the minds of many and provided fodder for those who sought to preserve both higher education and womanly grace by ensuring that the two did not quickly join forces. “The delicate bloom, early but rapidly fading beauty, and singular pallor of American girls and women have almost passed into a proverb” (p. 21), said Clarke (1873) as he lamented a future where women would surely cease to be women as they had been known.

**Women as an Operational Necessity.** In the early years of higher education and throughout the Civil War era, enrollments on campuses across the country dwindled. “The inevitable result was that most colleges subsisted on the verge of insolvency” (Lucas, 1994, p. 114). Early universities barely sustained themselves with the meager population of male
students who trickled in. The Civil War exacerbated this problem. Indiana provided significant manpower for the Union army, with 74.3% of its military-aged men serving in the war (Thornbrough, 1989, p. 124). This level of support was second among all states participating in the conflict. As such, it is not a coincidence that women began to arrive on campus during the years immediately following the Civil War. The introduction of coeducation was certainly not a progressive or egalitarian effort, but instead one that recognized the dire economic conditions of colleges at the time. “One of the main arguments for admitting women to formerly all-male colleges was that the resulting enlargement of the student body might be expected to increase their total resources” (Phillips, 1968, p. 426).

Nidiffer (2000) further asserts: “The presence of women on a campus was a tangible sign of an institution’s lack of wealth and prestige. The rather condescending attitudes of eastern educators…fueled resentment” (p. 31). Given the need to maintain a level of growth while accounting for the economic and human losses suffered during the Civil War, it had ceased to be fiscally responsible for Indiana University and other institutions to exclude half the population from becoming students.

Another factor that contributed to the emergence of coeducation was the need for teachers. The short supply of available male teachers following the Civil War combined with the fact that men were typically paid two to four times more than women were paid (Newcomer, 1959) created a market for females to attend college to become teachers. Indiana would be subject to this national trend:

The demands for teacher training after 1900 reflected several important social and educational changes in Indiana. Since the 1870s the university had attempted to discontinue its own involvement in preparatory training…Liberal
arts presidents and professors were forced to submerge their opposition to the normal school and to permit it to award the A.B. degree…the organization of a college of education opened the doors of the university even more fully to women. It was now an established fact that women constituted an enormously important source of teachers, and to cost-conscious legislators and local boards of trustees, the cost of their hire was much lower. (T. Clark, 1973, pp. 102-103)

While the growth of the female student population was slow during the early years of coeducation, the population of female students doubled at Indiana between 1892 and 1898. During the 1898-1899 academic year, women accounted for 30% of the student body. Also, the institutional requirements of serving the female student population changed during this time. Rosenberg (1988) said that “The first generation of college women was a dedicated group, more interested in preparing for a career than in finding a husband…” (p. 115), while “…the next generation represented a broader group of young women, many of whom regarded college not simply as an avenue to work, but also as preparation for marriage” (p. 116). Solomon (1985) affirms this perspective saying that “First generation college women were forthrightly serious; single-minded and conscientious, they hid neither purposefulness nor anxiety. In contrast, the women of the second and third generations let themselves appear to be at college for the ‘pursuit of happiness’ ” (p. 95). This change in focus provided challenges that did not exist for colleges when women first arrived on campus. Further, as was the case when male students engaged in untoward behaviors, a cohort of females who were not perceived as altogether academically serious presented a challenge to Indiana University’s academic culture.
The College Campus: A Man’s World. By the turn of the 20th century, the female population at Indiana University had increased exponentially since coeducation arrived in 1867. In 1903, more than one third of Indiana University students were women: 560 women out of 1,460 total students. Despite their significant numerical growth as a percentage of the student body, parity did not exist for women on campus, as their experiences and opportunities were still very different than those of their male counterparts. In addition to the necessity of maintaining a high level of scholarly excellence to justify their presence on campus, women faced additional and significant barriers to success both inside and outside the classroom:

First, they were forced to find living quarters on their own and in town. In their searches, they were often victimized by landladies’ preferences for male roomers. Co-eds had to protect their maidenly image as best they could in conformity with a strict moral standard of the pre-world war years, yet they often lived in what both parents and deans of women viewed as unsatisfactory proximity to male students. Women in the university had limited voice in expressing opinions about either their welfare or campus manners. (T. Clark, 1977, pp. 132-133)

Women on college campuses were further subject to heckling and ridicule at the hands of their male classmates. “Women were explicitly ridiculed under the guise of humor as misogynistic cartoons and stories filled campus newspapers, literary magazines and yearbooks” (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 30). They were excluded from participating in many of the activities that were available to men. Further, women experienced marginalization at the hands of faculty members who ignored them in the classroom, ignored their gender when
referring to them, and omitted them in university policies (Nidiffer, p. 30). Though women were responsible for keeping the man’s university financially afloat during a time of need and though they did what was asked of them, it is clear that their presence evoked a not-so-subtle resentment among male students and faculty alike.

As the economy recovered near the turn of the 20th century, arguments against coeducation would resurface on campuses across the country. The woman’s tuition was no longer necessary to maintain the solvency of the university. Further detrimental to their cause was the fact that faculty members perceived the second generation of female students as less serious about academics than had been their predecessors. Other critics lamented the fact that women had feminized the college campus at the same time as they lamented that women were becoming masculine and therefore undesirable wives as a result of their college education. There were arguments that suggested that the presence of women on campus was a distraction to the men, and thus to the learning environment. “Whatever form the argument took, the essential point always resurfaced, that the value of educating women was less than that of educating men in American society (Solomon, 1985, p. 61).

Even in an environment that allowed women and men to attend the same institution the outcomes were divergent. As is still evident in contemporary times, women in those days did not typically earn the same degrees as their male classmates and their options were more limited:

As student bodies became more broadly representative of the American Populace and as men within academia struggled to secure a position of strength amid the female invasion, it became harder to distinguish the coeducational experience from life in the larger society. As new disciplines
developed, men and women became concentrated in different fields within
them. (Rosenberg, 1988, p. 120)

The most desired, academically legitimate and rigorous disciplines remained male dominated, a reality that has not fully dissipated.

**Womens’ Freedoms Fleeting.** As recently as the 1940s, women were clearly treated different than their male counterparts on the Indiana University campus. While they were challenging old social mores by asserting themselves in ways that administrators found uncomfortable, they were still subject to the parental rules of the university. For instance, women were not allowed to

...leave the campus for an overnight visit except on written permission of her parents. If she went for a ride in a student-driven car, she had to sign an application for permission in the dean of women’s office, giving the name of the driver. (T. Clark, 1977, p. 60)

While many women found innovative ways of skirting the rules, it was clear that the institution was unwilling to provide them with the same inherent freedoms their male counterparts experienced. When women were caught running afoul of the university’s expectations of them, they were subject to a standards board that was instituted by the Associated Women Students. The body would be composed of three seniors, two juniors and one sophomore who would meet weekly with the dean of women to adjudicate matters involving woman students (T. Clark, 1977, p. 81). This body served as a symbolic reassurance mechanism that woman students were being held to a high moral standard. Simultaneously, the presence of students on the board symbolically represented self-
governance and a sense of peer accountability. The extent to which the desires of the student members of the board ultimately carried the day is not known.

In a further effort to provide more close watch over the activities of female students, “President Herman B. Wells ended a long and troubled chapter in university history in February 1940, when he announced that all freshman women would have to live in dormitories” (T. Clark, 1977, p. 60). Wells stated that “…the rule was intended to help girls adjust to college life, improve their scholarship, and encourage good social relationships” (p. 60).

**Emergence of the Dean of Women.** The emergence of the dean of women role at Indiana University was a partial response to the difficulties associated with serving a population of female students who brought different challenges to campus than their male counterparts for whom the institution had been designed:

> The rapid rise in female enrollment, together with the more diverse character of the female student body, persuaded many university officials that they could no longer dismiss women students as exceptions or rely on mutual hostility between the sexes to preserve Victorian morality. Schools that had consciously refrained from passing any special regulations for women in the early years of coeducation began hiring deans to supervise their women students. (Rosenberg, 1988, p. 117)

President Bryan was known to have informed the trustees that he was baffled by, but not oblivious to, the needs of the growing number of female students on campus (T. Clark, 1973, p. 27). The introduction of women to campus presented a great number of challenges for the
young institution. “In this highly conservative age university officials felt obliged to assure Hoosier parents that parental overseeing would be exercised…” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 26).

Despite the misalignment with both the cultural and institutional environments, Indiana University committed to coeducation, partially because of the necessity to expand what had been a shrinking task environment due to a Civil War-induced decline in male enrollment. To manage the perceived threat of coeducation, President Cyrus Nutt hired Sarah Parke Morrison in 1873 to serve as an advisor to women. Morrison, who was also the first woman to receive a bachelor’s degree at Indiana University, “… was regarded as a too-stern disciplinarian; she had no clear mandate, and little support for her job” (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 55). This dearth of support for the work of this position would become common for her successors through the years. Following Morrison’s departure from the university in 1875, it would be more than 25 years before a replacement was hired.

The reemergence of an anti-coeducational attitude near the turn of the 20th century eventually lead to colleges hiring deans of women en masse. “As the 1890s progressed, faculty members around the country grew concerned about the extracurricular activities and the anti-intellectual posturing of students” (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 31). At the same time, the same faculty members were becoming more focused on academic pursuits: “The growing demand for research productivity placed new pressures on faculty and created an unwillingness on their part to spend vast amounts of time on administrative details or student discipline” (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 32). It became evident that the need for an administrative presence to manage the “Woman Problem” as it was known, was great.

Most faculty members and presidents did not believe that a matron in the residence halls could adequately monitor the socializing that went on among
men and women outside the classroom. Other issues such as the health of women students, also required attention, but this was not a chore for which the faculty wanted direct responsibility either. Making sure that women were not crowding men out of humanities courses, that their health and virtue were intact, and that they had a place to reside on campus with proper supervision came to be known among college presidents as the “Woman Problem.” Hiring a dean of women freed the president from dealing with it any more than he had to. (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 32)

Mary Bidwell Breed. President Swain called upon Mary Bidwell Breed in 1901 to serve as the university’s first Dean of Women. Her hire was the result of a thorough search that included correspondence with colleagues at Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin and visits to interview candidates on the campuses of Michigan, Vassar, Western Reserve, Chicago, Smith, Mount Holyoke, Barnard, Pennsylvania, and Bryn Mawr (Nidiffer, 2000). Dr. Breed was given a dual appointment as an Assistant Professor of Chemistry with a salary of $1,300 per year and a promise of a $100 raise each year for two years if her work was satisfactory (Swain, 1901). “She was a social arbiter on campus and boarding house row, a disciplinarian, a public health expert and a teacher” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 26) “…who combined scholarly accomplishment with gentlewomanly grace. Thus were the two spheres deans of women were expected to straddle” (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 58).

The dean of women position was initiated with an ill-defined set of expectations or protocols in the beginning. Upon offering the position to Breed, President Swain stated that the
…duties of this position would be a matter somewhat of development. Our present idea is that she should teach perhaps seven or eight hours and give the rest of her time to helpful assistance of the college young women in educational, social and personal ways. (Swain, 1901)

Upon assuming the role as dean of women, Breed found the environment on campus to be less than desirable for the college women who attended the university. “Conditions, she admitted, were difficult for the administration of her office. Her charges were scattered over the town. Their living quarters were often shockingly poor. Social life was undesirable at best, and menacing at worst” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 26). Because of what she observed as a poor living environment for female students, Breed believed it was the university’s responsibility to provide residential facilities and services, such as healthcare and entertainment, in an attempt to improve the lives of female students. Further, she believed that there ought to be a selection of coeducational organizations on campus so that female students would have an opportunity to become more actively involved in activities outside the classroom, just as their male counterparts were (T. Clark, 1973).

Despite her articulation of what constituted a more favorable environment for women at Indiana University, Breed’s requests did not yield additional resources for women students, nor were the barriers that limited the social lives of women on campus addressed to her satisfaction. The work she hoped to do with the women students was obscured by the limitations placed upon her work by organizational and financial barriers. “She had to cope with an administration that committed too few resources to her proposals and her work was dominated by the issue of housing women” (Nidiffer, 2000, p. 55). President Bryan was dismissive of Breed’s requests as “he still considered the central business of the university to
be expanding its academic base, reappraising its curriculum and seeking additional financial support from the legislature” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 27). Despite his focus on academics, President Bryan still believed that “the university must assume a closer guardianship over its women students, and at least over those whose parents expressed a desire for such watchcare” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 23).

In her letter of resignation, Breed referenced the fact that she was leaving Indiana, in part, because she desired to work at an institution that offered university-owned housing and supported a more progressive approach to addressing the campus life of its women students:

I wish to present my resignation of the position of Dean of Women in Indiana University to take effect at the end of the current academic year. I have been elected to the corresponding position at the University of Missouri, and after long and careful consideration I have decided to accept their offer. The reasons for my decision it is unnecessary to give in detail, but I may say that the University of Missouri offers me…about $2,200; and what is more important, it owns a model hall of residence for women students, of which I shall be head. The hall is conducted by the University in an enlightened way, and is an invaluable tool in my profession (Breed, 1906).

It is also worth noting that Breed’s starting salary at the University of Missouri was significantly higher than what she earned at Indiana University for the same position.

**Louise Anne Goodbody.** Following Mary Bidwell Breed’s departure, President Bryan appointed Louise Anne Goodbody as the acting dean of women. Unlike Breed, Goodbody was not a product of the academic culture. She assumed the dean of women role
after having previously served as President Bryan’s secretary for more than a decade. Bryan said of Goodbody:

> It is said to be impossible to find any man entirely fit to be president of a University. It is still more difficult to find a woman having all the qualifications of the Dean. But Miss Goodbody does the most important things so well that the University should not be deprived of her services. I cite the fact that within the period of her service in that capacity, the records of the University show a remarkable decrease in the number of failures by women students. This is largely due to her influence in securing more reasonable hours for social affairs and also in dealing personally with girls who were not doing well. In other ways her service to the women students is no less valuable. I put my recommendation on the ground that we cannot afford not to have her service. (Myers, 1952, p. 55)

President Bryan permanently appointed Goodbody to the dean of women position in 1908, but she served in this role for only three years before her death in 1911. During her time in the position, Goodbody reported three major problems: (a) the propensity of female students to dance too much during the week, (b) the need for a dean of men to control male students, and (c) issues related to the conditions and management of boarding houses and clubs. She was also responsible for the establishment of a fairly structured set of social rules that governed visiting hours and days as well as social behavior in Bloomington.

In his November, 1909, report to the trustees, President Bryan specifically included Goodbody’s report that outlined the current status of female students on campus as well as a new set of rules governing good conduct (Myers, 1952):
Before the University reopened in September, I visited all of the houses which were open to women students. The landladies were each interviewed and informed of the few regulations which are now required in connection with the student girls. Without any exception, the landladies were very glad to receive me and to be assured that we wish to cooperate with them in making proper conditions for the women students. I made between sixty and seventy calls and I believe the knowledge I gained will be of help to me and I trust that beneficial effects will result to all concerned. Uniform house rules were presented at each house.

After a conference with the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Chaperones of the various Sorority Houses the following uniform house rules were presented to the Sororities and these were accepted as a matter of course:

1. That men callers may be received between the hours of 2 and 10:30 P.M.
2. That each sorority House shall have two evenings in the week when no men callers shall be received.
3. That the young women shall not drive in single carriages at night; and when driving in double carriages shall be home by nine o’clock.
4. That each Sorority House shall have the porch lighted on calling nights.
5. That the young women shall under no circumstances go to the fraternity houses or men’s club houses unchaperoned, whether on a formal or informal occasion.
6. That the young women shall not be “uptown” at night after nine o’clock unless with a chaperone or an escort.
The Chapter Houses of the Sorority girls are presided over this year in most cases by desirable women. This fact makes the Sorority House problem a somewhat less serious one.

I still hope, however, that dormitories for women may be established at some future time…and entirely under University control. I believe a dormitory of this kind would be very popular and that it would further be an important factor in moulding the proper life and spirit among the women students. (pp. 78-79)

Goodbody was a stern enforcer of rules and a steadfast guardian of the university’s image. She was known for her severe response when her wishes were unmet. She once banned photographers from an annual event for female students (Panthygatric) because the Indianapolis Star, the state’s flagship newspaper, had printed photos of women in their pajamas and the accompanying account of a group of men “crashing” the event out of curiosity. She attempted diligently to keep the story from appearing in the paper but was ultimately unsuccessful:

After trying all week to keep it from appearing I am not going to worry now that it has been published in spite of me. However, I will say, and that most emphatically that never again shall a photographer be admitted to Panthygatric.

(T. Clark, 1973, p. 134)

**Carrie Louise DeNise.** Following the death of Dean Goodbody (March 5, 1911), President Bryan was once again tasked with filling a position he believed to be among the most difficult positions to fill (Myers, 1952), due to the fact that the incumbent must exhibit “rock-bottom integrity, sound judgment, tact, courage and spontaneous sympathy” (p. 139).
Following a search, Bryan recommended hiring Miss Carrie Louise DeNise, who previously served as Dean of Women at Iowa Wesleyan College. DeNise began working on August 1, 1911. Shortly thereafter, she issued a report that supported many of Goodbody’s recommendations, including her desire to expand suitable housing for female students. She was reportedly appalled by the lack of suitable housing for women to the extent that she refused to submit a report to the board of trustees one year. She did, however, work diligently to describe and explain the current state of affairs. “Her study showing the need for better housing was used by the Indiana federation of Women’s Clubs in 1913 and 1914 to urge the establishment of dormitories at all state schools” (Myers, 1952, p. 139).

In outlining her recommendations, DeNise expressed considerable criticism of the living conditions for women at Indiana University:

Landladies were irresponsible, the five sorority houses were of poor quality, prices for board were out of line, unhealthy conditions threatened everyone, dusty carpets covered plain dirty floors, double beds sagged under thin mattresses, there was insufficient light and heat, halls were dirty, and in comparison bathrooms were worse. (T. Clark, 1973, p. 29)

She criticized Alpha Hall (the private women’s residential facility that Indiana University later purchased), the boarding clubs, the level of cuisine, the nutritional value of the meals, the physical setting of meals, and the people who cooked them. She was further very critical of the current state of the university and the community that supported it:

Although the foundations of the university are laid firm and true…we know that certain phases of its life are justly criticized as being still in the
rough…We must insist that some fundamental advantages counterbalance, but we must also concede the great lack. (T. Clark, 1973, p. 30)

Dean DeNise was strict in her interpretation of proper social behavior for women on campus. “She had abolished all forms of dancing except the ‘dipless’ Boston. She tried to break up the semi-weekly hops, but with limited success” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 30). She was not a product of the Indiana University cultural environment and was critical of most things “Hoosier,” including the ability of the women to dance with proper form and the ability of the men to dance as well as men who would visit from other universities (p. 30). She even suggested hiring a university official whose role it would be to instruct students in proper dancing technique.

**Ruby E.C. Mason.** Dean DeNise resigned following the 1913-1914 academic year to pursue graduate study. She was succeeded by Miss Ruby E.C. Mason who had been educated in Canadian universities and at Oxford and who would arrive at Indiana having served at Ward-Belmont immediately before. Unlike DeNise, Mason proved to be amenable and accepting of her new environment. She served until 1918 when she resigned to accept a similar position at the University of Illinois.

**Agnes E. Wells.** Agnes E. Wells succeeded Ruby Mason as Dean of Women, beginning on September 16, 1918. After arriving in Bloomington from the University of Michigan, Dean Wells served as Indiana University’s Dean of Women for nearly 20 years. She was known as someone who “…had a way of getting things done” (Myers, 1952). Despite this propensity for getting things done, Wells was unsuccessful in her attempts to slow the tide of the changing culture. The world was changing. Student attitudes were
changing. The culture of campus was changing and there was precious little that Dean Wells or her colleagues could do to stop it:

Across Indiana Avenue the establishment itself was undergoing a revolution in social mores. Dean Edmondson, Dean Wells, and President Bryan discovered that youth – or the younger generation – had problems they could neither understand nor solve. The code by which families and their offspring had lived since the 1880s without material revision was now all but inapplicable. Girls no longer looked forward to romantic love matches which led them to the altar with the “right man” un kissed and uninstructed in the facts of life. Legislators and moral crusaders had no impact on female dress – skirts grew skimpier, so did blouses, and cor sets and bustles went away with the day’s trash. This was a physical age in which people everywhere either became more conscious of their bodies or more open in displaying them. (T. Clark, 1973, p. 280)

**Kate Hevner Mueller.** Kate Hevner Mueller served as Dean of Women at Indiana University for 21 years from 1937 until 1945. A former high school mathematics teacher and university faculty member in psychology, Mueller was a pioneer in the still developing student-affairs profession. Mueller did not seek the dean of women position at Indiana University but was recommended by the retiring Dean of Women, Agnes Wells. Wells said of Mueller that “She has a good husband and a Ph.D., and psychology is the new thing for these jobs, and she also has 10 years of experience at five different places and does not belong to a sorority” (as cited in Coomes, et al., 1987, p. 411).
As was the case with her predecessors, Mueller’s role was one that balanced what had to be done for individual women with what the institution expected to be done. Discipline and order continued to be the primary functions of the dean of women:

In the offices of “the disciplinary deans,” as the president always referred to us, it was always difficult to keep our heads above the never-ending flow of individual students who came for appointments. Every day brought its quota of student officers and committee chairs, wrongdoers, complainers, and out-of-town visitors. Positive and constructive work was carried on largely through group meetings (as cited in Coomes, et al., 1987).

Mueller articulated a more expansive philosophy of student-affairs. She believed the dean of women’s work ought to be concerned with more than simply managing conflict.

As a pioneer in the practice and study of student-affairs (then known as student personnel), Mueller (1961) wrote extensively about the roles and responsibilities of student-affairs work. In her book titled *Student Personnel Work in Higher Education*, Mueller explored a number of subjects in depth. However, she also offered four overarching objectives of the student-personnel worker as it pertained to higher education:

1. Preserving, transmitting, and enriching the culture…The personnel worker will expedite the subject matter learning by providing optimum living and study conditions during all the time when students are outside the classroom. He will, as far as possible, eliminate such obstacles to student learning as financial, emotional or physical stress…
(2) Developing all aspects of the personality. Central to the programs and the point of view of college personnel work is its recognition that the human personality is a complex of various parts which function as a whole…

(3) Training for citizenship…The personnel division will provide practice in these techniques and attitudes of good citizenship appropriate to the post-adolescent years and to the higher intellectual and socio-economic levels…

(4) Training for leadership…If higher education must train the leaders of our civilization, a fourth function of the personnel division is to help identify such leaders, motivate them toward assuming their responsibilities, and develop in them the personality traits which will make them ardent and effective workers…. (Mueller, 1961, pp. 64-66)

Despite her progressive and holistic view of student-affairs work, she was nonetheless expected to do the same type of reactive conflict-management work that was typical of her predecessors:

No college in those days was without its pages of silly little rules that students resented, faculty laughed at, housemothers could not do without and, of course the deans were expected to support: “One glass, but never two on the cafeteria tray”; “When entertaining your date in the living room on the sofa, one foot always on the floor”; “Five minutes late after 9:00 P.M., one fewer night out that week, 10 minutes late, two fewer. (Coomes, 1987, p. 206)

In 1946, Indiana University centralized many student-affairs functions under a dean of students, thus dissolving the office and position of dean of women. As a result, Kate Hevner Mueller’s title was changed to Assistant Dean of Students and Educational Advisor
for Women. Henceforth, her influence and impact as an administrator at Indiana University was minimal.

**Summary: Women Go to College.** For many years on either side of the turn of the 20th century, coeducation was a new concept in higher education for which there was very little support in the cultural environment. The resistance to coeducation was deeply woven into the fabric of the Indiana culture and very much linked with the Protestant theology that had long been a primary driver of the cultural environment. Though Indiana University was a pioneer among state universities in admitting women, critics nonetheless believed the education of men and women together to be a foolish and ungodly act.

Despite having been in conflict since Indiana University’s founding, the institutional environment was aligned with the cultural environment on this particular issue. Nationally, the embrace of coeducation was not appreciably more advanced than it was in Indiana. Authors advanced biological arguments against coeducation, citing circumstances a dearth of necessary mental capacity, compromised reproductive function, or increased masculinity among women students (among others) as compelling reasons why women should not be educated alongside men. Additionally, the presence of women on a college campus was viewed as being detrimental to that institution’s prestige. Elite faculty from eastern colleges looked unkindly on their colleagues on campuses that admitted women. This was not likely embraced by faculty members at Indiana University who desired alignment with the elite academic institutional environment.

Because enrollments on college campuses were low through the Civil War era, colleges and universities were barely able to sustain themselves with the available population of male students. The Civil War exacerbated this problem for Indiana University as a
significant number of its college-aged men were involved in the war effort. As such, it is not a coincidence that women began to arrive on campus during the years immediately following the Civil War as Indiana University sought to expand the scope of its task environment to ensure its continued ability to exist. From an *input* perspective, women were needed in order to maintain a level of resources adequate for supporting the continued function of the university. From an *output* perspective, there was a sizeable market for teachers following the Civil War. Women were ideal candidates for these positions because of the relatively low salaries they commanded.

Despite their considerable contribution to expanding the task environment and keeping Indiana University afloat, parity did not exist for women on campus as their experiences and opportunities were still very different than those of their male counterparts. They were subject to heckling and ridicule at the hands of their male classmates. The subject of ridicule in various publications, women were also excluded from participating in many of the activities that were readily available to men. Further, faculty members marginalized female students by routinely disregarding their presence on campus and in the classroom.

While the first cohort of women on campus was more mature and focused, subsequent cohorts of female students would exhibit some (but certainly not all) of the youthful characteristics that were present among the young men on campus. These behaviors would threaten to divert time and attention away from Indiana University’s increasingly elite academic activities. As a result, it was necessary for Indiana University to acknowledge this student population and seriously consider the provision of additional targeted services in an effort to maintain the expanded task environment. Ultimately, it was Indiana University’s desire to expand the task environment that provided women with the opportunity to attend
Indiana University. Neither the cultural environment nor the institutional environment would align in support of women in higher education for decades hence (see Figure 27).

Figure 27. Environmental Alignment in Opposition to Coeducation: Making it Necessary to Manage Alignment with an Expanded Task Environment.

While Indiana University developed various managerial activities to privatize conflict and to buffer the academic core’s technical activities from outside distractions, the dean of women is the most tangible indication of the formalized structures, functions, and organizational subunits that would follow. The advent of coeducation at Indiana University ushered in a new era and a new set of conflicts for the growing university to manage.

As early as 1873, the institution invested in a staff member whose role was to manage the various aforementioned conflicts related to women’s participation in higher education at Indiana University. Six women held the title of dean of women between its permanent institutionalization in 1902 and its subsequent dissolution in favor of a dean of students in 1946. Though each of the deans brought different qualifications, expectations, methods, and attitudes to the position, their experiences in the burgeoning student-affairs profession were similar.
Initially created as a partial solution to what was called the *woman problem*, the dean of women existed to provide a measure of symbolic reassurance to parents and Indiana citizens alike that Indiana University was a place where female students were protected from morally reprehensible situations and were subject to active and ever-present guardianship under the dean’s close supervision. The position also served as a buffering mechanism for the institution’s technical activities. The elite academic core was not designed nor was it quickly augmented to accommodate women (see Figure 28).

*Figure 28.* Dean of Women as a Buffer and Source of Symbolic Reassurance.

Though the dean of women position succeeded in accomplishing precisely what Indiana University needed it to accomplish serving a symbolic function and as a set of managerial activities, the deans of women expressed a degree of discontent with the divide between the institutional intention for the role and what they perceived to be the social, educational, and developmental needs of women students. The first Dean of Women resigned from her position because of this philosophical divide. Following her, other deans
of women described the unmet needs while focusing on exerting control over the lives of female students. Even as the dean of women’s position was phased out in favor of a different model, Kate Hevner Mueller spoke of the challenge of balancing the contrasting demands of providing individual student development while prioritizing organizational intentions for student-affairs work.

The frustration of balancing student-development work with organizational demands remains in the DNA of the institution even today. The frustration of the deans of women is the same frustration that prompted this study.

World War II

Veterans Return to Campus. Indiana University played a major role in preparing soldiers for the war effort via its various military-related programs. During the war years the university was considered to be “…as much a military training camp as an educational institution” (T. Clark, 1977, p. 120). The war years were challenging for Indiana University as scarce resources were dedicated to the effort while the student population dwindled.

Following World War II, Indiana University experienced tremendous growth in its student population due in part to a considerable influx of war veterans.

Still reeling from a period of stagnant resources and a time of national consternation, the arrival of a cohort of veterans who were paying tuition via the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (also known as the G.I. Bill) was a welcome addition to the university’s budget. The replenishing of depleted coffers signaled looming opportunities for the university. Following steady growth throughout its history and a recent war-induced decline (see Figure 29), Indiana University’s attendance increased from 6,821 students in 1943 to a whopping 18,668 during the 1946 – 1947 academic year (T. Clark, 1977).
As a result, the demand for both classroom instruction and support services was immediately amplified, thus mightily straining the university’s ability to deliver desired support services. Housing for veteran students, particularly those who brought families to live with them on campus, was a significant demand that the institution struggled mightily to offer adequate levels of supply. In preparing Indiana University for the continued and significant influx arrival of veteran students,

President Herman B Wells viewed the academic year of 1945–46 as one of anticipations and preparations comparable to that of a large family awaiting the blow of a heavily menacing cyclone. He and his staff devoted most of their energies to planning for the instant doubling of student enrollment during the next year. (T. Clark, 1977, pp. 198-199)

Administratively, it was clear that there was an “…urgent need in Bloomington not only for a centralization of the management of student-affairs, but for the employment of trained personnel to deal with this important phase of the university’s operation” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 374). The overwhelming influx of veteran students coupled with growing concerns

Figure 29. Indiana University Student Population, 1902 – 1947.
regarding the management of non-academic issues precipitated the formal establishment of a centralized entity to attend to those issues.

The Indiana University Board of Trustees approved an integrated division of student affairs on September 20, 1945. In doing so, President Herman B. Wells stated that the new division was concerned with “…the integration and correlation of the work of all University offices concerned with student personnel problems” (Wells, 1945). As such, this new structure provided a solution to a number of other problems articulated in a university self-study report, in addition to the problem of the veteran influx. Most notably, faculty members believed students were spending too much time participating in student organizations and hanging out in the Memorial Union (T. Clark, 1973, p. 370). Faculty members were further disturbed by the indifference shown toward the social issues of the day.

As would be expected, the cohort of returning veterans presented a different set of challenges than did the standard college freshman arriving on campus from the family farm. It is probable that an institution predominantly concerned with the continued expansion of its elite academic technical activities found it overly demanding to respond to the unique challenges of a cohort of students who had recently participated in one of the world’s bloodiest conflicts to date. The veteran students “shattered old controls” while placing strain on the remaining in loco parentis policies of the past (T. Clark, 1977, p. 246). This dynamic taxed the administrative structure’s ability to respond to the needs of the veteran students and to the different brand of conflict that their presence on campus introduced. The Dean of Men’s Office Annual Report (1946) describes some of the additional challenges the influx of veteran students presented:
The increase in men’s enrollment brought an unusual demand for general counseling facilities and served to emphasize the fact that the increased size and complexity of the University has reduced markedly the ability of the faculty to fill the general counseling needs of the student body. The problems brought to the office by students are legion and to a large degree defy classification. They range from minor points of information to complex matters of personal adjustment, all important to the student. Because this part of the work was considered to be a responsibility of the highest priority the major portion of the Dean’s time was given to it even though it meant deferring [sic] many other matters of fundamental importance. (p. 2)

Leadership of the new student-affairs functional entity was of the utmost importance as Indiana University responded to arguably the most colossal period of change it had experienced during its history. Colonel Raymond Shoemaker was appointed as Indiana University’s first Dean of Students and Director of the newly formed Division of Student Personnel in March of 1946. His appointment followed a career in the military that included years of service with the Indiana University R.O.T.C. Shoemaker served as the Dean of Students until 1955. His experience as a military leader provided a measure of symbolic reassurance as he guided the young division through a difficult first decade. Specifically, …Dean Shoemaker brought to his new University position the same energetic, dedicated attention which characterized his military service. He made a permanent and lasting contribution to the University through his administrative skill in creating a division which was administratively sound enough to meet the varied and unique problems of the immediate post-war
student body and at the same time, flexible enough to serve a complex, growing and ever-changing institution. (Memorial resolution on the death of Dean Raymond L. Shoemaker 1893-1963, Faculty Council Document No.10, March 19, 1963)

**Summary: World War II.** In the wake of World War II, Indiana University experienced an unprecedented influx of military veterans who were returning from war to attend college. Having adjusted to growing at a steady pace throughout the institution’s history, the veterans’ sheer numbers overwhelmed the academic structure’s ability to effectively manage their abrupt influx. In addition to the added student population, the veteran students brought myriad complex and difficult issues to a campus that was not yet organized to absorb their numbers or their problems. Because the institution was overwhelmed, it was necessary to formalize systems and structures to deal with increased inputs while also serving to buffer the students whose characteristics were incongruent with the academic core of the university. It was further necessary to provide the requisite services (e.g., housing) to mitigate potential conflicts. Housing solutions for veterans also served to privatize conflict through segregating them from other Indiana University students.

Formalized via a self-study process, the division of student personnel was created to attend to the aforementioned non-academic issues while simultaneously providing a response to a number of faculty concerns related to the student behavior and priorities outside the classroom. Organizationally the division of student affairs served as a device to formalize input, maintenance and output structures (see Figure 30). A military man was selected to lead the division, in order to maintain control over a significant cohort of military men. This measure was both instrumental and symbolic in that Col. Shoemaker was uniquely qualified
to be sensitive to the needs of this student population while also serving to send the message that Indiana University was doing everything it could do to create an appropriate environment for the returning veterans.
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*Figure 30. The Dean of Students Management of Veteran Student Population.*

As it turns out, World War II was the precipitating factor in the formalization of what would be known as student-affairs at Indiana University. Prior to this time, there had been various positions and informal structures that served symbolic purposes, privatized conflict and/or buffered the core from unwanted external influence. The numbers coupled with the challenging issues demanded that student-affairs assume an instrumental maintenance role as it provided student services (see Table 10).
Table 10.

**Veteran Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Demand</th>
<th>Indiana University Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influx of war veteran students &amp; veteran student issues</td>
<td>1. Division of Student Personnel created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Col. Shoemaker appointed as the Dean of Students and Director of the newly established division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Adult and married housing emerged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Hoosiers**

Indiana University was a forerunner in the admission of international students (or foreign students as they were called at the time). From the beginning, their presence on campus was desirable for a number of reasons. T. Clark (1977) asserts: “There is no doubt that the influx of foreign students into Indiana University after 1945 had an important leavening influence on the campus as a whole” (p. 244). During the 1947 – 1948 academic year, Indiana University would enroll 150 international students. This represented an increase of 45 international students relative to the previous academic year. The international student population continued to grow. By the late 1950s, there were nearly 700 international students in attendance at Indiana University. By the mid 1960s, that number grew to nearly 1,500 international students.

The growth of the international student population represented a significant expansion of Indiana University’s task environment at a time when the population of veteran students was waning. In an environment that was suspicious of the infiltration of foreign ideas, such as communism, and in a state that was homogenous by any measure and one that had been
subject to the influence of the Ku Klux Klan in the recent past, it was important for Indiana University to ensure that it remained a viable college option for international students who wished to study in the United States.

By virtue of their unique circumstances, international students desired and commanded specialized attention. The infrastructure of the academic enterprise was not well organized to accommodate the unique issues associated with international students. It was necessary for Indiana University to provide support and services to the international students to ensure their retention and to extend the prospect of growth in that student population; one that, incidentally, performed quite well academically (Dean of Students, 1948). In reference to the labor intensity inherent in providing such services, it was later noted:

The special services required for the proper administration of the foreign-student program continued to require a disproportionate amount of staff time compared to that needed for a similar number of students who are citizens of the United States. (Division of Student Personnel, 1962, p. 3)

As such the Dean of Students Office became the entity that was charged with providing services for international students. Specifically,

The Dean of Students Office assumes responsibility, in whole or in part, for foreign students in the following areas: admission, housing, personal counseling, academic counseling, health, social life, scholarships and loans, discipline and liaison service with the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, and liaison service with foreign embassies.

(Dean of Students, 1948, pp. 4-5)
Unlike other student populations who might require fewer of these services or who might be better positioned to access them absent administrative assistance, the international student population was, like the veteran-student population before it, both a boon and a burden.

Eventually, it became evident that extending additional support to the growing international-student population required additional support structures. For example, provisions were made for an on-campus international house in 1951, which served as a social hub for international students. Also, by the mid 1950s, there was a stand-alone department whose role was to provide specialized support for international students at Indiana University.

**Summary: International Hoosiers.** The arrival of international students at Indiana University provided a host of unique challenges for the institution, not the least of which was attracting and retaining said students at a university that existed in a cultural environment that was not historically comfortable with people they perceived to be outsiders. The presence of international-students was usually the result of their earnest desire to be a member of a world-class higher-education community, which likely endeared them to faculty members and aligned their presence at the institution with the technical activities of the elite academic core.

Despite this, it was fairly labor intensive for the university to host international students. Faculty members had little interest in or capacity for carrying out the many tasks necessary to recruit and retain an international-student population. As such, specialized managerial activities were developed to manage inputs and privatize conflict through segregation of services and living spaces (housing) (see Table 11). These programs and services were partially intended to assist the institution in maintaining access to a growing
task environment of individuals who added value to the academic environment while paying a higher rate of tuition than students from Indiana.

Table 11.

*Accommodation of International Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Demand</th>
<th>Indiana University Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>1. Functions incorporated into the Dean of Students Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. International Center established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Office created to serve international students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Specialized functions emerged to serve international students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ultimately, activities that were formalized and reconfigured to provide input, output and maintenance functions for returning veterans were also mobilized to access a task environment composed of international students who, like the veteran students, required very labor-intensive programs and services and thus an expanded student-affairs infrastructure (see Figure 31).

*Figure 31. Managerial Activities Tend to the International Student Population.*
The More Things Change…the More Things Stay the Same

By the 1940s it was difficult for Indiana University to play the role of parent and arbiter of morally upright behavior as it had done in the past. The rationale for dealing with such issues as smoking on campus had shifted from a primary focus on the morality of such an act to one that was more concerned with the potential threats to university property (T. Clark, 1977, p. 58). Student-governance boards challenged what they believed to be archaic rules governing student behavior on campus. In one such challenge that offered six potential rules changes, the student Board of Aeons...concluded that rules governing student lives were unjustified in a more modern era. In the six proposed rule changes graduate students were to be given full exemption from in loco parentis restrictions, including entertainment of members of the opposite sex in their rooms. No student should be disciplined for offenses committed off campus, university officials should stay out of students’ rooms, and rules for upper-class women were declared archaic. (T. Clark, 1977, pp. 560-561)

The theocratic rules of years past were beginning to dissipate. Gone were the days when the stewardship of a student’s eternal soul was the primary responsibility and concern of the faculty and administrators. Said T. Clark (1977), “The days of surrogate parental deans of men and women were near an end” (p. 246). The emergence of a morally ambiguous time changed the nature of Indiana University’s relationship with its students, but it did not eliminate the demand for various managerial activities that served to privatize conflict, provide symbolic reassurance and buffer the elite academic activities from unwanted influences from the cultural environment.
Student Misbehavior. Issues concerning student misbehavior were a time-tested phenomenon at Indiana University. Since its founding, there had been a keen awareness that youthful energy was something that must be controlled to maintain a scholarly environment. T. Clark (1977) reports that even in the 1950s, the behavior of college students was unpredictable and eerily reminiscent of the pranks of days past:

They swallowed live goldfish, crammed themselves into phone booths, Volkswagens, and piled ‘man on man’ up into teetering pyramids. They engaged in ‘kiss-a-thons,’ ‘dance-a-thons.’ And as their professors and elders said every other kind of show-off except ‘work-a-thons.’ (pp. 228-229)

While a certain degree of tomfoolery was to be expected, the emerging division of student-affairs was organized to address behaviors that ran afoul of university policy and that threatened the integrity of the academic community. As was stated previously, discipline was the primary function of the emerging division. While addressing specific behaviors in years past, the dean of men’s department attempted to quell behavioral issues through intervention:

As a preventative to disciplinary action, the Department attempts to inculcate such attitudes and behavior as will direct student deportment into areas where discipline need not operate. The Department does considerable investigation in cases of student immorality, the use of liquor or narcotics. These measures, of course, do not forestall all misconduct, and the enforcement of discipline is a regular part of the duties of this office. (Office of the Dean of Men, 1940, p. 3)
The dean of students office also relied on organized groups of students to assert peer pressure in the prevention and in the response to disciplinary matters:

Encouragement has been given to student governing groups to assume more and more the responsibility for discipline of their members who are guilty of minor infractions…Students’ active interest in general conduct and a willingness to assume some share of responsibility are regarded as heartening signs. (Dean of Students, 1948, p. 4)

As was the case in years past, the organizing of student clubs exerted a cooling effect on student behavior. The mobilization of students to police the behavior of their peers became an effective strategy for responding to student behavioral issues and for reducing their frequency.

By the 1970s, the problem of student misbehavior had not subsided, and there were no indications of it happening. Twenty-five years since its organization as a stand-alone entity, the Division of Student Affairs found itself reacting to problems rather than doing what it believed to be educational work. There was an emerging desire among student-affairs staff to “…focus its attention on more positive and productive activities” (Division of Student Affairs, 1971, p. 11) while exerting “productive efforts to focus on positive services” (p. 13). Simultaneously, there were a number of pervasive societal problems on campus that required their attention. Issues such as drug use, increased racial tensions, and theft were not to be ignored.

This confluence of circumstances led to the establishment of a stand-alone Judicial Affairs office that “…helped to remove those negative but necessary services of student discipline from program and service areas” (Division of Student Affairs, 1971, p. 10). The
stated intention was to “…emphasize the positive program and service aspects of student-affairs while retaining adequate control functions” (p. 10). Essentially, an entity that was originally created to deal with issues such as these began to push those issues to the periphery of its own organization in an effort to refocus on what it believed to be its true role: The proactive work of student development.

**Mental-Health Issues.** By the early 1940s there was an increase in mental-health issues among the Indiana University student population (or at least a heightened awareness of them relative to the past). The Dean of Men’s Office assumed the responsibility for responding to these issues:

College youth are often subject to social problems which are more vital to them than the problems they will encounter in later life. This semester the Dean of Men’s Department intercepted plans on the part of two men students, which due to love frustration, carried strong evidence of suicidal intentions. Most cases can be aided by such measures as the suggestion of an approach to social opportunities, planning of balanced living, or assistance in establishing fraternity connections. Many times, a sympathetic hearing accomplishes the relief students need. (Office of the Dean of Men, 1940, p. 2)

Embedded in the response to mental-health issues was the promotion of a number of other items that were or would later become functions of the Indiana University student-affairs organization. This suggests that while some functions were not always a direct, targeted, strategic solution to a particular problem, they nonetheless exhibited some utility in serving in combination with other services as managerial activities that responded to various organizational and social challenges.
While mental-health issues were certainly a concern on their own merits, there was a related concern that untreated mental illness might cause students to withdraw from the institution altogether, thus serving as a consideration for managing the task environment:

Last year there were sixteen students who came to the office who had clear-cut mental aberrations. All of these were advised to see a physician, or preferably a psychiatrist. Almost without exception, these people withdrew from the University or failed to return the next semester. (Dean of Men's Office, 1942, p. 2)

As a matter of importance for students personally and for the institution in terms of student retention, counseling functions were formally included in the responsibilities when the Dean of Students position was initially created. Counseling for mental-health issues were explicitly separated from academic-counseling functions, thus buffering the elite academic technical activities from such tasks:

The dean will encourage the development of adequate academic counseling wherever it does not exist. The counseling functions of his own office will be those concerned with vocational-choices, adjustment problems, personal problems and all other problems not of a strictly academic nature (Briscoe, 1946).

Once again, it was clear that the purpose of the emerging Division of Student Affairs was concerned with buffering items such as mental health from the technical activities of the institution and serving as a resolution to conflicts that might arise from mental-health issues on campus.
**Student Activism.** The 1960s was a time of transition from an era of relative student apathy to one of heightened awareness and active engagement with regard to the pressing issues of the day. Following the 1950s when “Professors had perennially lamented the apathy of students…” (T. Clark, 1977, p. 231), The 1960s were marked by a heightened sensitivity among Indiana University students to what was happening beyond the limestone walls of their campus. During this time, Indiana University stood in stark contrast to its home state, which was not a hotbed for political activism:

As the national leaders of these (political) movements seek to utilize the latent power of aroused young idealism and energy, the last vestige of the campus as an isolated cloister will be removed. Indiana University is no exception among the major universities and will have its share of students eagerly seeking to advance one cause or another. A major problem will be to interpret this trend to alumni, politicians and the general public who may not have the information or experience to view events with the perspective of current developments. (Division of Student Personnel, 1963, p. 3-4)

While administrators viewed this renewed interest in issues such as segregation, nuclear testing and international affairs as a positive development and as “…an indication of a maturing student body” (Division of Student Personnel, 1963, p. 1), they were nonetheless charged with managing the youthful energy of its students: “These tendencies combined with the impatience, inexperience, idealism and bluntness of youth caused minor public relations problems for the university and disturbed those who wished to keep things quiet” (Division of Student Personnel, 1962, p. 2).
Issues of free speech, recognition of student organizations, interpretation of university policy and an ever increasing student desire among students to participate in university decision-making coalesced to define an student environment that was markedly different than the one that had existed in the relatively quiet pre-World War II period. The circumstances required student-affairs staff to devote what they believed to be an “inordinate amount of staff time” (Division of Student Personnel, 1963, p. 2) to addressing the emerging issues related to social and political activism among Indiana University students.

**Student Activities.** As was mentioned prior, there were numerous other initiatives throughout Indiana University’s history that were intent on providing students with productive outlets for social life. By the 1940s, the university had assumed an active role in the supervision of student activities on campus, particularly as it pertained to student organizations and student-governance boards. While efforts were made to perpetuate a myth of self-governance for such activities, it is clear that they remained closely associated with administrators who no doubt wielded influence in their activities:

All organizations of student men are subject to the approval of the Dean of Men. Social fraternities, and some other groups, need to have the approval of the Dean of Men’s Department before initiating new members. Though the policies and behavior of the groups are kept under scrutiny by the Department, the general policy of the Department is to allow democratic self-government as much free play as possible, with the Department attempting to guide rather than control. (Office of the Dean of Men, 1940, p. 3)

An all-University committee on Student Activities was created during the 1960 – 1961 school year. Composed of students and faculty, “It met bi-monthly during the year and
devoted most of its efforts to establishing policies for adjudicating conflicts between activities, improving procedures for scheduling events, and reviewing present policies” (Division of Student Personnel, 1961, p. 3) “The committee found itself the center of attention, often critical, in a number of campus issues. If this Committee is to serve a useful purpose, it must expect some criticism, since most policy decisions will be opposed by some segment of the campus population” (Division of Student Personnel, 1962, p. 7).

**Fraternities and Sororities.** Fraternities and sororities had a longstanding and important presence on Indiana University’s campus. Specifically, “…sororities and fraternities were genuine aids in solving student-housing problems” (T. Clark, 1977, p. 242) on a campus where it had periodically been in short supply. Recognizing the importance of fraternity and sorority housing on campus, President Herman B. Wells developed the innovative “Indiana Plan” that resulted in financing for 35 chapter houses during the decade following its commencement.

Aside from the basic fact of providing a considerable amount of student housing…the Indiana Plan solved the ancient problem of friction between fraternities and sororities and their private neighbors in the town. Equally as important, it brought this large assortment of student residences closer into the university system itself, and under the more direct safety and financial watch care of the institution. (T. Clark, 1977, p. 243)

Staff responsibility for work with fraternities and sororities was embedded into the job responsibilities of the dean of women and was also mentioned as a primary function of the dean of men (Dean of Men's Office, 1942) and of the dean of students. In describing the dean of student’s relationship to fraternities and sororities, Briscoe (1946) stated that
The Dean will develop and maintain contacts with these organizations with the view not of dictating or determining policies of the organization but of encouraging effective study habits and methods, wholesome group living, and high standards of performance. In short, the Dean will in every possible way encourage fraternities and sororities to realize their maximum educational and social values. (p. 2)

Through the years, Indiana University would maintain close ties with fraternities and sororities. T. Clark (1977) suggests that

The university looked with favor upon the fraternities and sororities, despite the eternal threat of social snobbishness and other problems. In a small rural community such as Bloomington, the organizations gave a touch of glamour and sometimes grace to campus life. (pp. 241-242)

As one of the largest identifiable groups of students on campus, close supervision allowed administrators to manage conflicts while ensuring a thriving culture of campus life and a significant source of student bed space. Eventually, supervision of fraternities and sororities would move into the Student Activities Office, where staff provided a singular focus.

**Summary: The More Things Change…the More Things Stay the Same.** While the influx of veteran-student and international-student populations required Indiana University to develop formalized managerial structures to provide services to various student populations, the historical role of student-affairs functions in privatizing conflict was deeply embedded into the structure of the new student-affairs division. Whether managing behavioral issues, responding to the challenges associated with student activism or devising interventions for mental health issues, student-affairs staff members were still primarily
responsible for privatizing conflict while buffering technical activities from environmental influences.

Attempts were made to separate these buffering, conflict privatization and maintenance functions from the educational and developmental work of student-affairs (e.g., a stand-alone Judicial Affairs Office), but even in more developmental pursuits such as student governance, student activities or fraternity/sorority life, the role of the student-affairs staffer was usually to exert some form of control over the student body and to ensure that student behaviors did not interfere with the technical activities of the institution (see Figure 32).

Figure 32. Student-affairs Functions.

Student organizations, fraternities and sororities provided the perfect delivery mechanisms for the type of covert conflict-privatization mechanisms that the organization needed to maintain order. Also, the presence of these organizations and these discrete functions served to decouple non-academic managerial activities from Indiana University’s core technical activities.
Student Affairs in Conflict with the Organization

Student Affairs Ideology Emerges. Beginning with Indiana University’s first Dean of Women, Mary Bidwell Breed, staff members employed an ideology that prescribed an expanded role and one that was more closely aligned with the institution’s technical activities. As was previously stated in reference to Dean Breed, she had far more responsibilities than resources. President William Lowe Bryan dismissed her requests for resources dedicated to a more developmental and service-oriented focus. His view that the focus of the university ought to be “…expanding its academic base, reappraising its curriculum and seeking additional financial support from the legislature” (T. Clark, 1973, p. 27). This conflict led to Breed’s departure to a university that she considered to be more supportive of student-development efforts.

Just as the first Dean of Women had suggested, Indiana University’s last Dean of Women, Kate Hevner Mueller (1961) articulated a proactive, developmental role for student-affairs work by offering four overarching objectives of the student-personnel worker as it pertained to higher education:

(1) Preserving, transmitting, and enriching the culture…The personnel worker will expedite the subject matter learning by providing optimum living and study conditions during all the time when students are outside the classroom. He will, as far as possible, eliminate such obstacles to student learning as financial, emotional or physical stress...

(2) Developing all aspects of the personality. Central to the programs and the point of view of college-personnel work is its recognition that the human personality is a complex of various parts which function as a whole…
(3) Training for citizenship…The personnel division will provide practice in these techniques and attitudes of good citizenship appropriate to the post-adolescent years and to the higher intellectual and socio-economic levels…

(4) Training for leadership…If higher education must train the leaders of our civilization, a fourth function of the personnel division is to help identify such leaders, motivate them toward assuming their responsibilities, and develop in them the personality traits which will make them ardent and effective workers…. (Mueller, 1961, pp. 64-66)

As their female counterparts had done throughout history, the deans of men articulated a disconnect between their rightful work and what the organization considered to be their purpose. By 1946 the student-affairs unit actively called for clarification regarding its purpose:

The revitalization of men’s student activities and organization is an important part of the reconversion of student life to peacetime conditions. The part to be played by the university in this revitalization must be determined by the policy of the University regarding student activities. They can be considered a peripheral phase of student life as is suggested in the word “extra-curricular” commonly used in reference to them or they can be considered an integral part of the educational program of the University. Without any clear-cut definition of policy, the University has over a period of years made a series of concessions toward the later position…If the activities program is to retain a peripheral status common in universities in times past, the work of this office should be limited largely to general supervision and regulations. If, on the
other hand, this phase of student life is to be considered an integral part of the university educational program, it then becomes the responsibility of this office to see it conducted in such a way as to contribute most effectively to the education of the student. It is the opinion of the Dean of Men that the latter point of view should be adopted…The educational world has long since abandoned as inefficient the practice of providing education by simply turning the student loose in the library or laboratory to shift for himself and has substituted in its place a rather closely supervised library and laboratory work to supplement that of the classroom. There is no reason to think that a similar evolution is any less desirable in the case of the activities program (Dean of Men's Office, 1946).

By posing this question, the Dean of Men’s office strongly advocated that its role ought not be limited to general supervision and regulations. Instead, it was desirous of a role that placed proactive student development at the forefront of its efforts. The input, maintenance and conflict privatization functions related to triaging the influx of the World War II veteran student population prevented it from engaging in what it considered to be more developmental and appropriate work: “Because this part of the work was considered to be a responsibility of highest priority, the major portion of the Dean’s time was given to it, even though it meant deferring many other matters of fundamental importance” (Dean of Men's Office, 1946, p. 1).

In explaining the value of student-affairs work, Dean Robert Shaffer pointed out that the value of a student-affairs division could “…only be measured by its contribution through student services to the basic objectives of higher education” (Division of Student Personnel,
1961, para. 1). To that end, the Division of student personnel expended significant effort toward a “…careful evaluation of the educational contribution of extra-class life to students…” (Division of Student Personnel, 1961, para. 1). Inherent in this discussion was an assertion that while the importance of various services might not be obvious, they were still a vital part of creating a holistic campus experience:

…less obvious are those support services not needed by every student but essential to many if they are to progress successfully toward their academic goals…which help a student adjust, understand himself, identify his objectives and develop into a more complete adult…Without many of the services generally grouped together in the student affairs area, curricular offerings would have less meaning to many students whose problems would interfere with their progress toward academic goals. (Division of Student Affairs, 1973, part III).

Year after year, the student-affairs division existed in a state of confusion due to the fact that what it believed to be the essential work of Indiana University was not valued to an appropriate extent. In an effort to prove that the work of student-affairs was indeed essential in furthering institutional objectives, the practice of assessing student-affairs programs and services emerged during the 1970s:

For far too long student personnel administrators have suggested that the nature of these services could not be quantified and measured. With the advent of systems approaches to budgeting and allocating resources it becomes essential to articulate objectives and measure the degree of attainment. (Division of Student Affairs, 1971, p. 12)
In doing so, it was acknowledged that the effectiveness and importance of student development functions were difficult to measure relative to other competing demands on campus:

Admissions and record-keeping functions speak for themselves as do high school contacts and freshman advising. Perhaps less obvious are those support services not needed by every student but essential to many if they are to progress successfully toward their academic goals…which help a student adjust, understand himself, identify his objectives and develop into a more complete adult…Without many of the services generally grouped together in the student affairs area, curricular offerings would have less meaning to many students whose problems would interfere with their progress toward academic goals. (Division of Student Personnel, 1973, p. 1).

Each year, the student-affairs division articulated a purpose that was rooted in the tenants of proactive and holistic student development. By the 2000s the primary articulated purposes of the student-affairs division were: to provide opportunities for personal development, to foster respect for diversity, to encourage physical and emotional wellness among students, to protect student rights, and to promote ethical behavior” (Campus Life Division, 2000). While these articulated purposes were closely aligned with the functions and the purposes that the student-affairs division had always claimed, these purposes were nonetheless disconnected from the ways the division spent its time, which was described as responding to crises and to external expectations (Campus Life Division, 2000).

**Financial Struggles Thwart Pursuit of Technical Rationality.** Despite its establishment as a stand-alone unit at Indiana University, the student-affairs division was not
on equal footing with academic units, despite its desire to be so. Faculty members often questioned the usefulness of some student-affairs functions vis-à-vis the institution’s technical activities. Dean of Students, Robert Schaffer, defended fraternities and other extracurricular activities to faculty members and others who believed such activities to detract from student-academic achievement. In doing so, he challenged what he believed to be:

…the erroneous assumption that intellectual endeavor will be increased merely by preventing students from engaging in one or two specific types of activities. Thus, one argument runs that if universities would abolish fraternities, prevent students from having automobiles, and limit the number of group social events, students would automatically study harder…there is little evidence to support this view. (Division of Student Personnel, 1959, p. 1)

In a further attempt to integrate extracurricular activities with Indiana University’s technical activities, Shaffer actively sought to fortify relationships between academic-affairs units and the student-affairs division. Schaffer stated that “One of the significant challenges facing student-personnel administrators today is to find appropriate ways to work more closely and in greater harmony with faculty members as both attempt to fulfill the legitimate objectives of the University” (Division of Student Personnel, 1962, para. 1). The assumption was that the work of student-affairs was well-suited for integration with academic affairs.

Michael Gordon was appointed to the Dean of Students role after having served as a faculty member at Indiana University. Vice President Kenneth R.R. Gros Louis charged him with bringing the Dean of Students Division “…more in tune with what the faculty perceived of as the academic mission of this university” (Sanders, 2002, 21:59). Despite having served as a faculty member, Gordon’s ideology pertaining to student-affairs was closely aligned
with that of the men who had preceded him. It was Gordon’s belief that faculty members did not understand or appreciate the importance of campus life (Sanders, 2002, 34:45). As such, he assumed the dean of students role with the intention of aligning the student experience more closely with the academic experience.

Having served on the music faculty for the majority of his career to that point, he had overestimated the extent to which proactive and innovative approaches to student-affairs work would be possible, given Indiana University’s financial commitment. As Dean of Students, it was his role to make a case for the funds necessary to create the most effective student-affairs unit possible. As Dean Gordon progressed through his tenure, he refocused his efforts toward ensuring that basic student needs were met, stating that “The relative diminutiveness of the Division’s budget does not permit much flexibility, so we are often strapped to satisfy even our most basic needs, such as supplies and equipment” (Dean of Students Division, 1986, p. 15). In an interview (Sanders, 2002) several years following his retirement from the dean of students role, Gordon reflected on his first experience requesting funding for the student-affairs unit:

"The first year, I was just learning what a budget conference was...I don't think most faculty members know. The administrator goes in and he presents a program for what he's requesting and why he's requesting...and so I went with grand ideas about what I was going to ask for and of course I quickly found out that it was just perfunctory. You got nothing! You got nowhere! As a matter of fact, you got a budget cut! And so, the second year I decided I would go in and be very dramatic. Since I had sung in Porgy and Bess and the big song that Porgy sings is I got plenty of nothing. I basically went in there
and said, 'You expect me to be the Dean of Students at one of the largest schools in the country...and give him an almost zero budget, so I sang *I got plenty of nothing* (28:26).

Employing quick wit and humor, Vice President Gros Louis quickly reminded Dean Gordon that the song also said “…and nothing is enough for me” (30:50). Such a financial situation did not allow the student-affairs division to engage in the proactive and developmental work it desired. Further, it was unable to move beyond meeting basic needs and on to the work of integrating with academic affairs.

**Summary: Student Affairs in Conflict with the Organization.** For as long as there has been a formalized student-affairs structure at Indiana University, there has been an effort among its staff to engage in the proactive work of student development. From the beginning of the profession, student-affairs ideology developed based on the assumptions that a student’s life outside the classroom was as important as his or her life inside the classroom. Student-affairs professionals believed that in addition to teaching and serving students, the role of the university was also to develop them holistically.

In the pursuit of a more proactive, developmental focus for student-affairs functions, student-affairs staff articulated the need for more purposeful alignment with Indiana University’s technical activities. Student-affairs leaders presented compelling cases for the integration of student-affairs functions into the academic fabric of the institution. Further, they debated the merits of claims that student-affairs functions were deleterious to the academic community. At each turn, the assumption was that the true possibilities of student-affairs functions were not well understood. Essentially student-affairs professionals articulated a desire for student-affairs functions to achieve technical rationality in the
organization. Because of inadequate funding, inadequate facilities and inadequate opportunities for collaboration, student-affairs functions existed in a constant state of uncertainty and were often limited to providing the most basic services.
Chapter 5: Summary of the Study and Conclusions

Statement of the Problem

As an individual whose professional life is generally guided by logic, I was disconcerted during my tenure as a “middle manager” in the Student Activities Office (SAO) at Indiana University because of what I perceived to be illogical organizational decisions (and what I perceived to be chronic indecision) regarding the student-affairs division. It seemed that even as student-affairs professionals attempted to align their work with the academic mission of the Indiana University, the institution itself was not interested in promoting or supporting such work beyond the minimum level necessary for survival. I believed that, at best, this stance represented a blatant disregard for student-affairs functions at the institution, and, at worst it, represented a concerted effort to marginalize student-affairs functions and the committed professionals who carried them out. There was a divide between student-affairs functions and the larger structure of the university, and I was convinced that they (whomever they were) simply did not get it.

My frustration with this state of affairs and that of my colleagues eroded my belief in my chosen profession as I developed a sense of hostility toward an institution I believed to be capable of accomplishing monumental things on behalf of its students. I felt stuck, hopeless, and frustrated due to what I believed was an illogical disregard of student-affairs at Indiana University. In an effort to understand the logic of the system, I pursued this study focused on the organizational realities of student-affairs at Indiana University. Even if the logic of the system turned out to be unpalatable, it would nonetheless be useful for me to understand the logic and to mobilize that understanding to inform decision-making and to align my own leadership with institutional goals.
Further, as an individual who chose student-affairs administration as my profession, I recognized that effective leadership required more of me than simply being able to recite the time-tested and oft-celebrated student development theories that serve as guideposts for decision-making and prompts for professional discourse in our field. The nature and context of our profession’s emergence is not well-known and is generally rooted in a “glass-half-full” mentality that can serve to perpetuate the myths and misplaced realities that prevent us from achieving the level of knowledge we ought to have and the legitimacy we assume is due us. My desire to travel a different path coupled with frustration related to my professional situation combined to prompt this study.

Speaking to the value of exploring one’s own experiences during the course of a research study, Lofland & Lofland (1995) remind us that “Unless you are emotionally engaged in your work, the inevitable boredom, confusion and frustration of rigorous scholarship will endanger even the completion—not to speak of the quality of the project” (p. 15). This study and my experience conducting it serve as further proof of the validity of Lofland & Lofland’s assertion.

**Purpose(s) of the Study**

**Inform Effective Leadership and Decision-Making.** The primary purpose of this study was to inform my practice as a leader in the field of higher education and student-affairs. Prior to the commencement of this research project, I operated from assumptions about universities as complex organizations that have proven to be deficient in their ability to explain the nature and purpose of my work within the broader context of higher education. Further, I operated from the assumption that student-affairs could exist as an
indispensable island unto itself in the university organizational structure. This study informed my thinking and therefore my actions as a leader.

As an emerging leader in my field, it was incumbent on me to understand the nature of my work at a fundamental level. Doing so required me to understand where we have been as a profession and how that is related to where we are today. I believed that understanding the logic of a system was a prerequisite to practicing effective leadership and decision-making within it. While I was no longer an employee of Indiana University during the final stage of this study, I believed this research would assist me in shaping my understanding of higher education and the role of student-affairs functions within it to the extent that I was able to make sense of an organization on its terms...not mine. This, I believe to be indispensable to me as I continue to serve as a student-affairs practitioner and leader.

**Advancement of Professional and Academic Knowledge.** Though there are many byproducts of this study, a primary purpose for the exploration was simply to make sense of a phenomenon that did not make sense to me. I came to believe that Indiana University behaved in a manner that was illogical and that marginalized student-affairs functions and the professionals who carried out these functions. In an effort to understand the logic of the system, I pursued this study focused on the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. The findings served the purpose of helping me to understand the logic of a system that did not make sense to me prior to the study.

Understanding the logic of this particular system additionally advances knowledge in the profession of student-affairs. It is my desire that scholars, administrators and student-affairs practitioners alike will utilize the findings of this study in combination with the conceptual framework that guided this study as a means of understanding the organizational
uses of student-affairs functions. I believe that doing so will assist them in successfully and proactively aligning student-affairs functions with the dominant values of the environment and institution in a manner which insures that co-curricular programs and services are able to maintain relevance to the higher-education enterprise.

During this investigation into the topics of change in student-affairs, I discovered a number of things that I did not originally expect. I have found that organizations are not as easily understood or explained as I had assumed. Further, I have found that knowledge related to the development of student-affairs functions is incomplete.

I also believe this study serves to advance an emergent conceptual framework that has shaped my knowledge and understanding of organizational theory and the role of conflict and symbolism in organizational life. I owe much to those scholars, mentors and colleagues whose work has informed this study. I can think of no greater way to express my gratitude than to see that their work is further developed. Achievement of this purpose made achieving the other purposes of the study possible.

**Development of Self.** The final purpose of this study was to develop myself as a scholar, as a professional and as an individual. Though I have seen far too many sunrises since I originally began this journey, I do not believe I would choose a different path were I given the opportunity to do so. I have often said of this process that it requires a person to acknowledge whatever they find challenging about the way they operate and face it head-on. This process is not only a display of intelligence, nor is it only a display of stamina, discipline, insight, courage, commitment, self-awareness or anything else. It is a display of all of those things. Completion of this project serves as proof of my competency and of my
ability to hold all of these things together toward the completion of a project…if only for an instant.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework that informed this study and that this study served to advance is drawn from classic organization theory, specifically contingency theory, which argues that there is no one best way to organize (Galbraith, 1973; Parsons, 1960; Scott, 2003; Thompson, 2004;). This framework is represented below (see Figure 33).
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*Figure 33. Conceptual Framework.*

There are three levels of organizational activities that are well-established in the literature:

1. Technical activities are those activities that transform inputs into outputs. At Indiana University, these activities pertained to the creation and dissemination of knowledge. This is the level at which the faculty exist. Technical activities provide an organization with a *reason* to exist. At Indiana University, there are a number of activities going on at any given time. For instance, there are parking garages, student activities and football games, but
none of these activities can stand alone. They are not the reason for the university’s existence.

2. Managerial activities are those activities that serve to manage the task environment, which accounts for both organizational inputs and the market for organizational outputs. At Indiana University, student-affairs functions reside at this level of organizational activities, along with a number of other functions. These activities collectively secure the organization’s ability to exist. Additionally, these activities serve to buffer the technical activities from external influences, allowing the technical core to function as a closed system.

3. Institutional Activities are those that manage the institutional environment, which accounts for the elements with which the university seeks to become / remain isomorphic and/or compliant. Indiana University’s institutional environment is composed of a combination of federal and state regulations, peer institutions, accrediting agencies, the Association of American Universities, etc. Ultimately, the purpose of Indiana University’s institutional activities is to secure the organization’s legitimacy.

A fourth level of organizational activities is emerging as a useful addition to this conceptual framework. Cultural activities are those serving to manage the cultural environment. Muwonge’s (2012) recent study pertaining to the American Catholic cultural environment provides a thorough analysis of a particular cultural environment. The cultural environment can be described through the demographics, tasks, and ideologies of the people who collectively provide an organization with its right to exist. This environment is often, but not always, bound by geography. Using two universities in Indiana as an example of this: Indiana University South Bend and Notre Dame are located in the same town. Whereas Indiana University South Bend exists in and responds to the demands of a cultural
environment that is linked to northwest Indiana, Notre Dame exists in and responds to the demands of the American Catholic cultural environment. At Indiana University, intercollegiate athletics is an example of a cultural activity. Athletics (particularly men’s basketball) serves as a symbol that interacts with the Indiana cultural environment. Certainly, the university would prefer that members of the cultural environment concerned themselves with basketball rather than academic subject matter, issues of tenure or pedagogy.

In addition to the theoretical framework rooted in the study of complex organizations, it was necessary to utilize concepts articulated in the political science literature. Schattschneider (1983) offers that “What happens in politics depends on the way in which people are divided into factions, parties, groups, classes, etc.” (p. 60). To understand the dynamics that influenced the development of Indiana University, it was necessary for me to understand how various constituencies were divided (see Figure 1) relative to various conflicts. The same groups of people might be divided differently, depending on the particular conflict. This was certainly the case when describing the divisions that influenced the development of Indiana University.

In addition to concepts related to conflict, the concept of threat and reassurance were useful as I sought to understand the development of Indiana University. Using Edelman’s (1967) concept, it is clear that whether real or perceived, the cultural environment will react to things that threaten its values. During times when Indiana University itself was perceived as a threat to the cultural environment, symbolic reassurance, in the form of managerial or cultural activities, was necessary. During this study, there were a number of threats to the cultural environment that required symbolic reassurance as a counterbalance.
Research Methods

**Research Tradition.** My particular research paradigm is best described as constructivist or interpretive. This paradigm seeks to subjectively understand the construction of reality by interacting with a phenomenon socially and/or historically (Crotty, 1998). From this perspective, accurate understanding and explanation is the primary goal. As such, accurate understanding and explanation were my primary intentions during this study.

Methodologically, this study was aligned with the ideographic approach. As such, there has been no effort to generalize, as is often done in the natural sciences. Ontologically, this study was relativistic in nature, in that I assume that the social world is constantly changing. Epistemologically, this study utilized the anti-positivist perspective, in that it relied on symbols and meaning to make sense of the phenomenon. Finally, this study is based on the symbolic interactionist assumption of causality that assumes that a response to a given stimulus is not directly related to that stimulus, but instead to the meaning that the stimulus holds in a given context.

**Unit of Analysis.** To define the unit of analysis, I utilized the concept of the organizational set (Blau & Scott, 1962; Evan, 1966) as a means of understanding Indiana University and its interactions with various environments. Scott (2003) states that the organizational set approach “views the environment from the standpoint of a specific (focal) organization” (p. 126).

**Case Study.** This study utilized the case-study research design. The case-study design prescribes that the researcher investigates a phenomenon during a given period of time (Stake, 1995; Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989).
**Data Collection.** Much of the data collected and analyzed during this case study was of a historical nature. Historical analysis is...a method of discovering, from records and accounts, what happened in the past” (Marshall & Rossman, 1995, p. 89). Both primary and secondary sources were utilized. Primary sources included reports, letters, podcasts of interviews and various other documents collected from the Indiana University archives, archival websites and from division of student affairs files. When possible, I photocopied documents for additional analysis. When it was not possible to photocopy a document, I analyzed the document, making detailed notes to be analyzed further. Secondary sources included various historical works that explored Indiana University, higher education, the State of Indiana, religious denominations, etc. As I explored these texts, I made descriptive notes and recorded initial observations.

**Data Analysis.** During this study, the process of data analysis was not a task that was performed independent of the process of data collection. As Coffey and Atkinson (1996) stated, “We should never collect data without substantial analysis going on simultaneously” (p. 2). As such, the phases in the data analysis process were ongoing and repeated rather than systematic and chronological. The first phase of data analysis required that I familiarize myself with the data. The second phase required me to organize the data. The third phase of data analysis required me to generate categories, themes and patterns from notes and data (Marshall & Rossman, 1995) and to group them accordingly. The final phase of data analysis required me to utilize the aforementioned conceptual framework to make sense of the categories, themes and patterns that emerged from the data.

*Validity.* I conducted this process in a manner that guarded against potential threats to the validity of the research. Throughout the process, I triangulated findings when possible,
sought feedback as my findings and interpretations emerged, remained mindful of my own biases and of their potential effects on the process and actively searched for evidence that disconfirmed my findings or my interpretations of them.

**Research Questions**

This study sought to answer two primary questions:

1. What are the organizational functions of student-affairs at Indiana University?
2. What is the nature of the conflict between student-affairs and the organization?

To answer these primary questions, it was first necessary to answer these secondary questions:

a. What were the dominant conflicts during the emergence of Indiana University? How were they related?

b. How did managerial activities develop at Indiana University?

c. How did student-affairs functions develop at Indiana University?

d. What factors led to the formalization of student-affairs functions at Indiana University?

**Summary of Findings**

The findings of this study are summarized below as answers to the secondary-research questions.

**Dominant Conflicts.** There were four distinct dominant conflicts identified during the emergence of Indiana University: 1) A denominational conflict among the largest protestant denominations in Indiana in the early to mid 1800s that is more accurately classified as a conflict between evangelical and academic values, 2) a conflict between theocratic and secular / scientific values, 3) a conflict between vocational education and elite
academic values and 4) a conflict between Indiana University’s cultural environment and its institutional environment.

Conflict 1: Evangelical vs. Academic. As was often the case for institutions of higher education during the early to mid 1800s, Indiana University was originally founded as a non-sectarian seminary. The fact that the institution was originally founded as a state seminary is indicative of the pervasive influence that Protestant theology wielded in the realm of public affairs during this time. While the seminary was intended to be non-sectarian in nature (in that it was not affiliated with a particular denomination), its initial purpose was nonetheless to educate men to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ.

During the first five decades of Indiana University’s existence, the institution’s relevant cultural environment was best understood through the lens of protestant theology. At that time, the institution was organized to respond to the demands of the cultural environment and thus to the teachings of protestant theology. In particular, the ideologies of Indiana’s three major protestant denominations, the Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian Churches, (see Figure 14) played a significant role as the university moved from its infancy as a state seminary into its adolescence as an increasingly influential state university. During the early years of Indiana University, each of the three major Protestant denominations positioned themselves as the de-facto “owner” of Indiana University as members of their congregations ascended to leadership positions on the board, as president or as faculty members. While all three entities were focused on the transmission of the values of the Christian faith, the Presbyterian theology and values were more closely aligned with the elite academic direction of other colleges and universities that comprised Indiana University’s institutional environment. In contrast, the Baptist and Methodist theologies and values were
more closely aligned with the theology and cultural values of the Indiana citizenry, who comprised Indiana University’s cultural environment. Therefore, while the Methodists and Baptists desired to control Indiana University for their own reasons, it was also likely that both entities were also interested in preventing the Presbyterians from controlling the institution in a manner that would fundamentally diverge from the evangelical values of the cultural environment (see Figure 12).

What can be viewed as an ongoing battle for control of Indiana University among the three major protestant denominations is more accurately understood as a conflict between the evangelical values promoted by both the Methodist Church and Baptist Church and the academic values promoted by the Presbyterian Church. The Presbyterians and their academic values essentially won the initial battle over denominational ownership of Indiana University as evidenced by the institution’s movement toward greater alignment with the institutional environment. Ultimately, the evangelical values of the Methodist Church and Baptist Church began to lose prominence in the institution, which prompted those denominations to establish other colleges throughout Indiana.

**Conflict 2: Theocratic vs. Secular/Scientific.** Because the Presbyterians essentially won the initial denominational conflict to establish the trajectory of Indiana University, it was their more academic set of values and practices that became embedded into the institution (see Figure 13). These academic Presbyterian values aligned more closely with Indiana University’s institutional environment than did the Methodist and Baptist values, which were more representative of Indiana University’s cultural environment. The trajectory of Indiana University was perceived by the evangelical masses as being more akin to that of a godless, secular institution that one might find in a city on the east coast. This emerging secular
reality stood in stark contrast to the wishes and desires of the majority of the cultural environment who still ardently believed the university’s role was to save souls and to train clergy.

**Conflict 3: Vocational Education vs. Elite Academics.** By the turn of the 20th century, the role of religion in public affairs began to dissipate, due in part to a decline in the membership of the rural Protestant Church in Indiana (Phillips, 1968). As a result, expectations regarding the incorporation of religion on college campuses shifted. Also during this time, Indiana University was relentless in its efforts to continue the elite academic trajectory that was initiated with the incorporation of academic Presbyterian values.

The introduction of the elective system coupled with more specialization among faculty members and a growing desire to be isomorphic with the institutional environment (i.e., elite academic community) stood in stark contrast to the desires of those in the cultural environment, who still desired *practical* vocational training for their children, rooted in Indiana values (see Figure 21). The Indiana citizenry believed the university to be out of touch with their desires and the state’s needs. For many of them, this was partially evidenced by the presence of progressive beliefs among its faculty, who were also less representative of the clergy (and the cultural environment) than they had been in the past.

**Conflict 4: Cultural Environment vs. Institutional Environment.** Eventually, as Indiana University became more specialized, sophisticated, complex and legitimate as an institution of higher education, its technical activities became more secular, more academic and more isomorphic with its institutional environment. Conversely, the technical activities became less faith-based, less directly relevant to Indiana citizens and less aligned with Indiana University’s cultural environment. Thus, the ultimate dominant conflict was one that
divided Indiana University’s cultural environment from its institutional environment (see Figure 22). Simply stated, the people of Indiana were in conflict with the *ivory tower*. This iteration of the conflict was abstract enough that the combatants had likely long since forgotten the origins of the conflict. At this point, the conflict was affective more than empirical, in that the Indiana citizens didn’t know why they were displeased with Indiana University’s trajectory…but they knew they did not like it.

**Summary of Dominant Conflicts.** This series of conflicts illustrates the collision of culture and the fight for ownership of Indiana University. With Indiana University as a potentially powerful symbol of a culture’s legitimacy, the stakes were high from the beginning. What began as a concrete conflict between identifiable protestant denominations vying for control of a small seminary in rural Indiana became an abstract conflict between the people of Indiana and emerging elite academic culture. At distinct mileposts along the way, each dominant conflict became a more abstract redefinition of the preceding dominant conflict. Despite the multiple redefinitions of the conflict and changes in its scope, each redefinition of the conflict retained vestiges of the previous conflicts. Today, there still exists a conflict between Indiana University’s cultural environment and its institutional environment. Though the scope of the conflict has changed and the language and symbols used to describe the conflict are different, the original conflict is nonetheless still found in the institution’s DNA.

**The Development of Managerial Activities.** As is true for any organization, three distinct environments exert influence on Indiana University: The institutional environment, the task environment and the cultural environment (see Figure 34).
During the founding years of the Indiana Seminary, all three environments were aligned. Preparing men for the ministry was a legitimate function of higher education in the early 1800s; thus Indiana University’s alignment with the institutional environment was satisfied. There were sufficient human, physical and fiscal resources available for the preparation of men for the ministry; thus Indiana University’s access to the task environment was satisfied. The citizens and taxpayers of Indiana were interested in the institution training men for the ministry; thus Indiana University’s alignment with the cultural environment was satisfied. Finally, the institution was organized to train men for the ministry; thus the technical activities were aligned with the multiple environments (see Figure 35).
Figure 35. Environments Aligned with Technical Activities.

As the technical activities of Indiana University became more closely aligned with the Presbyterian Church (see Figure 16), the institution became more closely associated with Presbyterianism in the eyes of the largely Methodist and Baptist Indiana citizenry, who were representative of the dominant cultural environment. In response to this belief, various symbolic mechanisms were deployed to reassure the citizens who were threatened by the prospect of a Presbyterian bias being incorporated into the state college.

As the academic trajectory of Indiana University and its technical activities became more pronounced and the aforementioned dominant conflicts between the cultural and institutional environments were defined and redefined, it was vital for the institution to consistently ensure access to the task environment, which was then closely aligned with the cultural environment. Managing adequate access to the task environment required Indiana University to develop various managerial activities to interface with both the task environment and the cultural environment while buffering those same cultural elements from the institution’s evolving technical activities (see Figure 18).

Those managerial activities were of two types: The first type of managerial activity focused on providing symbolic reassurance, that, despite suspicions to the contrary, Indiana
University was in fact a godly institution aligned with the values of the cultural environment. The second type of managerial activity focused on conflict-privatization mechanisms that buffered unwanted behaviors (originating from the cultural environment) from the technical core while simultaneously assuring elements in the cultural environment that the institution was actively enforcing the expected cultural standards of right conduct (see Figure 36).

Figure 36. Managerial Activities Buffer and Reassure.

**The Development of Student-Affairs Functions.** Despite its rising academic stature and emergence as an elite academic institution and continued alignment with the institutional environment, Indiana University existed in a physical location that generally supplied it with the children of unlearned parents as its students. Additionally the university’s location in rural south central Indiana was not ideal for providing these students with options for productive recreation outside the classroom. As a result, unwanted student behaviors emerged, which compromised the university’s relationship with the already suspicious Bloomington townspeople. The crude behaviors of the *Hoosier* children (representative of the university’s cultural environment) were also incongruent with Indiana University’s increasingly elite technical activities (aligned with the university’s institutional environment).
Townspeople expected the university to prevent such untoward behavior from affecting the Bloomington community. Faculty members expected the rural Indiana student behaviors to be buffered from the academic community. The resulting organizational response to these conflicts was the development of various managerial activities that were specifically suited to address student-related issues. These particular managerial activities would become the functions typically associated with student-affairs organizations.

Structured events, student-focused spaces and the establishment and promotion of various student clubs all combined to fulfill a number of managerial activities related to the management of students at Indiana University. These student-affairs functions buffered the technical core from unwanted disturbances from the cultural environment while privatizing the conflict typically caused by unwanted behaviors either through occupation of student time or through the segregation of students into identifiable groups that functioned as control mechanisms for the individual students who identified with these groups or who participated in the various formal activities (see Figure 37).

*Figure 37. Student Affairs Managerial Activities.*
Early examples of Indiana University student-affairs functions were: 1) the Athletic Booster Club, the purpose of which was to limit unruly athletic celebrations, 2) the Indiana Union, student clubs and campus council, the purposes of which was to minimize disorderly off-campus behavior and 3) various athletic events and student activities, the purposes of which were to limit various uncontrolled or spontaneous student activities.

**Student-Affairs Functions Formalized.** Student-affairs functions initially developed as informal managerial activities in response to the need to buffer the technical activities, privatize conflicts and reassure the cultural environment. The formal structures that became known as student-affairs developed at two distinct points in the history of Indiana University and in the history of the United States: The Civil War and World War II. During both periods of time, the institution responded to the demands of student populations for whom university structures and processes had not been designed.

**Civil War and the Admission of Women.** The Civil War presented a number of challenges for Indiana University, most notably a precipitous decline in the number of available students. In order to maintain the ability to exist in a period of uncertainty, it was necessary for Indiana University to expand its task environment beyond that which it had relied on for decades. In doing so, the institution initiated the practice of admitting female students, who were willing to pay tuition during a time when Indiana University desperately needed it to survive. Further, there was a considerable market for the services of educated females, as teachers, upon their graduation.

Despite the advantages that the admission of women and expanded task environment presented for the university’s bottom line, neither the cultural environment nor the
institutional environments were yet supportive of women in higher education. (see Figure 27).

The citizens of Indiana believed the education of women to be an ungodly and dangerous act, whereas the prevailing belief in the elite academic community was that the presence of women was an indication that a university had not achieved elite status. As a result, a new set of managerial activities emerged to manage the unforgiving environments while simultaneously expanding and maintaining access to an expanded task environment. The influx of women during the Civil War era represented a major environmental demand that student-affairs functions were developed to address.

*The Dean of Women.* The aforementioned student-affairs functions were first formalized by the introduction of a dean of women, whose stated role was to provide supervision for female students at Indiana University. As had been the case as previous managerial activities and student-affairs functions emerged, the dean of women provided symbolic reassurance to the cultural environment while buffering the technical core from the effects of female students (see Figure 28).

*World War II and the Return of Veterans.* As was the case during the Civil War era and the associated influx of women to Indiana University, World War II also presented a major environmental demand that necessitated a deliberate and substantial organizational response. Having dwindled in population during the war years the institution benefitted mightily from a task environment that was expanded by men returning from the war, ready to pay tuition. During a four-year period between 1943 and 1947 (see Figure 29), the Indiana University student population nearly tripled in size. The sheer numbers of returning veterans overwhelmed existing organizational structures and necessitated the development of formal
and bureaucratized managerial activities to manage the onslaught from an input \( \rightarrow \) maintenance \( \rightarrow \) output perspective. This formalized, bureaucratic structure emerged in the form of a student affairs division, which was established to consolidate like student-affairs functions into a cohesive structure for managing the myriad issues associated with students.

In addition to the overwhelming numbers of incoming students, the World War II veterans presented a number of unique challenges to campus. Indiana University was unprepared to respond to these overwhelming challenges through existing structures and processes. Mental health issues, the processing of G.I. Bill and financial aid paperwork and the fact that many of the veteran students brought families to campus all combined to require the emerging formalized student affairs division to provide a host of bureaucratic maintenance activities that had not existed prior to this influx of students. Simultaneously the university responded with mechanisms that buffered the technical core from unwanted influences stemming from the influx of veteran students while developing additional mechanisms for privatizing conflicts. Typically, these activities were accomplished through segregation of services and space for various student populations and through the provision of counseling services for students with mental-health concerns (see Figure 30).

**International Students.** While the introduction of international students was not of the same intensity or scope as either the introduction of female students or veteran students to campus, their introduction serves as a useful example of the further formalization and proliferation of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. As was the case with both female students and veteran students, the introduction of international students also mandated the refinement of managerial activities. While far less in number, international students
represented an attractive student population because of their alignment with technical activities and their ability to expand the task environment through the payment of full tuition. Despite the technical and organizational rationality associated with their presence, the introduction of international students presented two main challenges: First, international students were not aligned with the cultural environment of Indiana. Therefore, segregation of spaces and services provided a measure of conflict privatization as distinct and separate cultural environments existed together. Second, governmental policies and protocols related to the admission and matriculation of international students were quite cumbersome and required that additional maintenance activities be created to manage students whose needs were distinct from the needs of the average Indiana University student.

Conclusions

**The Organizational Functions of Student-Affairs at Indiana University.** Student-affairs at Indiana University emerged as a set of managerial activities in response to various conflicts and environmental demands over time. These activities emerged to provide four key functions for the organization: To privatize conflict, to maintain, to buffer the technical activities from environmental influences and to provide symbolic reassurance to the cultural environment (see Figure 38). More recently, there is evidence that student-affairs functions have further served as a mechanism for achieving institutional isomorphism with like institutions. Such isomorphic mechanisms serve to further Indiana University’s legitimacy among its peers by serving as further proof that it has all the features that are commonly associated with a real university (e.g., fraternities and sororities).
The Nature of the Conflict Between Student Affairs and the Organization. As has been noted throughout this study, student-affairs functions emerged at Indiana University as responses to various environmental demands arising from increasing quantitative and qualitative complexities presented by a growing and increasingly diverse student body. The function of student-affairs was historically to engage in the managerial activities of privatizing conflict, buffering the institution’s technical activities, providing symbolic reassurance to the cultural environment and securing legitimacy in the institutional environment through various isomorphic activities. The nature and purpose of these activities was to support and buffer the institution’s technical activities (see Figure 32).

Since the first formalized student-affairs role was first established at Indiana University in the form of the Dean of Women, student-affairs professionals have sought to engage in the proactive and educationally purposeful work of college student development. They believed in developing the whole student. They believed that a student’s experiences outside the classroom were as consequential and potentially educational as the student’s experience inside the classroom. Such beliefs emerged at Indiana University and on other
campuses and have framed the student-affairs professional’s view of the purpose of their work for more than 100 years. This belief is at odds with the reasons for the emergence and formalization of student-affairs functions, which was to privatize, maintain, reassure and buffer (see Figure 39).

![Figure 39. Student Development in Conflict with Organizational Functions](image)

Beginning with Indiana University’s first Dean of Women, Mary Bidwell Breed, student-affairs staff members at Indiana University have historically desired an expanded role on campus that was more closely aligned with the institution’s technical activities. They wanted to be on equal footing with their academic colleagues. Just as President William Lowe Bryan rebuffed Dean Breed’s overtures, making a distinction between student-affairs work and academic work, subsequent efforts to align more closely with the institution’s technical activities have been similarly rebuffed.

Over time, student-affairs professionals beliefs about and focus on the work of college student development became the professional ideology of student-affairs and of the professionals who carried out student-affairs functions. While the promotion of this ideology is supported in the student-affairs literature and is consistent with a broader social and educational mission for student-affairs functions, it was not aligned with the organizational purposes for the development of student-affairs functions at Indiana University, which were
to privatize, maintain, reassure and buffer. The nature of the conflict between student-affairs functions at Indiana University and the boarder organization is one that sets the professional ideology of student-affairs at odds with organizational functions of student-affairs for Indiana University (see Figure 40).

Figure 40. Student Affairs Ideology in Conflict with Organizational Functions.

Student-affairs functions were organized to fulfill the aforementioned purposes in the organization, despite any ideologies that the professionalization of student-affairs functions might have created. As such, student-affairs functions have emerged, evolved, persisted and have been funded to the extent that they are able to achieve organizational purposes.

Achievement of additional purposes linked to student-affairs ideology has occurred, but only in concert with organizationally prescribed managerial activities.

Achievement of Purposes

Informed Effective Leadership and Decision-Making. While this process is often framed as an academic exercise, I believe it to be equally effective as a leadership-development exercise. Having been socialized into the ideologies and assumptions of the student-affairs profession, I have operated from a limited view of higher education. While I believe student-affairs work to be fundamentally important and necessary, I also recognize that such belief does not require me to eschew the organizational realities that are often in
conflict with my professional ideology. Instead, these organizational realities can serve as
guides for how best to accomplish organizational goals and professional goals
simultaneously. This is of tremendous importance as a leader in student-affairs.

This study has assisted me in developing the ability to think about higher education at
multiple levels. At any given time, there are four distinct sets of rationality at play in a
university. The ability to discern which rationality is being employed in a given
circumstance is an important and enlightening leadership tool. Additionally, the
understanding that decisions, beliefs or things that simply do not occur as I hoped they would
are rarely irrational, but instead, differently rational.

Additionally, this study has helped me to develop the skills necessary to view an
organization in its historical context. If I did not understand the initial conflict between the
various religious denominations in Indiana, it would have been difficult for me to have fully
understood the nature of the dominant conflicts as they were redefined. Additionally, had I
failed to understand the conflicts, it would have been difficult for me to understand the role
of student-affairs functions in responding to them.

**Advanced Professional and Academic Knowledge.** Understanding the logic
pertaining to the development of student-affairs functions at Indiana University advances
knowledge in the profession of student-affairs. This study provides multiple lenses through
which to view logic in higher education and the organizational uses of student-affairs
functions. It is my desire that scholars, administrators and student-affairs practitioners alike
will utilize the findings of this study to proactively and purposefully align student-affairs
functions with organizational realities in a manner that ensures that co-curricular programs
and services are able to contribute in a meaningful way to the lives of college students.
Additionally, it is my desire that this study will invite other student-affairs practitioners into a conversation centered on the organizational uses of student-affairs functions. While student development scholarship will continue to serve as the cornerstone of the student-affairs knowledge base, I believe our profession would also benefit from a renewed focus on additional frameworks and ways of knowing.

In addition to the student-affairs literature, this study advances knowledge related to contingency theory. While the institutional activities and the institutional environment are well-established in the literature, I believe there is a compelling need to consider the organizational and political influences of cultural activities and the cultural environment. More fully understanding the nature of the cultural environment as distinguished from the institutional environment is an important advancement in knowledge (see Figure 33).

**Developed Self.** I have changed during this process. My statements are clearer. My writing is better. My thinking is more nuanced and organized, and my self-confidence has improved. I learned that understanding higher education is simple, but certainly not easy. I learned that student-affairs literature holds few of the answers to the questions that will be asked of us during the coming years. I learned that no matter how illogical something seems, there is always a systemic logic at play. The role of the scholar-practitioner is to unearth the logic and utilize it toward becoming a more effective leader and informed decision-maker. I learned that conventional wisdom is often wrong and that there is almost always a story behind the story.

This has been the most profound professional-development experience I will ever have. While I entered the process as a young man in search of credentials that would somehow prove my intelligence, I emerged as a seasoned professional who is both less
interested in the credential this study has earned me and more thankful for the journey this study has afforded me. I have come to believe that a dissertation is not just something you do, it is something you become. While it would have been possible for me to have gone through the motions and created a “passable” product without investing fully in the process of growth, learning and development (as some do), I am thankful that this was not an option. I realize this document will sit idly on the shelf for years. Perhaps it will never be read. This is not the point. The point of this document and the process that yielded it is who it allowed me to become. I am the product.

Limitations

As is true with any research, this particular study had limitations. The data and findings pertain to the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. As such, they are not generalizable to other student-affairs units, other universities, or other units or functions at Indiana University. Despite this, the conceptual framework utilized and advanced during this study has a degree of analytic generalizability. During the process of this study, I have found this framework to be relevant for understanding the nature of another university and its environments.

A second limitation of this study was the fact that I served as the primary research instrument. I was steadfast in my commitment to behave ethically during the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. I was also fastidious in my attempts to guard against threats to the validity of the study. However, it is important to acknowledge my presence as the research instrument as a limitation.

The third limitation of the study was the use of unobtrusive measures to construct a narrative explaining the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. While
I sincerely believe I was able to assemble an accurate narrative, I also believe there to be available documents that I either was not able to access or of which I remained unaware during the data-collection process.

Finally, this study is limited by my own understanding of the conceptual framework I employed. While I believe this study advanced the framework to an extent, I know that future scholars will identify ways of using it that did not occur to me during this study. This represents my best effort with the knowledge and understanding I have. Despite these limitations, I believe this study to represent scholarship of a high caliber that will advance knowledge in the study of higher education and student-affairs as well as in the study of organizational theory.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

This study explored the emergence of student-affairs functions at Indiana University. Despite the relative specificity of the topic, there were a number of items that emerged during this study that I believe merit future investigation. These are briefly mentioned below.

**Cultural Environment.** During this study, an emerging distinction between an organization’s institutional activities and environment and that organization’s cultural activities and environment was explored. Though not well-defined in the literature, it is increasingly evident that a complete framework employed for the purpose of exploring an organization and its relevant environment must consider the cultural environment and its related organizational activities. In the realm of higher education, such a study might specifically consider the cultural activities that universities deploy to achieve isomorphism with the cultural environment. “Big time” intercollegiate is one such potential cultural
activity that might be explored in an effort to better understand the nature of the cultural environment.

**Institutional Environment.** During this time of increasing legal scrutiny, Title IX regulations and other elements originating in the institutional environment, it will be necessary for scholars and practitioners to be more fully equipped to respond to these shifting dynamics. Doing so will require intentional adjustments to existing managerial activities. Additional managerial activities will likely be necessary as well. Because budgets rarely increase as a result of increased expectations in the institutional environment, fully informed practitioners will be in the best position to make the necessary adjustments in a resource poor environment.

**Segregation of Spaces and Services as an Organizing Strategy.** During this study, it was apparent that a diverse menu of student-affairs functions developed for specific purposes over time. While these functions were loosely coupled together in a student affairs division, they were not integrated physically, fiscally or philosophically. At times the decentralized nature of the student affairs division was remedied, only to be returned to a previous version of its decentralized form. There is much left to explore regarding this particular dynamic.
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