

Foubert's two articles were very similar in the sense that they both dealt with the topic of rape prevention college campuses. The first "Behavior differences seven months later: Effects of a rape prevention program" takes a quantitative approach towards the topic while in the next article, "Perceptions of a rape prevention program by fraternity men and male student athletes: Powerful effects and implications for changing behavior", he applies a qualitative methodology. Each one is a valuable contributor to helping diminish as well prevent rape on campuses today.

In "Behavior differences..." Foubert takes a groups of male students from a public university and separates them into two different groups. The first attended a rape prevention program designed to spread knowledge and awareness on the topic to students, while the second was the control group and were free to join fraternities and go about their normal business without the seminar.

In the former quantitative investigation, Foubert analyzed the current trends of rape prevention methods and changed his own research technique to focus on men instead. Normally, classes teach women the usual low-risk situational teachings that keep women safer to a degree from sexual predators, however in past classes they fail to better educate men (the usual predator of such acts) on the topic. Foubert's logic centers around the fact that when men know the ramifications of rape and sexual abuse, they are less likely to commit or coerce in such actions. That being the case, half of the students (out of 90% of the male first year students), attended the Men's Program, which was a seminar designed to teach them not about rape prevention, but more about how to assist women who come to them for help after being sexually assaulted.

The experiment produced motivating results. The first result was that men who were members of fraternities were more likely to commit acts of sexual assault than men not in fraternities, and second was that men in fraternities who did not attend the Men's Program were significantly more likely to commit sexual assault than men in fraternities who did attend the

program. These quantitative results, when analyzed six months after first conducted, were seen as largely significant results in rape prevention.

The latter study, however, is much more qualitative, and analyzed the feelings and thoughts of the participants, instead of the more factual, research-based data of the former. Foubert took the same students in the Men's Program and gave them questionnaires after they attended the program, to better understand their feelings and thoughts throughout. The results ended up being similar to what might be expected; more empathy towards rape survivors, and better understanding of their experiences as well as a broadened sensitivity towards the topic as a whole.

Each approach is important to the topic, as it is a multi-faceted problem on every campus. While the quantitative approach is easier to see on paper and to analyze, the qualitative approach actually teaches us what about the program actually affected the participants and how and why it changed their lifestyles (measurably, thanks to the first approach). Each approach tackles a different aspect of the problem, and is essential in creating fully comprehensive results with inclusive research techniques.

Sources used:

Foubert, J.D., Newberry, J.T., & Tatum, J.L. (2007). Behavior differences seven months later: Effects of a rape prevention program. *NASPA Journal*, 44(4), 728-249.

Foubert, J.D. & Cowell, E.A. (2004). Perceptions of a rape prevention program by fraternity men and male student athletes: Powerful effects and implications for changing behavior. *NASPA Journal*, 42(1), 1-20.

Questions answered:

1. What elements of Upcraft & Schuh's overview of qualitative and quantitative approaches do you observe in Foubert's studies?
2. How are these two (Foubert) studies different?
3. What are the strengths of each approach?

Ben Helms
February 17, 2009

Program Evaluation
Reading Response (Tanaka)

The NSSE for 2008 covers every area of student involvement and learning that I could think of when it comes to student engagement. In fact, while reading it every time I thought of something missing, I came upon it soon after. The survey seems to be extremely comprehensive, and the only real “weakness” I could see could possibly be seen as a strength by someone analyzing the survey. For instance, in several of the sections I think a “never” or “always” square would have made the test easier and truer for some students, however, it may have made the results too lop-sided, or insufficient, by adding an additional option. While these could possibly be upgrades in the survey process, I’m sure they were thought of, but the designers just had better reasons for not keeping them.

The voice of the NSSE is something that I definitely did not catch, or even understand when I first read the survey. Now, I can see it slightly, but at the same time, would probably need to read a few more examples to better analyze it. I thought it was interesting when Tanaka wrote, “Having voice means having culture.” (266). This gives much more credence to the objective voice idea. Rather than just a “politically-correct” adjustment being made, it should begin to see members of each and every culture as individuals, and attempt to quantify the test in such a way. The test seems to speak to me in a normal, socially adept manner, but I can definitely see where some aspects cater to my culture (the dominant culture). For me, it’s hard to recognize when things only cater to my own culture alone, because nothing stands out, but I’m becoming more and more observant of such surveys, actions, words all the time and slowly surmounting my own ignorance as well. I thought Tanaka ended the voice section well by stating that “there is also great variation and shifting within categories, so that the act of knowing each student’s social location is a search for an evolving, negotiated, multilayered cultural perspective.” This, to me, means that we aren’t supposed to put students in boxes (even if there are a lot of boxes, that cover

every culture, denomination, sexual orientation, etc.) because students are so multi-faceted, that they cross cultures, sexualities, and identities constantly.

I liked how Tanaka broke down the power section into two different parts; one of academic knowledge and might, and one of human, emotional connectedness and authority. By interconnecting both power and knowledge, he asserts that it is important to find out just what knowledge and power look like on a given campus, and if that is not something that is taken into account, or is something that is forced on or assumed of a student, it will skew the results. The NSEE seems to accommodate traditional American universities, in the units it measures knowledge (extracurricular activities, hours studying, involvement with campus community, etc.). This is something that is definitely hard to become less specific with, and still cater to all types of schools/students however, and I definitely do not know how to improve upon this aspect of the survey.

Authenticity was the concept that I struggled with the most. Tanaka explains it simply as, “locating each student in his or her own time and history”, however, I find it hard to believe that is completely possible (at least, without a completely comprehensive—without a multi-hundred page all-encompassing document, that is). To put it bluntly, I understand his points in the authenticity section, but don’t understand how to accomplish them. The NSEE does not seem to encompass every single culture and possible identity, however, I don’t know what that would look like either.

The Tanaka definition of self-reflexivity is, “what happens when a researcher uses what he learns about another culture to better understand all cultures, including his own.” This is something that on the surface makes a lot of sense to me. For example, a researcher should apply everything he/she learned, and how he/she learned about another culture, towards other cultures including his/her own. At first, this seemed close-minded in the sense that once you learn about one culture, you should assume the same for all cultures. However, this being obviously ignorant, I went on to assume Tanaka meant that the differences and amounts of variance from one culture

to another, is a similar measurement of how difference every culture is to one another. NSEE does not seem to deal with this at all, however, again I am not sure how this would look in this particular survey.

The last section of reconstitution encompasses all necessary changes addressed in the thesis of Tanaka's article. Here, he better lays out all aspects of his proposal. For instance, he asks the tough questions that people would ask at universities in order to better organize and accommodate his ideas. Tanaka breaks it down more simply, "In other words, higher education researchers can begin to identify specific ways to change their own departmental structures and reward mechanisms to accommodate the new demographics." While this, to me, seems like an almost impossibly all-inclusive task, he seems to believe it is an almost obvious conclusion to everything he's written. While he's got a point in the fact that I came to a similar conclusion, it still seems too difficult to honestly materialize and still remain objectively fully within all the rules he has set out.

For the most part, it took me a while to better understand each category. Whether it was the difficult topics, or the seeming repetitiveness of it all, they all seemed to warn of the same idea: do not assume anything about a student, and try to incorporate every facet of every type of student you or anyone has ever come across. I know Tanaka wasn't saying this, but he just seemed to lean towards the impossibly meticulous and exhaustively comprehensive in every factor. I'm sure the reality of the article is more realistic, but even sections I read again and again seemed to be saying that all surveys are not possibly thorough enough and can almost impossibly not be. This was my frustration throughout, however I did enjoy the specificity, and completeness of each idea in the article. I never missed an idea, or was left wanting a better explanation at any point. That being said, for the most part, I was frustrated with the content, and would have loved a few examples (or surveys that meet all of his standards).

Ben Helms
March 31, 2009

Program Evaluation
Reading Response (Pascarella)

The first Pascarella's ten directions that seemed most interesting to me was definitely #3) Expand Our Notion of Diversity. He begins it with, "Racial diversity enriches the postsecondary academic and social experience and enhances the intellectual and personal impact of college." (Pascarella, 2006) I personally have not read a lot of research pertaining to diversity in the classroom, especially diversity leading to enhanced learning overall, but if this is true then it is essential for the next generation. He certainly gives a lot of evidence (in sources) for this, and it gives much more credence to diversity programs designed to simply project a "politically correct" student body atmosphere. He goes on to say that while most diversity topics on college campuses center around racial/ethnic diversity, it is all types of diversity that can enhance learning potential in the college experience.

I would love to see more studies and theories on living areas. That's something that I didn't realize until I began thinking about this question, that I haven't heard a lot about. Obviously we talk about Residence Life, and the lives of RAs and RDs, but it seems like we rarely discuss the developmental process of students living within close proximity with each other. Maybe it's just something that's assumed, or is obvious, but there are many topics discussed in class that seem much more obvious to me, that subjects centering around students' living areas.

Secondly, and this is not something we talked about in my undergrad that much, but is something that I think is missing, I think that ethics within program evaluation is something that needs to be discussed more. And again, this may be something that's simply assumed by everyone, especially at a Christian institution, but data can be so misleading. I think that ethics is something that's almost assumed and goes unsaid in all institutions concerning data, because data as a whole is seen as untouchable and objectively empirical, impossible to spin and subjectify. But in my program evaluation, I felt the desire to change "facts" or at least spin them in order to fit my hypothesis (along with other "flawless" data) at several different junctures. Because of

this, how dependable can other research be, if I know I can't even fully trust my own? We had a good discussion on this in class, but it really didn't go anywhere.

We had a great discussion of tradition vs. research as well. One aspect brought up was, what if research done on Walkabout proved that it was no better than just a weeklong training schedule full of seminars and classes for student leaders here on campus instead of going into the woods at all? Just because it's a great tradition, and the faculty/staff love it, does not mean it should go on unquestioned. Again, this backs up the idea that research is necessary and crucial to a program's success, but how dependable is that research? I suppose it all depends on who is conducting that research. It's tough because if the director of Residence Life wants to prove Walkabout is benefiting students amazingly well, he can collect whatever data he/ wants and prove it.

The NSSE does a great job of addressing similar needs that Pascarella describes. I think that Pascarella covers as many topics as you can in 10 simple objectives. I think as long as the NSSE and his ten directions are continually changing and altering to fit the current (and future) cultures, they will be progressive and meet the needs of their current students.

References:

Pascarella, E.T. (2006) How College Affects Students: Ten Directions for Future Research. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(5), 508-520.

Questions Answered:

1. Which of Pascarella's ten directions is most interesting to you? Why?
2. What are some areas in which the theory and research we've studied thus far in the CCSD program have not included important elements of your undergraduate experience?
3. What elements of the undergraduate experience seem to be based on tradition rather than on research? To what extent does that limit your confidence in them?
4. How does the NSSE address the needs Pascarella describes?