

Our Orientation

Arthur W. Chickering

— “T he physicist Leo Szilard once announced to his friend Hans Bethe that he was thinking of keeping a diary: “I don’t intend to publish. I am merely going to record the facts for the information of God.” “Don’t you think God knows the facts?” Bethe asked. “Yes,” said Szilard. “He knows the facts, but he does not know this version of the facts” (Baeyer, 1992, p. 9). Szilard’s orientation is similar to ours in writing this book. There are many perspectives on authenticity and spirituality. Moral development and character development were key purposes for our early colleges. There is substantial research and theory concerning the development of identity and integrity, of purpose and meaning. Authenticity and spiritual growth interact with and in many ways encompass these other conceptual orientations. And there are many perspectives concerning whether higher education should help students address such issues and, if so, how. We don’t pretend to have the “truth” about this complex area, but we do have our own “version” concerning these issues and what needs to be done.

This work grows out of our shared concern about the limits of the heavy emphasis higher education places on rational empiricism and its increasingly narrow focus on professional and occupational training.

This combination has led to growing neglect of larger human and societal issues concerning authenticity, spiritual growth, identity and integrity, purpose and meaning. We aim to help create a better balance by proposing a wide range of policies and practices that address these aspects of human development, that will strengthen authenticity and spiritual growth—for our students, for us as professionals, for our institutions, and for the larger society we want to serve.

This chapter opens with our definitions of spirituality and authenticity and then turns to issues of values and indoctrination, our “bedrock orientation,” and personal statements. We close with why we think that higher education must move in this direction. We believe the needs are great and that getting started expeditiously is critical.

THE LANGUAGE CHALLENGE

When we gather with colleagues to discuss “spirituality in higher education”—a problematic, many-faceted arena—we find ourselves using diverse terms that vary depending on our personal and professional backgrounds. Persons anchored in various religious traditions and from faith-based institutions are typically accustomed to, and comfortable with, the language of spirituality. But for others, that language carries baggage from the worlds of established religions and churches with which they do not identify. They do not want to be understood to endorse anything that hints at proselytizing or indoctrination. Atheists, agnostics, and persons with strong humanistic orientations find that words like *authenticity*, *purpose*, *meaning*, *integrity*, *wisdom*, and *values* express their concerns. For these persons character development and moral development are legitimate concerns for higher education, but “spiritual growth” raises red flags. Nevertheless, when we have been in half-day and weekend workshops with 40 to 150 persons whose backgrounds span the world religions and every shade of humanist, and whose institutional affiliations are similarly diverse, we rapidly move beyond the language challenge. We quickly find that we share very similar hearts and desires, disaffections and dismay, at the social and institutional conditions that characterize most of our communities and institutions. We find that we yearn for safe spaces and for colleagues with whom we can discuss these concerns. In creating these safe spaces we need to recognize and respect the different conceptual orientations and linguistic differences among our colleagues. We believe that two- and four-year colleges and universities need to

legitimize and value such conversations and to create changes that do the same for our students.

For the purposes of this book, we need a shared definition of spirituality. The one we have adopted (Teasdale, 1999) opens with what for us is an important distinction and goes on to language with which we three identify:

Being religious connotes belonging to and practicing a religious tradition. Being spiritual suggests a personal commitment to a process of inner development that engages us in our totality. Religion, of course, is one way many people are spiritual. Often, when authentic faith embodies an individual's spirituality the religious and the spiritual will coincide. Still, not every religious person is spiritual (although they ought to be) and not every spiritual person is religious. Spirituality is a way of life that affects and includes every moment of existence. It is at once a contemplative attitude, a disposition to a life of depth, and the search for ultimate meaning, direction, and belonging. The spiritual person is committed to growth as an essential ongoing life goal. To be spiritual requires us to stand on our own two feet while being nurtured and supported by our tradition, if we are fortunate enough to have one [pp. 17–18].

Karen Armstrong's way of thinking about religion and spirituality also resonates with us:

Religion is not about accepting twenty impossible propositions before breakfast, but about doing things that change you. It is a moral aesthetic, an ethical alchemy. If you behave in a certain way you will be transformed. The myths and laws of religion are not true because they conform to some metaphysical, scientific, or historical reality but because they are life enhancing. They tell you how human nature functions, but you will not discover their truth unless you apply these myths and doctrines to your own life and put them into practice. The myths of the hero, for example, are not meant to give us historical information about Prometheus or Achilles—or for that matter, about Jesus or the Buddha. Their purpose is to compel us to act in such a way that we bring out our own heroic potential.

In the course of my studies, I have discovered that the religious quest is not about discovering “the truth” or “the meaning of life” but about living as intensely as possible in the here and now. The idea is

not to latch on to some superhuman personality or to “get to heaven” but to discover how to be fully human—hence the images of the perfect or enlightened man, or the deified human being. Archetypal figures such as Muhammad, the Buddha, and Jesus become icons of fulfilled humanity. God or Nirvana is not an optional extra, tacked on to our human nature. Men and women have a potential for the divine, and are not complete unless they realize it within themselves [2004, pp. 270, 271].

Those are the ways we define and think about spirituality and religion. Please note that this definition includes atheists. Many atheists, though not religious, share “a contemplative attitude, a disposition to a life of depth, and the search for ultimate meaning, direction, and belonging” and are committed to growth. Many atheists are trying to discover how to be fully human. Estimated at about 5–10 percent of the population, they need to be respected by, and included in, our varied efforts.

Authenticity seems to be a more straightforward and less loaded term. Being authentic means that what you see is what you get. What I believe, what I say, and what I do are consistent. Of course creating that consistency is a lifelong challenge as we encounter new experiences, new persons and new information. As we mature and move to new levels of cognitive and affective complexity, deconstruction and reconstruction must occur.

We must recognize that we usually assume that authenticity carries a positive value, that authentic persons are good, honest, trustworthy, and so forth. But that need not always be the case. History tells us of individuals who were authentically evil. Their words and deeds had a high degree of internal consistency used for selfish and malevolent ends. Also there are historical precedents for authenticity—strong consistency among words and deeds—driven by religious beliefs. Today’s suicide bombers are a case in point. But we strive for an authenticity that is kind, caring, and socially responsible.

We can put flesh and blood on these abstract definitions and illustrate the kind of authenticity we espouse by recalling some exemplars. Some who come to mind for me are Mahatma Gandhi, George Fox, Barbara Jordan, Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela, Eleanor Roosevelt, Mother Teresa, Sojourner Truth, and Desmond Tutu. Each of us has his or her list. These internationally recognized exemplars set a high standard. But there are many others, closer to home and not widely known, who in less dramatic ways live up to the values we

espouse. In totally unbiased fashion, I would include my mother, my wife, my son and three daughters, and my two colleagues who are the coauthors of this book. There are local friends and good neighbors, community leaders, and socially responsible citizens who display the qualities of those well-recognized exemplars in their daily lives. Each reader probably knows similar individuals, so this kind of personal development is not beyond our reach.

These definitions of spirituality and authenticity imply that these domains intimately interact with other major vectors of human development: integrity, identity, autonomy and interdependence, meaning and purpose. Striving for integrity—for a life where word and deed, word and word, deed and deed are consistent with a personally owned value structure, over time and across varied contexts—is critical for spiritual integrity and growth. “Stand[ing] on our own two feet while being nurtured and supported by our tradition” calls for a significant level of autonomy even as we recognize our necessary dependence on family and friends as well as on our local, national, and global communities. And it requires that we recognize the importance of our own support and contributions to those personal, institutional, and political entities that depend on us. Our character and our purposes configure our lives. Our interdependencies depend on our capacity to identify with something larger than our own self-interest. Ultimately, it is our character, our purposes, and the values inherent in the way we live these out in our daily lives that express our spirituality as “a way of life that affects and includes every moment of existence.” Therefore, when we talk about encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education and the changes called for in our institutions and in ourselves, we are talking about all these major dimensions of human development.

VALUES AND INDOCTRINATION

Higher education is not value free. Each policy and practice we adopt, each resource allocation judgment or staffing and personnel decision we make expresses a value priority. The gap between our espoused values and the values actually in use is often large, unrecognized, and unarticulated. Stephen Glazer (1999) addresses one of these gaps:

A great irony is that while spiritual indoctrination, in particular, has been banned from our classroom, indoctrination and imposition continue

unimpeded. Students aren't indoctrinated into religious liturgy but instead into dualism, scientism, and most especially consumerism. We have been indoctrinated into a severely limited, materialistically biased world view.

Rather than learning to nurture and preserve spirit, we learn to manipulate the world: to earn, store, and protect wealth. Rather than learning to be sensitive—understand and attend to the needs of others—we learn to want, rationalize, and do for ourselves. With the rise of a kind of “economic individualism” as our basic sense of identity has come the centralization of wealth and power, the loss of the commons, and the ravishing of the planet. The fact is, within our schools and culture, identity is being imposed: not spiritual identity but material identity [pp. 79, 80].

Like most of our colleagues in higher education, we certainly do not approve of indoctrination of any kind. Yet wittingly and unwittingly, we and our institutions do indeed indoctrinate. We believe we must become aware of the subtle, and not so subtle, kinds of indoctrination expressed through our daily practices, and address those institutionally and in our own professional lives.

OUR BEDROCK ORIENTATION

Our approach to strengthening authenticity and spirituality in higher education is rooted neither in a church nor religious orientation, nor in the state nor in politics. We believe we need to move from the inside to the outside, to work out from the core of our experiences. Kant said that logical concepts are abstracted from empirical experiences. The language of science is our most precise way of communicating meaningfully about facts. But because it is based on observing external facts, the language of science and logic does not cope well with our inner experiences. It follows that the most central tenet of our orientation toward strengthening authenticity and spirituality in higher education is that each and every one of us must be as candid and open as we can about our own orientations, motives, prides, and prejudices. We also recognize that we are all possessed by our own “mental models.” We recognize that our biases compromise our “objectivity.” Our beliefs and behaviors are rooted in our prior experiences and preconceptions. And of all the areas for potential sharing, self-descriptions and self-attributions are most subject to bias. We

all—the “good” and the “bad,” the “evil” and the “righteous,” of whatever political or religious persuasion—create personal systems of self-concepts and beliefs we live by, stories that explain ourselves to ourselves and make sense, to us at least, of our checkered existence. The secret to a satisfying existence—remaining open to new experiences, saying *yes* to life—is to recognize and accept those formulations and live them as best we can. Unfortunately, it is also true, as we have learned recently to our sorrow, that people defend nothing more violently and fanatically than the preconceptions they live by. But given all this, we believe that the path to hope and reconciliation, to strengthened authenticity and spirituality, lies in sharing those preconceptions, exposing our assumptions and preconceptions, and risking the vulnerability entailed.

That is what is required for significant amplification of higher education.

We higher education professionals need to be knowledgeable about—and to appreciate—our religious and spiritual historical antecedents and social perspectives. We need to create new curricular content and to become competent with a wide range of pedagogical strategies. We need to introduce new experiences for students through creative student affairs programming accompanied by powerful partnerships, all of which are well integrated with courses and classes. We need to be aware of various strategies for intervention. Leadership, not only “at the top” but throughout the organization, is critical. But these leaders will need courageous followers who ask tough questions, who address gaps between “espoused values” and “values in use,” who challenge policies and practices that run counter to realizing a shared vision. Finally, of course, hard-nosed evaluation, formative more than summative, is necessary, as we try to create an integrated complex of college and university policies, practices, and cultures that helps us balance our considerable talents for rational analysis and scientific research with similar competence and effectiveness concerning authenticity and spiritual growth.

But all the structural changes, all the creative, adventurous innovations, will only scratch the surface unless each of us professionals can be authentic ourselves. Each of us needs to be as forthcoming as possible about our own passions and prejudices. We need to declare why we believe being authentic is critical not only for higher education but for the United States, where we are struggling to sustain, if not to create, a multicultural, civil democracy in the face of terrorist

threats and growing gaps between the haves and have-nots, at home and abroad.

THE AUTHORS

To be consistent with this fundamental tenet, we each, in alphabetical order, make our own declarations. And, as you will note in the Table of Contents and in the chapter openers, we have each written chapters individually. Some readers may find our personal statements and changes in style from chapter to chapter distracting or off-putting. If so, we simply ask you to bear with us. We are trying to act with the professional authenticity we believe is critical. This orientation does not imply differences among us in the positions taken. We have all reacted to each other's work, made suggestions, and profited from those reactions. We all agree on the strength of the underlying research and the soundness of the views expressed. So by agreeing that each of us will write from his or her own foundations, we do not dodge accountability for the whole.

Please recognize one final point. In all our chapters we address large ballparks where there is wide-ranging research, theory, and practice. We do not aim to be comprehensive, to provide exhaustive reviews of all relevant literature. We are selective, relying on research, theory, and practices that are directly pertinent to our concerns and that seem sound given our own knowledge and prior experiences. Of course all scholarly work is selective and seldom encompasses or recognizes all the relevant perspectives. We simply want to be forthright and up front here about our own orientations.

Art Chickering

Until I reached about age fifty, I was strongly anchored in rational empiricism. I thought of myself, and in many ways I was, the stereotypical "rational man." One fundamental reason for that posture, that orientation, was that—for a variety of reasons I won't belabor here—I had very limited access to my emotions. Of course that does not mean they were not there. But I had been quite successful in sealing them off. So I was not very sensitive to, or behaviorally affected by, hostility from others, anger, anxiety, fear, or sadness. I was strong and tough. I went toward conflict and a good fight rather than away from

them. I had a solid history of keeping my cool in the face of personal attack, whether verbal or physical.

My professional work built on those strengths. It was firmly anchored in my own empirical research and in comprehensive knowledge of pertinent prior and ongoing work by others. I had a good capacity to stand back and synthesize my own findings and relevant literature to create useful books and journal articles. I was very productive because I was much more “task oriented” than “relationship oriented.” I certainly appreciated and felt honored by public recognition of that work, beginning with the annual book award from the American Council on Education for the 1969 edition of *Education and Identity*, which took me from the woods of Vermont into the national scene. Subsequent awards—one from the American College Personnel Association for contribution to knowledge, the E. F. Lindquist award from the American Educational Research Association, the Howard R. Bowen Distinguished Career Award from the Association for the Study of Higher Education for “outstanding scholarship, leadership, and service”—bolstered my sense that I had been, and was, making useful contributions.

In short, I was a good product of, and exemplar of, the Age of Reason. I clearly remember assuming that as reason and research liberated our minds, cultural transformation toward peace, equality, and prosperity would surely follow. And the decade of the 1960s, when I was in my thirties and early forties, seemed to validate powerfully all those assumptions.

Since the Industrial Revolution our technological evolution has been on an accelerating upward curve. New machines and medical practices, anchored in scientific research, have brought marvelous new capacities and cures. Our social and psychological research has brought increased understanding of individual and group behavior and dynamics. In the 1960s, Gardner Murphy—an elder statesman in the same generation as such groundbreaking scholars as Ted Newcomb, Gordon Allport, Nevitt Sanford, Erik Erikson, Abraham Maslow, and Robert White—wrote a wonderful book called *Human Potentials*. His thorough review of the literature documented our growing capacity to understand and guide human behavior to speed the realization of human potentials and aspirations. “Self-actualization” and the human potential movement, together with the so-called greening of America, were gathering momentum. Surely equal justice, truth speaking,

environmental awareness and self-discipline, and global peace were just around the corner.

But for me, and for many others, that faith, hope, and promise has waned during the past thirty years. Our cultural transformation, at least in terms of things I value, seems to be on an accelerating downward curve. “Rational man” continues to kill, and to exploit the poor, the “underdeveloped,” the less powerful and well organized. (Pardon the apparent sexism, but despite progress during the last thirty years, it has been and continues to be a male-dominated world.) We now wage wars for economic and political purposes. Terrorists respond to economic oppression and Western cultural imperialism by murdering children, women, and men who are simply going about their daily lives. Our capacity for atrocity seems limited only by our imagination. It turns out that rational man can be as greedy, power hungry, dominating, and cruel as the hordes of Genghis Khan; the Vandals and Vikings; the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century western conquerors who went throughout the world killing and exploiting indigenous populations; and our own forebears, who systematically dislocated and demolished native populations.

Rational man seems bent on using the explosion of new technologies for managing machines and for manipulating information and communication as means to diminish our democracy, deplete and desecrate our environments, and exploit any globally available sources of cheap labor.

Colleges and universities are supposed to be bastions of rationality, dispensing knowledge and encouraging its application. But, ironically, despite our almost exclusive emphasis on rational empiricism in research, teaching, and service, we do not typically apply the substantial body of research concerning college impacts on student learning and a variety of developmental outcomes to our own policies and practices.

During 1963–64, Tim Pitkin (then president of Goddard College), Ernie Boyer (on his way to SUNY with Sam Gould), and I conceived the Project on Student Development in Small Colleges and got funding for it from the National Institutes of Mental Health. The basis for the project was simple, growing out of my work as coordinator of evaluation at Goddard. We identified thirteen very diverse institutions that were part of the then Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, now the Council for Independent Colleges. All the institutions administered a comprehensive set of surveys and tests to entering students

and repeated the process at the end of the second and fourth years. We also collected extensive information about students' experiences, using an Educational Testing Service instrument, a self-designed survey, and extensive site visits. We then carried out three-day workshops at each campus, sharing our findings, many of which were very persuasive concerning effective and ineffective policies and practices across the institutions, and discussing their implications.

We were operating on what turned out to be a misguided assumption that the institutions would then undertake appropriate changes based on evidence from their own students and from those at peer institutions. Deeply etched into my mind is the first summer workshop that brought together the presidents and academic vice presidents of the participating institutions. My first question was, "Let's hear from you about the changes you are undertaking based on the research findings from your students and the other institutions." Now, as a Quaker and an experienced psychotherapist and counselor, I had become comfortable with silence. It was literally three or four minutes before anyone spoke—a psychological infinity for our academic cultures. Not one of these small colleges had taken any action on those results.

The classic change theory during the 1960s was "RD&D": research, development, and diffusion. This theory was primarily based on agricultural extension efforts to improve farming. We were acting on that. The idea was that the change process started with research to document effective practices; some practitioners then tried out the ideas; finally, their experiences were "diffused" through various media, consultation, and so forth. Agricultural extension workers soon learned that changing farming behaviors was much more complicated than that simple model suggested. Thirty-five years later we are still struggling to understand and manage institutional change in higher education. So rational man seems no more adept at creating humane cultures and conditions on our own campuses than when at large in the world.

Thus for me "rational empiricism," though necessary, is no longer sufficient as a way of knowing, a way of thinking, or a way of being. My soul, the animating force that gives me purpose and meaning, needs to be rooted in something more than simple rationality. I certainly cannot articulate what that "more" is or may be. I do know when I experience it.

I experience it being with my wife, whose life I have shared for more than half a century, through serious challenges to our psychological

and physical health and well-being. I experience it sitting quietly watching the wildlife around the beaver ponds in front of our house. I experience it working with chain saw, ax, and tractor when getting my winter wood supply under cover. I experience it when I am in the presence of classical and contemporary visual and performing arts, music, novels, poems, plays, and apt metaphors. I experience it when I am with others, in a context where there is authentic sharing. I experience it through energetic collaboration trying to address mutual concerns about societal problems. Thus the collaborative work with friends and colleagues who share my concerns continually nourishes my soul, as does working on this book with good friends and colleagues.

Jon Dalton

I began student affairs work in higher education in the 1960s with a deep personal sense of calling, a sense that I was meant for this work. My undergraduate years in a small liberal arts college had been life changing. I entered college with a vague notion of preparing for a good job. By graduation I had developed an overriding commitment to make a difference in the great social and moral problems of the day. Something about college touched my spirit.

It could all have been very different. In high school I was in a vocational training program with no plans for college. Nobody in my immediate family had attended college; few of my high school peers planned to go. A benefactor I barely knew opened the door by providing my college tuition and pocket money. Those four undergraduate years transformed and liberated me intellectually, socially, and spiritually. In a way I could not anticipate or comprehend at the time, I found my “soul” in college. Nothing else I had experienced brought together my head and heart in such a personal and powerful way. My experiences convinced me that colleges and universities can be among the most transforming institutions in our society.

The challenge of working with young people at a pivotal time in their lives in the powerful environment of higher education led me to become a college teacher and administrator. Over four decades I have worked with college students as a student affairs vice president, dean of students, counselor, and professor in four large public research universities. For the past fifteen years I have conducted the annual Institute on College Student Values at Florida State University. I join with colleagues from around the country to examine how colleges and uni-

versities can better influence moral and spiritual development. My observations about the connections of spirituality to college student learning and development draw on this professional history. So forty years later, that calling I first felt in college remains strong.

Something is wrong with higher education that greatly diminishes its effectiveness as a transforming societal institution. What is wrong can best be seen in what so often fails to happen to students during their college years. In so many students today we see unfulfilled hope and idealism, unrealized commitments, and private ambitions disconnected from social and moral purposes. Students come hoping that learning and growing will not only enhance their knowledge and skills but clarify their deepest commitments and calling. They expect college to transform both intellect and spirit. But too often these two domains are severed in their daily lives. The possibilities of what they can become and what our nation needs for them to become at this time are lost. Disturbing trends in higher education's priorities and practices work against educational and developmental transformation. I believe that a renewed commitment to recognizing and honoring spirituality in the academy is essential if we are to succeed in providing higher education that integrates intellect and spirit.

I am persuaded that my own experience of transformation in college was not unique. I believe that most students share a sense of calling or purpose, a sense that their lives are destined for something special, something unique. Some express this sense in a religious context, others as a spiritual quest, and still others as a vague notion of personal destiny. However they conceive of it, most students feel that they are meant for some special role or task and that college is their time, their best time, to discover this destiny.

There are, sadly, too few occasions during their college years when students are intentionally helped in connecting their learning and development with their sense of spiritual calling. As a result, students often remain silent about one of the most important, most deeply felt aspects of their lives. They are eager to explore and share the deep meaning and purpose they associate with their sense of spiritual identity and calling, yet find few opportunities to do so.

What I have learned about students' needs and circumstances has been shaped in part by a perspective on college student life that is largely unobserved by most faculty and staff. The work of student affairs is largely invisible in the academy. Much of students' lives take place in a shadow land, when most in the university have closed up

shop. Anne Matthews (2001) describes this zone of college student life as the “night campus” and accurately observes that it is the most dangerous and unsupervised domain in higher education. The night campus is the turf of student affairs staff in residence halls, crisis centers, student clubs and organizations, recreation programs, and fraternities and sororities. The night campus is where students are most active and open, most intensely engaged, and where their passions are most visible. The night campus is the place for social bonding, experimentation, spiritual search, and emotional expression.

In contrast, the day campus is cool, dispassionate, and intellectual. Students learn quickly that success in the day world of the academy depends on demonstrating intellectual skills and objectivity divorced as much as possible from emotion and spirit. Students perceive that intellectual life, the life of the mind, does not accommodate matters of deep personal meaning and emotion. The day campus treats many of the things students believe in and feel most deeply about as matters of private emotion or irrelevant subjectivism. Separating intellect from personal meaning and purpose makes many students feel alienated almost immediately. They routinely describe their experiences in the day campus as “impersonal” or “uncaring,” saying that they feel “like a number” among so many faces. This makes the night campus even more important to students. There, many of them find some sense of wholeness and belonging. The night campus provides escape from the day world, a world that students prize and compete in intensely but that does not allow them to feel authentically themselves. To work in the night campus is to see a part of students’ lives that desperately needs connecting to the day campus.

Things have gotten worse as higher education has moved increasingly toward a market-oriented enterprise model. Individual self-interest is the chief value communicated by the popular culture. Most colleges and universities reinforce this value in the curriculum and extracurriculum. Colleges market good jobs, good times, and the good life as their primary benefits. They promote their institutions as essential gateways to these high prizes of private self-interest and materialism.

The shift from a student or learner orientation to a customer or consumer orientation reflects this fundamental change. Although the consumer orientation strengthens some aspects of student welfare, it focuses almost exclusively on responding to students’ self-interest. Purdy (1999) compares this self-interest orientation to “free agency” status. Students expect colleges and universities to compete for them

and to do everything possible to meet their needs and interests. At the same time, students know that they are ultimately on their own in college and graduate school competition, so they learn to take safe paths early (p. 84). The “free agency” mind-set is reflected in the student attitude, “You can’t change the world, so you might as well get ahead in it” (p. 96).

Students’ privatism of values and beliefs and their disillusionment with much of what they see in society’s leaders and institutions help explain their increasing interest in spirituality and religion. Youth is an idealistic and introspective time of life. The inward journey is heightened even more when young people feel cut off or disillusioned by their perceptions of the world outside. The scandals, deception, and greed they see so evident in business, politics, and in institutions of higher education make them outwardly cynical and inwardly guarded. They seem willing to deal with the world outside on its own terms, but, as Purdy (1999) suggests, they want to keep a sacred, internal place that is their own and unspoiled by the world they must live in. Students’ increasing interest in spirituality may reflect a refusal to accept the sacrifice of soul that is demanded by the standards of success they confront in college and in the world outside.

Denny Reuel (1965) once described his perspective for studying young people as that of a “spy in the country of the young (p. 156).” I like his analogy because it suggests that the country of the young is very different from the place I inhabit as a college administrator and faculty member. I need to make a special effort to know that youthful country. It also suggests the importance of quietly listening and observing in order to understand the inner terrain of students’ lives. When we do such “spying” well we can create powerful educational environments that help students to integrate the rich context of meaning and purpose in their lives with what they are called upon to learn in college.

Liesa Stamm

For more than twenty-five years I have contributed to higher education in a variety of capacities. I have often characterized my professional endeavors as involving the extreme ends of the higher education spectrum—from teaching in the college classroom to state-level academic affairs administration involving oversight of the state’s colleges and universities, particularly the development of new degree

programs, institutional accreditation, and the design of statewide higher education policy. Recently, I have brought these extremes together through my work with several institutions in planning, program development, and evaluation designed to improve the lives of children from low-income and racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds, and to address national and state concerns and policies.

As is true for many of us, my original vision of higher education's potential for transforming individuals and informing societal change grew out of my own formative years, first in college and then in graduate school in the 1960s and 1970s. This vision encompasses first of all an educational environment that challenges young people to stretch their intellectual abilities, to discover a love of learning with the concomitant rewards of delving into the academic inquiry process and of exploring new ideas and knowledge. My vision also includes an environment with the primary purpose of guiding students in developing the skills they need in order to fit the knowledge they are acquiring into an explanatory framework or theory and to use their understandings for addressing "real-life" issues. Margaret Miller's definition of the general aims of higher education (2003) captures this vision well. She proposes that the basic goal of the baccalaureate degree is to prepare "college graduates who demonstrate an advanced ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and solve problems" (pp. 5–6).

During my undergraduate years I found my personal locus for the love of learning in the field of anthropology. Cultural relativism is the driving theoretical and analytic framework of anthropology, and the essential work of the discipline consists of documenting and attempting to understand the global diversity of human expression and experience. To come to know another culture, another way of understanding and defining the world, requires a basic respect for the variety of possible human perspectives and ways of living. Anthropology is a discipline that by its nature is concerned with the topics of meaning and purpose, values and beliefs, the spiritual and the secular. For me the study of other peoples and cultures has provided an opportunity to unify my love of academic inquiry and my deeply held personal value, learned through my Quaker upbringing, of honoring the essential worth of all individuals.

In contemplating my core commitments in higher education, I am reminded of key factors for understanding human behavior from a lifelong perspective that have been proposed in the field of human development: (1) historical context, (2) dominant social influences,

and (3) individual psychological characteristics. I view my own professional odyssey in higher education as strongly influenced by the interplay of these three factors. My early explorations of professional calling were framed by the prevailing societal definitions of women's roles and women's work during the time I was coming of age at the end of the 1950s and during the 1960s. Because I had very few personal experiences with women professionals, I did not have a clear idea of what I wanted to achieve from my college education. To a large extent because of the social constraints of the time period, many colleges, particularly on the East Coast where I lived, were single-sex institutions. I therefore chose to attend a women's college without having any recognition of the profound effect this choice would have on my subsequent commitment to the academy. Reflecting the fact that this was a women's college, there were more women faculty than was the norm in higher education at that time. As a result, my fellow students and I encountered strong role models of academic women, many of whom had chosen the academic life over the more accepted roles of wife and mother. These faculty role models, as well as a college culture that valued academic inquiry above all else and promoted a sense of personal responsibility for using one's abilities to the fullest, significantly influenced my professional choices, in part by providing me with the confidence to pursue my love of exploring ideas and knowledge at the graduate level.

A second major influence on my life purposes and values was the emergence of the largely youth-driven counterculture of the 1960s and 1970s, which to a large extent was centered on college and university campuses. I learned directly about these young people's movements from my friends and fellow students who were on the front lines of the civil rights, antiwar, and free speech movements and the emerging Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). As I began to join with demonstrators seeking to change the directions of society, my own commitments to the causes of social justice and world peace took root and flourished. A significant part of our education at that time was not through classes and books but at the demonstrations and through the long debates about politics, social change, and altering the university structure, held at the student union or the local pub or sitting around on mattresses on someone's living room floor.

During my student years, the study of women as a topic of serious research was not yet recognized, and there were no full-scale ethnographic studies of women; despite this, my early ethnographic field

research centered on studies of women's roles and women's concerns. For one study, I lived in North Africa for a year-and-a-half and conducted field research on Muslim women's roles. My resulting analysis focused on defining the dynamics of women's domestic power. I subsequently became involved in contributing to the emerging field of women's studies, including participating in the development of the women's studies program at the university where I was a faculty member, and in advancing a range of initiatives to promote increased opportunities and support for women students and faculty.

Similar to many faculty members, I was not particularly focused on the educational process but on teaching about and conducting research in my discipline. With my subsequent transition from the faculty role to an administrative one working for a state board of governors for higher education, I came to recognize my personal commitment to promoting accessibility to educational opportunities for all young people. As a senior administrator in a state department of higher education between 1986 and 2000, I had the opportunity to foster standards of quality for institutions of higher education and to contribute to the development of regional and state programs and policies to improve the state's public education and employment training, health care, and other services, particularly those for children and youth and their families. My underlying goal was to more fully utilize the expertise of college and university campuses, bringing it outside the academy to address the needs of society.

A number of my professional choices were mediated by prevailing societal expectations and practices regarding women, including the ambiguities of combining women's roles as mothers and wives with a professional life. The unspoken barriers for women in the academy became clear to me as I began looking for a faculty position in the early 1970s and faced several instances of discrimination. One of the most difficult and painful decisions of my professional life occurred in the early 1980s when my academic career was beginning to flourish through the presentation and publication of my research. At that time the academy was beginning to emphasize professional preparation over a liberal education, and for many of us in the liberal arts disciplines, it was increasingly difficult to find the type of positions we wanted. Faced with the difficulties of the job market and the demands of becoming a single parent, I decided to leave the academy. In the process of seeking other professional directions, I came to understand my deep personal dedication to the educational process, and through

my work in state-level higher education discovered a whole new professional field and pathway for putting my values and purposes into practice.

Although my professional endeavors for some years have involved higher education administration, planning, and assessment, the underlying objective of all my work has been to ensure quality education and to promote institutional practices that encourage high educational attainment for all students to attain their personal and professional goals. Above all else, it is always my hope that the collegiate experience will spark the excitement of learning that became the foundation of my own professional commitment to higher education. As we will discuss more fully in later chapters, history has affirmed the profound impact on American society, including in modes of religious expression, of the hopes and dreams for a more just society expressed by my student cohort, in some cases through obstruction and even violence. The values and beliefs publicly expressed by many of us at that time, through large demonstrations in Washington and numerous smaller actions on our own campuses, appear to have faded in subsequent years, during which societal structures seem to support individual gain and consumption rather than the public good. For many of us, however, the promise of a better society and the personal values we developed in the 1960s and 1970s remain our essential core. I join my colleagues Arthur Chickering and Jon Dalton in challenging higher education to again become a center of dialogue and debate about human purpose and values and to use the great intellectual capacity and knowledge of the academy to become a partner in helping young people shape their own authenticity and pursue spiritual growth in whatever ways speak to their particular condition.



We hope these personal statements give you a sense of where we come from as we tackle this work. We also share a strong sense that encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education is critical if we are to respond to significant societal needs.

THE NEED

The fundamental argument of this book is that we need to temper our current heavy emphasis on rational empiricism and professional and vocational preparation with increased efforts to help students address

issues of authenticity and spiritual growth. Certainly the scientific research done in our colleges and universities has made huge contributions to improved health and longevity, to the development of wide-ranging technologies that enhance our quality of life, to our understanding of our global environment and the complex interactions among human and natural elements, and to our sophistication concerning human behavior. We have put men on the moon, explored Mars, and split the atom, and we are coming to understand and manipulate our own genetic structures. You can make your own list.

And of course, logical analysis, cognitive complexity, and rational processes are critical for a productive career, effective citizenship, a satisfying marriage, and a mutually supportive, loving family. But it seems clear to us that our institutions of higher education need also to address issues of affective complexity and social responsibility.

There are four major contexts that cry out for significant growth in these areas:

1. Our global and national condition, whose problems higher education has an important role in addressing
2. Our institutions, which need to do more than provide professional and occupational training
3. Our students, whose needs should drive our educational policies and practices
4. We professionals, who need to invest our time, energy, and emotion in purposes larger than our own advancement

Our Global and National Condition

My international experiences consulting and traveling in Canada, Latin America, Europe, and the Far East during the last twenty years suggest that things are getting worse, not better. Many persons are experiencing life as more stressful and less meaningful than even during the cold war in the early 1960s. Our economic interdependence and ability to move jobs to take advantage of cheap labor create employment problems in the countries where jobs leave and social dislocation and disruption in receiving countries. Our global communication systems let hackers in one location cause widespread disruption across national boundaries. A SARS outbreak in China be-

comes an international threat. Starvation and disease increase despite dramatic increases in food production capacity. Intercultural, intertribal, interregional, and interreligious conflicts flame up and seem immune to peaceful resolution. Politically driven misinformation and disinformation renders informed decision making almost impossible.

Each reader will have a different list of challenges and different priorities, but few persons think that everything is just fine on our special planet.

Here in the United States we have become almost numb to the litany of problems we face:

A two-tier society in which the gap between the rich and the poor has increased dramatically during the last thirty-five years

Recurrent violence and crime, some driven by drugs, some apparently random expressions of rage and frustration

Moneyed special interests dominating our elections and political decision making, accompanied by apathy and declining civic engagement

Increasing costs for health care, schooling, and higher education that are significantly outrunning inflation

No significant federal responses to address the challenge of maintaining Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security as the baby boom generation reaches retirement age

Recurrent corruption in politics, corporations, and financial institutions

Persistent environmental exploitation and degradation

In the last thirty to forty years our “social health” has dropped precipitously. Fordham University’s Institute for Social Policy has an Index of Social Health based on sixteen variables that include infant mortality, teenage suicide, school dropout, drug abuse, homicide, food stamp use, unemployment, traffic deaths, and poverty among the elderly. On a 0–100 scale, after rising to a high of 71 during the 1950s and 1960s, from 1970–1992 the index showed a decline from 71 to 41.

Much of that drop in social health results from our unbalanced priority given to work. Joe Robinson (2003, p. 13) put it this way:

How do Americans do it? Asked the stunned Australian I met on a remote Fijian shore. . . . The feat he was referring to is how Americans manage to live with the stingiest vacation allotment in the industrialized world—8.1 days after a year on the job, 10.2 days after three years, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. . . . In this country, vacations are not only microscopic, they're shrinking faster than revenues on a corporate restatement. . . . A survey by the Internet travel company Expedia.com has found that Americans will be taking 10% less vacation time this year than last—too much work to get away, said respondents. This continues a trend that has seen the average American vacation trip buzzsawed down to a long weekend. Some 13 percent of American companies now provide no paid leave, up from 5 percent five years ago. . . . In Washington state, a whopping 17 percent of workers get no paid leave. . . . The result is unrelieved stress, burnout, absenteeism, rising medical costs, diminished productivity, and the loss of time for life and family. . . . Vacations are being downsized by the same forces that brought us soaring workweeks: labor cutbacks, a sense of false urgency created by tech tools, fear, and, most of all, guilt. . . . Guilt works because we are programmed to believe that only productivity and tasks have value in life, that free time is worthless, although it produces such trifles as family, friends, passions—and actual living. But before the work ethic was hijacked by the overwork ethic, there was a consensus in this country that work was a means, not an end, to more important goals.

Overwork does not just cost us workers. Businesses pay \$150 billion a year dealing with job stress, despite the fact that vacations alleviate burnout, the worst form of stress, by helping us recover our emotional resources. But it takes two weeks, not just a long weekend. Further, annual vacations cut the risk of heart attack by 50 percent. Certainly “time is money.”

But time itself is our most precious currency. It is finite and limited. Investing it in ourselves, our families, our friends, and our neighbors will yield richer dividends than all those extra hours on the job. Re-creating that better balance will nourish our souls as well as our minds and bodies.

Let me be clear that we are not harking back to some “Golden Age” of the United States. We have come a long way in the past hundred years. Corporate greed was alive and well at the turn of the century.

The required work week averaged forty-nine hours in the 1920s. Women and African Americans could not vote. We have Social Security, more widespread access to health benefits, a twenty-five-year increase in the life span, and better standards of living. These changes flow largely from the theory building and empirical research carried out in our higher education institutions. This research has fostered systematic application of results to policies and practices that generated these changes. But our current “age” has a full platter of daunting problems we need to address. No other social institutions are better positioned to address those problems than our two- and four-year colleges and universities. To realize that potential we need to redress some of our own imbalances.

Our Institutions

Up until the 1990s, higher education had gone from an aristocratic, through a meritocratic, to an egalitarian orientation. With the success of the community college movement that began in the 1960s and the federal grants and loans programs created in the early 1970s, a college education became accessible to a high proportion of the population. Professional and vocational preparation became almost universally available. Unfortunately, during the 1990s and continuing today, that trend and social orientation have shifted. Higher education increasingly has come to be perceived as a private benefit rather than as a public good worthy of tax support. Many of us remember when education at state colleges and universities was basically free. Now, in many states tax support equals only 25–35 percent of total revenues; each cut in state support is accompanied by authorizing tuition increases, which our institutions adopt simply to stay even.

The cuts in support for higher education are occurring while the complexity of the problems our society faces seems to be growing faster than our capacity to deal with them at either the state or federal level. Colleges and universities are the only social institutions that can help educate a citizenry able to function at the levels of cognitive and affective complexity the problems require. They are the only social institutions that can help create the courageous followers, the “servant leaders” our distressed globe requires. Ten capacities of servant leaders include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people,

and building community. No other educational institutions can do as much to enhance these human competencies and personal qualities. But higher education is not succeeding in these tasks.

To redirect our priorities to enhance authenticity and spiritual growth requires major institutional amplification. How can our institutions—supported by a capitalist economy, collaborating with and supported by local, regional, and national corporations—provide the critical research and reflection necessary for the common good? As the market mentality and its associated values triumph nationally and globally, critical analysis of its intended and unintended consequences becomes ever more important. But instead we reduce ourselves to dispensing information and knowledge, credit hours and degrees—commodities to be delivered with maximum speed and efficiency, as though we are an educational Federal Express or United Parcel Service. Administrators and faculty members become producers, and students become consumers. Chapter Six discusses further the impact of the student-as-consumer mentality on higher education. Student affairs professionals put out fires, cool out the unruly, and struggle with students' use of drugs and alcohol to keep things running smoothly. A faculty caste system is alive and growing, with a few highly paid star aristocrats at the top, a modest middle class of tenured and tenure-track professionals who work long hours and are stretched thin across multiple responsibilities, and, outnumbering both these groups, masses of minimally paid adjuncts.

In response to these conditions state legislators concerned about crime, drugs, voter apathy, and public morality withhold support for educational alternatives that foster critical thinking, multicultural understanding, and civic responsibility, in favor of professional and vocational certification.

There is a big difference between preparing for a job and preparing for a satisfying and productive career. The latter requires, first and foremost, interpersonal competence and the ability to work with others diverse in race, ethnicity, gender orientation, and national origin. It requires skills in identifying and solving problems. It requires a sense of purpose and the confidence that you can act in ways that make a difference. These are the same competencies and personal characteristics required to become an effective citizen, to create a lasting marriage, and to raise a healthy and happy family. They are the characteristics that need to accompany spiritual growth if we are to act in the world in ways consistent with our beliefs, whatever our faith. So if we focus only

on specific professional and vocational preparation, we sell both our students and our society short.

Our heavy concentration on objectivity and empirical rationality and on professional and vocational preparation indeed can work against encouraging authenticity and identity, integrity and spiritual growth. Parker Palmer (1994) puts it this way:

The mode of knowing that dominates higher education I call objectivism. It has three traits with which we are all familiar. The first of these traits is that the academy will be objective. This means that it holds everything at arms length. . . . Secondly, objectivism is analytic. Once you have made something into an object (in my own discipline that something can be a person), you can chop that object up into pieces to see what makes it tick. You can dissect it, you can cut it apart, you can analyze it to death. . . . Third, this mode of knowing is experimental. . . . I mean by experimental that we are now free with these dissected objects to move the pieces around to reshape the world in an image more pleasing to us, to see what would happen if we did. . . . Objective, analytic, experimental. Very quickly this seemingly bloodless epistemology becomes an ethic. It is an ethic of competitive individualism, in the midst of a world fragmented and made exploitable by that very mode of knowing. The mode of knowing itself breeds intellectual habits, indeed spiritual instincts, that destroy community. We make objects of each other and the world to be manipulated for our own private ends [pp. 41-42].

Parker's view may seem a bit extreme for some of us. But recall the difference between Lockean and Kantian models in science. Kantian theoretical models propose an active organism, and questions of meaning and purpose are legitimate concerns. Lockean models presume that the organism is passive, a machine; issues of purpose or meaning are irrelevant. So our problem is not with scientific methods and research or with rational inquiries concerning human nature. Instead the problem is that we tend to assume that objective methods require us to eliminate questions of purpose, value, and meaning, and to assume that we humans are only machines or collections of molecules or interacting subatomic particles.

For me Palmer's comments and the Kantian-Lockean distinction indicate why we need to achieve a better balance of intellect and spirit within our two- and four-year colleges and our universities.

The emphasis on rational empiricism, on conceptions of truth as objective and external, and on knowledge as a commodity delegitimizes active, public discussion of issues of purpose and meaning, authenticity and identity, spirituality and spiritual growth. Meaningful dialogues concerning these issues require communities of trust, openness, and candor, where participants can expose vulnerabilities, knowing they will be heard and supported in their searching. Limited self-understanding and self-reflection, and fear of being vulnerable in competitive, individualistic environments leave us swamped with conflicting impulses and ambivalent about appropriate actions. (Chapter Seven examines why a sense of community is so often lacking and how it can be created.)

We must tackle these issues. Society requires it. Many of our students want us to. All of them need us to redress the current imbalances.

Our Students

An April 13, 2005 press release shared results from the College Student Beliefs and Values Survey carried out by Alexander and Helen Astin and their colleagues at the University of California at Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute (HERI).

“Today’s entering college students report high levels of spiritual interest and involvement. Four in five indicate ‘having an interest in spirituality’ and ‘believing in the sacredness of life’ and nearly two-thirds say that ‘my spirituality is a source of joy.’ Many are also actively engaged in a spiritual quest, with nearly half reporting that they consider it ‘essential’ or ‘very important’ to seek opportunities to help them grow spiritually. Moreover, three-fourths of the students say that they are ‘searching for meaning/purpose in life’ and similar numbers report that they have discussions about the meaning of life with friends. . . . The entering freshmen also show a high degree of involvement in religion. About four in five report that they attended religious services in the past year and that they discussed religion/spirituality with friends and family. More than three-fourths believe in God, and more than two in three say that their religious beliefs/spiritual beliefs ‘provide me with strength, support and guidance.’ Four in ten consider it ‘essential’ or ‘very important’ to ‘follow religious teachings in everyday life. . . .’

Despite their strong religious commitment, students also demonstrate a high level of religious tolerance and acceptance. For example, most students agree that ‘non-religious people can lead lives that are just as moral as those of religious believers’ (83%) and that ‘most people can grow spiritually without being religious’ (64%). Similarly, nearly two-thirds of the students (63%) disagree with the proposition that ‘people who don’t believe in God will be punished’.

While today’s entering college freshmen clearly expect their institutions to play an instrumental role in preparing them for employment (94%) and graduate or advanced education (81%), they also have high expectations that college will help them develop emotionally and spiritually. About two-thirds consider it ‘essential’ or ‘very important’ that their college enhance their self understanding (69%), prepare them for responsible citizenship (67%), develop their personal values (67%) and provide for their emotional development (63%). Moreover, nearly half (48%) say that it is ‘essential’ or ‘very important’ that college encourage their personal expression of spirituality.” (Higher Education Research Institute, April 13, 2005.)

In Chapter Three Liesa Stamm summarizes findings from several studies that documents students’ eagerness to explore their spiritual concerns. And in Chapter Six Jon Dalton shares data from student affairs leaders across the country who report rising interest in spirituality among their college students.

These findings make it clear that our students need more opportunities to engage issues of spirituality, purpose, and meaning and that our institutions need to respond.

Some students are acting on these concerns, creating their own initiatives within diverse institutions. The Self Knowledge Symposium (SKS), one of the most energetic and sophisticated student-led initiatives, provides a striking example. Started at North Carolina State University back in 1989 by students who were inspired after hearing a lecture by Triangle entrepreneur Augie Turak, the SKS quickly caught on at UNC-Chapel Hill and Duke, eventually incorporating as a 501(c)(3) foundation in 1999. According to Ed Cheely, the coordinator and a Duke 2000 alumni,

SKS provides a community for the positive spiritual transformation of college age students, as well as an ongoing community for adults

looking for further spiritual transformation. It provides not only a community, but also a wealth of mentors, resources, philosophy, and programming to help students in their quest for “the life worth living.” Spiritual transformation as practiced by the SKS typically falls into one of three areas:

1. The quest to be a genuine, or authentic person.
2. The discernment of vocation.
3. The spiritual search for Truth.

Within each of these three components lies a strong emphasis on leadership, character, and integrity, because without these qualities, it is impossible to live out the discovery of authenticity, vocation, or truth [E. Cheely, personal communication, June 12, 2004].

Ed reports that the backbone of SKS activities are weekly meetings, where they use “anything from readings to movies to thought-provoking questions to get students to examine their lives and share their experiences, while also teaching the SKS fundamentals of character development, self-knowledge, service, etc.” They put on lectures, workshops, and retreats where students work together and “where they are exposed to dynamic teachers and mentors from a wide range of background and perspectives.” They have a journal, *The Symposium*, in which students share stories and interview well-known spiritual leaders. They have taught classes, such as What is Zen? Authenticity 101, and Thinking the Unthinkable: An American Nekyia. They take alternative spring break programs to Trappist and Buddhist monasteries and to meditation centers, “which sell out every year.” And “we do anything else we can think of—skydiving, rock climbing, etc., to help students get out on the edge.” One of their most ambitious ventures was an Inward Bound Conference held in October 2002, which brought together three hundred students from sixty institutions around the country.

When I asked Ed about their plans for the future, he said:

We believe that the SKS chapters, which introduce hundreds and often thousands of students to spirituality each year, along with the Inward Bound Conference, have proven two things: there is a tremendous need for authentic spirituality among college students and the SKS has a model (not at all perfect!!!) that can meet that need. We want to use these “test cases” to find other people, organizations, and foundations

who are interested in bringing authentic spirituality to young people, and who would want to work with us to reach young people on a much larger scale than we can do on our own. We are developing curricula that could be replicated on other campuses, and we just recently had a wealthy local benefactor and business person outside of the SKS donate free office space and a great deal of free housing downtown, where we could potentially host summer or year long spiritual leadership programs. We would like to work with others who have proven models for transformation, and we would also like to work with others who can bring resources of marketing or funding.

This kind of action initiative illustrates students' flesh-and-blood, concerted efforts and personal commitments that lie behind HERI's survey results.

We Professionals

Ernest Becker (1970, p. 291) says, "The distinctive human problem from time immemorial has been the need to spiritualize human life, to lift it onto a special immortal plane beyond the cycles of life and death that characterize all other organisms." Higher education needs to create conditions under which all of us professionals, as well as our students, can address this fundamental existential problem.

The first definition of *soul* in *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* reads thus: "An entity conceived as the essence, substance, animating principle, or actuating cause. It is correct of life, esp. of individual life manifested in thinking, willing, and knowing." This definition captures what I believe many of us higher education professionals feel we have lost, or are losing. The "essence, substance, animating principle, or actuating cause" that brought us to this calling, which has sustained us throughout the ups and downs of challenging careers, seems increasingly out of tune with the dominant directions of change in our organizational cultures; in our institutional priorities, policies, and practices; in our departmental norms; in our collegial relationships. I believe reclaiming our professional souls is essential if we are to address successfully the daunting social problems we face. It is essential if we are to achieve the amplification of higher education required for our colleges and universities to generate graduates who can function at the levels of cognitive and affective complexity to address those problems.

The major amplifications required to reclaim our institutional soul cannot be achieved unless our professional souls are respected, supported, and celebrated. They cannot be achieved with organizational cultures, institutional policies and practices, departmental norms, and collegial relationships that view administrators, faculty members, and student affairs professionals as instruments for production used to achieve competitive advantage in a market-driven enterprise. They cannot be achieved if students are simply consumers generating credit hours and credentials.

Diana Chapman Walsh (1999) put the issue well for us faculty members: “We know intuitively that ineffectual, dispirited, and alienated faculty are unlikely to be teaching well, unlikely to be providing their students with the inspiration and guidance they need at a time when we need students to be inspired. If the task of a college or university professor is, as I think we can agree, to inspire students with a love of learning that will companion them throughout their lives . . . then surely we need faculty themselves on fire with a passion for their work” (Glazer, 1999, p. 5).

In *Let Your Life Speak*, Parker Palmer (2000) suggests the orientation we need:

There is a simplistic brand of moralism among us that wants to reduce the ethical life to making a list, checking it twice—against the index in some best-selling book of virtues perhaps—and then trying very hard to be not naughty but nice.

There may be moments in life when we are so unformed that we need to use values like an exoskeleton to keep us from collapsing. But something is very wrong if such moments recur often in adulthood. Trying to live someone else’s life, or to live by an abstract norm, will invariably fail—and may even do great damage. . . .

Vocation does not come from willfulness. It comes from listening. I must listen to my life and try to understand what it is truly about—quite apart from what I would like it to be about—or my life will never represent anything real in the world, no matter how earnest my intentions.

That insight is hidden in the word *vocation* itself, which is rooted in the Latin for “voice.” Vocation does not mean a goal that I pursue. It means a calling that I hear. Before I can tell my life what I want to do with it, I must listen to my life telling me who I am. I must listen for the truths and values at the heart of my own identity, not the stan-

dards by which I *must* live—but the standards by which I cannot help but live if I am living my own life [pp. 3–6].

Parker's emphasis on listening for our own identity, for our own standards, suggests some specific things we and our colleagues can do to start reclaiming our professional souls.

As individuals we can seek out trusted colleagues and create times and spaces to share our experiences, our feelings, our conflicts and ambiguities, and our ideas about how to find some better resolution. We can legitimize such conversations between ourselves and our students, and among our students. We can encourage students to organize such activities as a way to show the university system what they truly value. We can read pertinent literature, write for ourselves and for others, and speak about these issues in public settings when given the chance. We can undertake systematic inquiry concerning our own institution or our own unit as to the gaps between ideals and realities, between espoused values and values in use.

Collectively we can work with regional and national organizations to bring to the surface and explore these concerns. We can survey the higher education landscape and aim for a vision of what it might become, in terms that are relevant and tangible for our diverse institutions and constituents. We can tackle the cultures of our graduate schools to help future professionals recognize the importance of addressing issues concerning purpose and meaning, authenticity and identity, spirituality and spiritual growth. We can create a series of publications, principles for good practice like those articulated in Jon Dalton's final chapter, and state-of-the-art reports. We can create a national teleconference that brings some of our most thoughtful and active leaders together with professionals from diverse institutions. We can recruit some high-profile presidents and administrative leaders to help create a political and multi-institutional inquiry and action base for sustained effort. We can bring these issues to the attention of larger audiences outside higher education, to explore their significance for the larger cultural context within which we work. Bolman and Deal (1995) put it well for me:

Perhaps we lost our way when we forgot that the heart of leadership lies in the hearts of leaders. We fooled ourselves, thinking that sheer bravado or sophisticated analytic techniques could respond to our

deepest concerns. We lost touch with our most precious gift—our spirit.

To recapture spirit, we need to relearn how to lead with soul. How to breathe new zest and buoyancy into life. How to reinvigorate the family as a sanctuary where people can grow, develop, and find love. How to reinfuse the workplace with vigor and élan. Leading with soul returns us to ancient spiritual basics reclaiming the enduring human capacity that gives our lives passion and purpose [p. 21].

So, despite the obstacles, there are individual and collective initiatives we can pursue to reclaim our souls, to reclaim the “essence, substance, animating principle, or actuating cause” that brought us to this calling. Momentum is building. We hope this book adds weight to current initiatives.