Building Community on Campus: Student Affairs Professionals as Group Workers

By: Deborah J. Taub

Abstract:
This article describes the role of student affairs professionals in building campus community through work with natural groups such as residence halls, clubs and organizations, classes, and service-learning groups. Challenges to the creation of campus community are discussed. The Social Change Model of leadership development is highlighted as an example of a model for working with groups. In addition, other campus community-building approaches such as service learning, learning communities, and ceremonies, rituals, and traditions are described. The role of student affairs professionals as group workers and community builders—and the potential for their involvement in these approaches—is highlighted.

Article:
Community imparts a common sense of purpose (Boyer, 1987). Community can provide individuals with a sense of meaning and continuity; of acceptance, belonging, and safety; of affirmation; and of mattering (Hampton & Norman, 1997; Manning, 1994; Roberts & Brown, 1989; Schlossberg, 1989). Within community, "people grow by means of meaningful relationships" (Young, 1996, p. 90). Community, therefore, influences its members to look beyond themselves and to feel a sense of responsibility and commitment to valuing others, Roberts (1993) identified the elements required to establish community as (a) common values and purpose; (b) practical and psychic collaboration (c) connection, support, and affirmation; (d) openness to constructive question and challenge; (e) willingness to limit one's own freedom for the collective good; and (f) fulfillment of aspirations.

Building campus community has long been a goal of higher education that has increased in importance and in challenge over the past decade (Boyer, 1987, 1990). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in a study of social conditions on campuses, identified a number of concerns that threatened community: student conduct, campus crime, the breakdown of civility, racial tension, gender discrimination, and "an unhealthy separation between in-class and out-of-class activities" (Boyer, 1990, p. 2).

However, community continues to be valued by institutions of higher education. According to Boyer (1990), 97% of college and university presidents "strongly believe[d] in the importance of community" (p. 64) and believed that institutions should do more to foster campus community. Boyer proposed six attributes that characterize the ideal of campus community: a college should be educationally purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebrative. He challenged campuses to adopt and embrace these principles as the basis for strengthening "the spirit of community on campus" and "also provide, perhaps, a model for the nation" (p. 8).

Although much has been made of the career orientation and "me" orientation of recent college students, there is reason to believe that students on today's campuses will also be receptive to these messages of community and inclusiveness (Boyer, 1987; Chambers & Phelps, 1994; Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990a; Levine, 1998). For

example, students are displaying an increased interest in community service; about 70% of students today come to campus with the experience of doing volunteer work in high school and almost two thirds are involved in volunteer work as undergraduates (Jacoby, 1996). Levine (1998) noted that today's undergraduates are socially engaged, particularly at the local level, and Chambers and Phelps (1994) have emphasized the reemergence of student activism on campuses. Although a majority of college students say that it is very important to them to be financially well off, a majority also say that they want a career that will enable them to make a meaningful social contribution (Levine, 1998). Komives (1993) has pointed out that

> our 1990s freshmen come to campus with an expanded perception of their role in the world. Several trends from the 1980s may have helped shaped their generational perspective (a) global awareness and the consciousness of diverse cultures; (b) recognition of the earth's fragile ecosystem; (c) concern for human and civic rights; and (d) a new quest for a high quality of life, including meaningful work, fitness, personal safety, and friendships. (p. 70)

Jacoby (1997) asserted that commuter students, part-time students, and adult learners "are not less desirous of being members of an academic community but. . .their life experiences and schedules mean that they may define that community differently from traditional age, fulltime, residential students" (pp. 1,5). Although campus community may be more commonly thought of in terms of residence halls and student organizations, commuter students, part-time students, and adult learners may be more likely to think of community on campus in terms of classes and/or on-campus employment (B. G. Jacoby, personal communication, October 8, 1997). Just as with more traditional students, community for commuter, part-time, and adult students is represented by a sense of mattering-that one's presence is missed (B. G. Jacoby, personal communication, October 8, 1997; Schlossberg, 1989). In addition, although diversity may present challenges for the building of community, diversity also has the potential to enrich the community.

The purpose of this article is to explore the challenges to the creation of campus community and to highlight some ways in which student affairs professionals, working with natural groups on campus, are meeting this challenge. Contemporary challenges to the creation of community on campus will be discussed. Next, the role of community building in the mission of student affairs professionals will be described. The Social Change Model (The Working Ensemble, 1996) of student leadership development will be highlighted as an example of how student affairs professionals are both group workers and community builders. Finally, other approaches to building campus community, such as service learning, learning communities, and rituals and traditions will be described, along with the role played by student affairs professionals in these community-building efforts.

CHALLENGES TO A SENSE OF COMMUNITY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES
Diversity among today's student body has made the building of campus community particularly challenging (Boyer, 1990; Roberts, 1993). "America's first colleges were guided by a vision of coherence and for the first two hundred years, college students appeared socially and economically to be very much alike" (Boyer, 1990, p. 4); that is, college students were almost universally White, male, and privileged. However, diversity characterizes today's college students, including diversity of gender, race and ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, ability, sexual orientation, nationality, and religion (El-Khawas, 1996).

> While colleges and universities celebrate this pluralism, the harsh truth is that, thus far, many campuses have not been particularly successful in building larger loyalties within a diverse student body, and there is disturbing evidence that deeply ingrained prejudices persist. Faculty, administrators, and students are now asking whether community can be achieved. (Boyer, 1990, p. 4)

Other factors in higher education today also present challenges to the building of community. The majority of college students are commuters who typically have competing demands of multiple life roles and whose college experience is likely to be very different from that of resident students (Jacoby, 1989). Some commuter students may be more likely to identify with the community within which they live rather than with the campus community. Other commuter students may find that the limited amount of time that they spend on campus

inhibits the degree to which they can participate in the cocurricular activities and groups that can form campus subcommunities and take part in the rituals, ceremonies, and traditions, such as homecoming or campuswide convocations, that serve to foster a sense of campus community. Such activities also may not be designed or appear to be inclusive of nontraditional students (B. G. Jacoby, personal communication, October 8, 1997).

Another category of students that is increasing is non-degree-seeking students; it is estimated that 25% of postbaccalaureate students and 19% of students in community colleges are non-degree-seeking (El-Khawas, 1996). These students, too, may not identify with the campus as their community, especially because they may be affiliated with the campus for only a short time. Increasing numbers of degree-seeking students are attending college part-time; their time on campus is, by definition, limited. Therefore, they too may be unlikely or unable to participate in the events and activities that are designed to build campus community. Many of these students are what has been called *educational* surfers:

> They surf across the higher education wave, skimming the surface. Their goal is to move quickly; finish their ride without falling; and get to the shore, which is the completion of their educational goal….They have neither the time, nor the inclination to jump off the board, plunge into the sea and go for a swim. (Helfgot, 1997, p. 4)

How can community be built with such students who may be representative of the majority of students on some campuses?

Technology presents challenges to campus community as well. The growth of student interest and involvement in the Internet has led to concerns that students will choose to interact on-line, rather than face to face, even with fellow students who may live down the hall or across the street (Scherer, 1997; Treuer & Belote, 1997). This ability to interact anonymously and at a distance permits students to remain disengaged physically and psychologically from the campus community. Similarly, the rise of distance education presents unique challenges to the creation of campus community, when some or all of the student population may never set foot on campus or interact face to face with one another or with members of the faculty or staff. Recently, however, there have been some innovative attempts to create learning communities on-line (Silver, 1997; Treuer & Belote, 1997).

Finally, Kuh and his colleagues (1991) identified two additional changes in American higher education over the past 25 years that have contributed to a lessening of a sense of community on campus: increasing institutional size and changing faculty roles. First, as universities and colleges have increased in size and complexity, this has often also meant fewer opportunities for involvement and connection for students. The resulting anonymity can lead students to feel that they do not matter to the institution (Kuh et al., 1991), which is antithetical to community (Schlossberg, 1989). Second, as the emphasis on faculty research has increased, less time is available for faculty members to engage in other activities:

> As a consequence, faculty, particularly junior faculty, spend little time with undergraduate students and in university service, direct avenues to maintaining a sense of community. Without spending time together, people cannot develop the relationships and understanding needed to establish and maintain a sense of community. (Kuh et al., 1991, p. 16)

Furthermore, faculty members may identify more with and place greater value on the community represented by their individual academic disciplines than with campus community (Roberts, 1993).

All of the factors identified by the Carnegie Foundation (Boyer, 1990) (student conduct, campus crime, the breakdown of civility, racial tension, gender discrimination, divisions between in-class and out-of-class activities), as well as increasing student diversity, the rise of technology, increased institution size, and increased emphasis on the research role for faculty members may help to explain why, according to Boyer (1987), almost two out of five undergraduates did not feel a sense of community at their institutions.

THE ROLE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS

Although the challenge of community has been a particularly hot topic in higher education this decade, building community on campus has long been central to the work of student affairs professionals and has been identified as one of the essential values of the profession (Lloyd-Jones, 1989; Roberts, 1993; Young, 1996; Young & Elfrink, 1991). "From its inception, the student personnel concept has focused on building a sense of community on the college campus" (Lloyd-Jones, 1989, p. 1).

Student affairs professionals have not only been community builders but also group workers. Although we, perhaps, most commonly think of group work in the familiar context of college counselors working with counseling or therapy groups, student affairs professionals are actively involved in group work with task groups and psychoeducational groups. In addition, even those student affairs professionals who do not work directly with students provide services, manage the environment, and craft and enact policies that support the work of those who do work more directly with students. Community building on campus by student affairs professionals is undeniably group work.

Much of the work in community building performed by college counselors and other student affairs professionals occurs with *natural groups* on campus. These natural groups include student clubs and organizations, fraternities and sororities, residence halls, and academic and continuing education classes. It is very common, for instance, to hear residence life professionals talk about their efforts to build community within a residence hall. Classes and student workers in various sites around campus represent alternative natural groups with which student affairs professionals can work to build community, and include commuter, part-time, and adult students. Student affairs professionals such as college counselors, residence life staff, student organization advisors, and others have worked at the task of community building through outreach, teaching and training, and consultation. They perform these activities in a variety of contexts, including leadership development, community service, and learning communities.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY

A traditional mission of college is developing leaders (Caruso, 1981; Komives, 1996; Schwartz & Lucas, 1998). It is common to find language about developing leadership in college and university mission statements. However, the vast majority of campuses are failing in this area, with only a few students participating in a given campus's leadership development program and with leadership development occurring along very traditional lines (Komives, 1996; Tyree, 1996; Woodard, 1994).

Traditional thinking posits that leadership is positional (i.e., the president of an organization, the chair of a committee). Furthermore, traditional thinking holds that only one person in a group will have power and, therefore, be the leader. However, the challenge of building community calls for new thinking about and new models of leadership that are more broadly inclusive. Building community calls for "a new definition of leadership that challenges every individual, whether or not in a traditional leadership position, to find a way to make a positive difference in the world" (Delve & Rice, 1990, p. 56). Such leadership models emphasize collaboration, empowerment, inclusion, and "the common good" (Schwartz & Lucas, 1998). This section will present one such model, the Social Change Model of student leadership development (The Working Ensemble, 1996).

The Social Change Model

The Social Change Model (The Working Ensemble, 1996) of student leadership development is grounded in the new leadership paradigms. Among the assumptions on which the model is based are inclusiveness, collaboration, and service. The focus of the approach is to foster the development of leaders who will have a sense of social responsibility and the skills and desire to bring about social change not only during their college years but after they leave campus (Astin, 1996). The model presumes the formation of a "leadership development group" that will engage in a community service/social change project. It is through the project that students will develop leadership skills (The Working Ensemble, 1996). The model has two main goals: helping

each student develop greater self-knowledge and leadership competence, and facilitating social change (The Working Ensemble, 1996).

The model comprises seven core values—the 7 C's of Change—collaboration, consciousness of self, commitment, congruence, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship (The Working Ensemble, 1996). The model also has three levels or perspectives: the individual, the group, and community or society. Each of the 7 C's is associated with one of these three levels. The values are taught and practiced through the leadership development group's involvement with the community in a service-social change project.

The individual-level values are consciousness of self, congruence, and commitment. *Consciousness of self* refers to one's awareness of one's own attitudes, beliefs, feelings, and values. *Congruence* is defined as "thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty toward others" (The Working Ensemble, 1996, p. 22). *Commitment* refers both to commitment to the group and to the goals or intended outcome of the group. Commitment is the individual energy that motivates the member to the group effort.

The group-process values are collaboration, common purpose, and controversy with civility. *Collaboration* is working with others through the multiple talents of group members. Common purpose is defined as working with "shared aims and values" (The Working Ensemble, 1996, p. 23). *Controversy with civility* is disagreement or conflict within the group with respect for others. This refers to the recognition that controversy is not necessarily negative, that it is, in fact, inevitable in group process and can lead to creative solutions, but needs to be couched in an atmosphere of respect.

Finally, the community/society value is citizenship. *Citizenship* is defined as "the process whereby the individual and the collaborative group become responsibly connected to the community and the society through the leadership development activity" (The Working Ensemble, 1996, p. 23).

There is a complex and reciprocal set of interactions among the three levels and the values (the 7 C's) associated with them. The individual-level values (consciousness of self, commitment, and congruence) on the part of individual group participants facilitate group process. At the same time, group process characterized by the group-level values enhances the development of the individuals in the group. Individual growth in consciousness of self, commitment, and congruence is facilitated by feedback. This feedback is most likely to be effective and heard by the individual when it comes from a group acting collaboratively, with common purpose and civility.

Similar relationships exist between the group and the community levels and their associated values. Group effectiveness is enhanced when the group works collaboratively and with shared purpose and is able to accommodate the expression of controversy. Diversity of thought and feelings, the acceptance of constructive conflict, and the ability to tolerate and appreciate a variety of perspectives create a more realistic environment to facilitate social change. The Social Change Model labels these relationships between the group level and the community level the "'group learning' process that occurs whenever any group endeavors to effect change" (The Working Ensemble, 1996, p. 25). Through processing its successes and failures, the leadership group is able to modify its approach and then to evaluate the successes and failures of the new approach.

Finally, reciprocal relationships exist between the individual and the community. This set of relationships represents "individual learning" on the part of the group members engaged in the service project/social change. On one hand, the individual has an effect on the community; this effectiveness is enhanced when the individual's actions are characterized by commitment, congruence, and self-awareness. At the same time, the individual is affected through his or her community involvement. The individual student learns, among other things, what he or she can and cannot do and that he or she has the ability to make a difference in the community. This learning enhances the individual's consciousness of self, commitment, and congruence (The Working Ensemble, 1996).

The service project. The service/social change project is a vital element of the Social Change Model approach to leadership development. "Ultimately, by embracing the values of citizenship, each group member becomes committed to insuring that the group effort serves and benefits the service recipients themselves, the local community, and the society at large" (The Working Ensemble, 1996, p. 68).

In its coupling of leadership with service, the Social Change Model echoes the idea of servant-leadership (Greenleaf, 1970, 1977). In the servant-leadership model, the leader is a person who seeks first not to lead but to serve and to assist in the personal growth of others. In their discussion of integrating service learning and leadership development, Delve and Rice (1990) explained, "Servant-leadership can be a means of mutually enhancing and empowering all members of an organization" (p. 56).

Skills, attitudes, and values. A valuable contribution of the Social Change Model (The Working Ensemble, 1996) to community building is that it both provides a process and identifies many of the skills, attitudes, and values that need to be developed in community members. According to Komives (1996), "Students need reinforcement and practice in collaboration, in working toward shared goals, and in shared leadership" (p. 2). The model emphasizes these skills (collaboration and common purpose in the language of the 7 C's) and provides for learning and practicing them in the educationally powerful context of the group. The Social Change Model guidebook (The Working Ensemble, 1996) also suggests that students need to learn skills of task definition, division of labor, and assessment and feedback, among others, to function effectively as a group and to accomplish their common goals as exhibited in their chosen service/social change project.

Once again, the educationally powerful context of group work provides ample opportunities to develop and refine these skills. The core values represented by the 7 C's and the skills and attitudes developed in the group echo many of the therapeutic factors articulated by Yalom (1995). Among these are altruism, defined by Yalom as "receiving through giving" (p. 12), interpersonal learning, and group cohesiveness, represented by the C's of commitment, collaboration, and common purpose. The service project and the group experience also help participants develop a sense of universality.

The Social Change Model guidebook (The Working Ensemble, 1996) describes a number of case examples of the use of the model with various campus groups. In one example, a graduate-level class in student affairs was taught the model and presented with an assignment that required working with the model. For this assignment, students working in a small group could design a case study that illustrated one or more of the 7 C's and write individual papers reflecting on the 7 C's in their small-group processes; or students working in a small group could design and implement a change intervention in which the 7 C's model was used and, again, write individual reflections on group process; or students could work individually on an essay and training materials that could be used to teach others about one of the 7 C's. The guidebook provides extensive comments from the students about each of the 7 C's. For example, on controversy with civility, one student commented, "What a message this term gives when approaching conflict. This philosophy can help break through power differentials, and help bring out the value of appreciating a diversity of perspectives" necessary to community building (The Working Ensemble, 1996, pp. 152-153); the students came to recognize that conflict in the group could be healthy rather than destructive. About the model, a student observed, "It was easy for me to be congruent when I knew that others would express disagreement with my beliefs, attitudes and values in a thoughtful and caring manner" (The Working Ensemble, 1996, p. 154). The Social Change Model came to have an effect on the class in general, providing the students with a common vocabulary—the 7 C's—that they used frequently in class discussions (The Working Ensemble, 1996).

Community service projects offer an educationally valuable tool for community building with a variety of natural groups on campus, including residence hall communities, Greek organizations, student clubs and organizations, and classes. Service promotes the development of values such as empathy and a sense of responsibility to others that supports and strengthens commitment and the sense of community (Delve et al.,

1990a; Slepitza, 1990). Service provides common goals and opportunities for collaboration and for learning about the self and the group as well as about one's role in the larger society. The Service Learning Model (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990b), described later in this article, describes the transition of individuals' commitment to service and the community from short term to lifelong and from an orientation toward self to an orientation toward society.

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITJES AND BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS IN THE CREATION OF COMMUNITY

A number of writers (Delve & Rice, 1990; Komives, 1996; Tyree, 1996; Woodard, 1994) have called for the expansion of leadership development on campus. The challenge is to reach beyond traditional student leaders to see all students as potential leaders. Tyree (1996) advocated "expanding our model of leadership training to include the concepts of leadership across the curriculum" (p. 32). To do so requires creating alliances across some of the traditional barriers on our campuses.

> The balkanization of campuses into units that rarely communicate has reduced many campuses to silos of antagonism. Effective change will require coalitions of stakeholders working creatively to share human, fiscal, and other resources. Student affairs staff are positioned in the connective junctures of campus life-serving students, faculty, and the broader community. (Komives & Woodard, 1996, pp. 549-550)

The Student Learning Imperative (American College Personnel Association, 1994) challenges student affairs professionals to transcend these barriers to promote student development and learning:

> The more students are involved in a variety of activities inside and outside the classroom, the more they gain. Student affairs professionals attempt to make 'seamless' what are often perceived by students to be disjointed, unconnected experiences by bridging organizational boundaries and forging collaborative partnerships with faculty and others to enhance student learning. (p. 3)

One way to do so would be for college counselors, group advisors, instructors, and other student affairs professionals to facilitate the formation of leadership development groups, as described by the Social Change Model, with the natural groups on campus.

Other approaches to building a seamless learning environment and breaking down traditional barriers on campus that might be adopted are (a) the Service Learning Model (Delve et al., 1990b), which takes a developmental approach to students' involvement in service and which promotes the development of qualities such as empathy, responsibility to others, and citizenship; (b) the development of learning communities (Schroeder & Hurst, 1996), including living-learning centers; and (c) the creation and promotion of ceremonies, rituals, and traditions (Boyer, 1990; Manning, 1994). Each of these approaches offers rich opportunities for broad campus collaboration across student affairs/academic affairs boundaries as well as across the boundaries of academic disciplines. In addition, they offer other means to building community on campus. This section of the article will describe these three approaches, the opportunities that they offer for collaboration and for community building, and ways that student affairs professionals as group workers can be involved in these approaches.

The Service-Learning Model

Service learning goes beyond just the provision of service to the community to the intentional integration of learning and service. Service learning offers excellent opportunities both for the facilitation of community and for campus collaboration (Engstrom & Tinto, 1997). Delve and her colleagues (1990b) developed the Service Learning Model to guide the development of service-learning programs.

This model articulates five developmental phases of an individual's involvement with service (exploration, clarification, realization, activation, and internalization) and four variables associated with each phase

(intervention, commitment, behavior, and balance). As described above, this development includes the movement from an individual to a societal orientation and from a short-term to a lifelong commitment. For example, in the first phase of the mode—exploration—the student would engage in a short-term, one-time group service project in which he or she would not interact directly with the client population. For example, a student might participate in a community "Day of Service" and help paint the local legal aid office or might, as a member of her sorority, raise money for a charity. The outcome for the student would be in the personal satisfaction he or she achieved as a result of participation in the activity. In contrast, in the fifth stage of the model—internalization—the student is engaged individually in consistent service, which may involve direct work with the client population, as part of a lifelong commitment to social justice with the outcome or motivation being the enacting of his or her values and the integration of those values into his or her lifestyle. For example, a student might structure his schedule to act as a mentor or a literacy volunteer and make career plans that would enable him to continue to be involved in meaningful service.

Reflection is considered to be an essential element of service learning (Jacoby, 1996). Although reflection can be an individual activity (such as journal writing), it also can occur in a group setting. Albert (1996) described a number of group formats for service-learning reflection, including group meetings for processing service-learning experiences and types of group journals. Albert suggested guidelines for such groups, including having the group set the rules, mutual respect, allowing each member the opportunity to speak, being nonjudgmental, and expressing oneself in "I" statements. These groups for reflection on service learning offer a very obvious facilitator role for the student affairs professional as group worker. Furthermore, groups for processing service-learning experiences and promoting reflection can be very educationally powerful.

Learning Communities
Schroeder and Hurst (1996) defined learning communities as being

> characterized by associational groups of students and teachers, sharing common values and a common understanding of purpose, acting within a context of curricular and cocurricular structures and functions that link traditional disciplines and cocurricular experiences in the vital pursuit of shared inquiry. (p. 178)

One type of learning community is the living-learning community, which might be organized around a theme, where students share a living environment, take courses in residence, and participate in learning activities outside the classroom. For example, the University of Maryland's College Park Scholars program provides 10 learning communities for academically talented freshmen and sophomores based in three residence halls. Each of the scholars communities is organized around a theme such as "Advocates for Children," "Science, Technology, and Society," and "Public Leadership." Students take a thematic cluster of courses plus a colloquium that relates to the theme. Each program also has an experiential learning component, which may be service-learning, research with a faculty member or an internship. The College Park Scholars program integrates curricular and extracurricular activities and promotes student-faculty and student-student interaction. An intentional goal of the program is to create community both among students and among faculty and students by promoting interaction within the residential space, in other campus settings, and off campus (College Park Scholars, 1998).

Another type of learning community is represented by course clustering (Jacoby, 1997; Schroeder & Hurst, 1996). These course clusters are organized around a common theme, often involve activities outside the classroom, and promote academic integration and cross-disciplinary learning. For example, the University of Maryland uses course clustering in its First Year Focus program, which provides learning communities for first-year students. In Fall 1997, 24 First Year Focus clusters were offered. One such cluster for freshman journalism majors, Focus on Journalism, linked American government, speech communications, a special section of introduction to psychology with enrollment limited to the members of the cluster, and a one-credit professional orientation to journalism (O. D. Reid, personal communication, April 14, 1998).

Both the living-learning community and the course-clustering approach intentionally break down the distinctions between the curricular and the cocurricular and between various academic disciplines, and promote the formation of subcommunities on campus. Both approaches also create natural groups of students and opportunities for student affairs professionals to work with these groups as they work to integrate their learning experiences.

Ceremonies, Rituals, and Traditions
Boyer (1990) called for campuses to become celebrative. Ceremonies, rituals, and traditions—campus celebrations—can "unite the campus and give students a sense of belonging to something worthwhile" (Boyer, 1990, p. 55).

> Such activities—and almost all colleges have their own unique traditions—show how memories can be kept alive and a sense of community can be sustained from year to year. Community must not only be created but re-created continually in institutions of higher education, and ritual has a vital role to play. These celebrations are critical, because from a quarter to a half of the undergraduates are new to a college each fall, and without traditions, continuity is lost. (Boyer, 1990, p. 55)

Manning (1994), in a discussion of the role of rituals in building community on campus, observed that students at campuses without strong traditions frequently complain about the lack of a feeling of community on campus.

Campus ceremonies and traditions might involve such events as Orientation Week, Homecoming, campus-wide convocations, Parents' Weekend, and Commencement and the ways those events are observed on one's particular campus. Kuh and his colleagues (1991) described campus traditions including Earlham College's Winter Carnival, Mount Holyoke College's Mountain Day, and Xavier University of Louisiana's Founder's Day, among a host of other campus-specific traditions, and the ways in which such traditions contributed to students' experience and involvement.

For ceremonies, rituals, and traditions to serve to bind together the members of today's diverse campus community, such celebrations must be inclusive of all members of the community and celebrate the contributions of all members (Boyer, 1990). To do so may mean adapting and expanding current traditions (e.g., transforming Parents' Weekend to Family Weekend) (Boyer, 1990; B. G. Jacoby, personal communication, October 8, 1997). It may also mean the creation of new rituals (Schlossberg, 1989). Again, observing campus traditions, expanding old traditions, and creating new ones offer ample opportunities for diverse groups of students, faculty, and staff to work together in community-building groups. For example, task groups made up of diverse campus constituents might be formed to plan and carry out the programs for Orientation Week, Alumni Reunion Weekend, or Homecoming.

CONCLUSION
Student affairs professionals with training in group work can serve as facilitators of leadership development groups, service-learning groups, reflection groups related to service learning, discussion or activity groups that are part of learning communities, and groups involved in the creation of campus tradition. Another important role for the student affairs professional is to serve as a role model, embodying the principles and values of community.

In learning to create community and to live in a state of community on our diverse campuses of today, students learn that it is possible to live in community with others who may be very different from themselves. Inclusiveness is an essential characteristic of community (Peck, 1987). Learning the meaning and value of citizenship, the role of service, and the experience of community provides today's college students with the foundation for building community in the multicultural and globally interdependent society of which they will be citizens and leaders.

REFERENCES

Albert, G. (1996). Intensive service-learning experiences. In B. Jacoby & Associates, Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices (pp. 182-207). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American College Personnel Association. (1994). The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for student affairs. Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, H. S. (1996). Leadership for social change. *About Campus, 1*(3), 4-10.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Campus 1ife: In search of community. Princeton, N J Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Caruso, R. (1981). Rationale. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Student leadership programs in higher education* (pp. 7-15). Carbondale, IL: American College Personnel Association.

Chambers, T., & Phelps, C. E. (1994). Student activism: Impacting personal, institutional, and community change. In M. C. Terrell & M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *Developing student government leadership* (pp. 45-57). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

College Park Scholars. (1998, March). College Park Scholars webpage [On-line]. Available: http://www.inform.umd.edu/scholar

Delve, C. I., Mintz, S. D., & Stewart, G. M. (1990a). Editors' notes. In C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, & G. M. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service and values education* (pp. 1-61. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delve, C. I., Mintz, S. D., & Stewart, G. M. (1990b). Promoting values development through community service: A design. In C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, & G. M. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service as values education* (pp. 7-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delve, C. I., & Rice, K. L. (1990). The integration of service learning into leadership and campus activities. In C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, & G. M. Stewart (Eds.), *Community service as values education* (pp. 65-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

El-Khawas, E. (1996). Student diversity on today's campus. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates, *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 64-80), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Engstrom, C. M., & Tinto, V. (1997). Working together for service learning. *About Campus, 2*(3), 10-15.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Newton Center, MA: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.

Hampton, M. R., & Norman, C. (1997). Community-building in a peer support center. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*, 357-364.

Helfgot, S. R. (1997). Learning communities: Are we wearing professional blinders? *The Commuter, 22*(1), 4-5.

Jacoby, B. (1989). *The student as commuter: Developing a comprehensive institutional response* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7). Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-learning in today's higher education. In B. Jacoby & Associates, *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 3-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B. (1997). Learning communities and commuter students. *The Commuter, 22*(1), 5-7.

Komives, S. R. (1993). Back to the future: Class of 1996. *NASPA Journal, 31*, 64-71.

Komives, S. R. (1996). A call for collaborative leadership. *About Campus, 1*(3), 2-3.

Komives, R., & Woodard, D. B., Jr. (1996). Building on the past, shaping the future. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates, *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 536-555). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., Andreas, R. E., Lyons, J. W., Strange, C. C., Krehbiel, L. E., & MacKay, K. A. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. (1998). A president's personal and historical perspective. In J. N. Gardner, G. Van der Veer, & Associates, *The senior year experience: Facilitating integration, reflection, closure, and transition* (pp. 51-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lloyd-Jones, E. (1989). Foreword. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Designing campus activities to foster a sense community* (pp. 1-3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Manning, K. (1994). Rituals and rescission: Building community in hard times. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 275-281.

Peck, M. S. (1987). *The different drum: Community making and peace*. New York Simon & Schuster.

Roberts, D. C. (1993). Community: The value of social synergy. In R. B. Young (Ed.), *Identifying and implementing the essential values of the profession* (pp. 35-45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Roberts, D. C., & Brown, L. (1989). Value education through activities involvement. In D. C. Roberta (Ed.), *Designing campus activities to foster a sense of community* (pp. 69-79). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scherer, K. (1997). College life on-line: Healthy and unhealthy Internet use. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*,655-665.

Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Marginality and mattering: Key issues in building community. In D. C. Roberta (Ed.), *Designing campus activities to foster a sense of community* (pp. 5-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schroeder, C. C., & Hurst, J. C. (1996). Designing learning environments that integrate curricular and cocurricular experiences. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*, 174-181.

Schwartz, S. W., & Lucas, N. (1998). Leadership education in the senior experience. In J. Gardner, G. Van der Veer, & Associates, *The senior year experience: Facilitating integration, reflection, closure, and transition* (pp. 116-132). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Silver, D. (1997). Building effective online learning communities. *The Commuter, 22*(1), 3, 6.

Slepitza, R. A. (1990). Service learning in the residence halls: A fertile ground for student development. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Designing campus activities to foster a sense of community* (pp. 65-75). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Treuer, P., & Belote, L. (1997). Current and emerging applications of technology to promote student involvement and learning. In C. M. Engstrom & K. W. Kruger (Eds.), *Using technology to promote student learning: Opportunities for today and tomorrow* (pp. 17-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tyree, L. W. (1996). Leadership across the curriculum. *About Campus, 1*(3), 32.

Woodard, D. B., Jr. (1994). Leadership challenges, 2002. In M. C. Terrell & M. J. Cuyjet (Eds.), *Developing student government leadership* (pp. 91-99). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The Working Ensemble. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development guidebook: Version III*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.

Yalom, I. D. (1995). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy* (4th ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Young, R. B. (1996). Guiding values and philosophy. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., & Associates, *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 83-105). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Young, R. B., & Elfrink, V. L. (1991). Essential values of student affairs work. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 47-55.