

LEARNING RECONSIDERED RECONSIDERED:
A FOUCAULDIAN POWER ANALYSIS OF THE DISCURSIVE RELATIONS
BETWEEN STUDENT AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

A Dissertation
by
AARON W. VOYLES

Submitted to the Graduate School
at Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 2015
Educational Leadership Doctoral Program
Reich College of Education

LEARNING RECONSIDERED RECONSIDERED:
A FOUCAULDIAN POWER ANALYSIS OF THE DISCURSIVE RELATIONS
BETWEEN STUDENT AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

A Dissertation
by
AARON W. VOYLES
May 2015

APPROVED BY:

Alecia Youngblood Jackson, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

Brandy Wilson, Ph.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

Vachel Miller, Ed.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

Vachel Miller, Ed.D.
Director, Educational Leadership Doctoral Program

Max C. Poole, Ph.D.
Dean, Cratis D. Williams School of Graduate Studies

Copyright by Aaron W. Voyles 2015
All Rights Reserved

Abstract

LEARNING RECONSIDERED RECONSIDERED:
A FOUCAULDIAN POWER ANALYSIS OF THE DISCURSIVE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN STUDENT AFFAIRS AND ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Aaron W. Voyles
B.F.A., University of North Carolina Wilmington
M.F.A., Sarah Lawrence College
Ed.S., Appalachian State University
Ed.D., Appalachian State University

Dissertation Committee Chairperson: Alecia Youngblood Jackson, Ph.D.

The purpose of this study was to investigate power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and how those power relations position Student Affairs within that relationship. This research employed the use of a poststructuralist framework and document analysis developed from Michel Foucault's concept of genealogy. To facilitate the investigation of discourse, the significant Student Affairs document *Learning Reconsidered* was chosen as a starting point. By investigating the historical development of discourse in that document, as well as the ramifications of the discourse presented in that document, this study sought to unveil the intersections of power and discourse within the field of Student Affairs and in its relationship with Academic Affairs.

Through poststructuralist analysis, specific strategies of discourse emerged to reveal the way in which Student Affairs had responded to its environment with

a desire to create a singular identity for itself and enter into an equitable partnership with Academic Affairs. These strategies and their outcomes have both created opportunities for partnership and have limited the ability of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to partner together successfully. Deconstructing the implications and development of discourse in the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs revealed impacts of power on the positioning of Student Affairs in higher education. This study provided the context of these discourses and theoretical, methodological, and practical implications based on the discursive relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not be possible without the help of many outstanding individuals. Alecia Youngblood Jackson took me in as a poststructuralist neophyte and guided me through difficult times. My committee members, Brandy Wilson and Vachel Miller, provided me the feedback and critique to continue to get better. I extend special thanks to Vachel for convincing me to take the plunge into doctoral waters. Additionally, I must thank Amanda Werts for her contributions to my proposal and my qualifying examination.

On a personal level, I thank my partner, Tessa, and my parents for their unwavering support. I thank all of my Cohort 19 clan, especially Cathy Roberts-Cooper, David Elrod, and Alicia Vest. I also want to give thanks for the mentors I have had in higher education, Larissa LaCour, Jeff Doyle, Kelly Clark/Keefe, and Hemlata Jhaveri. Finally, I am appreciative of the support of my best friends, Andre Manukyan and Brandon Nelson.

I am grateful to all those on this list and many more. Without you, there would be no me, and there certainly would not be over 200 pages of text following this page!

Dedication

This study is dedicated to the field of higher education and my peers in both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. May we continually rise for our students so that they too can rise.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract..... | iv |
| Acknowledgments..... | vi |
| Dedication..... | vii |
| Chapter 1: Introduction..... | 1 |
| A Powerful Problem with Collaboration | 5 |
| Research Questions..... | 8 |
| Methodology..... | 9 |
| Why Poststructuralism and Power? | 11 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 16 |
| A Guide to Reading this Dissertation | 20 |
| Chapter 2: The History of Student Affairs and Academic Partnership | 23 |
| A Note on “Discourse” | 24 |
| The Student Services Discourse..... | 25 |
| Significance..... | 29 |
| The Student Development Discourse..... | 30 |
| Significance..... | 33 |
| The Student Learning Discourse..... | 33 |
| Partnering Student Affairs and Academic Affairs | 37 |
| Fluidity | 37 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Faculty integration | 38 |
| First year experience programs | 39 |
| Significance..... | 41 |
| Conclusion | 41 |
| Chapter 3: Modes of Research..... | 43 |
| The Development of a Poststructural Framework | 44 |
| The interview | 48 |
| Academic partnerships..... | 52 |
| Lessons from a pilot project..... | 57 |
| Pilot study design..... | 58 |
| Findings..... | 59 |
| Relevance to dissertation | 60 |
| Poststructuralism and Discourse..... | 61 |
| Foucauldian Power Analysis..... | 63 |
| Research Questions..... | 68 |
| A Rupture in Student Affairs | 73 |
| The purpose of applying genealogy | 75 |
| Genealogy and discursive considerations | 78 |
| Applying genealogy | 81 |
| Discovering ruptures: where to begin | 82 |
| Working with texts..... | 85 |
| Examining texts for power..... | 85 |
| Finding additional texts..... | 87 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Other considerations | 88 |
| Conclusion | 90 |
| Chapter 4: Interactions with <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 91 |
| Examining My Process for Interactions..... | 92 |
| A note on interactions with documents..... | 95 |
| Interactions with <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 95 |
| The false agency of working with documents | 96 |
| The content and context of <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 97 |
| Continuity and discontinuity..... | 98 |
| Learning and development..... | 101 |
| Collapsing “learning” into “development” | 103 |
| The failings of traditional education | 104 |
| Presenting both an inclusive and exclusive definition | 105 |
| Audience | 107 |
| Flipping the marginalization of Student Affairs | 108 |
| Goals | 110 |
| Recommendations..... | 112 |
| Discourses Deployed Through <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 113 |
| Chapter 5: The Learning Continuity/Discontinuity Dichotomy | 116 |
| Expanding the Audience of <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 117 |
| The need for the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy..... | 122 |
| Obfuscating Discourse | 125 |
| Two critical documents in the development of this discursive effect..... | 126 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Shifts, cracks, and switches | 128 |
| Unity and Practices | 131 |
| The Effectiveness of the Learning Continuity/Discontinuity Dichotomy | 134 |
| National Student Affairs organizations and <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 135 |
| Examining ACPA | 136 |
| Examining NASPA..... | 136 |
| Identity and the discourses of the national organizations | 138 |
| Documents in response to <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 139 |
| Viewing <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> as discursive discontinuity..... | 140 |
| Viewing <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> as discursive continuity..... | 144 |
| Examining <i>Learning Reconsidered 2</i> | 146 |
| Conclusion | 148 |
| Additional documents | 148 |
| Conclusion | 151 |
| Practices and learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy | 151 |
| Conclusion | 153 |
| Chapter 6: The Learning/Development Doublet..... | 155 |
| Learning/Development in <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> | 155 |
| Learning/Development, Identity, and Subjectivities | 160 |
| Conditions for subjectivities and the learning/development doublet..... | 162 |
| The development of identity as performance..... | 165 |
| Conclusion | 170 |
| The Learning/Development Doublet and Positionality | 170 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Producing new positions through elevating development | 171 |
| The impact of <i>Learning Reconsidered</i> on positionality..... | 174 |
| Conclusion | 177 |
| Chapter 7: The Three-Pronged Approach..... | 179 |
| The Development of the Three-Pronged Approach..... | 180 |
| How the Three-Pronged Approach Operated | 183 |
| The Cyclical Nature of the Three-Pronged Approach | 187 |
| The cycle with the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy | 188 |
| The cycle with the learning/development doublet | 189 |
| The Three-Pronged Approach and Power..... | 192 |
| Conclusion | 193 |
| Chapter 8: Conclusions and Implications | 194 |
| Finding an Ending..... | 194 |
| Summary of results | 197 |
| Considering a conclusion..... | 204 |
| Implications of this Study | 205 |
| Theoretical implications..... | 205 |
| Methodological implications | 207 |
| Examining texts for power..... | 208 |
| Implications for research by Student Affairs professionals..... | 210 |
| Conclusion | 211 |
| Practical implications..... | 212 |
| Considering a rupture..... | 214 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Limitations | 215 |
| Recommendations for Future Research | 217 |
| Creating a Poststructuralist Leader | 219 |
| The dangers of poststructuralist leadership..... | 222 |
| Conclusion | 225 |
| References..... | 226 |
| Vita..... | 241 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

I became a Student Affairs professional because I wanted to be in a position to help students succeed not only in college, but also once they left college. Because of my background and the way my education developed, I viewed Student Affairs as the perfect compliment to Academic Affairs. As an undergraduate student, I did not get involved much in activities outside of the classroom for the first three years of my collegiate life. When a would-be mentor noticed me and reached out, it changed my perspective on my college education and it changed my pathway through my education and beyond.

Educational researcher David Kolb (1983) posited that learning is at its peak when a curriculum encompasses theoretical, reflective, and experiential components. Kolb's work has led to a well-recognized tenet of the Student Affairs field, which is that partnering the curricular and extra-curricular or co-curricular activities best benefits students (Kuh et al., 1991). When I entered the Student Affairs profession, I latched onto the ideas of Kolb and the ability for Student Affairs professionals to make learning as complex as our students were. Rather than isolated to classrooms, as I had been, learning could encompass and integrate disparate parts of the university and lead to better retention, grades, graduation, and post-college futures for students.

For students, college is a combination of components, rather than a separation of classroom activities and outside-of-class activities; Arcelus (2011) outlined these components as, “academic and cognitive, psychosocial, attitudes and values, career and

economic, and quality of life” (p. 62). Students do not view these components as individual entities on which they are working like a checklist to be completed. They do not view attending an event with members of their residence hall as a time to work on their attitudes and values, separate from working on academic intelligence when they are in class. Instead, the collegiate journey is a composite one. Because students experience college as a weaving of all the components of their education interdependently, combining these elements leads to the most growth both cognitively and affectively for students (Areclus, 2011).

Due to these assertions from Kolb (1983), Kuh et al. (1991), and Areclus (2011), among others, I got involved in Student Affairs. These understandings of the student learning process are also what forged the environment that allows Student Affairs to exist. Student Affairs has continually referred to collaboration with Academic Affairs as key to success in presenting a comprehensive learning environment for student. *Powerful Partnerships*, the joint report from the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) (1998) attested that the only way to ensure the experiential and meaningful learning that researchers such as Kolb (1983) investigated is through partnership.

In my work as a Student Affairs professional, I have often been tasked with making these partnerships happen, and I have also seen their benefits. From producing learning communities that encompassed residential, experiential, and academic components, to connecting faculty in mentoring roles with students, I have seen just how powerful these partnerships can be on a small-scale level.

Partnership is also necessary for Student Affairs to exist. Student Affairs, the portion of higher education responsible for the curriculum outside of the classroom, would have no role or place without Academic Affairs. Without classes for students to attend, colleges would not exist and there would be no development of extra-curricular and co-curricular activities. But despite the fact that partnership is seen by Student Affairs as critical to students' success and critical to the field's own existence, evidence of successful partnerships and how to integrate sustainable partnerships is not as clear as my own individual story made it seem. In fact, there still is not a significant body of literature surrounding the empirical evidence supporting successful partnerships or how to successfully integrate learning and development (Kezar, 2001; Baxter Magolda, 2009).

As a Student Affairs professional, I too can attest to the reasoning behind this gap in the literature and practice. Every partnership in which I have been has been a unique combination of my experiences, the experiences of those involved from Academic Affairs, our specific institutional culture, and the context of the research in higher education altogether. Pinpointing what might make one partnership more successful than another relies on understanding how this delicate weaving of experiences and the wide-ranging conversations about education across the fields of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs come together.

Although the environments of each partnership do vary greatly, the context of the conversations, dialogue, and discourse across higher education are more readily visible to professionals in the field of Student Affairs. As a professional, I often examine the literature that comes out and the various "best practices" that are presented by schools that have created sustainable partnerships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

and feel those partnerships are creating the learning environment envisioned by Kolb (1983) and others. I have attended countless national presentations on working with faculty and helping to expand the classroom to out-of-classroom connections our students have. The refrain in the literature and presentations is that people are still searching for answers to how to make a partnership successful. As Acerlus (2011) questioned, if these partnerships are so good for our students, why are there still so few examples of successful ones?

The dialogues across higher education left me wondering what has caused the gap that leads to the question posed by Acerlus (2011). *Powerful Partnerships* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) declared these partnerships critical long ago, and yet, there are still difficulties and we are still searching for what makes a learning environment for our students that ensures that success in and past college. Acerlus's (2011) question also fits with my experience. Though I have often been assigned in higher education to partner my Student Affairs departments with Academic Affairs, I have also seen where these partnerships have been unsuccessful. At times, it has seemed as though I was speaking a different language than my Academic Affairs counterparts and that no amount of translation would have us understand each other.

With the assertions of partnership as necessary for success and my own combination of limited successes and shortcomings in attempting to partner, I set out on this project to investigate that conversation across higher education about partnership, how the gap between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs developed, and if there are opportunities to address that gap and to reposition Student Affairs to be a successful partner with Academic Affairs. In this project, I have focused on the environment of

discourse surrounding Student Affairs in its partnerships with Academic Affairs, as well as the constructs of power that enter into those relationships. By investigating discourse and power, it was my goal as a researcher to reveal the complicated intersections of discourse across the field of higher education and the practices of individual professionals to make more visible the opportunities to create successful partnerships.

A Powerful Problem with Collaboration

I came to this dissertation following not only my own experiences with power relations in working with Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, but also through a finding from educational researcher Adrianna Kezar (2001), whose work suggested that there lacks empirical evidence as to what makes a partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs successful. Though Kezar's work is no longer contemporary, more recent works by Baxter Magolda (2009) and Acerlus (2011) echo Kezar's findings, and the impact of what Kezar discovered still speaks to what I have experienced as a professional in Student Affairs. There is a gap in how Student Affairs and Academic Affairs see partnerships, and that gap impacts how these partnerships are created.

To examine this gap and the differences between how Student Affairs and Academic Affairs approach learning, I decided to focus my research on power and how the presence of power within the relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs both creates the identity of Student Affairs and delimits how Student Affairs can work with Academic Affairs. Not only are the fields of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs wrapped up in power as institutions, but so too are the individuals who work in these fields. As a professional in Student Affairs, my relationships are infused with power dynamics. Power is the veil through which we see and operate in all of social, cultural,

and even institutional relationships, and deconstructing the effects and products of power is critical to providing new perspectives from which to view collaboration.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate power to provide a new conceptual framework with which to deconstruct the research that already exists about collaboration and how those collaborations developed throughout the history of Student Affairs. Ignoring the implications of power is to view the relationships as though they are forever equitable at every juncture and that they may be shifted through addressing pragmatic or utilitarian interests such as time or economic resources. The use of all these resources depends upon and influences the power relations present in higher education.

The complex interweaving of individual practices and the field-wide dialogue that I mentioned in the previous section both creates and is created by the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. No individual practitioners can avoid the implications of power, and so, because I could not investigate the specific experiences of every practitioner, I designed my research to look at the context of power *through which* all of these specific experiences operate. The *Powerful Partnerships* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) about which higher education speaks do indeed involve power, and through seeing the products and effects of power, this study served as an investigation into unveiling the underlying assumptions of products of power influencing our ability to provide the educational environment that Kolb (1983) described.

In order to facilitate my examination of power, this study employed a poststructuralist discourse analysis, investigating the concept of power described by Michel Foucault (1975/1980b) in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and how power creates and delimits discursive possibilities for Student Affairs.

Power—which I discuss in-depth in Chapter 3—is critical to examining Student Affairs because power is ubiquitous in relationships; as Foucault (1975/1980b) stated, “it produces effects at the level of desire—and also at the level of knowledge” (p. 59). The effects (and perceived effects) of power, created and perpetuated by the discourses surrounding the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, have produced and reinforced how Student Affairs is positioned within higher education.

The focus of this study was to examine power relations within higher education because if power is indeed intrinsic to every relationship, then it is important to consider how power can “produce knowledge about the self” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 54). Because power is productive and helps to create and reinforce notions of identity and other knowledge and because that knowledge then produces power as well, analyzing and critiquing the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs makes Student Affairs’s knowledge of itself more visible. I chose to apply a power analysis for this study to examine “the functions and effects of power” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 56). The result of this power analysis has revealed increasingly complex intersections for how Student Affairs is discursively positioned in higher education and how that positioning creates or limits opportunities for partnership with Academic Affairs. Through this study, I have aimed to make the dynamics of power and discourse more visible for the benefit of professionals in both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs by deconstructing the framework for how they operate together as a whole and at individual institutions of higher education.

Research Questions

Because power and discourse are two immense concepts that envelope all relationships (Foucault, 1975/1980b; MacLure, 2003), I created a series of research questions to help me to better investigate the intersections between power and the way that Student Affairs and Academic Affairs collaborate and interact. Beginning with the working assumption that power is capillary and present in all relations (Foucault, 1977/1980h), these questions served as the foundation for my research project and methodology. These questions are also rooted in a viewpoint that discourse is tied to power and that power both influences discourse and is influenced by discourse. Therefore, revealing power's effects is dependent upon revealing how discourse operates within the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The guiding research questions for this project, presented in greater detail in Chapter 3, were as follows:

1. What are the conditions that form and deploy the Student Learning Discourse (the current dominant discourse) for Student Affairs?
2. What power/knowledge relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs are enabled by this discourse?
3. How do these power/knowledge relations produce particular discursive positions for Student Affairs? And how, in turn, does Student Affairs further power/knowledge relations and practices?

Together, these questions provided the outline for maneuvering this project through investigating the way in which discourse operates to how power was both productive and effective in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic

Affairs. As I detail in Chapter 3, these questions allowed for the unveiling of those power relations, which was critical to deconstructing the gap in collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and how Student Affairs can move forward to create better partnerships with Academic Affairs.

Methodology

This project developed through a poststructuralist framework, with which I then applied Foucault's concept of a genealogy in order to expose discursive practices and the concepts of power/knowledge throughout the history of Student Affairs. Though Foucault resisted creating any sort of standalone methodology, his works provided useful tools for examining discourse for the purpose of examining power. Genealogy, as a method, is a historical perspective of looking at discourse. For this research, I viewed genealogy—though it is rarely defined in concrete terms—as a sifting of historical material in order to reveal how discourse operates.

Foucault (1980/1991), for instance, was not concerned with providing a totalizing historical perspective, but he was instead interested in examining the transformation of an institution through practices and what made those practices acceptable or unacceptable throughout various historical contexts. Those practices and their contingent relations can provide a different framework of how power relations work and how the past influenced the emergence of the present. Because my aim in this research was to investigate the ongoing partnerships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, examining transitions in history in order to look at the present environment suited my research questions.

For this dissertation, I applied a genealogy in order to examine historical documents to look at the present state of the collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. I therefore chose to use a form of qualitative document analysis developed through the lens of Foucault's work and poststructuralism. Document analysis made sense for this project because of the long lineage of documents that Student Affairs has produced related to its relationship with Academic Affairs. Document analysis provided a window into the transitions throughout the history of Student Affairs and allowed for me to investigate power through discourse in those documents.

In particular, I situated my research on a significant document in the Student Affairs timeline, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), because this document helped to usher in a change in the way that Student Affairs discussed its role in the learning process for students. Starting with that document, I moved outward in all directions using my document analysis in order to look at the development of Student Affairs, the presently dominant Student Learning Discourse, and the impact and effects of the way in which Student Affairs has discussed its relationship with Academic Affairs.

By taking this historical perspective, my intent was not only to analyze how the deployment of discourse and the influence of power in higher education have shaped the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, but also to make the constructs of power in those relations more visible. Deconstructing the implications of power relations is critical to improving collaboration and the overall student experience in higher education because of the intrinsic nature of power in relationships.

Through my methodology, I was able to reveal the operation of three specific discursive strategies within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and look at how

those strategies have perpetuated the identity and relational positionings between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The three strategies I identified—the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, the learning/development doublet, and the three-pronged approach—are discussed in depth in Chapters 4 through 7. Additionally, in Chapter 3, I provide a detailed outline of the development and employment of this conceptual framework and methodology that led to the identification and analysis of these strategies of discourse.

Why Poststructuralism and Power?

There have been many discussions and analyses of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs throughout the history and development of the field of Student Affairs, but the dominant discourse surrounding Student Affairs and its role in higher education is problematic for two reasons. First, the studies conducted and discussions surrounding Student Affairs and Academic Affairs do not focus on power as relational and instead focus on specific practices for working together. Second, there is an assumed conceit in the writings of Student Affairs researchers, which is a definition of “learning” made prominent by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), which is one that positions Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as equal partners in learning. I chose to apply a poststructural genealogy because it allowed for a novel perspective on this partnership that exposed assumed facets of the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Poststructuralism has perhaps not been applied previously to this field because what it refers to is “not an orderly, agreed on, and internally consistent set of ideas” (Gannon & Davies, 2011, p. 71). This non-definition means that it can be difficult to

think with poststructuralism if one's goal is to define or settle on a concrete outcome. Instead, poststructuralism's strength is to help "expose pernicious logic" in what we assume to be truths (Clark/Keefe, 2010, p. 26). Foucault (1977/1980d) reminded us that "truth isn't outside power" (p. 131) and that truth should be questioned because discourse and what can or cannot be said affect (and can even define) truth. For this reason, poststructuralism is anchored in critique of universal truths and what are considered to be objective ways of knowing (MacLure, 2003). Like Foucault (1977/1980c), I looked to poststructuralism as an anti-science. Poststructuralism, while not orderly, is a framework to challenge common sense and the way that literature and research so far exist within Student Affairs in reference to its partnership with Academic Affairs.

Literature so far available from Student Affairs researchers tends to fall into three categories: historical overviews, discussions of the benefits of partnering Student Affairs with Academic Affairs, and investigations into the relative success or failure of those partnerships. The historical overviews are useful for viewing the progression of events in the development of Student Affairs as a field. For example, Rudolph (1990), Frederiksen (1993), Ender, Newton, and Caple (1996), and Doyle (2004) each outlined expansions of Student Affairs from house parents, to men's and women's deans, to the current state of the field. Doyle, in particular, focused his work on how the events of the past have led in progression to where we are today in a logical flow of development. These historical overviews, however, attempted to provide a "total history" of the field and therefore examined history in a deterministic flow.

Foucault (1977/1980c) argued that this method of history was not useful because it would obscure the workings of power in our ideas of a natural progression of society. I

have chosen, however, to expand upon the historical development of Student Affairs in my overview of the literature in Chapter 2 in order to better position my study within and against the development of the currently dominant way of discussing Student Affairs within the field, which is the Student Learning Discourse. Poststructuralism provided the opportunity for me to invert that notion of a traditional history in order to examine discourse and history to reveal the workings of power.

The second subset of texts regarding the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs are those focused on the benefits of partnerships. These texts follow from the logical progression of the field presented within the historical texts. Of these, the dominant discourses stem from the work of George Kuh. Kuh et al. (1991) published research in *Involving Colleges* showcasing the benefits to partnering the two halves (curricular and co-curricular) of the student experience in higher education. Their work found that a holistic approach to learning, which includes both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, produced the most successful students; successful students are the ones with higher grade-point averages, strong desires to persist, and a quality education that leads to future career success.

The assumption of this holistic approach is embodied by the currently dominant discourse in the field of Student Affairs, which is the Student Learning Discourse (and is heavily featured in the language of *Learning Reconsidered* [Keeling, 2004]). The Student Learning Discourse is a discursive structure that supposes that the purpose of Student Affairs is not services for student or student development (i.e., cognitive and affective development), but instead is one involved in student learning. My overview of the literature in Chapter 2 examines the historical conditions that led to the creation of this

discourse, but the poststructural framework for my research allowed me to investigate the deployment of this discourse from a lens not considered by Kuh, Whitt, or their followers.

In subsequent works, success has often been manifested at its most tangible operations—grade-point averages and retention rates. Additional work from both Kuh (Banta & Kuh, 1998) and Whitt (Blimling & Whitt, 1998) continued to emphasize the success that comes from these partnerships, and the work of both Kuh and Whitt remains a centering discourse internally for Student Affairs and its role in higher education today. Their research also served as support for the notions presented in the *Powerful Partnerships* joint report (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) and, ultimately, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as well.

Not all of the texts in this category focus on the purely positive. Kezar (2001), for example, focused on the success of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, but her work also noted that there was little empirical evidence about what actually makes a partnership successful or unsuccessful. As Fuller and Haugabrook stated (2001), “There is no ‘one size fits all’ strategy for successful collaboration” (p. 87). While both the positive and the investigatory writings deepen the understanding of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, they did not examine the products of power or the deployment of discourse in the way my poststructuralist study on this relationship has. Though these works represent the dominant discourse, the research in this project provides an unveiling as to the creation of this discourse that has not previously been deeply investigated. The discussion of discourse in my analysis and conclusion (Chapter

4 through Chapter 8) provides a new conceptual framework through which to view this literature.

The third section of research regarding Student Affairs and Academic Affairs uses the premise provided by the research in *Involving Colleges* and looks at what creates a strong or weak partnership. Because, as Kezar (2001) noted, there is not a lot of empirical evidence for successful partnerships, many of these works focused on case studies or a culling of best practices. There is no shortage of these types of works (e.g., Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1996; Bourassa & Kruger, 2001; Crafs, First, & Satwicz, 2001; Degen & Sheldahl, 2007; Dunphy, Miller, Woodruff, & Nelson, 1987; Marin & Samels, 2001; Stodt, 1987), and many of them attempted to identify the problems that get in the way of collaboration, of which cultural difference is a primary barrier.

Bourassa and Kruger (2001) discussed that the vast differences in day-to-day working style and training lead to miscommunication. In similar fashion, Martin and Murphy (2000) spoke to differences in career mobility versus stability, with Student Affairs far preferring breadth of experience while Academic Affairs preferred depth and longevity. Hirsch and Burack (2001) referenced these barriers, stating that, “the gap between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is well documented” (p. 53), but that nobody had been yet able to approach them with sustained success. This may speak to why Kezar (2001) found that misunderstandings and miscommunication led to over seventy-five percent of schools in her study listing faculty resistance as a moderate-or-greater obstacle to partnering.

What these studies have in common is that they focus on identifying specific instances of collaboration or specific obstacles to collaboration between Student Affairs

and Academic Affairs. This poststructuralist investigation of the power relations between these two branches of higher education offers an alternative look into how power and discourse have influenced and affected the supposed “best practices” or obstacles to collaboration. The purpose of using a poststructuralism genealogical approach was to make visible those aspects of this relationship that typically have evaded our discussions.

This study helps to avoid having the discussion continue on one trek and a singular progression. Much of the literature cited above follows and flows from one to the other. My application of a Foucauldian genealogy has allowed me to challenge that evolution and reveal otherwise obfuscated constructs of power between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The conclusions of my study have underscored the invisibility of discourse and its effects, and the addition of the context provided by the analysis in this study will contribute to future studies and readings of studies in attempting to create successful partnerships.

Definition of Terms

Though it is not common in poststructuralist works to concretely define terms due to the flexible nature of the conceptual framework, it is commonplace to do so in a dissertation. Additionally, I find it helpful to define terms because I acknowledge that poststructuralism is a foreign framework for many Student Affairs practitioners (and researchers of every type). As I stated in the above section, it has not previously been used to investigate the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and therefore in this section I will briefly define terms that will appear frequently in this work. Many of the terms that I employ throughout this dissertation will also be capitalized within the text. I chose to capitalize some entities, such as Student Affairs or a

particular discursive node (like the Student Learning Discourse), in order to signify their importance to the discursive environment as concepts critical to the development of this research.

As I use the following terms throughout my dissertation, I will also place them (and others) into the context of my analysis or discussion in that section. My interpretation of these terms is critical to a reading of this dissertation, so I provide these definitions below:

Poststructuralism is a conceptual framework that offers critique of the constructed understandings of reality by society. As an epistemology, poststructuralism is skeptical of what structures assumed truths and “common sense.”

Discourse refers to the discursive structure and organization of what can be said (and done). It encompasses not only what is stated, but also what is not stated. Additionally, it refers to the set of rules understood (either consciously or subconsciously) by those who operate within the specific discourse.

Power is a concept of relations. Power, in poststructuralist terms, is not a “thing” that can be had or wielded but instead is both a product and an effect of the interaction between and among entities. Power is present at all levels of society and is deployed through all relations. It is not simply a repressive force, but is also a productive one that both limits and creates possibilities within discourse and relations.

Genealogy refers to a historical research method. Though it is loosely defined, it consists, in general, of a review of history for the purpose of understanding the relations of the present. Genealogy focuses on how discourses have been formed and deployed and on shifts in how discourse develops.

Student Affairs is a segment of higher education typically responsible for the development of students outside of the classroom. Though its contents vary by campus, it often encompasses the extra-curricular and co-curricular activities a student may experience while in college, including, but not limited to, residential life experiences, student clubs and organizations, counseling services, service opportunities, and more.

Housing refers to the unit within Student Affairs responsible for the living facilities for students. Housing departments include personnel for assigning students and managing occupancy, for keeping the buildings clean and operating effectively, as well as any curricular design for the students living in the facilities. Students who live in residence halls provided by their campus are generally referred to as “on campus” students.

Residence Life is a subset of Housing and refers to the entity within a Housing department that is tasked with the development of students. Residence Life staff include the Resident Assistants, as well as any professional staff. Residence Life is responsible for any curriculum of programs, activities, learning opportunities, or other involvement with students living in the residence halls.

The Student Learning Discourse is a term that I use to encapsulate the qualities of the current dominant discursive environment in Student Affairs. As Chapter 2 discusses, the Student Learning Discourse is a framework of thinking that views the purpose of Student Affairs as academically educational. This discourse positions Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as equal partners in student learning, which separates it from previous understandings of the role of Student Affairs.

Strategies and Practices are terms that refer to how discourse operates and is perpetuated within a discursive system. In this work, “strategies” are those discursive tactics or designs that deploy discourse. Most often, these strategies are seen present in documents, decrees, mission statements, and other published works representing the views of Student Affairs (or other entities, structures, or institutions). “Practices,” on the other hand, refer to the way in which professionals interact or operate. How a professional does their job or engages in a partnership with another professional is both influenced by and influences the discursive environment.

Best Practices is a vague concept that embodies the development of a specific set of practices thought to provide a preferred outcome. The notion of “best practices” can be derived from various types of research or individual experiences. Because there can be no agreement on what truly is “the best” way to partner between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, “best practices” always appears in quotes to indicate that this construct is one that is loosely defined within Student Affairs.

Holistic is a term used to describe an educational environment that combines curricular (in the classroom) and co-curricular (outside the classroom) activities for the purpose of learning. The notion of a holistic education is key to the framework that the Student Learning Discourse structures and it appears as a concept in many of the texts that perpetuate that discourse.

The purpose of providing these definitions is for reference throughout this dissertation. There are many other terms relating to discourse that I have applied throughout this work and due to the large lexicon needed to conduct and relay a poststructuralist study, providing an exhaustive list of terminology is not efficient and

effective to understanding the contexts of these words. Because of how intertwined these terms are with the milieu in which they are presented, I provide expanded definitions to the above terms (and others) as needed when they appear throughout this research.

A Guide to Reading this Dissertation

To facilitate this study and presenting its results, I worked with a nontraditional organization of the research. I chose to organize this study in a nonlinear fashion in order to best facilitate my understanding and analysis of the texts and strategies of discourse present for the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Because of the nature of working with historical documents in order to examine the present, I refer to my style of organization for this study as a series of “interactions.” In interacting with my texts, starting with *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), my analysis led to emergent strategies that the design of my study could not necessarily foresee. Those strategies led me back into the literature, which then brought me back to analysis.

The application of Foucault’s concept of genealogy required this fluidity, for as Foucault (1972) himself noted, using a typically constructed pattern of historical research is what has led to our common assumptions about truth. I organized the modes of research for this study purposefully to avoid that repetition and to reveal the underlying power relations present in this higher education relationship. Therefore, the analysis in this study developed in unpredictable ways and is presented with that caveat in the dissertation.

In Chapter 2, I present a relatively traditional history of Student Affairs, its development, and its relationship with Academic Affairs. I chose to conduct my literature review on the development of Student Affairs in order to look at the shortcomings of a

total history and also to be better able to investigate where a break in how Student Affairs discussed itself and its relationship with Academic Affairs occurred. This literature review led to the identification of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as a significant document to follow in this study. Because it provides a background to the development of Student Affairs, it also serves as a touchstone for those unfamiliar with Student Affairs and is tethered to the working historical assumptions that led to and guided this study.

In Chapter 3, I present the development of my genealogical method and document analysis I chose in order to conduct this study. To discuss my methodology, this chapter details my history in the profession, the experiences of other professionals gathered through a pilot project I conducted, and how I developed my conceptual framework and specific methods. Understanding the framework of my study is critical to engaging with its analysis and being able to apply that analysis to partnerships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

After the literature review in Chapter 2 and my discussion of methodology in Chapter 3, I present my unadulterated interaction process with *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) in Chapter 4, followed by a discussion of each major discursive strategies present in that document in the proceeding three chapters. I separated my analysis into these three additional chapters in order to be able to trace the development, deployment, and function of each individual strategy in *Learning Reconsidered*.

Finally, in Chapter 8 I return to my research questions and conceptual framework, as well as the problem of collaboration I discuss in this chapter, to investigate how the consideration of the strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), their development, and their deployment have impacted the relationship between Student

Affairs and Academic Affairs. This nontraditional design and structure allowed me the ability to trace the development of discourse and it also presents my experience with the project, which makes the interactions in my method more visible and more authentic. Through this analysis and investigation, I conclude this study with a discussion of the impact of poststructuralism, not only on Student Affairs, but also on educational leadership as a whole.

At times, this dissertation is scary and unsettling; it was for me as I conducted the research, too. Poststructuralism has the tendency to reveal hidden facets of our relationships, and exposing the intersections of power can be uncomfortable. If we envision a learning environment of collaboration and success for all students, as Kolb (1983) did, then we must also embrace the discomfort that comes with shining a light on discourse and power. Educational leadership is for the bold, and my aim in this project was to present a new way to view the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs with the hope of providing new opportunities for partnership and new positions from which Student Affairs can operate to push our students to be more successful.

Chapter 2: The History of Student Affairs and Academic Partnership

As I discussed in Chapter 1, a poststructuralist look at the history of Student Affairs and the development of the currently dominant Student Learning Discourse provides a novel look at the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. In order to better situate the research in this study and modes of research I employed, I outline the chronological history of Student Affairs in this chapter. I chose to conduct this literature review for two reasons.

First, this historical overview references the common literature of the field and the assumptions of the progression. The traditional history presented here represents a dominant telling of the Student Affairs story; in order to situate my examination of this same history, it is important to outline what the current status of the literature is. Second, because the historical viewpoints as to the purpose of Student Affairs have shifted and changed throughout its history, highlighting the major distinctive viewpoints and the discourses that surround those viewpoints is useful in understanding the development of the Student Learning Discourse and the assumptions surrounding its development.

Specifically, there are two other well-recognized perspectives as to the purpose of Student Affairs, the Student Services Discourse and the Student Development Discourse. In this section, I aim to provide a brief definition of each of these viewpoints, as well as the historical circumstances surrounding their dominance in the field. In Chapter 3, I outline the approach I took to investigate the history of Student Affairs, through

genealogy, which flows through these historical events in a distinctly different way than past histories have. This contrast harkens back to my first point, which is that this traditional historic view provides a reference point for how the progression of Student Affairs is currently situated.

A Note on “Discourse”

Throughout this historic overview, I use the word “discourse” to describe the dominant way of discursively positioning Student Affairs within its relationship with Academic Affairs. I implement the use of this word purposefully because, in my investigation of the deployment of the Student Learning Discourse, I find it critical to examine what the other dominant discourses in Student Affairs have been. The term “discourse” is not, however, referenced as a specific concept within the historical literature of Student Affairs. Doyle (2004), for example, referred to each of the viewpoints of Student Affairs as paradigms, or frameworks of assumptions about the role of Student Affairs. While they are indeed frameworks, they also cannot exist outside of discourse, which is why I have chosen to highlight them as such.

It is also important to note that this overview is not a total history and does not provide every potential or possible discourse for the relationship of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. While my study investigated power relations using the discourse analysis I discuss in Chapter 3, this historical overview is meant to provide a general context to the shifts in Student Affairs throughout its history. Student Affairs has been writing about itself and its relationship with Academic Affairs since nearly its inception (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001), and these writings provide insight and backdrop for my discussion of power relations in the current discursive environment.

The Student Services Discourse

Student Affairs's origin as a student services program provides much of the understanding of what the role of Student Affairs "should be" based upon its beginnings and initial development. The discourse surrounding Student Affairs as a student services entity could be considered as the most impactful because it is the origin story for the field. Essentially, when Student Affairs was first formally identified in 1937, it did not have a recognized curricular purpose (Doyle, 2004). Student Affairs was created because young students were thought to need parental guidance while studying at school; for the first 200 years of higher education's existence, faculty members were in charge of these tasks, but they moved out of those roles because of the conflicts it created in forcing faculty to navigate both roles as teachers and roles as disciplinarians (Rudolph, 1990). Additionally, faculty members were eager to spend most of their time on teaching and on research, not on actions typically associated with a caretaker role (Frederiksen, 1993).

Doyle (2004) argued that as faculty became more and more involved in their own research interests and as the ability to obtain and use research grants increased, faculty's overall interest in students' campus life lessened. This assertion was not to suggest that faculty were uninterested in the success of their students, but rather that the faculty interest in students manifested itself through the components of higher education that now fall under Academic Affairs.

The shift in attitude by faculty was what led to the idea of Student Affairs becoming formally adopted in 1937 (Doyle, 2004). It is important to note even though Student Affairs was birthed in 1937, it was not uniformly created across institutions of higher education, and the individual identities of each school affected the development of

Student Affairs on a local level (Doyle, 2004). Though faculty remained concerned with these co-curricular components of higher education, as schools increased in size, faculty became wearier of and disinterested in taking care of student needs outside of the classroom. Because of this shift in perspective and the continuing size increases in schools that led to a need for additional staff, the field of Student Affairs was formed (Rudolph, 1990). The need for student care, including basic “life skills” and developmental needs, was encompassed within a doctrine known as *in loco parentis*, which stated that the schools would act as proxy parents for undergraduate students (Beckham & Dagley, 2005). The *in loco parentis* doctrine continued to grow for much of the history of Student Affairs from its origin to the 1970s (Henning, 2007), with faculty and staff both perceiving the role of Student Affairs as an entity to control inappropriate behaviors and instill responsibility as parents would (Doyle, 2004).

Once faculty moved from the role of outside of the classroom care for students, housemothers (or dorm mothers) were instituted to provide “a control factor, a parent factor, and a social graces factor” (Frederiksen, 1993, p. 175). Though working as proxy parents can be argued as an additional element to student learning, it was not appreciated as such by either Academic Affairs or Student Affairs. The ability to ensure that students were safe and had their basic needs accounted for harkens back to Maslow (1943), who would argue that such items are critical for curriculum delivery and receptiveness, but the field of higher education at this time did not have a conceptualization of a holistic curriculum and thought of Student Affairs employees as strictly present to provide services for students and not to engage with their curricular needs. Developed throughout the 1930s and 1940s, this discourse situated Student Affairs in the relatively simple

purpose of ensuring that students were ready for the classroom by caring for other aspects of their collegiate lives (Ender, Newton, & Caple, 1996). Academic Affairs would act as the provider, bestowing education, while Student Affairs acted as the caretaker to ensure students had what they needed to be ready for class each week.

Though Student Affairs had both male and female professionals, the role in which Student Affairs was positioned led to women becoming integrated in this aspect of higher education prior to when women would join academia. Because academia was considered (and may be still considered) a man's profession (Pratt, 2002; Bracken, Allen & Dean, 2006; Jaschik, 2007), women were relegated to the role of providing motherly support for students when they were not in the classroom. Indeed, a lot of the content of women's jobs in higher education was tied specifically to their gender (Sturtevant, Strang, & McKim, 1940). They became the caretakers on campus. Faculty primarily served in the academic roles, for "intellectualism was considered masculine" (Duffy, 2010, p. 241) while women served in student services roles (Frederiksen, 1993).

I mention gender here because this influx of women no doubt continued to reinforce the servant position and its accompanying feminine assumptions and traits through the structures of this discourse, solidifying the presumed roles of each higher education unit during this time period. Gender related power differentials were also then institutionalized through the separation of roles for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, with one group situated as a servant operation (Duffy, 2010).

Other aspects of Student Affairs grew during this early time period in addition to collegiate housing, with Orientation, for example, serving as a way to introduce students to college life and transitions, and other units proliferating as student needs increased.

Student Affairs was to have four main goals, which were to (1) assist with the change from living with the family, (2) help students to choose a proper career path, (3) foster students' abilities to have relationships with the opposite sex, and (4) to integrate the personalities of students (Overland & Rentz, 2011). As the housing needs for universities continued to grow, beginning with the G. I. Bill in 1944, the need for a greater amount of Student Affairs professionals also grew; colleges and universities began to shift to the establishment of men's deans and women's deans on campus as the make-up of their student bodies increased and diversified (Frederiksen, 1993). These deans, in many ways, legitimized the profession, as they had ultimate control over who would stay at college and who would go from a disciplinary standpoint.

The creation and expansion of deans in colleges led to a formalized Student Affairs sector of higher education, one with responsibilities separate from Academic Affairs. Standardization remained uncommon, however, which continued to situate Student Affairs behind Academic Affairs. After World War II, the continuing expansion of student populations led to Student Affairs increasingly separating from Academic Affairs, as the needs of the greater student population necessitated a dedicated staff of specialists rather than a perceived shared-responsibility for students' wellbeing between institutional members (Doyle, 2004). The separation of the two halves of the university system and the work of the deans on the Student Affairs side solidified the purpose of Student Affairs at that time, which embodied caring for the comprehensive needs of students outside of the classroom.

The Student Services Discourse for Student Affairs is perhaps the most basic and concrete depiction and regulation of how Student Affairs and Academic Affairs should

work together. Within this arrangement, Student Affairs is responsible for the care of students, while Academic Affairs is responsible for the curriculum. Though dominant Student Affairs literature suggests that a true, integrated partnership would be most beneficial to students (Kuh et al., 1991), this discourse exclusively situates Student Affairs as housekeepers and emotional support for student. The Student Services Discourse, which was the dominant discourse from the onset of Student Affairs through the 1960s, was constructed through the assumption that academic conversations would happen naturally outside of the classroom for students and, therefore, no additional support would be needed. While this notion may have been true at one time, it is not the trend that students today experience (DeBard, 2004).

Though this discourse is the oldest of the historical relationships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, it has not been abandoned. In fact, many senior student affairs officers stated in the midst of the development of the Student Learning Discourse that they were positioning their mindsets back to student services as a way to explain why they are essential to higher education (Hartley, 2001). With budget cuts in many states currently, it can be hard to justify Student Affairs from one of the other viewpoints, because Student Development and extra-curricular Student Learning are considered “soft” goals. If Academic Affairs can provide the learning for students, then what does Student Affairs provide that is essential? For some institutions, the answer has been to reemphasize student services over any integrated connection to student learning.

Significance. This historical discussion of the origin of Student Affairs and the Student Services Discourse is helpful because it contrasts with the Student Learning Discourse. Student Learning and Student Services are at opposite ends of the spectrum in

terms of viewpoints for what staff can or should accomplish, and yet, Student Affairs has been able to shift as a field from one to another. With the lack of unity or standardization in the field, the Student Services Discourse is still around despite the overall shift to Student Learning, and those discourses interact and affect one another. I outlined the Student Services Discourse here in historical context as a reference point to my analysis, and the shadows of the Student Services Discourse are directly related to the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, as well as how Student Affairs has developed discursively.

The Student Development Discourse

The second of the three dominant Student Affairs discourses is focused on Student Development, which led to Student Affairs affecting the higher education environment in a much different way than that which a student services viewpoint allows. By attending to student services exclusively, Student Affairs felt supplemental and non-essential to the overall educational mission of a university, which dampened motivation among those in the profession who were looking for a meaningful connection to students and academics (Blimling & Whitt, 1998). Whereas the Student Services Discourse of Student Affairs positioned the field as servants and caretakers, the Student Development Discourse offered an area of expertise for Student Affairs workers. In a sense, by positioning itself through this discourse, Student Affairs created a distinct identity that was separate from Academic Affairs, yet complementary to it.

The Student Development Discourse is rooted in the creation of the field of student development theory and research, and the multiple theories focused on college-aged students and how they progressed cognitively and affectively. Beginning in the

1970s, developmental theories, originally the domain of Piaget and childhood cognition development, increased and led to a body of theoretical work on college students themselves and their development. Theory on student development grew during the time period following, and Student Affairs was able to embrace theory to position its purpose through the discourse and ideas theory provided.

Chickering (1974) reworked the goals of Student Affairs into a human development model that focused on personal identity development, relational development, and societal contributions (Overland & Rentz, 2011). Chickering's research suggested that residential students were all-around more successful students than commuter students, positing that Student Affairs had the ability to dramatically impact student success on college campuses, even though the field was not yet recognized as having a curricular impact. Similarly, Astin (1984) published about the positive impacts that involvement on campus could have, and he also suggested that students who lived on campus were more likely to have the type of positive experience that would enhance their learning as a student. Astin's (1984) findings, along with the findings of other researchers, drew Student Affairs to shift from merely providing student services and keeping order to having a goal of human development (Overland & Rentz, 2011).

Though Academic Affairs remained in the provider role by bestowing students with education, Student Affairs deepened its role as a caretaker, moving from merely providing services to looking to understand how students could develop into good students, good citizens, and good people. The previous role of Student Affairs in solely preparing students for academic readiness led to the belief that Student Affairs was merely supplemental to Academic Affairs; by focusing on student development, Student

Affairs was supposedly able to better argue its place as an educational partner in higher education (Doyle, 2004). The structure behind this discourse was that Academic Affairs was responsible for the cognitive and intellectual sides of students, while Student Affairs was responsible for the affective sides of students. Indeed, Stodt (1987) found that students had to be developed affectively in order to advance cognitively. Similarly, Banta and Kuh (1998) posited that affective development and learning were deeply tied. Though the roles remain distinctive and separate from this position, the understanding of how these two branches of higher education work together for student success shifted.

This shift to a student development approach changed the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, as Student Affairs professionals hoped that by focusing on student development they would be taken seriously as experts on college students (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1996). Tinto (1987) found that college student retention was tied closely to the “informal” interactions that students experience during their freshmen year, further emphasizing the need for Student Affairs as an equal partner. Tinto argued that Academic Affairs needed Student Affairs, for, without Student Affairs, students would not complete college or would not fulfill their potential as students.

The rise of student development theory throughout the 1970s and 1980s sought to legitimize the field of Student Affairs by bringing forth the notion that a curriculum that is solely academic is not effective across college campuses for most students. Though the Student Development Discourse did work to establish Student Affairs departments as the experts on issues of affective development, it also created an “us versus them” mentality across campus relationships (Doyle, 2004). The Student Development Discourse, however, did not change faculty’s perceptions of Student Affairs, as many of those

perceptions were still rooted in the origins of the Student Affairs field. This absence of a gained credibility with faculty led to “feelings on the part of Student Affairs professionals of a lack of appreciate and resentment” (Doyle, 2004, p. 71). This mentality may have continued to reinforce the separation of roles for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs that the Student Services Discourse first created, as the two branches of higher education moved into recognized areas in how they work toward student success.

Significance. The significance of highlighting the Student Development Discourse is in two things that relate to the Student Learning Discourse. First, the development of theory was supposed to legitimize the field of Student Affairs; the implications of the writings surrounding the need for legitimizing a field uncover facets of the power dynamics in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The primary works of Chickering (1974), Astin (1984), and Tinto (1987) all come out of a field that had been previously silent in affecting how students learn.

Second, as Doyle (2004) suggested, there remained negative feelings associated in working together. In trying to compile research on how Student Affairs and Academic Affairs partner, Kezar (2001) similarly noted these difficulties and cultural differences. Together, the feeling of having to legitimize the field and the disappointment in student development theory not fully doing so are conditions that relate to both the power dynamics of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and to the rise of the Student Learning Discourse.

The Student Learning Discourse

Though Student Affairs has been writing about and talking about becoming an equal partner with Academic Affairs since its beginning (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001), the

closest discourse from which to operate for that collaboration is likely the Student Learning Discourse, which began to emerge in the late 1980s.

This most recent discursive positioning has seen Student Affairs shift towards a model based on “educating for social change” (Duffy, 2010, p. 245). Many of the concepts and themes of this discourse are derived from the work of early women’s deans who sought to “build campus communities by giving power and ownership to others” (Duffy, 2010, p. 242), a role which conceptually suggests submissiveness to the masculine academia side of higher education. Though not acknowledged as a feminist progression, what Duffy (2010) suggested acknowledged a hidden impact women may have had on the development of discourse for Student Affairs. In examining power relations in this relationship, gender is present in the components I examined in the context of which factors have led to the creation and perpetuation of various discourses for Student Affairs.

According to Fuller and Haugabrook (2001), however, this paradigm shift was done with an eye towards making Student Affairs more relevant by focusing on enhancing the institutional learning climate, following the disappointment of the relationships from the Student Development Discourse. Fuller and Haugabrook (2001) stated that a student learning focus from Student Affairs worked to “further enhance the student learning environment and advance an institution toward share responsibility for student development and achievement” (p. 76). Within this discourse, Student Affairs moved from a servant role or a purely affective role to supplementing the academic mission of universities, with the goal of working collaboratively with Academic Affairs in order to accomplish greater learning goals for students (Doyle, 2004).

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), one of the major professional organizations for Student Affairs, noted in *A Perspective on Student Affairs* that Student Affairs was “a partner in the educational enterprise” and that Student Affairs “enhances and supports the academic mission” (NASPA, 1987, p. 9). While that mission, created in the shift from the Student Development Discourse, was vague, it continued to situate power relations for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Indeed, the history of the Student Services and Student Development Discourses still heavily influence the ways both sides of higher education view their roles, and despite the fact that the Student Learning Discourse is the most recently created, it is not ubiquitously endorsed, espoused, or implemented by either Student Affairs or Academic Affairs; all three discourses still operate within the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, both producing context for the relationship and being produced by the context of the relationship.

Allen and Garb (1993) suggested that the role confusion and the accompanying misconceptions about the purpose of Student Affairs (created by these competing and evolving discourses) led Student Affairs to feel victimized and submissive to Academic Affairs. Some researchers in Student Affairs have even gone so far as to suggest that Student Affairs too often willingly submits to unequal partnerships with Academic Affairs in an attempt to continually position itself as relevant despite the fact that both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs are critical to student success (Degen & Sheldahl, 2007).

Though this discourse was the only historical discourse to fully recognize a shared responsibility for learning, it does seem to also produce and reinforce a hierarchy of

expertise. If learning were the purpose of Student Affairs, then the Student Learning Discourse implies that they cannot be as good at it as Academic Affairs, whose expertise was learning; this may be why some researchers, such as Magolda (2005), have found that both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs professionals often believe that Student Affairs should take the deferential role. Whereas the Student Development Discourse gave Student Affairs a specific content area of expertise, the Student Learning Discourse, in many ways, was much more vague in communicating the actual role of Student Affairs for the higher education curriculum. If Academic Affairs were already the superior academic expert, then why would it be necessary to have Student Affairs work in academics at a lesser extent and with less ability? This discourse produced a relationship that was both liberating and limiting in that it provided for opportunities for Student Affairs to break free of past assumptions about what it should do, while at the same time reinforcing a power relations that place Academic Affairs as more important, and even render Student Affairs as potentially purposeless.

Part of what Allen and Garb (1993), as well as Magolda (2005), mentioned about a deferential Student Affairs comes from miscommunications about the partnership, created by a shifting set of ideals and goals for Student Affairs (Doyle, 2004). The history of Student Affairs reveals that the conceptualization of the field and its relationship with Academic Affairs is ever shifting and complicated. These competing historical discourses showcase how the interactions between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs both limit the ways units work with one another and produce distinctive identities for each. The behavior of each partner, then, has evolved with the historical changes and shifts in the discourse surrounding the relationship. My analysis of power relations between Student

Affairs and Academic Affairs in the chapters that follow examines that doublet and the implications that power/knowledge has on the positioning of Student Affairs and how Student Affairs's positioning produces power/knowledge in its relations as well.

Partnering Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Within this discourse, it is also important to note that the Student Learning Discourse is designed around partnership. Though there is not a solid basis of research as to what a solid partnership looks like (Kezar, 2001), I find it important to detail some of the common best practices for partnership here. I outline these in attempt to provide context to how Student Affairs views it should be working with Academic Affairs. Many of these texts were developed as the Student Learning Discourse emerged and work in concert with the viewpoints of that discourse, but they are also echoed in the timeline past the emergence of this discourse (Baxter Magolda, 2009; Frost, Strom, Downey, Schultz, & Holland, 2010; Keen & Hall, 2009; Kuh, 2009; McCarthy, 2015, Palmer, 2013; Pasque & Murphy, 2005; among others). I chose the texts for this section because they provide a basic understanding of ideas surrounding collaborating Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The development of these “best practices” is also entangled with the development, deployment, and reinforcement of the Student Learning Discourse.

Fluidity. Because of the inconsistency from school-to-school, the number one “best practice” presented for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs working together is to remain fluid. Marin and Samels (2001) stated that because turnover in Student Affairs is so rampant, a successful partnership must be one that can weave in and out of specific relationships rather than depend upon specific individuals. Faculty see turnover issues as

well, with members taking on other administrative tasks, research projects, or sabbaticals that take them away from the ability to partner in a particular semester.

Fuller and Haugabrook (2001) therefore argued that upper administrators must be responsible for prioritizing partnership and tracking progress, goals, and history. Kuh (2009), echoing the call for having administrators onboard, stated a need for “faculty, student affairs professionals, and institutional leaders [to] agree as to who shares responsibility for student engagement” (p. 696). Crafs, First, and Satwicz (2001) further expanded upon the idea of upper administration collaboration by suggesting that senior administrators must act as the glue to any collaboration or it will fail.

Faculty integration. Student Affairs literature suggests that fluidity is only the first step in a successful partnership. Faculty integration, according to Guarasci (2001), is the idea of expanding the “classroom” to include activities and learning outside of the traditional academic realm; these are spaces that would traditionally fall within the realm of Student Affairs. The goal of faculty integration is to create “seamless learning environments between in-class and out-of-class academic experience” (Pasque & Murphy, 2005, p. 429). The specifics of faculty integration vary from institution to institution, but Bourassa and Kruger (2001) recommended faculty-in-residence programs, First Year Experience (FYE) programs, and residential learning communities, which are residential programs that incorporate academic learning activities in the residence hall space.

The idea behind these programs is to increase the connection between students and faculty, so that students will feel more comfortable approaching faculty with academic and personal needs (Dunphy, Miller, Woodruff, & Nelson, 1987). Guarasci

(2001) mentioned these types of programs as effective because they did not apply an “add on” mentality, where students complete their academics and then “add on” extracurricular activities. Because everything was integrated, students should benefit to a greater degree. Regardless of the type of faculty integration used, Kuh (2009) found that it was critical that Student Affairs and Academic Affairs collaborate to review the data on effective periodically to ensure success.

First Year Experience Programs. Perhaps one of the most discussed avenues for potential collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is the formation of an integrated First Year Experience (FYE) program. An FYE program is a structured, purposefully designed holistic curriculum program for first-year students who encompass not only their academic transition to college but also their affective and developmental transitions as well (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001). Kezar (2001) named FYEs as a logical starting place for those institutions that wished to begin collaborating because of the natural transitional piece that occurs in students moving from high school to college. Additionally, Hirsch and Burack (2001) focused on the research from Tinto (1987) and others regarding retention and FYE programs.

Because funding for many colleges is now based on retention, FYEs also provide a financially responsible way to integrate Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and the financial component may help to convince upper administration to come on board. Hirsch and Burack (2001) further argued that retention and the success of students in school is an ethical issue in addition to being an issue of institutional survival. This sentiment echoes Stodt’s (1987) characterization of collaboration as a social justice issue and also welcomingly bundles economic and learning goals together to push institutions towards

opportunities to collaborate. If FYE programs are successful on campus from both a financial and a learning perspective, schools may be more likely to continue collaborating and to search for additional methods to create an integrated curricular experience for all of their students.

While there is not one set method for how to put an FYE program together successfully, Fuller and Haugabrook (2001) followed a program at the University of Massachusetts Boston to examine successful components. What they discovered was that the school implemented a program that gave curricular credit to Student Affairs activities for students. In addition to first-year academic programs, students were able to enroll their out-of-class activities as coursework for up to six credit hours. For students who cannot afford to participate in leadership opportunities because they must work in addition to schooling, this hybrid model allows students to get the experiences they need to successfully transition to college and beyond without limiting those opportunities to those who can afford to place activities on top of tuition. By having a common goal for student learning, the University of Massachusetts Boston was able to rethink its general education to provide credit for students to receive both the formal and the informal experiences they need in order to maximize their collegiate experience.

Elsewhere, it has been shown that a “survival skills” seminar can be extremely helpful for students, especially those who are a part of underrepresented populations or are high-risk students (Dunphy, Miller, Woodruff, & Nelson, 1987). By having a dual focus on, both academic skills (e.g., reading, writing, and mathematics) and affective skills (e.g., interpersonal competency, conflict management, independence), greater improvement in both was shown. Stodt (1987) argued that FYE programs help to create

“educational excellence,” which “includes elements that foster the development of students affectively as well as cognitively” (p. 15). He further posited that FYE programs helped to move collaboration forward in other avenues and that this increasing collaboration is in fact the key to student success.

Significance. I chose to outline not only the historical rise of the Student Learning Discourse in this section, but also commonly referred to “best practices” for collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs through this discourse and the development of this discourse. I have focused on these “best practices” because not only do I find the overarching discourse and discussion of Student Affairs’s role important to the power relations with Academic Affairs, but I also find the specific instances of collaboration critical to understanding power.

As Foucault (1977/1980c) stated, we must look for power not just in the obvious places at the top of the chain, but also in how it manifests and interacts in the outreaches. In my poststructuralist analysis of power/knowledge in this relationship, I explored the Student Learning Discourse from a variety of angles and vehicles of analysis, and I have provided this context here as a reference point for where my research situates discourse so that there is a common understanding of what the dominant discourse encompasses.

Conclusion

Though this overview of the historical literature is not exhaustive, it is not intended to be. Above I outlined each of the three primarily dominant discourses in the history of Student Affairs, as well as my specific reasons for wanting to highlight them. This chapter is intended to provide an overview of the types of literature currently dominating the Student Affairs and Academic Affairs relationship, as well as to serve as

a touchstone for the new perspective this research took in looking at that relationship. Beginning in Chapter 4, I discuss my analysis and how it provides new context for the historical understandings of Student Affairs and its current positioning as well. Next, in Chapter 3, I discuss how my investigation weaved through this traditional approach of history to provide a poststructural reading to Student Affairs and the rise of the Student Learning Discourse for the purpose of examining the products and effects of power in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Chapter 3: Modes of Research

In this chapter, I outline the conceptual framework, specific research questions, and modes of research that I used to investigate the complex web of power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. I created my methodology based on lessons I learned from my pilot project, personal stories, and from the results of the literature. I begin with my personal introduction to the problem of collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and follow this introduction by discussing my use of poststructuralism as my theoretical framework for investigation, the importance of discourse in my research, and the specifics of a Foucauldian power analysis, which was my guiding mode of analysis throughout this project.

To start, I want to note that while my work stems from a poststructural epistemology, my thinking throughout this project has remained rather fluid. The nature of this project is one of shifts and expansions, so I applied this framework purposefully to avoid delimiting the nature of my research or writing by using poststructuralism as a non-rigid and non-prescribed approach to research. As I stated in Chapter 1, the literature surrounding the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs tends to fall into three categories, including historical overviews, discussions of the benefits of partnering, and descriptions of “best practices.” My aim in this research is to expand the understandings of Student Affairs through a new lens, and poststructuralism allows for

the delicate weaving necessary to investigate the products of power that result from the discourse surrounding the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

In defining my terms, I referred to poststructuralism as an epistemological framework that is skeptical of common sense and assumed truths. To better understand what that definition means for the scope of this research project, before detailing the specifics of my methodology, I have outlined both the research and the empirical stories which led me to this project, as well as how I view poststructuralism in relation to discourse and power to create my underlying methodological framework.

The Development of a Poststructural Framework

Though I came to this research project through the literature on collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, I experienced the effects and products of power first through my own experiences. Power, abstract a concept as it may seem, is not a concept that exists only in theoretical, grandiose terms played out by the moves between inanimate entities such as the institutions of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Instead, it plays out in the extremities of these institutions—in the individuals who make up these departments on every campus in the higher education world. For me, this intersection of the macro dynamics of power and my own story is critical to deconstructing and revealing the effects of power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

A poststructuralist perspective is crucial to examining the products of power that I have seen in my professional experience, because it allows for an unveiling of the assumed structures that dictate power in relationships. Through my own story and the stories of others in the field that I examined during my pilot project, I saw how the effects

of power were not an abstract concept but were effects with which we tangled every day through our work. The investigation of both power and discourse in the experiences described next led me to develop the framework for this dissertation.

I provide my own stories and lessons from my pilot project in order to offer a grounding depiction of where the effects and products of power lie. Though this dissertation has theoretical implications for how we view collaboration as a whole, I find the constructs of power the most impactful for those who work through it individually every day to accomplish collaboration for the benefit of our students. I provide this window to my methodological journey to also reveal the perspective that guides my conceptual framework and its application in this research.

With the weight placed upon higher education for the betterment of the world, becoming a participant in that system was, for me, both invigorating and terrifying. My first position in higher education was in 2007, working in the field of Residence Life as a Hall Coordinator at a small, private liberal arts college in the northeast while I attended graduate school. My job consisted of the oversight and management of an area of residence halls on campus, as well as the safety, learning, and development of the students within those halls. I found that the possible significance I had in students' lives left me wanting to effectively perform my job because of the potential these students had and represented.

Though I began working in Student Affairs by supervising this area of undergraduate residence halls, I had never received any formal education as a foundation as how to embody that potentially critical role. I had two days of formal training, which consisted of crash courses in crisis management, team building, and leadership, and then I

was deemed “prepared” by my institution. Though training practices vary widely within the field and are not standardized, it is important to note that a two-day training is probably not typical, with many institutions (including all in which I have worked since) giving multiple weeks to training new professionals or graduate staff.

The combination of this non-traditional training with my already lacking formal education in Student Affairs made me demonstrably an outsider when I eventually decided to make a career out of Residence Life. Though postgraduate degrees for Student Affairs do exist, I was studying creative writing at the time and had essentially stumbled into my Hall Director position because I was unable to afford the cost of rent where I was attending graduate school. My school did not offer a degree in Student Affairs, and, to be honest, I was still interested in pursuing creative writing and had no desire to switch my studies.

I therefore approached my job without a solid backing in theory or practice, instead relying solely upon my own intuition and an intelligent supervisor who was able to challenge and mentor me. Needless to say, I was not immediately good at what I did. I felt as though I straddled two differing pathways: my degree in creative writing was intended to place me in the professoriate and in the realm of Academic Affairs, but my practical experience moved me toward Student Affairs. That bestriding of potential paths led me to a series of experiences that shaped who I became as a professional, my view of higher education, and my desire to study the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs—a relationship that is complicated and layered with dynamics involving both power and the positioning of each of these entities’ roles within higher education.

In particular, I will focus on two specific instances from my professional career. Because these events are what have led me to the creation of this project, these examples serve as the background and practical reference points for my dissertation. Foucault (1977/1980c) implored us to examine power not from a top-down perspective but at its extremities; power is present in my history and in these instances presented here. Examining power at its points of extremity is critical to understanding how power operates on an individual, practitioner level. Rather than focus on an obscure, thousand-foot view of power, these instances from my career show power at its edges and on a personal level.

Before I delve into specific events, I begin with a brief overview of my professional background to provide a timeline and context for the examples I share. As an undergraduate student at a mid-sized public university in eastern North Carolina from 2003 to 2007, I studied creative writing and earned a bachelor of fine arts degree. In terms of Student Affairs involvement at this point, I had little. I participated in the Student Government Association and our campus literary magazine. Upon graduation, I began my master's in creative writing with the goal of moving into academia at some point.

While attending graduate school, I took the aforementioned position as a Hall Director at my graduate school. While a Hall Director, I recognized that, for me, creative writing would not be the career path I desired; at the same time, I deepened my appreciation for the work I was doing with students on a daily basis and the impact I could have as a leader, role model, and mentor. The combination of those two realizations led me to pursue entering Student Affairs as a fulltime professional.

To better myself and improve my chances of turning my graduate assistantship into a career, I took a summer internship through one of the professional organizations for Student Affairs, the Association of College and University Housing Officers – International (ACUHO-I). Through ACUHO-I, I was able to find and apply for a variety of internships throughout the country. During the summer of 2008, I worked at an Ivy League institution to hone my skills and professional approach through my ACUHO-I internship experience. I met my first professional mentor while at this internship, and, with his help and hard work, I prepared myself for my first professional interview process upon graduate school's conclusion in May of 2009.

I had a long, drawn out job search, but I finished by finding that position at a mid-sized public institution in western North Carolina. I stayed for four years and, eventually, began my doctoral degree, in addition to increasing my level of responsibility yearly while working in Residence Life. At the conclusion of those four years, I moved positions, taking a significant promotion to a large public institution in central Texas, where I currently work and reside at the time of this project. The following two scenes illustrate some of my most impactful and developmental moments throughout my career as a young professional thus far and will serve to help identify my interpretations of power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

The interview. During my first on-campus interview for a professional job after graduate school, a representative of the department reprimanded me for using obscene language during lunchtime. Later, this would become a moment I recognize as a manifestation of the pressures of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

In the field of Student Affairs, it is common for candidates for professional positions to come to the campus of the school for which they are interviewing. During this visit, called an “on-campus interview,” the candidate typically has formal interview sessions with a wide range of constituents, from students to campus partners, all the way up to Vice President or Vice Chancellor-level staff members. Additionally, the candidate often has unstructured, informal time with members of the department. While these times are generally not scored in the interview tallies, they are a chance for coworkers and peers to determine whether or not a candidate will be a good “fit” for the department’s culture.

Working as a Hall Director at a small, private liberal arts had school left me outside the mainstream of Student Affairs trends. At my institution, traditions were important and modern fads within the field of Student Affairs were not. The residence halls on campus were referred to as “dorms.” Specifically, the campus was broken into an area of Old Dorms and one of New Dorms, which helped the staff identify the location of a crisis and quickly respond to it. Most college campuses are structured into groupings of residence halls because it makes it easier to manage each area in the event of a crisis, as well as to organize staff for general daily operation, and here, those were simply referred to as Old Dorms and New Dorms.

In Residence Life, however, the term “dorm” is often thought of as outdated and inappropriate. The term “dorm” for many professionals in the field is associated with places where students might sleep and live, but where no community is being built and no educational or cognitive development is included. The participants in the pilot project I later conducted confirmed this association, stating that they had all heard that “dorm” was

an inappropriate term. For professionals in Student Affairs whose livelihood and purpose is to build community and improve student success, the suggestion that the area they oversee is not a developmental environment is one that is offensive or even obscene on some level. Like so many facets of an institution, the language choice appeared connected to the significance of the work being done. “Dorm” did not represent how Student Affairs wanted its work to be seen or perceived within higher education.

Because of my work at the liberal arts school that was not well connected or networked in the field of Student Affairs, I remained unaware of this shift of terminology until this interview. Additionally, the term was not one I had ever experienced in my time as an undergraduate student; I had personally always referred to my own residence hall as “a dorm.” As my students now tell me, there is a convenience in saying “dorm” over stumbling through the multisyllabic “residence hall.”

In lunch at one of these interview days on-campus at this institution, I casually referred to a series of activities and programs we had put on in our New Dorms area of campus. Immediately, I was corrected.

“Don’t you mean residence halls?” I was asked with a gasp.

“Oh,” I said, “We just always called our areas of campus the Old Dorms and the New Dorms.”

My explanation was clearly not acceptable, as the eyes of my lunch partner were conspicuously dismissive. Had I crossed a line and made it seem as though Student Affairs was not legitimate? For the rest of the lunch and later in the day with this individual, I found his responses to be curt and frustrated. It was as though I had attacked the quality of his job. It did not help that in addition to not knowing the offensiveness of

“dorm” I also came from an academic background more suited for Academic Affairs work. I knew that this would not end up being a good fit for my professional career when he offered me a chance to take the train home at the end of my first interview day if I wanted to, as opposed to “having to” stay overnight, have another dinner, and have another breakfast. I knew even then, as a fresh and naïve candidate, that additional meals and chances to interact were all important to the interview process. Though those were on my schedule already, I had been given the opportunity to cut my interview short, even if it was only cutting the informal activities short and technically not any portion of the interview.

Knowingly, I ended up taking the train and was not surprised to discover weeks later that another candidate had been offered the job and had accepted it. At this point, I questioned whether or not I knew enough about the field to compete. This was the first time I recognized there to be a set of rules as to what I was supposed to say and know about Student Affairs, how I could talk about the job, and how to express what work I wanted to achieve. This was also my first cognizant experience with how discourse, power, and knowledge were intertwined. My lack of understanding of the discursive rules positioned me differently than candidates who would have known the appropriate language. That visit had been my only invitation on campus throughout a long interview season, and my current graduate assistantship was ending soon.

It would be a painstaking wait before I would have another opportunity on campus. In preparation, I worked with a mentor who tutored me on specific language pieces to show that I understood student development theory and the Student Learning Discourse, which I discussed in Chapter 2. Though throughout this particular interview, I

saw no real mention of academics outside of cursory discussions in specific answers to questions, I began to recognize that Student Affairs was shaped by its relationships in higher education. Later, I would find out that the primary relationship entangled with Student Affairs was its one with Academic Affairs.

Despite this interview and slow process, I was eventually able to find my position in North Carolina. Because I had a unique background, I was potentially going to be a good match for a job that would need to partner Academic Affairs and Student Affairs together.

Academic partnerships. I was chosen for the assignment of partnering Student Affairs with Academic Affairs in my first job because of my background in writing and in the academic world in general. My supervisor informed me that he placed me in this specific role because he felt I would better be able to relate to the professors and the “academics” with whom I would need to work.

Overseeing a campus residence hall pulled me in many directions. My responsibilities included managing the staff in the building, responding to crises, working on facilities issues, and working for the overall safety, wellbeing, and academic success of the residents who lived in my area of campus. One of my first responsibilities was to build a better partnership for our department with the Honors College, the faculty within that college, and the director of the college. My supervisor emphasized this connection as critical to the achievement and development of our students, as well as to my level of relative success in the position. My supervisor cited research showing that students who were in communities with strong academic/residential links outperformed their peers and that these students were also better retained with higher grade point averages. Retention

was a goal of our department, as was any sort of evidence that we positively impacted the residents' academic success. With the budget restraints on our campus as a state institution, it was important to emphasize the critical, essential nature of our department, and my supervisor wanted to make our connection with the Honors College a model for how we could build relationships across campus and improve our reputation within the context of the school, as well as in the region.

What I learned when I entered the job was that the relationship between Residence Life and the Honors College was tumultuous and uneasy. The Honors College leadership team (comprised of its head faculty) was apprehensive about partnering with Residence Life. In my first meeting with the director, she informed me that the previous person in my role was incompetent, had never done anything, and did not understand what they were trying to do in the Honors College. I also learned through this first meeting that though this partnership was a significant part of my job description, it was not in the job descriptions or expectations of anyone working in the Honors College.

In fact, in my conversation with the director, I learned that the Honors College did not want to be connected closely with Residence Life for fear of being thought of as a "residential learning community," which would mean that it did not have the same academic prestige and standing as other general education colleges across campus. To the Honors College, the partnership was primarily for using the residence hall as a recruitment tool for new students and parents, whom the director told me highly prefer their students living together in such an elite community rather than being randomly assigned to residence halls across campus.

These first conversations scared me. At the time, I did not realize the implications of what she was saying, but in retrospect, I now see that being associated with Student Affairs was seen as “less than” being a part of an academic department. I saw that the exclusion of Student Affairs in her role was not by accident. Every consideration had been made for the success of what this Honors College was trying to achieve, and now I applaud the intelligence and orchestration needed to work within a complex higher education system. Looking at this situation now, it becomes more obvious that not only was Student Affairs positioned in a relationship with Academic Affairs, but also the components of Academic Affairs existed in their own power struggles, disagreements, and successes. As a Student Affairs professional looking in and entangled with this relationship, I could not understand their intricacies then (or even now, by and large) nor how they would potentially affect my overall building of a partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

From my initial conversation onward, the relationship continued to be unstable and, at times, nonexistent. I was partnered with the director of the Honors College, who was a long-tenured and well-respected faculty member with nationally recognized expertise; I, on the other hand, was fresh out of graduate school and did not even hold a degree in the field in which I worked. The initial conversation and the comparison of my credentials left me gun-shy in attempting to navigate the complexities of the relationship between this academic entity and my own department. The comparison of our stature was not lost on the Honors College director either, who frequently would go three levels above my head to complain or make requests rather than working with me directly.

My supervisor had advised me to bring in data and to show her the “proof” that our partnership would benefit the students of the Honors College. Because I remained uneasy about confronting this director, these conversations came off as unfocused, and I felt as though I was patronizing a much more experienced, much smarter individual than myself. Just as I was unsure of how to legitimize myself throughout my interview process, I was unsure of how to legitimize Student Affairs partnerships in my work.

Of course the students were doing well, she gave in retort to my claims; they were in their class structure, advised by the Honors College, and lived together. The addition of other programs or activities would be odd, in her opinion, and would make professors feel as though parts of the class were getting more information than those who did not attend the co-curricular or extra-curricular opportunities.

Even using the residence hall as a meeting space was shot down because the program did not want non-resident Honors College students to feel as though they were missing out on a residential program when they came to the halls and saw the residence hall community. There were no real clubs or student organizations that met in residence halls, I was told.

Through all of this, one of my most distinct memories is that it took an entire year-and-a-half before I was allowed to be on a first-name basis with the director. I earned this distinction by co-teaching a course with the director, which I was permitted to do for no pay when the department was desperate to fill a spot for an interdisciplinary writing seminar and needed what would amount to a semester-long substitute. Prior to teaching that course together and having an experience outside the realm of our own partnership, all of my correspondences and conversations used the salutation “Doctor” to

address the Honors College director. I do not know if that salutation was her or my decision, but neither of us questioned it for some time.

After three years in the liaison position, I was chosen by my department to move into a different role and work with a different student population. Part of my concluding processes was discussing the change with the Honors College and talking to its leadership team about the upcoming personnel change. Though our personal relationship had grown throughout this three-year period, the professional partnership we were to forge remained stagnant. Our relationship was nominal, involved in advertising the hall and giving tours; we continued to have little involvement from Honors College faculty in advising or programming to our residence hall students directly or taking advantage of having offices and student rooms in adjacent spaces. As the director and I discussed the individual who would replace me, the director relayed a story to me about a conference she had recently attended.

At this conference, she had gone to a presentation that was purported to give new ideas for initiatives for academic/residential connections. The speaker, she told me, was very humble and talked about how Student Affairs and Residence Life would not exist if it were not for academics. She told me that the speaker spoke to the needed deference to Academic Affairs and the subordinate and supportive role that Student Affairs could and should play. She was amazed, she told me, to hear someone finally be honest about what the relationship should look like and to understand that there was a hierarchy in place. Too often, she continued, the priorities did not match and it did not work. She told me that if she could not work with me, she wanted to work with someone who understood the values of both education and the Honors College. It became clear to me what those

values were. At this point, however, I was happy that I would be moving on. Whereas she felt our relationship had been strong, it was purely a personal relationship. I still have great respect for the director of this Honors College, but our partnership was a farce. We did meet the Honors College's needs as a promotional tool, but we did not work together on the retention or to improve the quality of education our students brought out of the classroom to their homes. Those items that were in my job description were left unfulfilled, and so, in many ways, I too left this role unfulfilled.

These stories do not represent a linear progression in my own history, but instead are places where I noticed cracks or shifts in the discourse and power relations in which I worked. The reason these experiences have stayed with me is because they drew my attention to my discursive environment. These were the instances that influenced me to investigate the practices of other professionals and led to the creation of my pilot project examining discourse in Student Affairs.

Lessons from a pilot project. In addition to my own stories, my pilot project was integral in the creation of my conceptual framework. The work from the pilot led me to understand the significance of discourse and allowed me to see the intersections of discourse and power, which are critical to my understanding of the poststructural framework I applied, as detailed below. Additionally, the stories of the individual participants in this project echo and parallel my own story and are representative of power present and enacting in those extremities of the Student Affairs world.

As a professional, I struggled at times with the push and pull of partnering Student Affairs with Academic Affairs, and I observed other professionals struggling as well. Through my working relationships, I saw departments have ideas of what they were

“supposed to do” and what their partnering department was “supposed to do.” Those observations and my struggles led me to become interested in what developed these assumptions and how power played into the relationship. Specifically, I became interested in how departments and professionals spoke about their roles and how the departments published to the world what they were “supposed to do.” The interaction between discourse and power seemed to be important, as the dialogue that surrounded the relationships between departments reinforced or altered how they interacted.

To deepen my understanding of discourse and power within the field, I conducted a pilot project in the fall of 2012 to investigate participants’ thoughts and feelings on language that was appropriate to use within the field, as well as how they were introduced to the vernacular of Student Affairs. What I discovered in this investigation was that the language that the participants used was shaped by pre-constructed power dynamics in the field, and that their language reinforced those power dynamics. In other words, power affected discourse, and discourse affected power. This pilot project took place within a single, mid-sized, public university in western North Carolina and focused on the language of Housing professionals. Though the primary method of research consisted of interviews, observations also played a key role in the understanding and analysis of participants’ responses to the interview process.

Pilot study design. The pilot study featured three participants, all of whom were live-in Residence Life professionals; live-in Residence Life professionals are typically full-time workers who hold a master’s degree and supervise an area of residence halls and professional, paraprofessional, and/or student staff members. Live-in Residence Life professionals also live on the campus in residence halls in order to provide nighttime and

weekend coverage for crisis support and for community development. I chose three individuals with distinctly different backgrounds in order to provide a cross-section of the field. Criteria considered for choosing participants included racial identity, academic background, and longevity in the field. I interviewed each participant for approximately ninety minutes, and I conducted an additional five hours of field observations to provide context by viewing typical daily interactions. These observations included staff meetings, interactions with students, training sessions, and casual non-work gatherings.

Findings. I created the analysis from this pilot project through coding participant responses and motifs from observations to develop two compelling themes. Primary in the findings from this pilot project was the revelation that all of the professionals in the study seemed to suffer, at least to some extent, from an inferiority complex related to their profession. I discovered through this project that the discourse of the field affected the feelings of inferiority that participants explained. For example, each participant referred to a time in which they were reprimanded for incorrectly using the language that would be appropriate for Student Affairs. Each participant also noted that they felt the language of the field was strongly enforced because of an attempt to gain greater credibility and legitimacy within higher education. All participants stated that not only had they been reprimanded at some point for not knowing the “correct” language, but had at some point corrected others for their language use.

Though the pilot project researched only individual Residence Life staff, my findings were congruent with what Doyle (2004) pointed to for the Student Affairs field as a whole, which is to say that participants in the study brought to light the notion that Student Affairs needed to seek credibility and legitimize itself continuously. When

speaking about why they felt they were reprimanded or held to specific language, all participants noted that using specific language was done to set status and create a hierarchy that solidified elitism in the field. Participants spoke to this structure as a phenomenon of needing to appear exclusive in order to compete with other parts of the university that had much more stringent requirements to succeed (e.g., terminal degrees for Academic Affairs faculty). My findings support the notion that power dynamics were at play in the professional lives of these individuals, just as they were in the examples from my own past. The power relations at play between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs on a macro level were affecting individuals on a very small scale in how internal discourse operated in Student Affairs as well.

Relevance to dissertation. Together, my own stories and my pilot project serve as the bridge to the work in my dissertation. The information I gathered from my pilot project and my own experiences point to the role that power relations play in producing discursive possibilities for Student Affairs. Importantly, this bridge functions as the practical buoy to keep theoretical discussions of power interacting with the tangible manifestations of power and its effects. Though the pilot project had a tangential topic and different methodology, it reinforced my understanding of the importance of both power and discourse to how Student Affairs operates in the higher education world. This understanding allowed me to move forward to examine how Student Affairs is positioned within the discourses surrounding higher education and how power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs produce and reinforce those discursive possibilities and positioning for Student Affairs.

Discourse had massive implications for the professionals I interviewed and observed. Furthering my understanding of discourse and power in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs assists in uncovering the enacting of those implications for professionals in Student Affairs. The poststructuralist framework that I employed allowed me to examine this relationship in a way that previous research has not.

Poststructuralism and Discourse

Poststructuralism and its skepticism help me to focus my research on discourse, specifically the ways in which Student Affairs and Academic Affairs operate and relate to one another discursively. Discourse itself is a difficult concept to define. As Scott (1988) explained, “Discourse is not a language or a text, but a historically, socially, and institutionally specific structure of statements, terms, categories, and beliefs” (p. 53). Kendall and Wickham (1999) also offered a simple explanation for discourse as “a corpus of ‘statements’ whose organisation is regular and systematic” (p. 42). Despite the fact that discourse is structured and delimits what can be said or done, it is not closed off, so leaves open the possibility of new concepts or statements (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1984).

For my dissertation, when I speak about discourse, I refer to the discursive structure and organization of what can be said; additionally, it is critical to note that I also refer to discourse with an eye towards it being productive. For example, as Kendall and Wickham (1999) put it, “Medical discourses about ‘folly’ and ‘unreason’ produce the mentally ill person, penological discourses produce the criminal, discourses on sex produce sexuality, and so on” (p. 34). This definition conceives a discourse that both

regulates what is said about and within Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, as well as produces notions of identity—or, in other words, positions these entities discursively.

Poststructuralism focuses not on the meaning of language or discourse, but instead on the function of discourse, because once discourse is established thinking outside of it can become difficult, or even impossible (St. Pierre, 2000). For instance, even things which exist naturally and are non-discursive, like bodies, operate in a world of discourse; to attempt to discuss Student Affairs and Academic Affairs outside discourse would be troubling because even those things which we consider non-discursive operate in a discursive realm (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). For example, in terms of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, the discourse in which they are wrapped both limits the ability of Student Affairs to envision its relationship with Academic Affairs differently and also produces the discursive possibilities for Student Affairs.

Bové (1990) explained the important discursive uncovering that occurs with a poststructuralist conceptual context, stating that it can “describe the surface links between power, knowledge, institutions, intellectuals, the control of populations, and the modern state as these intersect in the functions of systems of thought” (p. 55). MacLure (2003) suggested that it is impossible to imagine the world existing without words that guide and limit it, just as it is impossible to imagine words existing without a world that they represent and describe. The poststructural conceptual context that frames my research helps to make the discursive more visible in how it produces power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

In the case of Student Affairs, it is important to keep the focus on discursive practices because Student Affairs is defined through discourse, both by being able to position itself opposite Academic Affairs and by being discursively positioned by its relationship with Academic Affairs. The discourse that surrounds higher education creates and reinforces the roles that Student Affairs can and does play. The dominant discourse that surrounds Student Affairs currently, the Student Learning Discourse, is one that both produces and limits the possibilities for the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Understanding the ways in which that discourse is produced and deployed is key to looking at power relations for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Employing a poststructuralist framework allowed me to have a deeper investigation of the discursive practices and elements of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs with the hopes of understanding how the power relations present in the relationship produce a discourse of Student Affairs. I look to discourse through this poststructural framework for the purpose of being able to apply a power analysis to the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Foucauldian Power Analysis

Within the realm of poststructuralism, I focused my research through a Foucauldian power analysis of the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Foucault (1977/1980d) referred to himself as being within the poststructuralist mindset, saying, “I don’t know who could be more of an anti-structuralist than myself” (p. 114). The purpose of thinking with Foucault specifically is to better investigate how power, identity, and subjectivity intersect in the relationship

between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. In her work “Fields of Discourse,” Jackson (2010) stated that her reasoning in applying Foucauldian analysis was to reveal, “complex intersections among power, identity, change, and community to show they are imagined, idealized, and maintained” (p. 73). Similarly, I used the tools of Foucault in order to look at the intricacies involved in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in order to examine power relations in a way not previously done in research on higher education.

I focus my work through a Foucauldian lens because Foucault approached power from a unique perspective useful in understanding the discursive positionings and possibilities of Student Affairs. Foucault (1977/1980d) critiqued the notion that power was often referred to as evil and reduced to focusing only on power from a top-down idea or a powerful/powerless juxtaposition. As St. Pierre (2000) reminded us, power is not of an individual or simply a negative in the world. For Foucault (1977/1980d), the discussion of power as an evil entity was not only not enough, but it was entirely inaccurate. The concept of power as only evil or top-down would also not serve to adequately describe what takes place in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Foucault’s (1977/1980d) concept of power, when applied to Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, is not one of a force wielded to create a hierarchy, but instead one that views power as functioning to produce the ways in which Student Affairs and Academic Affairs each operate and forge their discursive positionings within higher education.

Because power is productive and helps to create and reinforce notions of identity and other knowledge, and because that knowledge then also produces power, Foucault

(1975/1980a) employed the concept of a doublet, power/knowledge, speaking to how intertwined the two were and how they reciprocate one another. Foucault's notion of power/knowledge is useful in describing how power relations function within higher education, and I employed the power/knowledge concept (and the discursive underworkings of that concept) in my investigation of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Foucault (1977/1980f) talked about power as infinitely complex, stating that power "is a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised" (p. 156). Taking the concept that power does not exist as a singular, large weapon to be owned and controlled by an entity, Foucault insisted that it instead exists in relations (Foucault, 1984/1997). Because power does not come from one point exclusively and can shift contextually in any of the many differed institutions of higher education, Foucault's view of power provides the best entry point for understanding how power relations are circulated amongst Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Foucault (1975/1980a) also spent time discussing power specifically in the university setting. One of the reasons that Foucault did so is that he thought of universities as a tangible example of the concept of power/knowledge. Foucault (1975/1980a) viewed the university as "the most visible, most sclerotic, and least dangerous form of this [power/knowledge] phenomenon" (p. 52). For Foucault (1975/1980a), the teaching practices of university professors created knowledge, and though universities have a hierarchy, power was dispersed and practiced in a variety of diffuse ways because of the professoriate collective.

It is worth noting, however, that Foucault's (1975/1980a) understanding of universities as forms of the power/knowledge phenomenon are contextual as well. Discourse and the contemporary structures of the time influenced Foucault's understanding of the university setting itself. Though Foucault argued that universities were a minimally dangerous form of power/knowledge, I would argue that this is not true for every facet of the university.

The environments that I outlined for both me and for the professionals in my pilot study are products of the power relations in a university setting, and I argue that there is danger in the structures that marginalized Student Affairs throughout its development and that limit partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. While Foucault's (1975/1980a) experience with higher education was positively tilted, the ramifications of power in the university structure are perhaps even clearer today as Student Affairs has continued to grow and interact with Academic Affairs.

I also purport that universities have continued to diversify and become more diffuse. Because the student populations have grown and shifted, as I discussed in Chapter 2, Student Affairs has grown and split, professoriates have increased, and school administrations have become larger. The diffused and continually sprawling structure of a university assisted in the development of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and the intrinsic nature of power that Foucault (1975/1980a) viewed in all major institutions makes a Foucauldian analysis of power relations for higher education particularly viable.

Because no relationship escapes power (St. Pierre, 2000), and because this specific relationship is responsible for a significant amount of knowledge creation and

control in society, Foucault's works help to illuminate how power relations in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs affect not only the discursive positioning of Student Affairs, but also the way that Student Affairs may situate the knowledge it passes down to the students of higher education.

Foucault (1975/1980a) felt that one of the goals of his work was to make "discourses visible" (p. 38). Foucault (1977/1980h) was careful not to focus on trying to define one discourse or one subject as central to his work with the understanding that doing so might exclude certain discourses that would also exclude certain subjectivities and constructions of subjects. At first consideration, this method would seem to be too expansive and inclusive, in an attempt to see everything, but Foucault (1977/1980h) noted that all discourses come with obscurities, and there were even "obscurities of [his] own discourse" (p. 203). Rather than attempt to see everything about every discourse, a Foucauldian analysis examines strategies and strategic connections within discourse.

For the purposes of this study, I therefore looked to the development of a specific discourse—the Student Learning Discourse, whose historical rise was detailed in Chapter 2. By focusing on this one specific thread as a starting point, I was better able to make visible the strategies and practices that led to the creation of that discourse and how that discourse presently affects the field. Below, I discuss the specific starting points for looking at this discourse and the field.

Foucault (1977/1980g) believed that it was impossible to study discourses themselves and thusly focused on strategies that regulate discourse. In her work, educational researcher Jackson (2010) used a Foucauldian analysis in order to see how "strategies are animated by the practices of people within power/knowledge

relationships” (p. 76). Similarly, I used Foucauldian analysis to examine strategies through the practices of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in their relationship.

Using a Foucauldian analysis to illuminate the strategies of discourse in higher education is necessary to deconstructing power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Power is elusive and difficult to see because it is everywhere (Foucault, 1977/1980e), and focusing on discursive strategies that reinforce power relations helped to make the web of power more visible and deepen my conception of power/knowledge in higher education. Because “knowledge is an effect of power” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 49), making power more visible also serves to make knowledge more visible. Knowledge, which can be constructed and “produced in experience and relations with others” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 50), is at the heart of the discourse of Student Affairs. To better reveal the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is to investigate how Student Affairs is defined and positioned through discourse, and Foucauldian analysis enhanced my understanding of the interactions in those relational connections through this project.

Research Questions

There are many elements at play in a reading of the power/knowledge relationships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Above, I discussed my poststructuralist theoretical framework, investigation into both discourse as a whole and the specific Student Learning Discourse, and the workings of a Foucauldian power analysis. All of these facets led to the central questions of power and power’s products in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and it is impossible to appropriately consider power/knowledge in this relationship without first starting from

the framework and development of the Student Learning Discourse. Mindful that such a project could become sprawling and unwieldy, I formed a series of research questions to guide my Foucauldian power analysis.

I began with the assumption that power is capillary and that there is no single emanating point for power; as Foucault (1977/1980h) stated, “In reality, power means relations” (p. 198). Thinking with Foucault’s definition of power and power’s products in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs led me to a desire to deconstruct how the discourses of Student Affairs are perpetuated through power relations and how those power relations reinforce and create discourses surrounding Student Affairs. The research questions that guide my analysis are as follows:

1. What are the historical conditions that form and deploy the Student Learning Discourse for Student Affairs?

Foucault (1977/1980d) asked that when we study history, we focus not on meaning but instead on relations of power. My reason for first situating my analysis in the historical conditions surrounding the currently dominant Student Learning Discourse is that historicizing a subject can lead to assumptions and fabrications, and the field already has several traditional historical accounts of the development of the field.

Foucault (1977/1980d) stated that the study of history should “account for the subject within a historical framework” (p. 117). I focused on history to understand the present, and examined the discourse surrounding Student Affairs and Student Affairs’s relationship with Academic Affairs provided the contextualization for how power is dispersed within higher education. Focusing on discourse surrounding Student Affairs rather than viewing Student Affairs as a sole subject also deepens understanding of the

context in which Student Affairs exists. Studying discourse is fluid, for as Foucault (1975/1980a) reminded us, it would be impossible to “constitute an ensemble of discourses...as a unity” (p. 38), and this mode of study allows for the consideration of multiple discourses. But it is also important to remember that discourse is not the *object* of my discussion and analysis, but instead how discourse has been *formed and deployed*. Foucault (1977/1980g) warned us that discourse itself is impossible to study because it embodies everything, so instead we can reveal the ways in which discourse is enacted and enforced to learn more about the interactions of subjects.

Power is both produced by and produces discourse (Foucault, 1977/1980g), so deconstructing how the historical discourse surrounding Student Affairs is formed and deployed was critical to appropriately examining the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Because the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs exists at multiple levels, there are multiple discourses at play, including discourses that encompass the entire field, all the way down to discourses at specific campuses and schools. Making these discourses more visible was the first task in being able to think with power/knowledge for the field of Student Affairs.

2. What power/knowledge relations between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs are enabled by this discourse?

After investigating how the Student Learning Discourse was (and is) formed and deployed, the next step is to question what power/knowledge relations were present and enabled through this discourse. Power and knowledge are not the same thing, but they do enable each other through a reciprocal loop, in which “power creates and accumulates knowledge, and knowledge induces effects of power” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 62).

Because power is a part of every discourse and every relationship (Foucault, 1977/1980g), making visible the power/knowledge doublet was helpful in revealing the discourses that surround Student Affairs. Though every discourse has obscurities (Foucault, 1977/1980h), power relations serve to “play at once a conditioning and conditioned role” (Foucault, 1977/1980h, p. 142). In other words, power and discourse affect one another. Therefore, examining power relations helps to illuminate the discourse as the discourse produces the effects and manifestations of power in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Because a single origin of power cannot be traced (Foucault, 1977/1980h) and because we can neither identify nor understand intent behind acts of power (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012), my focus on power relations examined how exercises of power were enabled by discursive constraints. It is important to note that because of the fluidity in researching discourse surrounding a subject rather than attempting to investigate a sole subject, exercises of power must be understood as both affecting and being effected by the discourse in which they operate. Analyzing how the development of the Student Learning Discourse enables instances of power/knowledge is a necessary condition for examining Student Affairs and its position within higher education.

3. How do these power/knowledge relations produce particular discursive positions for Student Affairs? And, in turn, how does Student Affairs further power/knowledge relations and practices?

My first two research questions led me to the heart of my analysis—the ways in which the power/knowledge relations enabled by the Student Learning Discourse limit

how Student Affairs is or can be defined within the higher education discourse and how power relations produce possibilities for Student Affairs as well.

Although Student Affairs's identity is intertwined with Academic Affairs, the subject of this project is not the relationship specifically between these two entities; rather, my focus is on how power in this relationship serves to define Student Affairs as a field. I chose to focus on the positioning of Student Affairs in order to better understand partnership from the perspective of Student Affairs professionals, who have been musing about their relationship with Academic Affairs since the conception of Student Affairs (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001). Additionally, because my background as a professional is in Student Affairs, I felt I would most be able to investigate power relations from a perspective with which I have many entry points from a range of experiences.

The notions of Student Affairs that are constructed through the power/knowledge relations of higher education discourses may serve to limit or constrain Student Affairs's perceived ability or role. As the historical overview in Chapter 2 portrayed, Student Affairs has been somewhat wayward in the past, attempting to define itself in multiple different ways to show its value to higher education, thereby leading to the development of the Student Learning Discourse (Doyle, 2004). Revealing how power/knowledge relations constrain Student Affairs provides opportunity to understand how to alter the discourse surrounding Student Affairs in order to present other discursive positions from which it could operate for greater benefit to students in higher education.

Thinking with the idea of repositioning Student Affairs discursively also suggests the practical implications of this dissertation. Throughout its history, Student Affairs has experienced a litany of redefinitions and the flux of its roles are influenced by (and

influence) the discourses that surround Student Affairs and the power/knowledge relations enabled by these discourses. By making these relations more visible and focusing on how they constrain Student Affairs, practitioners working with the field and within the same discursive context may be able to better see the components at play when they partner with one another.

By deconstructing the nature of partnerships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and how we have defined and reinforced our notions of what a good partnership is or can be better partnerships can be created. Rather than limit our understanding of success or failure to one understanding of success, focusing on discourse allows us to open up the field to multiple ways of knowing and understanding the partnerships for the benefit of our students.

A Rupture in Student Affairs

As I showed through the historical overview in Chapter 2, the Student Learning Discourse has not always been the dominant way of understanding the Student Affairs profession. Indeed, the discourse and ideas as to the purpose of Student Affairs have changed throughout its history. The presently dominant Student Learning Discourse, however, has immense ramifications on the power relations between Student Affairs and Academics and was developed through circumstances that have been intertwined with power relations.

The question of what conditions led to the development and deployment of the Student Learning Discourse can have any number of supposed answers. A common assumption would be that it is a progression of thought. As Chapter 2 examined, Student Affairs moved from a Student Services model to a Student Development model and, most

recently, to a Student Learning model. Perhaps the emergence of the Student Learning Discourse was simply a function of this gradual development over time and the field progressed and advanced, as did other fields such as science, medicine, and psychology. Foucault (1972), however, argued in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, that we should be weary of this method of historical research, which encourages us to look for patterns, continuity, and accumulation of consistent growth. Foucault's hesitation with such traditional historical research is the reason I chose a poststructural framework for this research. Foucault argued that rather than look to the obvious, gradual changes in history, researchers should search for instances of disruption in history, which he referred to as "ruptures" throughout his work. Foucault (1972) stated that finding these ruptures was difficult, because disruptions in traditional history timelines:

... evade very largely the work and methods of the historian, attention has been turned, on the contrary, away from vast unities like "periods" or "centuries" to the phenomena of rupture, of discontinuity. Beneath the great continuities of thought, beneath the solid, homogeneous manifestations of a single mind or of a collective mentality, beneath the stubborn development of a science striving to exist and to reach completion at the very outset, beneath the persistence of a particular genre, form, discipline, or theoretical activity, one is now trying to detect the incidence of interruptions. Interruptions whose status and nature vary considerably. (p. 4)

Foucault (1972), in other words, was concerned not with the stability of growth and development throughout history, but rather he was interested in where history shifted and changed, as well as what conditions led to that shift. The development of the Student Learning Discourse is a shift such as those to which Foucault referred, and it shifted the

way in which Student Affairs operates and relates to Academic Affairs. As Chapter 2 showed, the Student Learning Discourse altered the way that Student Affairs was able to position itself as a partner to Academic Affairs and therefore attempted to change the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Foucault (1977/1980c) argued that in examining history, he was attempting to “reverse the mode of analysis” (p. 95) that dominated historical work, and genealogy serves as a tool for sifting through history without the presumptions of sustained evolution and progression to which a typical historical analysis might lead.

Using Foucault’s concept of a genealogy as a guide within a poststructural framework, I investigated the historical conditions of the presently dominant discourse in Student Affairs, that of the Student Learning Discourse. Below, I outline the purpose of applying a genealogy to examine power relations and the Student Learning Discourse, how I applied genealogy to this rupture to discover texts that are appropriate to examine, and how I used those texts to analyze the conditions that created and the effects of the Student Learning Discourse.

The purpose of applying genealogy. The goal of my project was to investigate the historical conditions that have led to the deployment of the Student Learning Discourse for Student Affairs in higher education; this investigation examined the effects and products of power/knowledge relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and how those relations led to the development of the Student Learning Discourse. Applying the work of Foucault to higher education is a rich and multifaceted process that could not be predestined. As Gannon and Davies (2011) reminded us, the adaptability and flexibility of poststructuralism also makes it “difficult to define discrete

methods for research” (p. 81). The difficulty in applying poststructuralist methods, such as those of Foucault, is its fluidity and nuance, which are also its utility in examining power relations. I am careful not to assume those as limitations (as I will discuss in Chapter 8), and instead I embraced poststructuralism’s resistance to definition and use its shifts to examine the contingencies that led to the emergence of the Student Learning Discourse for Student Affairs.

Poststructuralist methods are fluid, and they are influenced by (as well as influence) “diverse arenas of social and cultural life” (Gannon & Davies, 2001, p. 78). Because the examination of discourse and power relations also encompasses a diverse set of circumstances, using a methodology that embraces this complexity was critical to successfully delving into the history of the presently dominate Student Learning Discourse. Rather than look to a series of rigid methodological pillars, I employed what Foucault would refer to as “gadgets,” or a variety of methodological approaches dependent upon the situation (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). Foucault resisted creating a standalone methodology that would be transferable to works other than his own, instead using these so-called “gadgets” that researchers could transform “to suit the purposes of their individual projects” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 55).

Foucault (1975/1980a) stated that his preference in methodology was simply to “utilise the writers I like” (p. 53) rather than subscribe to a particular method or way of thinking. In general, however, Foucault (1975/1980a) referred to his historical work as a “genealogy of morals” (p. 53). Certainly, the term “genealogy” has since been widely associated with Foucault and is considered one of the major techniques employed by him (Gannon & Davies, 2011; MacLure, 2003). Shumway (1999) described a genealogy as

having a goal to “understand how and why [knowledge] constructs its truth as it does” (p. 86). For Kendall and Wickham (1999), genealogy was an historical exploration with an emphasis on power that makes individuals “feel decidedly uncomfortable by pointing out things about their origins and functions that they would rather remain hidden” (p. 29). Though upon first glance the creation of the Student Learning Discourse seems like a natural development for Student Affairs, the conditions of power/knowledge that led to the dominance of the Student Learning Discourse lend themselves to the genealogical method that Kendall and Wickham described.

Foucault’s genealogical viewpoint does not attempt to encompass a totalizing history that examines all cause and effect; instead it looks to make visible structures of discourse and power through examining how the contingencies formed that led to present conditions (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). Foucault (1980/1991) was not concerned with a holistic viewpoint, saying, “I like to open up a space of research, try it out, and then if it doesn’t work, try again somewhere else” (p. 74). Foucault (1980/1991) wished to examine the transformation of an institution through practices and what made those practices acceptable or not acceptable through whatever entry point he deemed appropriate (i.e., those “ruptures” in the historical timeline and discourse).

I worked with this Foucauldian concept of a genealogy and variable entry points, examining historical events in order to reveal the constructs of power/knowledge in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Because the historical context of the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs directly affects their interactions today, genealogy provides a tool for examining how those relationships have been forged, providing what Foucault (1977) referred to as a “history of the present”

(p. 31). What the past can tell us is critical to uncovering the current state of power/knowledge and discourse for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Genealogy and discursive considerations. Any discussion of power relations through genealogy is dependent upon discourse because “discourses make visible the ways in which values, beliefs, customs (and so on) become normalized and normalizing” (Jackson, 2010, p. 73). As MacLure (2003) stated, “there is no direct access to reality outside of discourse” (p. 180), and therefore it would be impossible to examine any relationship without considering discourse. Gee (1992) informed us that discourses and definitions are not natural or inherent, but rather are created and must embody some constructed knowledge or power relation. Because of the development of the current discourse through power, it would be impossible to examine one without the other. Discourses represent not only what is said, but also what can be said by creating a set of cultural practices or regulations in which everyone must fit (MacLure, 2003). In other words, discourses “produce ‘acceptable’ and ‘normal’ rules that make possible certain activities, beliefs, and desires” (Jackson, 2010, p. 74). For instance, my experience with the reprimand for using the word “dorm” is representative of a discursive rule structure.

I employed genealogy to reveal the conditions that led to the deployment of the Student Learning Discourse in order to examine the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. My primary mode of examination for this genealogy was to analyze discourse, its development, and its effects in order to investigate power/knowledge in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs; I worked to uncover how power/knowledge is produced and employed in this relationship. In order to identify and analyze discourse within a genealogical framework, I worked

through a Foucauldian notion of discourse analysis. Kendall and Wickham (1999) helpfully provided a basic outline of such an analysis and what is required to apply Foucault's methods:

- 1) the recognition of a discourse as a corpus of 'statements' whose organisation is regular and systematic.

The subsequent steps cannot be taken until this one has been safely negotiated, for they related to the fact that in being regular and systematic discourses have rules. These remaining four steps are steps of rule identification. They are:

- 2) the identification of rules of the production of statements;

- 3) the identification of rules that delimit the sayable (which of course are never rules of closure);

- 4) the identification of rules that create the spaces in which new statements can be made;

- 5) the identification of rules that ensure that a practice is material and discursive at the same time. (p. 42)

Kendall and Wickham's (1999) framework for the discourse analysis provided me with a set of guiding, yet unrestrictive, tenets that helped me follow the development of discourse through various types of historical texts. While Kendall and Wickham focused on the identification of discourse, Jackson (2010) employed Foucault's methods by searching for strategies and practices that organized and deployed discourse. By both identifying discourse and examining the strategies and practices surrounding its implementation in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, I was

better able to address the notion of power/knowledge present in the relationship and produced by discourse.

In “Two Lectures,” Foucault (1977/1980c) also offered a series of methodological considerations for applying genealogical methods to historical contingencies. First, Foucault (1977/1980c) posited that it is important to “try to locate power at the extreme points of its exercise” (p. 97). In other words, it is not enough to examine power from the top-down or where it obviously is taking place; instead, researchers should look to how power affects all individuals within the discourse. Though Foucault used the word “extreme” here, his meaning (through translation) is “extremities,” and I refer to power relations as taking place in the extremities of the field throughout this research. Second, and related to the first, Foucault (1977/1980c) reminded us that we should not be concerned with conscious possession of power and we should rather look to “where [power] installs itself and produces its real effects” (p. 97). Foucault (1977/1980c) looked to the subjects of power rather than those who may wield power, as is commonly done in historical pieces. These methodological considerations are the reason I have included my own story and the power considerations of my personal history, and they also serve as a reminder to look at the local products and catalysts for national or field-wide discourses.

A third methodological consideration Foucault (1977/1980c) provided is that we must be mindful that power “is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation” (p. 98). Here, Foucault again reminded us that power is not a top-down phenomenon and that when we investigate discourse, we have to keep in mind that power circulates texts and discourse rather than determines them. Foucault’s (1977/1980c) fourth methodological consideration from “Two Lectures” was that we could not examine

power through deductive reasoning; that is to say, we should not attempt to trace the source of power and look to its effects. Foucault stated that we have to “conduct an *ascending* analysis of power” (p. 99), which follows Foucault’s (1981/1991) notion of an inverted, or reverse, approach to historical analysis.

Foucault’s (1977/1980c) methodological considerations are a critical lens through which to use Kendall and Wickham’s (1999) strategies for discourse analysis. Foucault (1977/1980c) was careful to outline these methodological considerations specifically in relation to genealogy because of the tendency for historical work to become deductive and deterministic. In examining the development of the Student Learning Discourse and power/knowledge relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, using Foucault’s considerations as my dominant lens helped me to employ the various methodological tools and approaches needed to delve into historical texts without becoming trapped by dominant ways of knowing. Therefore, the discursive considerations in this section situate the use of the methods I present below. Additionally, they focused on the necessity of fluidity and flexibility in applying a strategy as nuanced and layered as genealogy.

Applying genealogy. I have outlined the conceptual framework through which I operate, as well as presented an overview of the genealogical viewpoint and how that has framed my method. In this section, I discuss how I began the genealogy, searched for texts and new avenues of discovery, and analyzed documents and discourses with which I came into contact. Through using these methods, I aimed to produce a genealogical “history of the present” (Foucault, 1977, p. 31) of the Student Learning Discourse to

examine the power/knowledge relations that circulate among Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Discovering ruptures: where to begin. Deciding how to begin this genealogy was both a critical step and a trap. As Foucault (1972) expressed in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, the usefulness of a genealogy is through its ability to avoid being deterministic. I could not, therefore, just begin at the supposed birth of the field of Student Affairs and trace its development to the Student Learning Discourse through time. Viewing history in this form would limit the ability to see those ruptures, or shifts in practice, which would help me to understand the power relations present between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Foucault (1980/1991), in talking about his method, noted, “there is no schema” (p. 85) to his work.

Foucault (1980/1991) went on to describe that while historians focused on society and its progression, they were irritated by his research because his work with discourse had no specific structure meant to determine a new scheme or validate or invalidate an existing schema. Because genealogy avoids the so-called “natural” progression of society, deciding where to begin is a question that can always remain fluid. Hunt and Wickham (1994) believed that power can be found where knowledge is available and that we can best see power in action by “elaborating the complex relations between definite institutions and available knowledge” (p. 91). Hunt and Wickham (1994) also acknowledged that there will always be unavailable knowledge that is hidden, obscured, or otherwise inaccessible, but that by beginning with what is available and teasing it out, the products of power can be revealed.

Hunt and Wickham (1994), in the footsteps of Foucault, seemed to embrace the idea of starting with one strand and seeing how it connects. Because a genealogy is not about determinism (Kendall & Wickham, 1999), the logic of a progression is not important; instead, the focus is on the circumstances that allow a rupture to occur and the discourse that surrounds those circumstances. For this reason, Foucault (1977/1980c) referred to genealogy as an “anti-science” (p. 83) where he would “reverse the mode of analysis” (p. 95). If I were to begin, as Foucault (1977/1980c) cautioned in “Two Lectures,” with the effects of power rather than to search for its source, then a production of power would be a useful starting point.

For this project, I therefore chose the starting point of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), which is a public document written in collaboration by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and College Student Personnel International (then known as the American College Personnel Association [ACPA]). Together, these two groups serve as the two primary professional organizations for the field of Student Affairs. Their collaboration on this document is significant because such organized collaboration on a major statement is not overly commonplace. These two organizations also represent the overwhelming majority of the field, and they are positioned to create policy and vision for Student Affairs.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) is an example of one of the ruptures about which Foucault spoke. The document itself noted that it is serving to challenge and change the progression of Student Affairs:

The purpose of this document is to re-examine some of the widely accepted ideas about conventional teaching and learning, and to question whether organizational

patterns in higher education support student learning and development in today's environment. The need to do so is clear: few of the social, economic, cultural, political, and pedagogical conditions and assumptions that framed the structures and methods of our modern universities remain unchanged. (p. 1)

This document went on to challenge both assumptions about students and about the ways in which learning should occur. Primary among those challenges was that this document addressed the role of Student Affairs in student learning. Student Affairs has undoubtedly shifted its understanding of its role in higher education throughout time, but what circumstances led to the creation of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and the shift to the Student Learning Discourse? The general historical overview and logical assumptions paint it as a natural progression, yet *Learning Reconsidered* emerged in 2004 as a major shift in how Student Affairs presented itself and its relationship with Academic Affairs; for example, *Learning Reconsidered* opened by addressing what the term "learning" should be and used a definition that strongly brought Student Affairs into the fold of learning:

Learning Reconsidered defines *learning* as a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates *academic learning* and *student development*, processes that have often been considered separate, and even independent of each other. (p. 2)

As a rupture, the field working to shift not only its role and the discourse surrounding itself but also to attempt to shift the definition of "learning" itself served as a significant effect of the power and a good starting place for this genealogy. Kendall and Wickham (1999) stated that power, its practices, and its effects could not be made into a

snapshot; they are an ongoing process. Because of this assertion, it is important to note that there could be an infinite number of entry points to a genealogy. Because genealogy is a fluid mode of investigation, starting with *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was only one way to begin. In thinking with the idea of genealogy as a history of the present, however, *Learning Reconsidered* offered a starting point for examining the present dominant discourse. The questions surrounding how this document was created, what led to its existence, and the effects of its existence are those pieces of available knowledge that can be expanded upon to view the power/knowledge doublet in action through the Student Learning Discourse in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Working with texts. In the above section, I explained how I decided to begin my genealogy. In this section, I detail how I interacted with *Learning Reconsidered* (2004) to expand my body of knowledge for my power analysis, as well as how I discovered other texts to improve the quality of the genealogy which I developed. Because my analysis and interactions are interwoven with my method, I continue to discuss this process as I introduce my analysis in Chapter 4.

Examining texts for power. In order to better understand how power functions in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, I began by asking *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) questions related to its existence. The questions that I developed are derived from Lindsey Prior's (2004) "Doing Things with Documents" and Paul Atkinson and Amanda Coffey's (2004) "Analysing Document Realities." I chose these two works to develop my questions because the approach to document analysis presented in both of these works is amenable to a Foucauldian

analysis through their fluidity and richness. As Prior (2004) mentioned, documents are often only considered for their content, but, “one interesting feature of documents in action is their tendency to exhibit what we might call such ‘monster-like’ qualities” (p. 77). In other words, documents can take on agency and run rampant on one’s ideas of where a project should go.

Documents, as considered by both Prior and to Atkinson and Coffey, are entities that have a dual role; not only are they content, but they are agents “always open to manipulation” (Prior, 2004, p. 75). Although they have content, this content might serve as not only what it says on its face, but also as a strategy or representation of an ideal rather than a reality (Atkinson & Coffey, 2004). There was a skepticism and curiosity surrounding documents that these authors bring to the way they investigate, and those pieces were useful in expanding my genealogy and keeping my method fluid. I also derived these questions through the methodological considerations of Kendall and Wickham (1999), Jackson (2010), and Foucault (1977/1980c) discussed above. I used the following questions to guide the interactions in my genealogy:

1. What processes or circumstances (i.e., power relations) produced this document?
2. What is the function of this document?
3. What are the effects of this document?
4. What knowledge is produced by this document and its relevance to the Student Learning Discourse?
5. How does this document influence the sayable? What does it silence?

6. How does this document function as a power/knowledge strategy in Student Affairs or higher education?

Through this series of questions, I was able to open up *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to provide more avenues for discovering the nature of power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. I then was able to trace additional documents using the same questions to begin to better see the deployment of discourse through this rupture and shift in the Student Affairs timeline. I did leave open the possibility to address additional questions as I discovered more documents, and those considerations are present in my analysis in Chapter 4, 5, 6, and 7; the nature of a genealogy is that I could not predetermine its outcomes and different subsets of questions may always become necessary throughout a project such as this in order to examine the products of power more clearly. I began, however, with these questions to expand my data set for analysis of my research questions related to how Student Affairs is positioned in its relationship with Academic Affairs.

Finding additional texts. Though a genealogy is fluid and brought me to unexpected points of analysis, it was important to have a strategy for discovering additional documents. Again, I turned to the lessons from Atkinson and Coffey (2004), who help to outline some qualitative strategies for finding documents. Atkinson and Coffey focused on a document's intertextuality; as they put it:

Documents do not stand alone. They do not construct systems or domains of documentary reality as individual, separate activities. Documents refer—however tangentially or at one removed—to other realities and domains. They also refer to *other* documents. (p. 66-67)

About what Atkinson and Coffey (2004) spoke, of course, is in line with MacLure's (2003) understanding that nothing operates in a vacuum or separate from discourse. Everything remains bundled, supposedly natural realities with discursive realities. Atkinson and Coffey (2004) recommended conducting an "audit" to "establish the extent of these relationships and intertextualities" (p. 67). By noting where a document mentions other documents, events, or individuals, we can open up other points for analysis. Additionally, looking at how a document has been produced reveals other historical moments or documents for review. These strategies helped to better examine the rupture that created the Student Learning Discourse rather than focusing exclusively on documents such as *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004).

I used such an audit to help discover what other avenues through which my genealogy expanded. Using an audit in combination with my analysis revealed the intersections and echoes of discourse and power throughout the development of the Student Learning Discourse. Auditing also helped create robustness in my discussion of power relations, and the investigation of additional texts assisted in answering the above document analysis questions as well. In *Qualitative Research Design*, Maxwell (2005) argued that this method of expanding the documents investigated also "reduces the risk of chance associations" (p. 112). As the circumstances surrounding the creation of the Student Learning Discourse are made more visible, so is the concept of power/knowledge in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Other considerations. In attempting to manage a project that was designed to avoid predictability or predestination, one of the biggest challenges I faced was in ensuring that my interaction with the documents and my analysis of power relations was

one of authenticity. I incorporated a few strategies to make visible my thought processes in working with this project. Maxwell (2005), in *Qualitative Research Design*, outlined such a strategy known as memo writing. Maxwell discussed memos as a chance to reflect on and informally think in an analytical way about data. Creswell (2012), too, discussed the importance of self-notes during the data collection process. By collecting this personal information in addition to what I gathered from my documents, I was better able to understand and discuss my own influence on this project and the creation of its analysis. Evidence of these memos and musings is present throughout my interactions in my analysis in Chapters 4 through 7.

My very background and existence in creating this project is dependent on the power/knowledge workings between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, so it is both appropriate and necessary to bring those considerations into my writing about the relationship. I am an effect of power and I affect power in this relationship myself, and the strategies that Maxwell (2005) and Creswell (2012) described helped me to better navigate how this relationship matters to this project. The evidence of this consideration is primarily seen in Chapter 8.

As Maxwell (2005) stated, bias is present in any qualitative work. I have aimed to make my bias and my thoughts visible throughout my research project through including my background in addition to the documents I analyzed, rather than attempting to set my theory forth as objective truth, so that my readers may see the workings of power/knowledge. Maxwell described this approach to bias as ensuring that both the reader and I understand how I am influencing the work and how that influence interferes with the quality of my data.

The use of this self-notes strategy to examine my own background and story throughout this project enriched my deconstruction of power/knowledge as well, which allowed for me to present a better analysis and provide a genealogy that appropriately investigates the rupture of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and its surrounding discursive context.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I laid out my conceptual framework and its relation to discourse and power, as well as an understanding of Foucault's concept of genealogy, the utility of applying a genealogy to approach my research questions, and my modes of research to use genealogy in this project. In the next four chapters, I discuss my analysis using my interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and other documents through this framework and method. As I outlined in this chapter, the method that I used for this project is one that relies of adaptability to the subject matter and the productive nature of discourse. My analysis in Chapters 4 through 7 reflects that and attempts to bridge my interactive process to the conclusions I make in Chapter 8.

Chapter 4: Interactions with *Learning Reconsidered*

In the preceding chapters, I outlined the progression of Student Affairs from a traditionally historical perspective. In the next four chapters, I rethink that history by applying the methods I describe in Chapter 3. By applying Foucault's notion of a genealogy to the history of Student Affairs, I reexamine the presently dominant Student Learning Discourse, its formation and deployment in relation to the rupture of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), and the implications that discourses have on the discursive positionings of Student Affairs (as well as the implications Student Affairs has on the discourses present). As I discussed in Chapter 3, the purpose of applying a genealogical method is to question the common sense surrounding the development of Student Affairs as a field and its shifts into talking about itself as an institution of Student Learning, rather than Student Services or Student Development.

I chose to separate my analysis into four chapters in order to explore the discursive strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). In this chapter, I focus first on my overall interaction with *Learning Reconsidered* through the methods described in Chapter 3. I provide an overview of my interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* to both highlight my methodology and to provide context for my mode of analysis and the individual strategies at play.

In Chapters 5, 6, and 7, I then investigate each of the individual prominent discursive strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), the conditions that led to

their development and deployment and the products of these strategies. With *Learning Reconsidered* as the starting rupture for this genealogy, I am mindful that my analysis sprawls both chronologically forward and backwards in time. Separating my analysis further into the three chapters that follow my interactions will allow me to make more visible the implementation and operation of the discursive strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* and the related practices by Student Affairs professionals in the field.

For my analysis in the proceeding chapters, I examine, as outlined in Chapter 3, documents related to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) in addition to the discourses in and surrounding that document itself in order to investigate the discursive deployments of the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered*. In this chapter, however, I begin by discussing my process of document interaction for this research and my close reading of *Learning Reconsidered*. This chapter follows through *Learning Reconsidered* in the order it was presented, thereby serving as a structural signpost for the analyses that follow. Because the following chapters of analysis move in a number of directions, I find it important to first examine how *Learning Reconsidered* was presented to its audiences because that dictated the process of my interactions. These interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* serve as the basis for my in depth analysis presented in the following chapters.

Examining My Process for Interactions

In Chapter 3, I discussed my method of document analysis as a genealogy that would attempt to “reverse the mode of analysis” (Foucault, 1977/1980c, p. 77) of a standard historical review. In this section, I expand on how my method and analytical thought processes are intertwined in order to continue to provide context for my

discussion of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and the discursive strategies and practices it perpetuates.

To enable this reverse analysis, I conducted the process of interacting with my documents and asking them questions. The purpose of doing so is to resist the urge to look for logical progressions and get caught into the same web of assumptions that the traditional history and literature review in Chapter 2 already take into account. Foucault (1980/1991) told us that his preferred method was to investigate at a particular research space within a history to find something that provided opportunities for analysis and discovery. Like Foucault, I chose a particular space to start, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), and moved to my interactions through it.

For these interactions, I conducted close readings of this document and the related documents with the questions from my methods in mind. I worked from Kendall and Wickham's (1999) discourse analysis guidelines that I discussed in Chapter 3. Of those, I found myself repeatedly focused on two tenets in particular; those tenets were the steps for identifying "rules of the production of statements" and "rules that delimit the sayable" (p. 42). In other words, I found myself focusing on how these documents influenced what Student Affairs professionals would (and could) say or not say about their profession and their relationship with Academic Affairs within higher education, as well as how they acted and interacted across higher education.

Additionally, I conducted my close reading through the questions I outlined in Chapter 3 to ask each of my documents. Those questions were as follows:

1. What processes or circumstances (i.e., power relations) produced this document?

2. What is the function of this document?
3. What are the effects of this document?
4. What knowledge is produced by this document and its relevance to the Student Learning Discourse?
5. How does this document influence the sayable? What does it silence?
6. How does this document function as a power/knowledge strategy in Student Affairs or higher education?

For the examination of the conditions that led to the formation of the discourse in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), I found myself most focused on asking my documents what power relations produced them, how the documents functioned (discursively and physically), how the documents influenced what was sayable, and how the documents function as (or in implementing) discursive strategies for Student Affairs.

With these questions, however, I maintained the flexibility necessary to allow for the genealogy to grow in whatever directions it needed to. My goal through this process of document questioning was to use discourse to examine “where [power] installs itself” (Foucault, 1977/1980c, p. 97) and how power operates at the smallest extremities of the Student Affairs/Academic Affairs relationship. By focusing on how these discursive practices and strategies influence where and how power operates as part of these relations, my aim is to reveal where power and knowledge influence each other and how these power relations determines Student Affairs’s positionality in higher education. Below, I discuss the discourse within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), and those interactions serve as the starting node for my discussion of the dominant strategies within the document.

A note on interactions with documents. Because my analysis is also a document analysis and focused on document interaction and not discussions with individuals, it also important to understand how these documents are and are not windows into not only discursive strategies deployed by these documents, but also practices performed and perpetuated by members of the field. Not all of the documents I investigated are focused on policy change or creation; as I referenced in Chapter 2, many of the works on Student Affairs are focused on so-called “best practices” (itself a vague concept) and reveal what campuses and individuals are doing in relation to the larger discursive picture. Organizations within the field also reveal practices through their influence, and the combination of these sources feed back into the strategies present in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and other documents.

I also am careful not to view relying on document analysis a limitation. Remembering Foucault’s (1977/1980h) assertions that it is impossible to see everything within a discursive web, my focus on practices is to look, as Jackson (2010) put it, at how these practices “animate” (p. 76) the discursive strategies present. The notion of “best practices” is so widespread in Student Affairs that understanding how those documented “best practices” feed back into the discursive strategies presented in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and other documents helps illuminate how Student Affairs is discursively positioned and how it positions itself.

Interactions with *Learning Reconsidered*

As I stated in Chapter 3, I chose *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as my starting point of analysis because it serves as a rupture in the discursive history of Student Affairs. In this section, I discuss the interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* that led to

my analysis. I started my genealogy with a rupture, because, as Foucault (1972) notes, we should not attempt to look for a gradual shift in thought but instead look to where there is a disruption in history. The switch to redefine “learning” that takes place in *Learning Reconsidered* is such an interruption for the history of Student Affairs (though not one without overlaps from the past), and the introduction of shifts such as *Learning Reconsidered* is fertile ground for the investigation of discourse.

In particular, the writing of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) is focused on the discourse of Student Affairs and the perceived need to redefine a word with a long, historical progression in the field of education. Because my aim is to use discourse to examine power relations, starting with a document at least somewhat aware of its impact on the discursive realities of the field provides many avenues to further investigate the shifts in the discursive schema of higher education and the subjectivities and positionality of Student Affairs. My examination of *Learning Reconsidered* as a rupture falls in line with Foucault’s (1978/1990) desire to reject traditional historical analysis and to reverse the way we look at history.

The false agency of working with documents. In this chapter, I detail what I have found from my interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and how I view those interactions through a Foucauldian lens. In my interactions, however, I have applied a sort of “false agency” to *Learning Reconsidered* in order to assist in my interactions. The document of course has no agency in a humanist sense, but it has, discursively, discovered a life of its own through the strategies deployed within it. The notion of applying a humanistic element to the field is one that I investigate further through my analysis of the discourses of *Learning Reconsidered*. Many of the strategies

present within *Learning Reconsidered* are based in a humanist mindset that would create Student Affairs as a singular entity with a notion of identity and a goal of equity with its partner, Academic Affairs (also given a sense of agency and identity by the discourse of Student Affairs).

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004), as a document, is the product of an editor and members of the field, but looking at the discursive contexts of Student Affairs, it does have an impact and is also a response to actions and writings in the field. Its products and the conditions that led to the deployment of the discourses within it are not humanistic, but the tone and structure of the way the discourse is designed to create a sense of identity to the field, as I discuss further in my analysis chapters. Applying this false agency to *Learning Reconsidered* allows me to ask questions and see how the discourses deployed operate and attempt to create a humanistic sense of identity within the realm of higher education. With that understanding in mind, I refer to *Learning Reconsidered* as “doing things,” because while I am not attempting to view the underlying intentions of its authors or history, I am interested in how the strategies perpetuate a sense of identity and how Student Affairs is positioned. This tactic within my method allows me to better investigate how this document interacts with the practices of the field and how its strategies are deployed.

The content and context of *Learning Reconsidered*. *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) purported to “re-examine some widely accepted ideas about conventional teaching and learning” (p. 1) and was thusly at least somewhat self-aware of its place in the overall discourse of Student Affairs (or perhaps anticipated its future place). In thinking with Jackson’s (2010) idea of searching for strategies that deploy discourse, it

becomes apparent that *Learning Reconsidered* can be seen as a strategy in the discursive positioning of Student Affairs itself (and contains multiple smaller strategies within it that all contribute to the overall goal of its authors and the field). To begin my analysis of *Learning Reconsidered*, I start by moving through my interactions and close reading of the document.

Continuity and Discontinuity. *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) pitted itself as both a natural progression in the field of Student Affairs with an air of inevitability as well as a revolution. I will use the terms continuity and discontinuity in my analysis to represent how *Learning Reconsidered* both resists and embraces the dominant discursive schema that conditioned it. When I refer to *Learning Reconsidered* acting from an air of continuity, I am referencing how the authors have discursively positioned it as the next document in a long line of progressive thought (and the presumed history of the field). When I refer to it instead as positioning itself as discontinuity and resistance, I am referencing the opposite discursive maneuvers, whereby it attempts to break with tradition and what has become before.

Of course, *Learning Considered* (Keeling, 2004) did not reference itself in either of these ways, but these concepts are useful in understanding the tone of the document at different times and the choices of its wordings. The effect of *Learning Reconsidered* using these two discursive tactics as part of its strategy is that it could both invigorate and motivate, without alienating. In a field as wide and diverse as Student Affairs (and in wanting to partner across higher education with an even larger and more diverse group encompassing all postsecondary educators), it follows that any document meant both to reframe a debate and to become a new discursive node from which Student Affairs could

balance itself and present as both new and inevitable. Through this balancing, Student Affairs could then also present a singular identity, coalescing the discourses of the past.

The presentation of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was based in an understanding of the diffuse nature of power in higher education. Foucault (1975/1980a) understood that power in universities was spread due to the disparity in the professoriate collective, and that idea of diffusion continues out of Academic Affairs and into the university as a whole as well. The very idea that *Learning Reconsidered* would need to work as both a continuity and a discontinuity is a response to the power relations present at the time of its creation. As I discussed in Chapter 2, the Student Development and Student Services discourses have never died out and compete with the idea of Student Learning. For *Learning Reconsidered* to have major impact on the discursive landscape of higher education, it would have to appeal across discourses and history.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) worked toward the feat of being both continuous and discontinuous by citing that it both “builds upon” and “is different from” (p. 1) previous statements. In Chapter 5, I further examine the notions of continuity and discontinuity through the previous statements that *Learning Reconsidered* references. *Learning Reconsidered* both “present[ed] the current and future *praxis* of student affairs and affirm[ed] the commitments of student affairs to educating the whole student” (p. 1). In other words, *Learning Reconsidered* was speaking to multiple audiences. As a rupture, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was faced with practices of resistance and the overlapping (and often competing) discursive nodes from which Student Affairs has operated (and continues to operate).

Throughout *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), it continued to shift back and forth from that discontinuous standpoint to the discourse of inevitability and continuity. Over the next few sections of the document, the authors discussed what *Learning Reconsidered* describes as both dramatic and gradual changes in the American college landscape. The strategy in taking the time to look at these changes was to create an assumption of continuity. In other words, because colleges and students continue to change, professionals and faculty need to continue to change as well. Coming after the new definition of learning presented previously in the document, these sections move forward with a strategy to connect that discontinuous definition of “learning” to the idea of a natural, continuous progression. *Learning Reconsidered* was presented as both new and not new.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) sustained throughout the document its deftly balance of its newness with its idea of a continuous progression. While it challenged the systems of thought currently in place by attesting that students are suddenly different and our understanding of their education needed to change, it also aligned itself with theorists (Kegan and Baxter Magolda amongst those most cited) and a long line of documents previously about learning and student development. I discuss these documents—*The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996), *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997), *Powerful Partnerships* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998), and *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002)—in greater detail in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 in order to examine how the discursive strategies presented in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) were informed and conditioned by the discursive environment these documents perpetuated.

I also examine how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) folded back into some of the discourses present in those documents and perpetuated the discourses of which it is apart. Though *Learning Reconsidered* was pitted as discontinuous, it was produced not just by conditions of the practice of Student Affairs, but also by the discursive strategies present in these documents it cites.

Both prior to the creation of this document and after, the field of Student Affairs has been diverse in how they approach their work. As I stated in Chapter 2, many Student Affairs professionals continued to return to the Student Services Discourse in order to justify their existence and funding even as the groundwork for the Student Learning Discourse was being laid (Hartley, 2001). But *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) also had to address resistance from Academic Affairs and all of the strategies and tactics it employs are in an attempt to speak to each of these audiences in attempt to bridge them for additional cohesion in the working relationships across higher education. In Chapter 5, I discuss and analyze the strategy involved in approaching the field as both a continuity and discontinuity further based on this portion of my interactions of the other interactions to which these led me.

Learning and development. *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) seemed to have acknowledged that statements about Student Affairs have been made in the past, but it did so in an attempt to bridge the past to the future. The document went on to redefine “learning” as “*academic learning and student development*, processes that have often been considered separate, and even independent of each other” (p. 2). This definition is key to how *Learning Reconsidered* operated as a rupture because, as I looked at in Chapter 2, the Student Development Discourse was the previously dominant discourse

for the field of Student Affairs prior to the rise of the Student Learning Discourse. Because the Student Development Discourse led to an “us versus them” mentality (Doyle, 2004), part of this strategy was to eliminate that separation, all the while attempting to bring along audiences who were positioned by the Student Development Discourse so that *Learning Reconsidered* could have the maximum possible audience.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) removed the idea of development from the equation actively, stating, “We do *not* say *learning and development* because we do not want to suggest that learning and student development are fundamentally different thing” (p. 2). Within the first paragraph of the Preface to *Learning Reconsidered*, it attempted to wash away that previously dominant discourse altogether. (We will see, however, that it does not completely abandon “develop” even as it did this, as a strategy to continue to speak to that audience.)

This notion of eliminating “development” is representative of the portion of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) that was based in discontinuity. The reframing of the “learning” definition gave Student Affairs professionals a new tool from which to justify their existence and their equality at the institutional level. Now that Student Affairs could consider “learning” and “development” the same thing from a discursive standpoint, it reframed the discourse to place Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as the same rather than pitting them against each other or organizing them into a hierarchy.

In thinking with Foucault’s concept of power/knowledge again, *Learning Reconsider’s* (Keeling, 2004) strategies were a product of the power relations created over time between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. These power relations led to the creation of this new definition of learning. The “us versus them” mentality of the

Student Development Discourse produced a definition of learning that would eliminate that mentality. Similarly, this discourse and redefinition was designed to produce new possibilities for the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

In looking to how the power relations position Student Affairs discursively, the strategies of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) were designed to actively reposition Student Affairs to be on equal footing with Academic Affairs and therefore better able to partner for student success. The use of both “learning” and “development” was a strategy design to perpetuate the notions of identity and equity that Student Affairs (represented by this document) wanted to present to alter the discursive environment. I discuss the strategy of using “learning” and “development” further in Chapter 6.

Collapsing “learning” into “development.” Circularly, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) pointed to its own definition of learning, saying, “Our understanding...of learning itself, has also changed...The new concept of *learning* recognizes the essential integration of personal development with learning” (p. 3). This statement was a discursive product of the power relations previously, and it was worded quite dexterously as well. Not only did it continue to point to the discontinuous nature of the document, but also it was discursively designed to state that this new understanding of learning is something outside the control of its audience.

By stating that the field has a changing understanding of learning, it avoids the notion that people in the field may have been doing things wrong before. This self-analysis is a response to some of the documents that *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) discusses in the document as part of the conditions for its existence (which I discuss in the following analysis chapters), referencing both that these have created the

circumstances for this document to exist and that this concept is innovative and somewhat unexpected. For the positionality of Student Affairs, *Learning Reconsidered* views a holistic sense of identity to be necessary in order to shift the power relations with Academic Affairs; as a strategy, the combination of speaking from continuous and discontinuous perspectives, as well as acknowledging and using ideas of both “learning” and “development” were critical in order to impact the largest audience.

Much of *Learning Reconsidered's* content (Keeling, 2004) was spent on the concept of learning and tying learning to what has traditionally been called “development” by Student Affairs professionals (here called “educators,” which I will discuss further in Chapter 6). While this document redefined “learning,” it again went to great lengths to present that “the nature of learning was probably not changed, but our understanding of the learning process has changed significantly” (p. 10). In other words, not only was Student Affairs now an important an integral part of the “learning” process, it had always been, but the field just had not realized it. *Learning Reconsidered* even went as far as to state that, “we must give priority to identity development” (p. 10). The previously dominant Student Development Discourse was rooted in identity development theories, such as the work of Chickering cited in Chapter 2. Therefore, this language operates to produce a Student Affairs that has priority within the realm of higher education.

The failings of traditional education. As I discussed above, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) had previously redefined learning in the document to include Student Affairs, and now the focus on bringing back “development” as the most import function of learning was a bold step and, as a discursive strategy, was designed to

give weight to practicing Student Affairs professionals. Because the research presented in this document now backed that traditional education was not going to produce learning in the way the changing demographics of the college world needed, positioning Student Affairs differently in the higher education hierarchy could help universities help their students succeed.

It is not surprising, then, that the document continues to explore the failings of traditional education. In developing a discursive strategy, the notion of failure is critical to the idea of giving priority to development because, though the tone of the document was not one that was overtly negative towards Academic Affairs, it did challenge the notion that Academic Affairs could solely provide successful education because such an education would not be holistic. As *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) stated, “The curriculum is usually structured around conventional categories that are meaningful to the academy, but it does not necessarily address issues that are meaningful to students” (p. 8). It was key to the discursive shift to redefine “learning” not just from a positive, inclusive vein, but also from one that distances itself from negatives. By contrasting the negatives of general education with the positive research cited on holistic education, *Learning Reconsidered* again pushed the need for a definition of “learning” that includes “development.” *Learning Reconsidered* had to walk the line between discontinuity and continuity here again as well, as it was careful to state that education needed to change because our student demographic had gotten more diverse and more inclusive, not that general education or our current ideals for the academy were bad in any particular way.

Presenting both an inclusive and exclusive definition. Though *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) placed Student Affairs within this definition of “learning”

as opposed to “development,” it was also careful to carve out a specialty for Student Affairs. One of the dangers of becoming inclusive with the definition of learning is that if Academic Affairs was purposed for learning, would this discourse of Student Learning actually eliminate a purpose for Student Affairs? *Learning Reconsidered* countered this idea by strategically and repeatedly calling out “development” as “learning,” despite the notion presented in its Preface that stated it would not separate the two.

For instance, in discussing integrated learning techniques, the document specifically listed opportunities that provide “student learning and development” (Keeling, 2004, p. 23). This comment did not accidentally ignore the previous commitment to abandon the language of development, but instead was presented as part of the overall strategy. In looking back to the idea of resistance from traditional practices and discourses and the need to influence all of Student Affairs, this discursive tactic was designed to give even more weight to Student Affairs within higher education.

Playing both sides of the definitional coin is critical to the success of this document because it needed to both repurpose Student Affairs and to reaffirm Student Affairs. Shifting the word “learning” to be primarily centered around “development” is a discursive tactic employed to give theoretical backing to the practices of professionals in the field working. Thinking with the previous dominant discourses for Student Affairs and the notions of agency and identity, dissolving “development” could be seen as akin to dissolving the identity of the field, and therefore this definitional doublet both reinforces the field’s identity and gives new language with which to speak when a professional is working at his or her individual school.

Audience. In prioritizing the “development” part of “learning,” this document undoubtedly spoke primarily to Student Affairs practitioners more so than to members of Academic Affairs. Though it offered recommendations for higher education, it did so on a broad, reaching scope. This could be for a few reasons. Firstly, Kezar (2001) reminded us that there was a lack of empirical evidence on partnerships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. With *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) positioning itself as a new envisioning of those partnerships, it is not a surprise if there was not yet a lot of concrete evidence to present. Secondly, the document itself noted the diversity of the students of higher education, as well as the field of higher education. Applying a broad hand stroke with recommendations not only would help to ensure universality in the message but also would allow individual practitioners or schools to interpret and act in whatever ways they feel translate best to their schools. Broad recommendations would setup for the strategies to perpetuate the discursive ideas through practices of varying professionals as well.

Another reason the authors of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) may have chosen to focus on Student Affairs primarily was due to its reach. Thinking of this document as both a rupture in the field of Student Affairs and a large-scale discursive strategic node, it is placed within a lineage of other Student Affairs documents. As I detail the development of the dominant strategies within *Learning Reconsidered* in Chapters 5, 6, and 7, the documents leading up to *Learning Reconsidered* do not cross the academic divide, and because of that, the conditions of the discursive environment in which *Learning Reconsidered* was issued would allow it to have impact in the realm of Student Affairs first. The implications from *Learning Reconsidered* rest primarily in the

Student Affairs discourses as well, suggesting that its choice to speak to Student Affairs did produce discursive possibilities and conditions within Student Affairs (but not necessarily across higher education).

In speaking to Student Affairs practitioners first, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) continued to work from two discursive angles. First, it continued to carve out an identity separate from faculty. Second, it set forth a group of broad recommendations to continue to build from the new definition of learning. In order for it to carve out an identity separate from faculty, it worked by both discussing faculty and by continuing to add Student Affairs criteria into the portfolio of what “learning” was.

Flipping the marginalization of Student Affairs. In terms of its tone towards faculty, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was careful, but it was also purposefully distinctive. As I discussed above, in removing the word “development,” Student Affairs was in danger of having its identity swallowed by an idea of “learning” that would only include Academic Affairs. When speaking of faculty, *Learning Reconsidered* works from the perspective of needing “to provide support” and to work as “accessible and flexible consultants, advisors and resources for faculty members” (p. 13). Interestingly, this discourse still posited Student Affairs as a support for faculty rather than a partner or an equal player (in the realm of the Student Services Discourse); however, the distinction was that it did so because faculty did not know how to envision learning or did not have the time because of the demands of a tenure process that did not reward “innovations in pedagogy” (p. 13). Student Affairs presented itself as necessary due to not only the changing college environment, but also because shortcoming that Academic Affairs had when it came to teaching with a holistic idea of learning.

As a strategy, the decision to position Student Affairs in this way is constructed by the practices of the past in the field. Working this new definition of learning back to the Student Services Discourse is critical to the idea of presenting this document as a continuity for the field. Historically, the student services model grew out of a need from academia to have caretakers for the aspects of students that they could no longer control with the restraints on their time (Doyle, 2004). Similarly, the mentality and duality of “learning” and “development” was not yet abandoned, and this document served to build on the work of those practitioners and theorists who were focused on development but did not feel as though Academic Affairs viewed them on equal footing.

And though my analysis is not based in a feminist methodology, I would be amiss not to mention how this documents works from a feminist perspective as well. With the doctrine of *in loco parentis* and the responsibility of schools to care for students, much of the Student Services work was given to women and some of the initial roles of Student Affairs tied to the female gender (Duffy, 2010). Such a binary set up Student Affairs as the caretaker while Academic Affairs was the breadwinner. With the discourse presented in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), Student Affairs, in a sense, turned this dichotomy on its head and posited that the breadwinner was incapable without the caretaker, moving caretaker from a passive, submissive role to one of power.

In thinking about this shift and the way this single instance in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) harkens back to the history of Student Affairs and its progression, the productive nature of it becomes clearer. The historical practices in the relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs placed Student Affairs in a caretaker role and by doing so left open the opportunity to develop a definition of

learning that suggests that learning is not possible without the development that Student Affairs professionals perform. In Chapter 7, I investigate further how the historical development of Student Affairs conditioned a strategy necessitating this discursive shift.

Goals. From this definition and shift in thought about how Student Affairs supports faculty, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) moved from the overall need for providing help to faculty to more concrete learning goals on which faculty need the “expertise of student affairs” (p. 20) to complete. All of these goals included developmental aspects promoted and deployed during the Student Development Discourse. These goals were as follows:

- Engaged citizenship; community service, social justice, and participatory involvement
- Career planning
- Ethical approaches to business, relationships, problem-solving, and conflict
- Practical leadership
- Emotional intelligence
- Critical thinking; evaluating sources of information
- Informed decision-making
- Working in teams and groups; conflict resolution
- Cultural competency and cross-cultural understanding
- Tolerance of ambiguity. (p. 20)

Each of these goals, though they have the potential to be covered in coursework developed by Academic Affairs, are also goals that specifically speak to what Student Affairs professionals value in their own work (or, that is to say, the type of work that is

discursively positioned within the realm of Student Affairs). For instance, many of these goals tied to the developmental theories of Chickering (1974), Astin (1984), and Tinto (1987). The “best practices” referenced by Student Affairs focus on many of the goals listed above, such as ensuring cognitive development, are paired with affective development (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001). *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) continued to expand upon these items throughout the document and the ways in which Student Affairs can involve itself in the learning process under this new, inclusive definition.

As *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) continued to work through and detail the ways in which Student Affairs was critical to learning, it moved from the assisting of faculty in working better towards learning to also creating a system of equivalency, suggesting, for example, “co-curricular transcripts” (p. 27) that could be used to provide a record of outside the classroom learning. This record was an attempt at creating a sense of equity through unifying Student Affairs under an identity of co-curricular learning. My current institution has such a program whereby students can mark off requirements in campus traditions, cultural awareness, wellness, and so on to complete a form much like a degree audit and “earn” a co-curricular diploma that they can cite on their resume.

Perhaps what is most interesting about the strategies deployed by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was its reliance on three major discourses from Student Affairs—presenting itself as a service model, a developmental model, and a learning model. Doing so would allow Student Affairs to meet this new definition of learning from any paradigm or discursive positioning. Because the new idea of “learning” allowed Student Affairs to work from any of those positions, it could be considered an inclusive

way to inspire change and motivate professionals. As a discursive tactic, the subtle use of each of these tools was incredibly dexterous and helped to continue to balance the line between continuity and discontinuity. In Chapter 7, I analyze the relationship between this subtle strategy and its relationship with the ideas of continuity, discontinuity, learning, and development.

Recommendations. One of the final pieces for *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was its inclusion of a series of recommendations. The recommendations are, to me, a somewhat odd inclusion because this document is not particularly comprehensive on any front. At its relatively short length (forty-three pages), it spent most of its time reframing the debate about what “learning” should mean and embody. The recommendations included seemed to focus towards continuing the progression of Student Affairs in this new paradigm. If the Student Learning Discourse was to be the dominant discourse, then *Learning Reconsidered* used these recommendations as guiding posts, much in the way a “suggestions for future research” section might. Additionally, these recommendations continued to reinforce the roles carved out for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in the document previously.

For instance, one of the recommendations included was to have schools “commit to rewarding the development of experiences that combine knowledge acquisition and experiential learning” (Keeling, 2004, p. 33). This recommendation was focused on including Student Affairs and “development” in the reward system, addressing faculty issues and moving faculty to be included in what is traditionally the Student Affairs side of learning. Many of the other recommendations focused on identifying the changing populations of students and working together to address their learning within the context

of this new definition of learning. In a way, these recommendations served to combine everything previous in the document by emphasizing the positives of student development, including student development into “learning,” and, finally, pulling faculty into student development in addition to putting Student Affairs into the world of learning. From these recommendations, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) moved to its conclusion and its restatement that we must reconsider learning in order to better educate students.

Discourses Deployed through *Learning Reconsidered*

The close reading of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) revealed this document to be a complex piece. It is, as Prior (2004) would state, “monster-like” (p. 77). *Learning Reconsidered* is a document I have experienced being often cited by Student Affairs because it reached in all directions. It moved both forward and backwards in time, citing references for the future and from the past, and it also moved both internally in redefining the role of Student Affairs and externally in working with Academic Affairs and beyond. Because of this nature, there are many discursive strategies at play within this document. These strategies are discursive elements and tactics present within *Learning Reconsidered* that serve to shift the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Though I discussed discourse within the document throughout my detailing my interactions above, this chapter has been focused on how the document is constructed and presented and what strategies are built through its presentation. In the next three chapters, I delve deeper into three of the most noticeable and impactful discursive strategies present in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to analyze their production through

discursive conditions and their impact on discourse as it relates to power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. As I discussed at the introduction to this chapter, my purpose in providing the overview of my interactions here is to serve as the basis for and connection to my analysis from my methods. By detailing my process in reading and interacting with *Learning Reconsidered*, I make more visible my process of revealing the discursive strategies contained within *Learning Reconsidered*.

In discussing some of the strategies present within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), it is important to keep in mind that discourses are productive (Kendall & Wickham, 1999). Regardless of intent by the authoring organization or editor, each of these discursive strategies produces subjectivities and discursive positions for Student Affairs, as Student Affairs attempted to synthesize a notion of identity from which to partner in an equitable relationship with Academic Affairs. These strategies are entwined with power because they organize both what is said and what can be said.

I have identified each strategy because they are each part of a process of determining what can be said and not said, done and not done. These strategies created the set of rules for how Student Affairs talked about itself and its relationships, and they were (and are) developed out of the practices of professionals in the field (as well as work to reinforce those). For example, the investment of a professional in providing programs for students focused on emotional intelligence is rooted in a belief that the field is about student development; *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) then perpetuates that understanding of the work and reframes it through changing how the field discusses that type of work. The productive power of *Learning Reconsidered* comes from how it then

impacts how Student Affairs professionals continue to their work, and it adopts these strategic elements to guide discourse in a particular way.

The three primary strategies on which I focus based upon my interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* are (1) the idea of “learning” as both a continuity and a discontinuity, (2) the pitting of learning and development both together and separate, and (3) the inclusion of work with each of the three dominant discourses of Student Affairs. My interactions revealed a lot about the first two dominant strategies in *Learning Reconsidered*, but through my analysis a third strategy with a cyclical relationship to the other two became prominent as well. I have named these three strategies the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, the learning/development doublet, and the three-pronged approach, and I discuss each in depth over the next three chapters.

Chapter 5: The Learning Continuity/Discontinuity Dichotomy

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) incorporated several discursive strategies both as a result of its discursive environment and the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, as well as to affect those power relations and the positioning of Student Affairs discursively. In other words, *Learning Reconsidered* used strategies of discourse conditioned by its discursive surroundings to specifically respond to and impact those conditions. In Chapter 4, I discussed my interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* as a document and how that led to the identification of strategies within the document. These strategies are the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, the learning/development doublet, and the three-pronged approach. In this chapter, I discuss the deployment and ramifications of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy.

The learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy is the most complicated and multifaceted strategy within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). The purpose of this chapter is to approach looking at the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy through my genealogical method. In that sense, Foucault (1970/1973) provided a helpful lens to consider this particular strategy. In *The Order of Things*, Foucault (1970/1973) discussed the idea of continuity as connections between the present and past and the idea of discontinuity as when “things are no longer perceived, described, expressed, characterised, classified, and known” (p. 217) in the same way.

In this chapter, I examine how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) presented a strategy encompassing both continuity and discontinuity and how presenting this dichotomy worked to shift the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Below, I discuss the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy's use in expanding the audience for *Learning Reconsidered*, obfuscating the discourses of Student Affairs, and providing a notion of unity (and a presumed singular identity) to the field of Student Affairs. Each of these three concepts served an intended discursive effect of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy and their impacts were critical to the strategies' effectiveness in shifting the positioning of Student Affairs. Therefore, I conclude this chapter by examining both the development of this strategy and the overall effectiveness of this strategy in repositioning Student Affairs in its relationship with Academic Affairs.

Expanding the Audience of *Learning Reconsidered*

Of *Learning Reconsidered's* (Keeling, 2004) many strategies, the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy is primary and the most critical. It served as a necessary condition for the remainder of the document; without the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, it is hard to see *Learning Reconsidered* developing the conditions for a wide audience and receptiveness. Thinking with Foucault's (1975/1980a) notion of power within a university as being dispersed and diffuse, it follows that creating a document that would be accessible to and influential for a group of professionals as disparate as Student Affairs would be difficult due to the varying nature of their jobs within and across universities.

Although the ideas of continuity and discontinuity sound dialectic in their presentation, the opposite is true in how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) approached continuity. Rather than have ideas of continuity and discontinuity interact and dialogue, *Learning Reconsidered* alternated in how it referred to Student Affairs. In terms of presenting continuity, it repeatedly attempted to create an environment where Student Affairs would be considered to be progressing naturally over the course of its history. Thus, the change in the definition of “learning” could be seen as simply a part of that natural progression. The natural progression and continuity is presented in the repetitive language, such as when *Learning Reconsidered* noted how it “builds upon” (p. 1) previous statements and the work of Student Affairs professionals thus far.

For instance, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) referred to how it “affirms the commitments of Student Affairs” (p. 1), thereby presenting *Learning Reconsidered* as part of a long lineage of Student Affairs documentation. The document continued, stating, “the nature of learning has probably not changed” (p. 10). These phrases are representative of the approach *Learning Reconsidered* took in terms of continuity and are discursive tactics designed to make Student Affairs professionals who encounter the document feel as though this document is not new and is one that not only affirms the place of Student Affairs as a whole, but the place of individual practitioners who are working for partnership with Academic Affairs.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) also referred to the gradual shifts in the college student population, developing an idea that presents the contemporary need to redefine learning as one based in “echoes” (Foucault, 1977/1980f, p. 149) of the past. For example, the document repeatedly referred to the ongoing “diversification of students”

(Keeling, 2004, p. 4) in higher education. This diversification of the study body gradually occurred, as is told in the literature review of Chapter 2, and increasingly has led to “far greater variability in preparedness” (Keeling, 2004, p. 3) for students. Though the shifts in the student population to which *Learning Reconsidered* referred can be interpreted as “new,” placing them in an ongoing lineage of progression “over the past few decades” (Keeling, 2004, p. 2) affirms the idea of continuity and familiarity.

The learning continuity portion of the dichotomy was presented under the “common sense” assumption made in how people generally view history, which is that there would be a consistent “progressive maturation” (Foucault, 1977/1980d, p. 112) throughout history. This side of the dichotomy relied upon the audience’s understanding of the traditional and total histories of which Foucault was weary (and the kind with which people are the most familiar). The implications of the continuity portion of this dichotomy is that it eliminates fear that might be associated with a sudden change or shift in the nature of the work of Student Affairs professionals.

Though *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) presented the continuity and idea of progressive history, it also developed a strategy of discontinuity, to provide a shift in the thought and practices of Student Affairs professionals. Foucault (1977/1980d) noted that these shifts were “not simply new discoveries” (p. 112), though in *Learning Reconsidered* the language alternated between the idea of continuity and progression and “learning” as a new discovery for Student Affairs. Instead, these shifts were actually a “whole new ‘regime’ in discourse and forms of knowledge” (Foucault, 1977/1980d, p. 112). In other words, at the same time that *Learning Reconsidered* presented itself as continuous with its history, it also attempted to usher in a new understanding of

“learning” for professionals. The discontinuity side of its learning dichotomy was built at the same rate at the continuity side, with *Learning Reconsidered* claiming to be “different from” (p. 1) any of the past works discussing the purpose of Student Affairs.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) perpetuates this discontinuity through language opposite the continuity side of the dichotomy. It explicitly states that it “is *not* yet another explication of the philosophy of Student Affairs” (p. 1) in order to set itself apart. While it discussed that the nature of learning hadn’t changed, a function of the continuity portion of the dichotomy, it also carved out a discontinuous statement in concert, stating, “our understanding of the learning process has changed significantly” (p. 10). The implication of this discontinuous statement was that although there was a progression, *Learning Reconsidered* also represented a rupture in that progression

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) also presented the changes in student demographics as a catalyst for change. Though it spoke of the changing demographics in a progressive fashion, it also separately discussed that there were “rapidly changing features, preferences, and needs of students” (p. 6). In this sense, the students coming to college provide the necessary condition for the new schema and new understandings of knowledge in Student Affairs. Whereas latching onto the continuous language would allow for the document to be seen as linear, the discontinuous language also provides the opportunity for *Learning Reconsidered* to emerge as groundbreaking.

It is important to note that this dichotomy can be confusing to follow, because, as I discussed during my interaction in Chapter 4, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) repeatedly used language and tones of language that place it both in a context of continuity and in one of discontinuity. The redefinition of “learning” within the text is

presented both as a “gradual transformation” (Foucault, 1977/1980d, p. 112) and a revolution that “doesn’t follow the smooth, continuist schemas” (Foucault, 1977/1980d, p. 112) of the past progression of Student Affairs literature and history of practices. This dichotomous strategy was built from the disparate histories of how Student Affairs developed and, as I investigated in Chapter 2, the perceived need of Student Affairs to switch paradigms of operation throughout its history between Student Services, Student Development, and Student Learning. This strategy was also purposed to function to appeal to the different parties within Student Affairs who may have developed under one of the aforementioned discursive paradigms in order to maximize the audience for this document and therefore maximize its impact in a unified field.

Being able to appeal to parties partial to both the idea of a natural progression and the creation of vast changes was important to maximize the impact of Student Affairs in an otherwise traditionally marginalized positionality within higher education. *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) even appeared to acknowledge its place in culling the masses of the field, giving a call of arms that states, “Regardless of our past accomplishment or disappointments, we are all, as colleagues and educators, now accountable” (p. 1). While *Learning Reconsidered* played to both sides of this dichotomy, it also worked to push its audience together from those places to this redefinition of “learning.”

The learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy was the strategy by which *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) attempted to center itself discursively. *Learning Reconsidered* served as a Foucauldian (1972) rupture, though it did not present itself as one. Its success as a rupture actually depended upon it walking the line between

presenting as evolution (continuity) and revolution (discontinuity). Its need to appear as both continuity and discontinuity was conditioned through the relations of power in which it was built, necessitating the use of the disparate nature of Student Affairs that resulted from Student Affairs attempting to engage in better relations with Academic Affairs (Foucault, 1977/1980d).

In the simplest terms, this discursive strategy of continuity and discontinuity is an example of the oxymoronic “new and improved” statement. The reason for it was the fractured nature of Student Affairs as a field, with disparate and diffuse operations and operating from multiple frameworks. In its relationship with Academic Affairs, Student Affairs historically operated within the margins and filling the spaces where Academic Affairs did not conduct its work. The learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy was a strategy designed to speak to all of the audiences of Student Affairs. As a discursive tactic, it was then capable of providing a unified voice to bring into its relations with Academic Affairs. Below, I detail more of the factors that led to the creation of this strategy within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004).

The need for the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. The creation of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy stemmed from a series of historical conditions presented in discourse. Aside from the historical context presented in Chapter 2, there are also discursive tidbits that point to the continuing marginalization of Student Affairs that create the conditions that make having a large, wide-reaching audience necessary. Looking back to the documents cited by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), Student Affairs and Academic Affairs did not fully interact in a partnership, even

in text. While Student Affairs continued to write about its relationship with Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs did not write about its relationship with Student Affairs.

Take, for example, *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002), a prominent document from Academic Affairs cited as partial basis for *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). The document functioned to delimit the discourse of Student Affairs. First, the document was produced exclusively by Academic Affairs. It is among the longest of the primary documents cited by *Learning Reconsidered*, and yet, it contained no specific references to Student Affairs. Many of the ideas in *Greater Expectations* did stem from the same holistic educational sense from which *Learning Reconsidered* was built, but the focus was primarily on classroom teaching. Even in implicit terms, Student Affairs was not a present partner in *Greater Expectations*, as academic pedagogy and collaboration within Academic Affairs were prioritized.

The reasons that *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002) did not mention Student Affairs are not addressed within the document. When it discusses collaboration, it does so through the faculty exclusively: “the concept of ‘my work,’ so characteristic of the present educational culture, becomes ‘our work,’ with the entire faculty assuming responsibility for the entire curriculum” (p. 36). Though it could be argued that *Greater Expectations* did not mention Student Affairs because of an assumption that faculty would have to coalesce before involving Student Affairs, its effect was a delimiting of discourse surrounding Student Affairs and partnership.

Though every Student Affairs document I reviewed in my interactions surrounding *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) mentioned Academic Affairs, *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002) is a curious choice of citation for *Learning*

Reconsidered because it did not mention Student Affairs. Though the catalysts cited in *Greater Expectations* for needing to change were similar to those in *Learning Reconsidered*, the absence of Student Affairs suggests that *Greater Expectations* was created out of a discursive environment that did not need to acknowledge Student Affairs, and its citation by *Learning Reconsidered* emphasized the power relations between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

Learning Reconsidered, in its attempt to present a case for partnership, reached to a document that did not come reinforce the discursive notion of including Student Affairs in learning. In fact, the citation of *Greater Expectations* reinforced the power relations because it underscored how Student Affairs required Academic Affairs to help them to redefine learning and position themselves, while at the same time showcasing (as a representative of) the historical power dynamics that led to the creation of *Learning Reconsidered* in the first place.

In interacting with *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), I kept in mind that the document is both a function of power and produced power. In terms of providing for the widest possible audience, this harkens back to Foucault's power/knowledge doublet. The power conditions of the historical relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs created the conditions for *Learning Reconsidered* to present itself and add this new knowledge to the field. The effectiveness of *Learning Reconsidered* on discourse was predicated on the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy as a strategy that aimed to effectively present this document to a wide-reaching audience by positioning itself as both a natural progression (continuity) and as a revolution (discontinuity) for the field of Student Affairs.

Obfuscating Discourse

As I stated from my backstory and pilot project lessons, although the concepts of power and positioning may be widespread for Student Affairs, they manifest in different ways at different institutions. What the varying manifestation suggests is that power relations at a particular university may be obfuscated or less visible than in other places or colleges. Whereas my task in this analysis is to make “discourses visible” (Foucault, 1975/1980a), the function of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) seemed to be the opposite. In examining the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy discursive strategy, the result of playing both the discontinuity side and the continuity side of the dichotomy was to make the audience comfortable with the argument approach from either side and to blur the distinction on what was happening across higher education. One discursive effective of using this dichotomy was that it provided a stage to obfuscate discourse and be accessible to professionals, regardless of their perspective or their own professional context.

Consider the implications of not doing so. The document opened with, “The purpose of this document is to reexamine some widely accepted ideas about conventional teaching and learning” (Keeling, 2004, p. 1). If a portion of the audience believed that their own ideas about learning were sufficient to do their work, they would be alienated by a text suggesting that their understanding of learning had not progressed enough. Therefore, *Learning Reconsidered* then doubled back to address the changing tides of education and pay tribute to the documents that have come before it. By doing so, it could make this revolution seem more as a natural progression than as a break with the past. Because the majority of the document focused towards the changing demographics of

education, it obfuscated any true break with the past. The discursive strategy at play here was to make the reader believe that, no matter what they think, they were a part of this repositioning and so it would appear natural to a multitude of audiences.

Two critical documents in the development of this discursive effect. From a historical perspective, the obfuscation of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was not surprising given the conditions of the documents that led to its creation. In addition to documents involving Academic Affairs, *Learning Reconsidered* also pointed to several documents exclusively from the field of Student Affairs. Specifically, there were two critical documents that forged conditions for the existence of *Learning Reconsidered*; these documents were *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) and *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997). These two documents developed in short succession and served as the discursive momentum for the redefinition happening in *Learning Reconsidered*.

These documents, both relatively short at five and six pages, respectively, served to fuel *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) through addressing many of the same issues. The difficulty with these documents from a discursive perspective, however, is that they created murkiness over the issues. The complications of learning versus development and the role of Student Affairs were present in neophyte stages in these documents and set a confusing course of discourse for *Learning Reconsidered* to have to follow.

The Student Learning Imperative (ACPA, 1996) opened with a Preamble describing the changing educational arena, much in the same way *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) opened. In this document, “learning” was of course not yet redefined, but

instead was mentioned as being “inextricably intertwined and inseparable” (ACPA, 1996, Purpose section, para. 2) from “development,” as well as pointing out that the key to progress was not to have better teaching but instead was to integrate teaching with out-of-classroom experiences. *The Student Learning Imperative* did not walk the lines that *Learning Reconsidered* did in its tone or audience. It was clearly for Student Affairs professionals, for as it stated in its conclusion, “Student affairs professionals must seize the moment by affirming student learning and personal development as the primary goals of undergraduate education” (Conclusion section, para. 2). This document served as a reminder that Student Affairs practitioners needed to assert themselves and student development as integral to the higher education mission. At this point, the Student Learning Discourse was not fully evident and developed textually, despite the sentiment that underlies *The Student Learning Imperative*.

When *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was published, the effects of *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) were apparent in its text. Previously in that document, the nature of Student Affairs had already been described as a revolution. When looking at the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, its function was to avoid apathy. If the revolution started in 1996, how then could there be a new revolution in 2004? The answer was to present it both as a new revolution (discontinuity) and as a progression (continuity) of the revolutions ongoing. For *Learning Reconsidered* to be an impactful piece, it had to present discourses that would survive in that murky ebb of past documents. For *Learning Reconsidered* to be a rupture, it did not need to have changed the entire discursive domain with a lean break to a new schema entirely, but it did have to

navigate the competing discourses of the Student Affairs and Academic Affairs documents that already existed in order to carve out a place and have relevance.

Shifts, cracks, and switches. The murkiness on “learning” continued when the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) released *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (1997), further solidifying the conditions that setup the need to obfuscate discourse. Two things were immediately evident regarding this document, released a year after *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996). First, it was released as a joint of ACPA and NASPA, the two major professional organizations for Student Affairs. Already, there was a shift in the scope of this document because of the inclusion of both organizations. The second major shift in this document was that it introduced the term “student affairs educators” to this field of discourse. Though this document did not completely abandon “student affairs professionals,” it did repeatedly refer to “student affairs educators” as the default for the profession. What is interesting about this shift is whereas *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) made it a point to discuss its redefinition, this document did not focus in the same way on the language switch, presenting Student Affairs as a natural “partner” (p. 1) to Academic Affairs instead without any special notice.

These shifts function within Foucault’s concept of a genealogy because they represent discourse shifting in the “cracks” (Nietzsche, 2011, p. 23) of the discursive environment. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) investigated epistemic shifts within history. To do so, he looked to extremities in discourse where the discursive schema did not follow a continuous trajectory. Applying that concept to Student Affairs, I

saw that the shifts in language within these two Student Affairs texts operated within a discursive field that placed Student Affairs and Academic Affairs on separate sides of the higher education spectrum. By creating these shifts in the language and moving closer to the idea of “learning” being a Student Affairs concept, these shifts and cracks resisted the dominant discourse and created minor discontinuities in the discursive schema. These discontinuities ironically created the progression that allowed *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to be presumed as continuous but also served as trial runs in resisting the dominant discourse that *Learning Reconsidered* would later rupture.

These language shifts in *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997) served as a subtle way to elevate Student Affairs workers to a presumed level of equity with Academic Affairs by labeling them both educators, and they were later expanded upon in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) through that document’s repeated discussion of “partnership” (p. 20, p. 23, p. 24, p. 25, p. 27, p. 33, p. 35), “opportunities to integrate” (p. 18), and “holistic” (p. 1, p. 2, p. 6, p. 8, p. 9, p. 12, p. 13, p. 17, p. 22, p. 25, p. 31, p. 34) education in an attempt to produce a perceived leveling of the higher education roles that posited both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as essential to learning.

Otherwise, *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997) discussed the changing context of higher education and a need to adapt. It identified itself as the next step to *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996), positing that now what was needed was “identifying practices that will move our profession forward in its focus on learning and guide us in meeting the challenges with which we are confronted” (ACPA & NASPA, 1997, Introduction section, para. 3). Much

of this document was spent on context, where, unlike *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), it wanted to paint itself as a natural progression exclusively instead of as both continuous and discontinuous. Though the principles it presented were done so as a set of learning goals, there was not a mention of any monumental shift. Like *The Student Learning Imperative*, the audience for *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* was clearly the Student Affairs professional itself and it perpetuated the tradition of previous statements on Student Affairs.

Together, these documents both set up the necessary conditions for the rupture that *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) served as. In *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997), the progression (continuity) discourse was much more evident due to the time spent on context and changing circumstances. Because of this discursive focus, Student Affairs was left with documents presenting both a continuity and a discontinuity within one year of each other. The confusing nature of this competing dichotomy meant that whatever document came to operate in this landscape to affect the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs would have to consider both sides, and *Learning Reconsidered* employed the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy to do just that.

When thinking with the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, it is again important to consider how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) is a product of power relations. Both of these Student Affairs documents cited by *Learning Reconsidered* were created out of the conditions of the changing nature of Student Affairs throughout history in its relationship with Academic Affairs. To not alienate the audiences created by those documents and to unify Student Affairs, the text of *Learning Reconsidered* had to be

forged through each of these notions. Though both *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) and *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NAPSA, 1997) teetered with aspects of both continuity and discontinuity, *Learning Reconsidered* focused on blending and making those discourses less visible so that the focus of the document would be on the present and the future of “making transformational education possible and accessible for all students” (p. 1), rather than the past and the disparate conditions that led to its existence.

Unity and Practices

From a power standpoint, the ramifications of this discursive strategy of continuity/discontinuity on the power relations for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs were primarily that this document sets itself to unify Student Affairs, as well as to whittle away at the distinctions between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. In looking for its predominant discursive effect, I found that unity is at the forefront. Note that the beginning statement spoke to “conventional teaching and learning” (Keeling, 2004, p. 1) rather than “learning” and “development” as one might expect. By placing teaching within its opening cry, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) attempted to pull Academic Affairs into the conversation (or to create the assumption of the inclusion of Academic Affairs), and its remaining arguments about change and its creation of the Student Learning Discourse could not take place without this happening.

The discourse within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) could not elevate Student Affairs to an equal partner with Academic Affairs without a sense of unity. As I stated previously, the idea of unity created by the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy is a necessary condition for this rupture. Student Affairs has historically been

a disparate and fractured field. The nature of the field may be why there has not been a wealth of empirical evidence suggesting the best ways to partner across higher education, and it is also why Student Affairs has not committed to one paradigm from which to operate, even though it did progress chronologically through a series of discourses to move between Student Services, Student Development, and Student Learning. Whereas the documents preceding *Learning Reconsidered* contained numerous discursive strategies that led to the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, the historical development of Student Affairs as a profession showcases the practices that supported and reinforced the discourse functioning in these documents.

In re-examining the practices presented in Chapter 2, they offer additional insight into the field and the rupture that was *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). As Doyle (2004) stated, it was practice for faculty members to perform many of the student support, mentoring, and guidance roles during the inception of Student Affairs. Although *Learning Reconsidered* came out in 2004, it was influenced by conditions from the very beginnings of higher education, referencing the “changing patterns and commitments” (p. 5) of faculty. Over time, Faculty members moved out from their roles as caretakers to focus on teaching, and women also began to take on positions of “dorm mothers” and caretakers within the field (Frederiksen, 1993).

Though the focus of my analysis is not primarily on gender, it is critical to note that the power dynamics focused on men and women parallel with the positionings of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The lack of being seen as equal is related to the function of the practices taking place throughout the history of Student Affairs. As I detailed in Chapter 2, much of the work of women’s jobs in higher education was tied to

their gender (Sturtevant, Strang, & McKim, 1940). Acknowledging the power dynamics and gender disparities in higher education (Pratt, 2002), we must also acknowledge that these practices set up a field regulated to service and one that would not have the similar ability to unify and establish itself.

In addition to the impact of gender on power relations, there is also the disparity in growth and change within Student Affairs. Though the G.I. Bill expanded higher education, it did not do so uniformly (Overland & Rentz, 2011). Similarly, desegregation, the rise of technology, and other progressive phenomena came to and influenced schools at different rates. This is the reason that I discussed all three discourses of Student Affairs being used to justify the field's existence despite an apparent progression (Hartley, 2001).

Schools changed at different rates and had varied demographic shifts, student population booms, and needs; thus, the field of Student Affairs operated differently within different campuses. Whether the idea of "learning" including "develop" was continuous or a discontinuous very much depended upon a campus's identity and context.

Within my own career, I have experienced a customer-service, business model of Student Affairs and one that espoused to be focused exclusively on learning. The disparity in my practice is not unique, as indicated by the variety of "best practices" available in Chapter 2 (Kezar, 2001). In thinking with the idea of Student Affairs as a marginalized field attempting to find its place and voice while justifying itself to Academic Affairs, the disunity became an evident condition for the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004).

The need for *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to work within all the margins to unify the field was therefore constructed through not only the strategies and

discourse present in the documents that led up to it, but also in the practices of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs historically. Together, they set the conditions and situate Student Affairs within its power relations with Academic Affairs, and thereby led to this rupture.

Practices are critical to examining how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was created and how it operates because in Student Affairs, though the documents are widespread, they were also not wholly representative of how the field operates. Because the field was (and is) heavily practitioner based, practices must be considered. Even in looking at the functioning of *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) and *Principles of Good Practice* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997) reveals their relationship with practices that reinforce discourse. The nature of having two distinct professional organizations with almost identical missions speaks to the disparate nature of the field and the factors that led to the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy's discursive effect of unifying Student Affairs. Unification—a result of the historical disparity in Student Affairs practitioners approaching work from paradigms of Student Services, Student Development, and Student Learning—was a necessary condition in order for the positioning of Student Affairs to shift within the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The combination of these strategies and practices led to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and provided the context for it to operate in this discursive realm.

The Effectiveness of the Learning Continuity/Discontinuity Dichotomy

Above, I discussed how the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy operated within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), as well as the historical conditions that

led to its deployment. To continue sifting material in a genealogical fashion, the next step in my method is to move temporally into the future from *Learning Reconsidered*. Only by examining the documents and practices that follow *Learning Reconsidered*, is it possible to fully investigate how the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy functions and its effectiveness as a strategy. In this section, I look to how both ACPA and NASPA reacted to *Learning Reconsidered*, as well as documents that viewed it as a progression (continuity), revolution (discontinuity), or both. Additionally, I examine the practices surrounding these documents to reveal how this dichotomy has continued to operate in the discourse of Student Affairs.

National Student Affairs organizations and *Learning Reconsidered*. As a document, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) did not contain much discussion regarding either ACPA or NASPA. *Learning Reconsidered* exists as a product of those organizations and the citations within it reflect that it is an outcome of those organizations and their histories and contexts. The strategy for *Learning Reconsidered* was to present unity through portraying itself to all audiences, done by speaking in terms of both historical continuity and discontinuity. In order to view the success of this strategy in producing unity to provide the foundation for Student Affairs to reposition itself in the context of higher education, I examined how the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy impacted the national organizations to reveal more about the current context of Student Affairs and how the organizations moved forward from the release of *Learning Reconsidered*.

First, it is worth noting that there are two dominant organizations for the field of Student Affairs. Though these organizations do operate separately, my experience in

working with both and observing colleagues is that they serve a similar function. Though unity was not achieved through a centralized voice for the field of Student Affairs in higher education, it is possible that *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) had other impacts on these organizations. To facilitate my investigation of that, I interacted with the websites, mission statements, and several critical documents from both organizations.

Examining ACPA. ACPA, in their 2014 mission, vision, and values (current at the time of this writing) used the same language as *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). ACPA stated that its mission was to “support and foster student learning” (ACPA, 2014a, Mission section, para. 1), and also stated that one of its core values was “education and development” (ACPA, 2014a, Core Values section, para. 1). The impact of *Learning Reconsidered*, though not explicitly stated, is evident. ACPA embraced both the idea of “learning” and the idea of “development” as critical to advancing its mission, and by producing this document it perpetuated and reinforced the trend that *Learning Reconsidered* began.

Additionally, ACPA cited *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) on its website (ACPA, 2014b), though it is worth noting that it existed in a long list of documents and was not prominently listed. ACPA’s website indicated that *Learning Reconsidered* was important, but its relative lack of visibility in the presentation of the mission, vision, and values suggests that it acted to influence how ACPA spoke about itself rather than as something to repeatedly point to. In other words, the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy served to shift the discourse for ACPA to how it discussed learning and development.

Examining NASPA. NASPA, on the other hand, approached *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) slightly differently. Its 2014 website was setup to promote

its long history and its progression (NASPA, 2014a), and its mission and vision were focused on being the preeminent voice for Student Affairs. Whereas ACPA was more directly focused on the content of *Learning Reconsidered*, NASPA was more focused on the context of *Learning Reconsidered*, and by focusing on being the preeminent voice of Student Affairs, its discourse acted to attempt to elevate Student Affairs within the realm of higher education.

The trend of promoting Student Affairs continued through the website and led NASPA to state how critical Student Affairs is to the higher education experience and that learning could not happen just within the classroom (NASPA, 2014b). Furthermore, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was given a more prominent placement on the NASPA website, being listed as a “seminal document” (NASPA, 2014b) for the profession.

The choice of the term “seminal” was an interesting one as a strategy of discourse. It not only implied that these documents defined the field, thus reinforcing the notion of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as a rupture, but it also served to gender these documents. As I discussed earlier in this chapter and in Chapter 2, Student Affairs as a profession has been tied in its history to the roles of women. By gendering these documents with a term derived from “semen,” NASPA served to masculinize the profession. As an additional strategy, this served to put Student Affairs documents in the same realm as the founding documents of academia. As a turn through the discourse of progression, it presented a progression of masculinization of the field of Student Affairs, from servant dorm mother to learning entity, equivalent to Academic Affairs. Much of the remainder of the core NASPA website revolved around legitimizing Student Affairs

through announcing competencies, as well as how critical the field was to higher education over and over again (NASPA, 2014b).

Identity and the discourses of the national organizations. The above examples of texts presented by NASPA and ACPA showcase the way in which many of discursive tactics of the national organizations even ten years after the release of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) were responsive to and results of the discourses surrounding and in *Learning Reconsidered*. *Learning Reconsidered* gave ACPA the ability to perpetuate the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. While NASPA did not as explicitly reveal its connection to that strategy, the way it operated used the discontinuities in *Learning Reconsidered* and presented them as continuities.

To look at it another way, NASPA essentially took the strategy one step further and consumed the discontinuity into its past history. The statements of values and competencies did not continuously exist throughout the history of Student Affairs, and the language surrounding partnership with Academic Affairs and purpose in higher education pointed back to the context of *Learning Reconsidered*, but NASPA was able to use those aspects of discourse and apply them to a lengthy timeline of its long history, thereby using both the aspects of progression (continuity) and of revolution (discontinuity) to the maximum potential as a strategy.

The reactions of ACPA and NASPA to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) pointed back to the work of the strategies at play in that document, as well as the milieu that surrounded its creation and led to the rupture. These strategies demonstrated the relationship of power/knowledge that Foucault (1975/1980a) investigated. *Learning Reconsidered* was created out of the power relations existing between Student Affairs and

Academic Affairs. ACPA and NASPA, then, were able to perpetuate the creation of their institutional identities and knowledge of the field through the discourse promoted by *Learning Reconsidered*.

The humanistic notions of unity and identity that the national organizations embraced came through the cracks in the discursive schema and relations that Student Affairs has with Academic Affairs. By working within these discursive cracks, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was able to challenge the understanding that Student Affairs had of its own relationship with Academic Affairs and started to build a new schema for Student Affairs through that discontinuity. As a strategy, the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy functioned to create new positionings for Student Affairs within its relationship with Academic Affairs, primarily through these organizations that reinforced the blurred notions of continuity and discontinuity within the document.

Documents in response to *Learning Reconsidered*. In examining *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, it is also important to consider how other documents responded to the publication of *Learning Reconsidered*. Over the course of the decade after its release, both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs have released countless documents. To conduct this portion of my genealogy, I sifted through these documents to examine commonalities in them and how they responded or did not respond to *Learning Reconsidered*.

The most common type of article after the publication of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) is the one that does not mention it. It is important to note that this does not necessarily mean that its discourse has been delimited, for as Chapter 2 detailed, the

field itself shifted primarily into the Student Learning Discourse, which was partially a product of this document. Even though the document was not prominently featured in texts after its publication, this absence does not necessarily suggest that it did not have an impact.

At the same time, the fact that this was a critical document (even “seminal”) for the major organizations in Student Affairs and was not widely cited is curious simply because if it is a foundational document, it would follow that other documents would cite it in order to perpetuate and reinforce the dominant discourses within. Student Affairs, however, has also been a field split between practitioners and scholarship, as the understanding of “best practices” presented in Chapter 2 detailed, and so the delimitation of this discourse may be the result of a field that was not as engrossed in academic scholarship as it was (or is) in practice. The critical function of this absence was that it did create a power dynamic whereby the discourse may be perpetuated and reinforced in individual practices, but not on a wide scale level and not through documents that would impact Academic Affairs, field to field.

Of those documents that did mention *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), they were split on their approach to the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. At first glance, this may seem to mean that the dichotomy did not function as structured—to unify—but, to the contrary, it allowed members with backgrounds that would align with either side of the dichotomy to claim *Learning Reconsidered* as their own, which is also how this discursive strategy operated within *Learning Reconsidered* itself.

Viewing Learning Reconsidered as discursive discontinuity. One set of documents referred to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as the discontinuity

presented within its text (Arendale, 2005; Fried, 2007; Higbee & Goff, 2008; Magolda, 2005; Wawrzynski, 2005). This set of documents was both fairly small and was primarily confined to Student Affairs, as far as publication is concerned. These documents are representative of the sector of higher education viewing *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to be a revolution for the field. Fried (2007), for example, referred to *Learning Reconsidered* as “higher education’s new playbook” (p. 2) and stated that *Learning Reconsidered* redefined learning, including “not only what is learned but where and how it is learned” (p. 3). Fried’s assertion was a product of *Learning Reconsidered* because *Learning Reconsidered* was able to provide the discursive structures for Fried’s article to exist.

Fried’s (2007) article, published in a Student Affairs magazine known as *About Campus*, was one that reiterated the principles of *Learning Reconsidered* while attempting to add a practical tilt and application to them. Fried’s work is an important consideration in the discursive environment of Student Affairs because it served as a bridge from a lengthier, headier document to a practical-based one in a magazine setting. When considering the function of unity for Student Affairs that the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy acts to produce, documents such as Fried helped to create the environment for practices from the theoretical pieces offered by *Learning Reconsidered*.

Most interesting about Fried’s (2007) piece was the amount of time it took to appear. For a piece referring to the higher education playbook being rewritten by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), the fact that it took three years to come across suggests a sluggish pace of discursive change and speaks to the context within which

Learning Reconsidered was created. Due to the many disparate views of the role of Student Affairs, the idea of *Learning Reconsidered* becoming a new playbook for the field unfolded slowly through the extremities of the profession.

Additionally, several other Student Affairs documents fall into the discontinuity schema. Wawrzynski (2005) had one of the first reactions to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), and his work stated that a challenge had been issued to combine inside and outside of classroom learning. It did not discuss the document much further than that. Similarly, Magolda (2005) looked to *Learning Reconsidered* for how it approached how faculty and staff worked together on the concept of learning and how that was now in a new context. This falls in line with what Higbee and Goff (2008) later asserted, which was that the divide between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs was artificial. Higbee and Goff, in reflection about *Learning Reconsidered*, stated that it redefined learning so that the artificial divide did not oppose Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, as the Student Development Discourse, discussed in Chapter 2, did.

Though language was hinted at in many of the works surrounding *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), Arendale (2005), a social sciences professor, approached *Learning Reconsidered* from a more specifically discourse-based perspective, suggesting that perhaps the issue is the language we use and that working with Student Affairs was not different for Academic Affairs, but instead perhaps *Learning Reconsidered* simply provided new language to talk about how higher education needed to integrate learning.

Arendale (2005), in his awareness of the discursive elements, raised a point that was (and is) pertinent to all of these works, which was that *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), in many ways, merely represented the change (or discontinuity) in

education rather than was an actual change in education. *Learning Reconsidered*, therefore, created new discursive space for Student Affairs where previously there was not the space to explore to the same level the discursive notion of Student Affairs being involved in learning. Arendale's assertion was that the power relations that produced *Learning Reconsidered* also produced these responses, rather than *Learning Reconsidered* having produced them. Arendale recognized this discursive turn, and suggested that the way forward was for practitioners to change the way they spoke about higher education and learning.

This set of documents is important because they not only supported the dichotomy created by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), but they also acted to erase it. Though this concept may seem paradoxical, it occurred through perpetuating the notion that *Learning Reconsidered* was a revolution (discontinuity). These documents then created, over time (and by combining with casual discourse within the field and practices in the field), a web of relations in which *Learning Reconsidered* served as one of the most vital power relays. These documents attempted to center Student Affairs on *Learning Reconsidered* by reinforcing its discourse as standard and professional vernacular. Not only was it then a revolution (or discontinuity), but the process also then attempted to create a new line of continuity through the echoes of the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered*. The perpetuation of the discourse within *Learning Reconsidered* acted to create the rupture in the schema where *Learning Reconsidered* served as an organizing node from which power relations and discursive positionings extended and progressed. The dichotomy of continuity/discontinuity with the past history of Student Affairs then started to blur (as it is obfuscated) and becomes one, where the idea of

redefining “learning” in Student Affairs as either a progression or revolution was no longer important, because *Learning Reconsidered* then served as a new organizing force within the discursive context of higher education power relations.

Viewing Learning Reconsidered as discursive continuity. The notion of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as a rupture is important to another set of documents, which are self-referential documents. There was an incestuous nature to the documents that follow *Learning Reconsidered* closely. The continuity of *Learning Reconsidered* was created by reciting and falling back upon it by those authors who were cited within *Learning Reconsidered*.

Much of this set of documents looked to the same group of authors who created the discursive possibilities for *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to exist. Kuh, Kegan, and Baxter Magola were all cited repeated (or were the authors and cited themselves) in many of the documents citing *Learning Reconsidered* (Baxter Magolda, 2009; Hall, Scott, & Borsz, 2008; King & Baxter Magolda, 2005; Kuh, 2009; Pizzolato & Ozaki, 2007). Thinking discursively with power/knowledge, I looked at this set of documents as a perpetuation machine. They treated *Learning Reconsidered* as part of a long lineage of research and they situated the document within it. From the standpoint of the dichotomy, this perpetuation acted to create a comfort level and place *Learning Reconsidered* within a rich research history, and therefore it presented as the presumed continuity for the field.

The self-referential literature also spoke to many of the same issues already brought forward from *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). Baxter Magolda (2009), for instance, stated that there still has not been a lot of literature to integrate learning and

development, despite *Learning Reconsidered*. Documents such as Baxter Magolda's are products of the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs; from a strategy perspective, they served to bolster the positioning of Student Affairs by reinforcing the concepts of *Learning Reconsidered*. Kuh (2009) also cited this problem, stating that Student Affairs needs to harness data in order to "leverage significant institutional change" (p. 697). The perpetuation of this continuity continued, looking back to *Learning Reconsidered* in an attempt to center it discursively within a context of research relations and discourse, in order to affect the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. In the context of these documents, continuity was used as a strategy to create momentum for change, whereas the discontinuous documents opted to create a spark of change.

Overall, the dichotomy is a strategy that operated out of necessity in both this continuity and in the discontinuity that I discussed above. The split nature of Student Affairs history and its varied discursive positionings not only necessitated the use of these two sides to a discursive strategy, but this nature also created the discursive space for each of these strategies to work independently. Note that while at times the ideas of continuity and discontinuity are blurred together, other nodes of documents exist that are at odds with one another in how they discuss and are impacted by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). This discursive space was critical to the effectiveness of the dichotomy because it showcased the notion of resistance to the overall discursive schema and power relations.

Foucault (1978/1990) noted that history does not move in clean breaks from one schema to the next. Instead, discourses feature "overlappings" and "interactions" (p.

149). The operation of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy represented the lack of smoothness in this transition, with Student Affairs professionals responding to and interacting with both sides of the dichotomy in an attempt to create additional discursive movement in how Student Affairs is positioned in its relationship with Academic Affairs.

Examining Learning Reconsidered 2. Perhaps the most significant self-referential document is *Learning Reconsidered 2* (Keeling, 2006). This document continued the momentum trend, by taking the *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) partnership and adding several more Student Affairs organizations for housing, advising, university unions, recreational sports, and campus activities. It did, however, continue to lack Academic Affairs related organizations. The design of *Learning Reconsidered 2* was to provide practical application for *Learning Reconsidered*. As I discussed in Chapter 4, *Learning Reconsidered* lacked concrete practices and action steps. *Learning Reconsidered 2* aimed to produce a practice guide and continue to bridge the theory world with the extremities of the profession at individual schools, much like Fried's (2007) article would later attempt.

The focus of *Learning Reconsidered 2* (Keeling, 2006) was primarily on how to make outcomes and how to assess them. Whereas *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) served as a call to arms in many ways and was a wide-reaching document, *Learning Reconsidered 2* functioned as a far more concentrated, specific document. Its function in the power relations of higher education was to further Student Affairs's ability to discuss its own impact on learning. Though it was positioned as a document for holistic learning across campuses, the works of Kuh (2009) and Baxter Magolda (2009)

chronologically following this document suggests that *Learning Reconsidered 2* did not alone shift the dynamics and that the assessment and presentation of that data still remained an issue for Student Affairs to position itself within higher education as an equitable partner in learning.

In fact, *Learning Reconsidered 2* (Keeling, 2006) appears to be contained to the same discursive node from which it is birthed. Rather than perpetuate and expand upon the ideas of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), it folds back into them. For example, it references how *Learning Reconsidered* “deliberately linked to the spirit of *Greater Expectations*” (p. 1) and reemphasized the ideas presented in *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996) and *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997). Much of the remaining document is spent looking at both why *Learning Reconsidered* needed to exist and why it reexamined learning. After pointing back to the past to recycle the looping of the ideas in *Learning Reconsidered*, *Learning Reconsidered 2* continues to expand upon the outcome creation and practices that were alluded to in the original. Rather than serve as a true sequel, *Learning Reconsidered 2* was positioned as an emphazier for *Learning Reconsidered*.

From the perspective of the discursive disruption and the functioning of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy serving the rupture, *Learning Reconsidered 2* (Keeling, 2006) stood as a singular example of attempting to recenter discourse around the conversation of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). *Learning Reconsidered 2* encapsulated the idea of blurring the echoes of history with the notions of revolution and new knowledge. From a positioning standpoint, *Learning Reconsidered 2* touched on all of my previous major observations. It served to obfuscate the shifts in discourse, to

combine the sides of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, and to unify Student Affairs through perpetuating the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered*. Though it did not act alone, it operated within each of the different discursive contexts I have discussed in this chapter, pulling from each of these nodes in an attempt to center discourse around *Learning Reconsidered* as the new organizing force for the Student Affairs power structures and discursive schema.

Conclusion. Together, the documents I discussed in this section of the chapter were critical to how the learning continuity/discontinuity strategy operated through *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). Whereas the discontinuous documents had a mode of operation that was easier to identify and determine, the continuity side of the dichotomy operated in a more complex fashion because the documents within it attempted to not only present *Learning Reconsidered* as continuous with the past history of Student Affairs (essentially a strategy to hide its nature as a rupture in order to make it seem more seasoned and inevitable), but they also worked to create new continuities and present *Learning Reconsidered* as a central discursive node from which future discourses should operate. Working with the discontinuity side of the dichotomy, this portion of the strategy operated to perpetuate and reinforce a new notion of an identity for Student Affairs that is unified and positioned to interact within the same discursive field as Academic Affairs rather than as a marginalized entity reacting to the discourse of academia.

Additional documents. There is another important set of documents related to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), which is the set of documents that did not deeply discuss *Learning Reconsidered* one way or another. In many documents, *Learning*

Reconsidered was mentioned as another source in a long list of many, or a short mention may be made of *Learning Reconsidered*, but it was not deeply considered as a portion of the text. Though documents in this category do represent an acceptance and progressive function of *Learning Reconsidered*, they also functioned as a delimiting of the specific discourses of *Learning Reconsidered*. In a paradoxical way, the delimiting of the specific discourses actually functioned to perpetuate the impact of *Learning Reconsidered* and its resistance to the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. By treating *Learning Reconsidered* as common sense and vernacular, it set up a confidence of the positionality of Student Affairs and presented the ideas of redefining “learning” to include Student Affairs as so normalized that they did not even warrant discussion further.

As *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was cited in this vanilla manner throughout documents, it became increasingly a part of the lexicon. The concepts within *Learning Reconsidered* became accepted to an extent, functioning to alter the overall discourse within Student Affairs. The use of its citation, however, also served to make it more and more invisible and less impactful as a rupture. For example, in Biddix’s (2010) work on technology the only citation to *Learning Reconsidered* was to note some of the outcomes about civil discourse on campus and to set these up as criteria for using technology for activism.

As I discussed in Chapter 4, the outcomes that *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) presented were relatively thin compared to the amount of discussion the document contains on the concept of learning itself and how we conceptualize teaching our students. The outcomes presented were a function of that notion of learning they were not

the central argument presented. Biddix's (2010) work did move past the central argument of *Learning Reconsidered* to perpetuate a discursive environment that is past needing to discuss learning in the way *Learning Reconsidered* does. In other words, the work of Biddix represents a discursive turn that strengthens the arguments of *Learning Reconsidered* by treating them as foundational and decided.

Another specific example of this type of reference to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) occurred in the work by Salisbury, Pascarella, Padget, and Blaich (2012). In this work, the notion of tying leadership to real world work experience was cited in many instances, of which *Learning Reconsidered* is one. Again, there was little discussion of *Learning Reconsidered* itself as a rupture or as an organizing structure for discourse. It was simply presented as another document to cite.

The works of Biddix (2010) and Salisbury, Pascarella, Padget, and Blaich (2012) are demonstrative of this type of discursive representation, and there are many additional examples of these types of citations (Barone, Wolgemuth, & Linder, 2007; Chakrabarti, Bartning, & Sengupta, 2010; Myers & Bastian, 2010; Pizzolato & Hickman, 2011). As *Learning Reconsidered* continued to fall into the discursive landscape as common sense, the power function that it once could work in changing Student Affairs was also eroded. Through that time, its impact lessened on the practices of Student Affairs and therefore its ability to reposition Student Affairs lessened. This function of time also produced the network of relations that created the self-referential documents, which attempted to resurrect the concepts of *Learning Reconsidered* in order to affect change in higher education.

Conclusion. As a document, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) produced a number of different responsive practices. Though disparate in nature, the products of *Learning Reconsidered* were products of the relations of power in which it was born. The disparate nature of the documents suggests that the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy was successful in reproducing the formal discourse of the field, with both camps claiming *Learning Reconsidered* as their own.

Though it did not accomplish a sense of unity in bringing those camps together at first glance, it lessened the divide by forging a way forward for *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to be both a rupture and a new node of discourse. The discourse of NASPA, for instance, was such that the momentum created from the document created the possibilities for a new discursive regime, which many of the documents citing *Learning Reconsidered* also spoke to. Together, these documents revealed the moving substrate of power relations and the positioning for Student Affairs within, all of which uncover the tumultuous nature of its ability/inability to partner with Academic Affairs. Along with the other strategies present in *Learning Reconsidered*, the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy created a large number of angles from which Student Affairs could position itself (as a whole, as specific campuses, or even as individuals) to work to partner with Academic Affairs by positioning itself within the same discursive field.

Practices and the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. Looking back to Chapter 2 and the practices discussed throughout the history of Student Affairs, it is also important to consider practices to the future of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and the presented continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. First, it is important to note

that, as I stated in Chapter 2, the Student Learning Discourse began to form from the 1980s onward. With Student Affairs being so practice-based, however, it took the appearance, acceptance, and continuity of documents leading up to and *Learning Reconsidered* itself to implement the discourse as a field-wide language of the sayable and unsayable. The practices that came out of *Learning Reconsidered* were those ideas of “best practices,” which were first detailed in the document itself as a series of recommendations.

While in my interactions with *Learning Reconsidered*, I found these recommendations an awkward inclusion. In the context of thinking of Student Affairs as a practitioner field, however, I noticed that they had a clear function. These recommendations became the guideposts for the practices that followed, and they gave weight to those individual practices by tying them to the greater research and vision of the field. In thinking with the idea of individual practitioners engaged in individual power relations, these recommendations supported those practices and solidified their worth. Essentially, they gave a place of argument for why Student Affairs was important and tied that argument to practices; individual professionals, then, could use this document to discuss their positions at a distinct university, as well as the idea of partnering.

In looking to the practices of Student Affairs with the perspective of Foucault guiding me, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) served to be a supporting document for anyone within the field. The product of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy is that *Learning Reconsidered* could remain applicable to an individual within the field. Because Foucault (1977/1980c) reminded us to look for the outskirts of power rather than an obvious, centralized point, it follows that this strategy would be at its most

effective in working with those individuals on specific campuses, especially considering that Student Affairs remained rather invisible within the wide-ranging texts of Academic Affairs, even following this document's publication. As a notion of resistance working within the cracks and fissures of the discursive schema in which it operates, the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy resisted and impacted the positioning of Student Affairs through these individual and disparate spaces.

"Best practices" may be a vague concept within higher education as to what will or will not work from an empirical standpoint, but tying those practices to the mission, vision, and values of the two dominant professional organizations, which stem from *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and the researchers behind it, produced an air of legitimacy to the "best practices" that dominated (and still dominate) the discussion of the partnering between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and thereby reinforced the greater Student Learning Discourse.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the development, function, and impact of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, as presented as a discursive strategy in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). The learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy worked in tandem, both together and as each side of the dichotomy, to resist the dominant discursive structure and to perpetuate the rupture that *Learning Reconsidered* serves as.

Combined with the learning/development doublet and the three-pronged approach, this strategy helped to deploy and reinforce the Student Learning Discourse and to position Student Affairs within the discursive context to partner with Academic Affairs. In the next two chapters, I discuss the other dominant strategies within *Learning*

Reconsidered to continue to examine how this document functions within the context of the power relations of higher education.

Chapter 6: The Learning/Development Doublet

In Chapter 5, I discussed the primary discursive strategy of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), which was its deployment of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. In this chapter, I discuss another important strategy for *Learning Reconsidered*, which is the learning/development doublet. Though I referred to the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy as the most critical of the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered* (indeed, it was a necessary condition for the document to function), the learning/development doublet moved forward from the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy into actually attempting to define the role of Student Affairs within higher education by positioning it in duality. In this chapter, I examine the learning/development doublet in relation to the competing subjectivities of Student Affairs, the positionality of Student Affairs, and within the context of both the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy and power. I begin first, however, by investigating how the learning/development doublet operated within *Learning Reconsidered*.

Learning/Development in *Learning Reconsidered*.

The learning/development doublet is a strategy deployed by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) in order to work in tandem with the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. Its function was similarly to bring disparate parts of Student Affairs together, though it moved past what the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy accomplished discursively. By referring to instances of both learning and

development—stating that “development” does not exist while also using the language of development with common vernacular Student Affairs terms focused on the “co-curricular” (Keeling, 2004, p. 27) or the statement that our understanding of learning needs to involve the “integration of personal development with learning” (Keeling, 2004, p. 3)—Student Affairs again could appeal to different sides of itself as a field.

Based on the history of Student Affairs discussed in Chapter 2, the unification was an important aspect of how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) operated (and continues to operate) in the discursive world. There was a sense throughout history that Student Affairs must be uniformly defined under a singular notion of identity in order to be equitable (or even to compete) with Academic Affairs for higher education resources and essentiality. As I examined in Chapter 2, Student Affairs has invested in both a Student Development Discourse and a Student Learning Discourse (in addition to the originally dominant Student Services Discourse). The Student Development Discourse, however, resulted in Student Affairs being set opposite of Academic Affairs, pitted against it, within higher education (Doyle, 2004). The Student Learning Discourse, on the other hand, opened up Student Affairs to have no role distinct from Academic Affairs. The learning/development doublet, therefore, functioned to serve both these discourses for the field and to even combine the positive facets of each.

How this doublet was presented in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was critical to the document’s success as a rupture. The language and tone of the document carefully play to both sides of the doublet and produce definitions of “learning” that both incorporate and separate “development.” For instance, “learning” was referred to as a “comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity” (p. 2) that folds developmental

activities into the idea of learning, but *Learning Reconsidered* then made sure to express the importance of developmental activities in particular, saying, “we must give priority to identity development” (p. 10). *Learning Reconsidered* continued to shift back in forth between enveloping “development” into “learning” and making it distinct.

Blurring the lines between the two was a deliberate strategy to set the ideas associated with Student Development within the new discourse of Student Learning. As a document that exists in a real world context, there was a danger in removing “development” from the lexicon because it could create an opportunity to push Student Affairs down the hierarchy of learning in comparison with Academic Affairs. This strategy was therefore used to bridge and balance those aspects of including Student Affairs in learning while not abandoning the idea of development.

There are myriad instances of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) prioritizing development, through phrasing referring to the need to approach “developmental outcomes” (p. 19) and the notion that learning could not exist without development. Despite these, the overall function of the doublet is to meld the products of Student Development into the idea of “learning.”

The doublet played both a “conditioning and a conditioned role” (Foucault, 1977/1980h, p. 142) for the discourses of Student Affairs. In other words, this doublet was conditioning in that it functions to remove “development” as a term from the forefront of a practitioners mind. It melded the ideas that practitioners have associated with “development” to the concept of “learning.” It was, however, also a “conditioned” role in that it was an *effect* of Student Affairs being split between different functional paradigms and discourses. It was created as a responsive strategy to the overlapping

discursive threads, because some Student Affairs practitioners practiced “development” while others practiced “learning.”

At the same time, the doublet’s function was to remove that conditioning and thus newly condition the field to meld the two. (This doublet also could operate to condition Academic Affairs audiences to recognize the similarity between learning and development.) The learning/development doublet essentially worked by shifting our thoughts toward “learning,” while also reminding us of what makes Student Affairs distinct.

As I stated during my interactions in Chapter 4, the authors of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) had no issue with contradicting themselves in stating that they would not use the phrase “learning and development” (p. 2) while then using that same phrase in pointing out that integrating learning *is* “learning and development” (p. 23). *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) teased out this doublet, both putting Student Affairs into the concept of holistic learning and pulling it out of the concept of holistic learning as distinctive with its own “particular responsibility” (p. 29) for ensuring student success and learning.

This notion of having a particular responsibility harkened back to the need to both incorporate with Academic Affairs and make Student Affairs distinct, and it also served as the groundwork for the melding that the doublet produced. While separating out the functions of Student Affairs as particularly important, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) goes on to repeatedly remind its audience “learning is a complex, holistic, multi-centric activity” (p. 6) and even that our ideas about “transformational learning [are] what Student Affairs professionals understand as developmental education” (p. 12). By

focusing “development” into the definition of “education,” *Learning Reconsidered* reinforced the cyclical reproduction of that the learning and development sides of the doublet have with one another. The ultimate realization of this doublet is when *Learning Reconsidered* introduced the concept of “Student Affairs learning” (p. 23), a concept that embodied the incorporation of development fully into the idea of learning.

In looking at the power connections created through this discursive strategy, the doublet worked, unsurprisingly, two-fold. It both served to elevate the work of Student Affairs professionals and to remove some of the power from Academic Affairs. In terms of student learning, the approach of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was that Academic Affairs had always been an oppressive (or dominant) entity and that Student Affairs had been relegated to a supporting (or marginalized) role. For instance, *Learning Reconsidered* contained multiple references to a higher education hierarchy that did not support innovative pedagogy that would include development aspects or experiences that include “experiential learning” (p. 33), both of which are areas of expertise for Student Affairs. As I discussed in Chapter 2 and Chapter 5, this relegation followed the creation of Student Affairs along gender lines, with Student Affairs having started out in the realm of dorm mothers and thusly originating as subservient to a male dominated field that assisted in developing these areas of expertise for Student Affairs.

To shift this notion of power and a supporting role, redefinition is required. The purpose of Academic Affairs then must include Student Affairs (through redefining “learning”), but there also must be a specific responsibility for Student Affairs within that purpose; the doublet attempted to infiltrate the Academic Affairs side of higher education in order to redefine the discursive positionings available to Student Affairs. In a way, it

serves as a discursive Trojan horse—first appearing to join in learning as one definition, but then flipping that definition to emphasize Student Affairs. Below, I continue to investigate this strategy and the production of subjectivities and positionality for Student Affairs to reveal more intersections of power in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Learning/Development, Identity, and Subjectivities

I have previously mentioned the design of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as being one pointed toward creating a singular notion of identity. In Chapter 4, I discussed how I would apply a false agency to *Learning Reconsidered* precisely because it was attempting to have agency and to forge a humanistic sense of identity for the field. Only by investigating *Learning Reconsidered* with agency and its underlying functionality toward identity and equity could I begin to reveal how the strategies of discourse within it were productive. Though multiple subjectivities will always exist for Student Affairs (and for the practitioners who make up the field), the notion of unifying the field under the idea of one identity was a necessary outcome for a field whose practitioners needed to forge a sense of purpose for both themselves and for their partners in Academic Affairs. The learning/development doublet, as my analysis shows, succeeded in some sense to forge competing subjectivities into what would be perceived by practitioners as an identity for the field, though it also perpetuated the very subjectivities that necessitated the drive for creating a singular identity.

As I discussed in Chapter 4, the learning/development doublet was developed throughout *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and its function was to create a singular identity for Student Affairs that melded the Student Development Discourse with

the Student Learning Discourse. As seen in Chapter 2, Student Affairs has operated from a number of discursive positions that have impacted its subjectivities and been impacted by its subjectivities. Though Student Affairs is not a true subject in the sense that it does not have feelings, emotions, thoughts, beliefs, or desires, it does operate from a variety of subjective standpoints in its relationship with the subjectivities of Academic Affairs. Student Affairs, comprised of individual subjects with subjectivities, has its positioning discursively influenced by the practices and strategies of individuals in higher education and has therefore operated from a variety of subjectivities created by the discursive nodes of higher education.

The difficulty in operating from competing subjectivities is that it splintered Student Affairs and its ability to partner with Academic Affairs. Because practitioners and educators on both sides might understand Student Affairs from a Student Services, Student Development, or Student Learning position, the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs remained fluid and vague, as evidenced in the types of partnerships described in Chapter 2. Because Student Affairs has been unable to define itself under a singular notion of identity, it had not operated in the same discursive realm as Academic Affairs or with the same sense of identity.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) worked again from the conditioned role, being forged from the multiple subjectivities and attempting to meld them and condition them into one. We can ascertain that the learning/development doublet operated in relation to subjectivity because of the nature of how *Learning Reconsidered* was presented. As I noted in my interactions of Chapter 4, the audience for *Learning*

Reconsidered was most certainly Student Affairs, even though it was not explicitly presented as such (and, in fact, was presented as the opposite).

Thinking again with Kendall and Wickham (1999) and their idea of productive discourse, the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) did indeed perpetuate a singular identity for Student Affairs. In examining the discursive from the perspective of my genealogy, the next step is to further investigate why Student Affairs would need to produce a singular identity within the realm of multiple, competing subjectivities.

Conditions for subjectivities and the learning/development doublet. As I examined in Chapter 2, Student Affairs has shifted its purpose, from a practices standpoint, throughout its history. In fact, the multiple subjectivities of Student Affairs have been forged primarily by its practices and by the practices of Academic Affairs. Throughout its history, Student Affairs has been maneuvered (and has maneuvered itself) based on the changing needs and demographics of higher education. As higher education expanded, Student Affairs was first created to fulfill service roles faculty no longer wanted or had time to handle, then to caretaker roles, then to roles based in outside of the classroom experience (Frederiksen, 1993; Rudolph, 1990). As *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) put it, there were “changing patterns and commitments in the faculty” (p. 5). As the population of higher education expanded over time, the opportunities for Student Affairs to play a diverse array of roles also increased (Overland & Rentz, 2011).

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) noted the shifting ideology of Student Affairs from a policy standpoint as well, discussing in depth at its beginning the shifting demographics of higher education, particularly the “diversification of students” (p. 4) in

higher education. By noting the demographics, *Learning Reconsidered* not only acted on the foundation of the previously discussed learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, but also it served to present a singular identity. In framing the demographic changes of the past as a premise for redefining “learning,” *Learning Reconsidered* worked under the condition that Student Affairs has ever-changing subjectivities and that the subjectivities could now be erased and repositioned into an identity by the learning/development doublet.

The erasure presented through this discourse is critical for Student Affairs because of the conflicts with Academic Affairs and institutional role that manifested through the historical development of Student Affairs; presenting Student Affairs under a new moniker and with a holistic identity around learning presented a new position from which Student Affairs could operate, as outlined within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). Though *Learning Reconsidered* operated as a set of discursive strategies because it is a textual document, it was based in the past practices of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and therefore had to operate from those competing subjectivities in order to attempt to forge a notion of identity.

In addition to the practices that led to the notions of identity from the learning/development doublet, many of the functions of power and discourse are revealed through looking at documents leading up to the creation of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as well. The split between documents with Academic Affairs and those solely from Student Affairs is a start to understanding the split subjectivities of Student Affairs, but investigating the individual documents reveals specific strategies and

functions of power that lead to the creation of the doublet and its melding and shifting of the subjectivities for Student Affairs.

The Student Learning Imperative (ACPA, 1996), for instance, was critical in paving the way for the shift in subjectivities discussions by naming that learning and development were “inextricably intertwined and inseparable” (ACPA, 1996, Purpose section, para. 2). By not yet redefining “learning” but setting up the discursive stage of learning and development being intermixed, this document served to soften the ground for the shifts that *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) would make and require. These documents thusly operate as resistance to the dominant discursive structures, working first in the existing cracks in the schema and then expanding those cracks to create more opportunities to shift the discourse. This shift was furthered through the tone and language of *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997), which made the subtle shift from “student affairs practitioners” to “student affairs educators” (and paved the way for the idea of “Student Affairs learning” [Keeling, 2004, p. 23]). Again, this shift served, through open spaces in the dominant discourses, to continue to soften the environment for the shifts in *Learning Reconsidered*.

When you consider these policy language shifts through the discourses of the ever-shifting practices and related subjectivities from the history of Student Affairs, they together work to collapse the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy by edging the concepts of learning and development together, as well as expand the notions of subjectivity through producing subjectivities by deploying notions of both learning and development separately. Though the collapsing and production of two disparate subjectivities seems paradoxical, it also produces the discursive environment and conditions for a rupture,

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004), to recondition the discourse and to emerge as a new productive node of discourse for Student Affairs. Neither of these previous documents was bold enough to change definitions, but they did prepare Student Affairs professionals for the conception of learning and development being one and the same, which ultimately conditioned the discursive notion of identity being presented.

The development of identity as performance. If we consider *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) a rupture in the timeline of Student Affairs, as I do, then our understanding of how it produced subjectivities also requires us to look past the document itself into how it was received and its future shaping of identity. Sifting through documents that cite *Learning Reconsidered* yielded additional context about how the learning/development doublet produced (and failed to produce) the notion of a singular identity for Student Affairs.

For instance, *Pedagogy and Student Services for Institutional Transformation*, edited by Higbee and Goff (2008), repeatedly referred to the existence of an artificial divide between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The authors throughout this edited volume supported the notion in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) that a dichotomy between learning and development was not helpful and that learning needed to be redefined. From a discursive standpoint, this suggested that the redefinition of “learning” in *Learning Reconsidered* produced a notion of identity that was both able to embrace the disparate past and meld it for the future.

While Higbee and Goff (2008) did not deploy the language doublet as *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) did, the descriptors of learning and the actions suggested throughout the book were conditioned by the practical side of that doublet. In other

words, Student Affairs would still be doing actions that were traditionally thought of as in the realm of Student Affairs expertise (e.g., extra-curricular functions, student support, etc.) and Academic Affairs would still be doing classroom teaching; these two functional areas, however, would coalesce and work together. The doublet then was still intact *de facto*, but starting to erode from a discursive standpoint (perhaps because it was thought not to be needed; perhaps for other reasons).

This notion was an important one for the production of Student Affairs subjectivities because it maintained the distinction of Student Affairs while melding it into learning. This combination of melding and separating past subjectivities served to condition the presentation a singular identity from which to work. The tasks listed throughout *Pedagogy and Student Services for Institutional Transformation* (Higbee & Goff, 2008) were quite similar to the ones listed in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and included first year transition programs, community service programs, learning communities, and other areas of partnership. In a sense, *Learning Reconsidered* functioned to set the stage to move the discourse forward to where future documents would not have to cater to both the ideas of learning and development in discourse to satisfy or relate to their audiences.

Though the subjectivities of Student Affairs throughout history overlapped, they also competed. Similar to the learning continuity/discontinuity doublet, the learning/development dichotomy attempts to center discourse of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as a primary node, producing a singular identity from which Student Affairs could operate. Student Affairs, therefore, would be able position itself more comfortably within the realm of Student Learning (the discursive realm of Academic

Affairs) without being trapped by multiple, competing subjectivities. The discourse perpetuated by Higbee and Goff (2008) suggests that the learning/development doublet did function to further the subjective unification for Student Affairs.

Though Higbee and Goff's (2008) work served as a clear example of the shifting discourse and its relation to identity, it is far from the only document produced from the learning/development doublet. Wildman and Baxter Magolda (2008), for instance, took a less embracive approach in suggesting that though *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) redefined learning, most literature still did not integrate the two camps of learning and development. Baxter Magolda (2009) went on to suggest that the ideas of learning and development were dependent on integration and holistic intersections rather than treating learning and development as "separate constructs" (p. 621). Baxter Magolda's (2009) writing then essentially functioned to support and buttress the context of *Learning Reconsidered*. Baxter Magolda looked heavily back to the educational researcher Kegan throughout the piece, who himself acted as theoretical conditioning for *Learning Reconsidered*.

This kind of theoretical cycle helped to reinforce the notions of identity presented through the original learning/development doublet (while also suggesting the continued perpetuation of the aforementioned competing subjectivities). Thinking again with the idea of Student Affairs as traditionally marginalized within its relationships in higher education, the cyclical support served to create a bigger base of expertise and consensus for the subjectivity created out of merging learning and development; its goal is to produce a new discursive schema to provide new positioning opportunities for Student

Affairs. This merger of subjectivities continues to be important in my discussion of positionality later in this chapter, as it is a condition for producing new positions.

While Baxter Magolda (2009) and Higbee and Goff (2008) were impacted differently by the learning/development doublet, both were products of the discursive strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and both assisted in producing a more stabilized notion of identity for Student Affairs compared to its shifting past. While these works are representative of the deep impact and productive nature of the learning/development doublet, there were also works that did not so directly address the idea of the doublet that also served to produce a singular identity and new discursive positionalities for Student Affairs.

These works were important in that they focused on other, more specific aspects within higher education but used the ideas of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as a discursive node for their theoretical discussions. For instance, Myers and Bastian (2010) examined students with visual disabilities. Their solutions, however, depended upon the integration of learning and development produced by the learning/development doublet in *Learning Reconsidered*. Myers and Bastian, for example, discussed how the tools of working with students with visual disabilities “is a shared responsibility” of the campus (p. 266) in the way that *Learning Reconsidered* discussed learning across disciplines. While Myers and Bastian did discuss “education and development” (p. 266) in the same way that *Learning Reconsidered* repeatedly moved back to presenting both learning and development, their ideas were bound to the combination of the two. While Myer and Bastian (2010) may not have served to unify the subjectivities of Student Affairs from the discursive strategy perspective, they did use this doublet strategy as a centering point for

later professional practice. The use of this doublet in this work and others suggests that the learning/development doublet effectively produced a new discursive node from which Student Affairs could center its discourse.

Other articles took a similar approach in that they were products of the learning/development doublet. Keen and Hall (2009) investigated service learning, Pizzalato and Hicklen (2011) looked at Millennial students, Myers (2008) examined disability education, and Biddix (2010) looked at technology. All of these articles on disparate topics had a common thread, which was *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). *Learning Reconsidered* served as the basis for the cross-campus collaboration in each of these, and, in turn, served to cycle back into the subjective notion of merging the Student Development Discourse into the Student Learning Discourse. By doing so, these continued the discursive shift towards referencing “learning” instead of “development,” and they also served to showcase the effectiveness of the learning/development doublet in embracing the practices and history of the “development” side of the doublet.

The operation of this identity is then seen as performance, presenting “learning” while functioning as “development.” The very notion of a humanistic identity for the field of Student Affairs is a performance, designed to inspire confidence, unity, and a sense of purpose in the practitioners who make up the field.

This performance is perpetuated in these documents that cite *Learning Reconsidered* and that perpetuation moves discourse towards this rupture as a recentering and as a condition to deploy new positionings for Student Affairs in its relations with Academic Affairs. From the perspective of Foucault’s (1980/1991) notion of genealogy, this strategy is where the history forges the present. Of the strategies within *Learning*

Reconsidered, the learning/development doublet is the most necessary for the transformation of discourse and the normalizing of a discursive environment that moves past responsiveness to the marginalized past to a blurring of the subjectivities of Student Affairs for the present.

Conclusion. In this section, I investigated the learning/development doublet in relation to its production of identity in the context of subjectivities. By looking at how the doublet functioned within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), as well as how it was developed previously and how it impacted the future from that document, it becomes clearer how this discursive strategy works in concert with the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy to solidify a singular subjectivity for Student Affairs and position it firmly within the discursive realm of Academic Affairs. The production of a unified identity was critical for positionality with Academic Affairs, which I investigate next.

The Learning/Development Doublet and Positionality

As I discussed in Chapter 2, Student Affairs has viewed being on equal footing with Academic Affairs as a necessary condition for partnership. In discursive terms, this means that Student Affairs as a whole has operated from varying subjectivities based on its relations with Academic Affairs; to partner with Academic Affairs, Student Affairs would then need to operate in the same discursive realm as Academic Affairs. Since the Student Learning Discourse and the learning/development doublet set up both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as being intertwined for learning, it follows that a new positioning setting Student Affairs into the discursive realm of Academic Affairs without marginalizing it or relegating it to a support role would be a necessary condition of

partnership as well. In that sense, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) worked to produce and deploy new positions, through this newfound notion of identity and unity, that equate the work of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to set up this condition for partnership.

Producing new positions through elevating development. The first necessary part of producing new positions was presenting a singular identity for Student Affairs, which, as I investigated above, the learning/development doublet perpetuated for Student Affairs. In Chapter 4, my interactions revealed that *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) repeatedly carved out practices for itself that learning depended upon. In doing so, it created a notion whereby Academic Affairs needed Student Affairs in order to function and produce learning. By prioritizing development in the doublet, *Learning Reconsidered* worked to elevate development. The notion that faculty needed Student Affairs to be “consultants, advisors, and resources” (Keeling, 2004, p. 13) and that “Student Affairs professionals have the skill to serve as faculty development resources” (p. 18) shifted the discursive positioning to move Student Affairs past a history of defining its subjectivities based on a subordinate relationship with Academic Affairs.

The previous thought processes throughout the history of Student Affairs had been that without Academic Affairs, there would be no reason for Student Affairs to exist. In fact, the changes in Student Affairs throughout its history from Chapter 2 and its disappointment in partnership I noted in that chapter were produced by the marginalization and inequity with which it viewed its relationships. The tone of this language in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) suggested a symbiotic relationship, stating that, in the contemporary world, Academic Affairs could not exist without the

support of Student Affairs and that both were needed to “restore the missing holism” (p. 8). Higher education could even look to “Student Affairs graduation preparation programs...regarding ongoing staff development for academic personnel” (p. 28), suggesting that the training that Student Affairs professionals had was necessary for all of academia to possess in order to be successful. By setting up the development side of the learning/development doublet as necessary for the learning side, the discursive shift attempted to provide Student Affairs not just a singular identity, but also an elevated position discursively from which to operate.

Foucault, (1975/1980a) in working with the concept of power/knowledge, noted that power and knowledge were not equivalents, but that they produced each other. Power relations perpetuated notions of knowledge, while knowledge deployed structures of power. The concept of positionality for Student Affairs depends upon the learning/development doublet working in a similar fashion. Though the doublet presented development as within learning through how it is discussed in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), it actually broke down learning into components whereby development produced an environment for learning and vice-versa; for instance, it examined learning about business from both an academic sense and from a sense of taking an “ethical approach” (Keeling, 2004, p. 20). Without taking an ethical approach, the authors posited, business expertise would be wasted.

Similarly, ethics could not operate in a vacuum void of business sense. Setting up this doublet as a perpetuate and symbiotic—one in which development and learning produce each other—was critical to position Student Affairs because deploying the doublet in this sense suggests that Student Affairs and Academic Affairs produce each

other, whereas the historical subjectivities of Student Affairs have been rooted in a discursive environment where Academic Affairs produces Student Affairs but Student Affairs does not produce Academic Affairs.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) continued to develop the learning/development doublet toward new notions of positionality by listing transformational learning goals that highlight developmental aspects so that education is focused on both “academic learning and developmental opportunities” (Keeling, 2004, p. 23). As I noted in Chapter 4, these goals included actions based on citizenship, social justice, career planning, emotional intelligence, and other items often found in the work and practices of Student Affairs professionals throughout its history. These functions were tied to the past subjectivities of Student Affairs, and, by elevating them in the doublet, *Learning Reconsidered* attempted to produce them collectively as a new discursive node and position from which Student Affairs could operate.

While I am not attempting to suggest that Academic Affairs does not address these items through classroom teaching (though *Learning Reconsidered* [Keeling, 2004] does mention that classroom teaching is “structured around conventional categories that are meaningful to the academy” [p. 8]), I am meaning to highlight that Student Affairs professionals often consider these types of actions as within the domain of their development, as I detailed in the history of the field in Chapter 2 and I have seen in my own experiences. Whether they are goals or not, they were cited in *Learning Reconsidered* and the documents leading up to *Learning Reconsidered* as products of Student Affairs and therefore were bound to its multiple subjectivities. By highlighting

these facets as the critical goals in learning, *Learning Reconsidered* again elevated the development side of the learning/development doublet.

Similarly to the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) relied upon its linguistic ability to both refer to learning and development as the same and to separate them. This linguistic dexterity functioned to create a discursive atmosphere that perpetuated the ideas previously thought of only as “development” to the idea of “learning.” By repeatedly referring to development focused goals, this discursive strategy worked in tandem with the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy to first unite Student Affairs under one umbrella, then to present a singular notion of identity, and then to elevate that performed identity to a non-marginalized position within the discursive realm of Academic Affairs. It is hard to understand the full context of how the learning/development doublet plays into positionality without looking at documents to the future of *Learning Reconsidered*. Consequently, I investigate how the positionings of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs were produced by the learning/development doublet below.

The impact of *Learning Reconsidered* on positionality. The reason that new positionings are such an important issue for Student Affairs arose from its historical development as a supplemental sector of higher education. As I discussed in Chapter 2, the development of Student Affairs was not in tandem with or equal to Academic Affairs, but rather it was in response to changes in how Academic Affairs worked with its students; its subjectivities were produced by its power relations with Academic Affairs, but it did not have a conditioning, reciprocal effect. As I investigated and interacted with the documents leading up to *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) that did involve

Academic Affairs, those documents took unambiguously different tones from the ones solely from Student Affairs.

Powerful Partnerships (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998), for example, situated the expertise of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as different domains and did not attempt to equivocate them even as it discussed both as components to learning; this document therefore produced an environment where Student Affairs did not operate from the same discursive realm as Academic Affairs. *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002), on the other hand, did not even make a mention of Student Affairs, delimiting discourse from Student Affairs and functioning to create a power dynamic through exclusion. *Greater Expectations* represented the absence of learning and development as perpetual products each other in the past. According to the discourse of *Greater Expectations*, Student Affairs may have been involved in learning, but it was an invisible, marginalized partner. It thusly created the conditions and discursive space for the resistance to this discursive notion, which the deployment of the learning/development doublet in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) provided.

While *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) attempted to take these inequitable discourses from *Powerful Partnerships* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) and *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002) and meld them into a new discursive node to provide for new positionings, its ability to do so is questionable. Though the function of the learning/development doublet ultimately was to establish an equitable position for the relationship Student Affairs has with Academic Affairs, its production of this discursive environment had limited results.

The trend of a lack of citations of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) from the academic realm that I discussed in Chapter 5 continued in regards to new positionings for Student Affairs. The sheer absence of documents from Academic Affairs referencing either *Learning Reconsidered* or even talking about Student Affairs is notable. The vast majority of academic documents that I interacted with that do mention *Learning Reconsidered* come from researchers who were firmly situated within the discourse of Student Affairs already, such as Baxter Magolda. This may be why Baxter Magolda (2009) noted that despite the research in *Learning Reconsidered*, little literature actually pointed to an integration between learning and development. This concept harkened back to Kezar's (2001) work on the "best practices" for partnership, which suggested that there was a lack of empirical evidence as to what works and what does not.

Even the documents that cited *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) as a specific and positive revolution, such as Higbee and Goff (2008), were situated on *Learning Reconsidered* as a paradigm shift and a new way of thinking. In terms of producing new positionings, the fact that these discourses continued to perpetuate the idea of a discontinuity and a shift in ideals suggests that while a singular identity may have become salient for Student Affairs, it still had not for the higher education community at large and therefore the repositioning and production of a new discursive schema has not yet been successful. In other words, the learning/development doublet's reliance on the multiple subjectivities to condition it also led to the continual perpetuation of those multiple subjectivities outside of Student Affairs rather than the creation of a purposed identity recognized by Academic Affairs.

While the strategies of *Learning Reconsidered* did appear to present an identity that would shift Student Affairs into new positionings and that identity appeared to coalesce due to the work of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy and the learning/development doublet, those strategies did not fully produce a positionality that situates Student Affairs in the realm of Academic Affairs through either language or practices in higher education.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the learning/development doublet and its production of identity (and subjectivities) and positioning for Student Affairs in its relationship with Academic Affairs. Identity and positioning are both critical components to the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, given that the shifting subjectivities of Student Affairs produced its positionality within its relationship with Academic Affairs throughout history.

The learning/development doublet, working alongside the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, created the enabling conditions for the crafting of a unified sense of subjectivity for Student Affairs. The discursive strategies presented in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) setup the ability for Student Affairs to perform as having a unified and distinctive role in learning with Academic Affairs. It appears, however, that these discursive tactics alone did not setup effective conditions for new positionings for Student Affairs within the discursive realm of Academic Affairs.

In the next chapter, I discuss the final major discursive strategy of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), which is the three-pronged approach to reaching and responding to its audience. Following that, I examine in Chapter 8 how these three

strategies served to position Student Affairs and leave opportunity for new positionalities for Student Affairs within the constructs of its power relations with Academic Affairs.

Chapter 7: The Three-Pronged Approach

In Chapter 5 and Chapter 6, I discussed two of the most prominent discursive strategies from *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), which were the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy and the learning/development doublet. Together, these two strategies functioned to reposition Student Affairs within its relationship with Academic Affairs to continually shift those power relations; they operated from a historical perspective of Student Affairs needing to partner with Academic Affairs for education in order to be successful, and they combined to attempt to recenter Student Affairs away from its status as a marginalized entity.

These two primary strategies also worked in a cycle with a third strategy, the three-pronged approach. The three-pronged approach was a background strategy of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) that operated by assuming the language and background of each of the three major discourses in Student Affairs history. In other words, the three-pronged approach was the strategy that allowed *Learning Reconsidered* to cater to individual professionals who identify with elements of the Student Services Discourse, Student Development Discourse, or Student Learning Discourse.

In the simplest terms, the three-pronged approach was an acknowledgement of the historical conditions in the past of Student Affairs and the understanding that the development of the field led to three disparate notions of how Student Affairs functioned within higher education. The three-pronged approach allowed the other strategies

employed in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to operate in an attempt to create that notion of identity for Student Affairs that would continually keep their positioning in higher education moving. In this chapter, I discuss how the three-pronged approach operated, its cyclical relationship with the other discursive strategies of *Learning Reconsidered*, and the implications of this strategy on the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

The Development of the Three-Pronged Approach

In this section, I return to what I learned from my interactions with *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) in Chapter 4 to discuss the three-pronged approach and its operation within *Learning Reconsidered*. As I discussed in my interaction, *Learning Reconsidered* used language that positioned Student Affairs within each of the three major discourses of Student Affairs—the Student Services Discourse, the Student Development Discourse, and the Student Learning Discourse. The operation of this strategy was closely aligned with the other discursive strategies present in *Learning Reconsidered*, but the three-pronged approach operated the most subtly; in fact, it was almost invisible.

The same discursive realities and relations that conditioned the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy also conditioned the three-pronged, which were that Student Affairs had a need to unite disparate paradigms within the field toward a notion of a singular identity. *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) seemingly acknowledged this need, stating, “regardless of our past accomplishments or disappointments, we are all, as colleagues and educators, now accountable to students and society” (p. 1). To approach the unification desired, this discursive strategy moved back into each of those

past paradigms through which professionals might view their accomplishments or disappointments.

As I discussed in Chapter 2, the three dominant discourses of Student Affairs are not exclusively chronological, and there are Student Affairs professionals and departments that espouse the values of each of those languages and enact practices that are derived from and support each of these discourses. *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) did not operate in a void (for, as MacLure [2003] reminded us, nothing does); instead, it was a contextual piece, stemming from these disparate discourses in an attempt to position Student Affairs in a different power relations with Academic Affairs. Because the stated goal of *Learning Reconsidered* was partnership, the attempt to position Student Affairs differently was tied to a goal of being perceived by Academic Affairs counterparts as an equal partner.

Because *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was purported to speak to (and for) all of Student Affairs, it was necessary for it to bring Student Services and Student Development under the umbrella of Student Learning if it were to succeed. From a power standpoint, the utility in doing so was that it continued to strengthen the notion of a singular identity for Student Affairs.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) attempted to make many various points of entry and exit within the field into one, unified point of entry, thus simplifying the role that Student Affairs played within higher education (and setting the conditions to present a notion of identity). For example, *Learning Reconsidered* employed the use of ideas of “support for faculty” (p. 13), as well as developmental-minded texts such as “collaborative co-curricular programming” (p. 18). The challenge that the three-pronged

approach faced as a strategy was that by catering to disparate discourses within Student Affairs, it reinforced the multiple subjectivities of Student Affairs even as it attempted to coalesce them into a central idea of an identity.

Although faculties are diverse and diffuse, many tenets of learning, teaching, and research that created the (presumed) central purpose to higher education resonate throughout academia (Jewitt, 1997) and had done so for far longer than Student Affairs has existed. The Academic Affairs side of higher education undoubtedly produced multiple subjectivities for academia, but because of a presumed central mission, a notion of identity is perpetuated through the core purpose of Academic Affairs. Because of the younger timespan with which Student Affairs has had to develop, it perpetuated a multitude of competing subjectivities from which it worked that do not share a core identity, as evidenced in the historical development in Chapter 2 and the conditions leading up to the creation of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). *Learning Reconsidered* employed the use of the three-pronged approach to push Student Affairs toward a singular identity, in the way that Academic Affairs is presumed to be rallied around “student learning” in discourse already. Speaking to each of the three prongs created the conditions for the learning/development doublet to operate.

From the genealogical standpoint, the three-pronged approach was a great enacting of not only the diffuse nature of power (Foucault, 1975/1980a), but it was also an example of a subject being set within a complex web of power relations. Although one could think of Student Affairs as a subject (presuming it a sense of false agency and therefore identity), its subjectivities were created by the discourses that formed how it operated and was positioned in higher education. In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault

(1978/1990) discussed that shifts and changes in power happened with “overlappings, interactions, and echoes” (p. 149). The three-pronged approach served as an example of this phenomenon within the schema of higher education. *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was produced by these overlappings of discourses and power, for each dominant Student Affairs discourse produced different ramifications for the power relations in higher education.

Although *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was a rupture to provide a shift in the positioning of Student Affairs, it did not do so void of any notion of the past history that led to it. The three-pronged approach both acknowledged these overlappings as a “variation in the content and context of institutions’ ways of accomplishing associated developmental outcomes” (p. 19) and took those echoes to set the stage for the discursive strategies to unify them into a new understanding of identity for Student Affairs.

How the Three-Pronged Approach Operated

Making the three-pronged approach visible is difficult, because, as I discussed above, it was the subtlest of the three primary discursive strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). While it is clearer to point to how *Learning Reconsidered* uses the specific language of both “learning” and “development” throughout, the three-pronged approach operated within the backdrop of the prose in the piece. It was the driving force of discourse for the creation of the document, but it was not in the spotlight.

For example, when speaking of working with faculty in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), the document framed the partnership as Student Affairs needing “to provide support” (p. 13) to faculty members. This mention was a subtle discursive tactic

that flipped the relationship of Student Affairs from being subservient to faculty to the other way around. By suggesting that Student Affairs were again a support, it built off of the Student Services Discourse, but then moved into positioning Student Affairs as experts that faculty had to rely upon rather than the presumption that Student Affairs needed Academic Affairs in order to exist. The distinction here appeared slight in text, but was monumental in the implications for practices in the future because it provides the discursive space for Student Affairs to be presented as indispensable to a university as a whole with not just its support of students, but also now due to the reliance of Academic Affairs on Student Affairs professionals.

By pitting faculty as needing the support of Student Affairs, who would need to work as “accessible and flexible consultants” (Keeling, 2004, p. 13), the three-pronged approach, built from overlappings of the Student Services, Student Development, and Student Learning discourses, then operated to break the dominant schema. It essentially operated by exploiting the cracks between these three dominant discourses, taking the idea of Student Services and filtering it through the discourse of Student Learning by pointing out gaps in the current learning process.

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) seemingly even acknowledged its breaking of the schema, stating, “certainly challenging teaching methods that have been widely used by generations of faculty will be challenging” (p. 12). If Academic Affairs were associated with learning, and if there were a gap in learning—which *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) argued there was due to the changing demographics of higher education—and if Student Affairs could fit a service role, then Student Affairs

could provide a service that would fill the gap in student learning left by Academic Affairs to teach them to reconsider “learning” as well.

It is important to note that the idea of a “gap” in education was presented in the context of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) through its discussion of the changing circumstances of the student population and context of the student body. This gap harkened back to the conditions that deploy the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy strategy. In the case of the three-pronged approach and the notion of Student Affairs filling a gap in student learning through providing a service to faculty, the gap was constructed through the discontinuity assumed in the dichotomy and then Student Affairs “filled” that gap by providing Student Services, which suggest the constant progression of the continuity portion of the dichotomy. This gap that *Learning Reconsidered* espoused was what created the discursive space for the three-pronged approach.

The three-pronged approach therefore both relied upon and expanded the other strategies present in *Learning Reconsidered* to exploit cracks in the common discourse of higher education. By using elements of each of the dominant discourses, Student Affairs attempted to position itself as the only portion of higher education that could provide the service needed to complete student learning. This notion was carved out through the language of the Student Development Discourse with which *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was filled. The functions needed to fill the gap in learning are from the “expertise of student affairs” (Keeling, 2004, p. 20) and therefore the service role to complete learning must be filled by experts in Student Development.

The three-pronged approach served as conditioning discourse for how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) emerged as a rupture. By using criteria from each of the dominant discourses, the three-pronged approach took the weaknesses of each of those discourses and allowed them to coalesce into a strong discursive strategy. From a power standpoint, this strategy also shifted the power relations through discourse by making faculty, generally considered experts, into neophytes for holistic learning; the previously presumed positions for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs throughout history were then flipped on their heads, as I introduced in Chapter 4. *Learning Reconsidered* cited a lack of support structure for tenure in innovative teaching and learning ideas and set its noting of learning goals firmly in the camp of traditionally Student Affairs related ideas, such as career planning, conflict resolution, and citizenship, which faculty had supposedly abandoned long ago in the evolution of higher education due to Student Affairs taking over those aspects of learning (Doyle, 2004).

The three-pronged approach provided the initial resistance to the dominating discursive environment in which Student Affairs operated upon the release of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). By picking up where there were contradictions in the way discourse framed the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, the three-pronged approach was able to use these “fissures and cracks” (Niesche, 2011, p. 23) to open up a challenge to the functioning power relations. It was then able to use these cracks, such as the constructed gap in how student services could be required for student learning, to influence a shifting positionality, which was where the three-pronged approach moved from being a product conditioned by the power relations to also being a strategy that could condition. Through providing this unified subjectivity across the

discourses of Student Affairs, the other two more prominent strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* could better function and influence the field of higher education.

The Cyclical Nature of the Three-Pronged Approach

In the previous section, I discussed how the three-pronged approach acted as the conditioning strategy for the other two prominent discursive strategies of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to operate. In this section, I further explore the nature of this strategy's relationship with the other two strategies.

All three strategies operate with the context of Foucault's notion of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1975/1980a), which is to say that all three strategies were forged from the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and that all three strategies also influenced this relationship. The power dynamics that created these strategies led to the knowledge that these strategies produce, which were new positionings for Student Affairs and the concept of creating a singular identity for Student Affairs within a discursive sense. The combination of these strategies, therefore, functioned in an attempt to unify Student Affairs and to affect Academic Affairs and the role that Academic Affairs plays in higher education as well.

Though each of these strategies had a conditioning role on the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, the three-pronged approach also operated cyclically with the other strategies. Similar to how Foucault (1975/1980a) discussed power and knowledge as producing and being produced by each other, the three-pronged approach produced and was produced by the other two strategies as well. Though it might be easy to push aside the three-pronged approach because it was the least visible of the three prominent strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), it did operate in

that document as a separate strategy that reinforced and deployed the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy and the learning/development doublet, as well as was reinforced and deployed by those strategies.

The cycle with the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. In Chapter 5, I discussed the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy as obfuscating discourse. As I noted in my analysis of that dichotomy, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) operated to obfuscate discourse in response to its preceding documents coming from disparate sources. These documents, *The Student Learning Imperative* (ACPA, 1996), *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997), *Powerful Partnerships* (AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA, 1998) and *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002) operated from all three of the discursive contexts that I outlined in Chapter 2. While *The Student Learning Imperative* and *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* both built toward the Student Learning Discourse, *Powerful Partnerships* firmly sat in the Student Development Discourse by presenting Student Affairs as focused in co-curricular learning and Academic Affairs in cognitive learning. *Greater Expectations* placed Student Affairs in the Student Services Discourse by delimiting its discourse altogether and stamping “learning” as a concept for Academic Affairs primarily.

The three-pronged approach could not exist without the split of these documents from different perspectives, but it also *must exist* because of the split of these documents. When I above referred to the cracks in normalized discourse, the disparate nature and premises of these documents created those cracks. These cracks that allowed for the three-pronged approach then also setup the conditions for the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy. By speaking across these different audiences,

Learning Reconsidered (Keeling, 2004) was an attempt to merge these subjectivities into something new, balancing the acts of continuity and discontinuity in how it reshaped different power relations with Academic Affairs.

The way the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy functioned then perpetuated the three-pronged approach strategy within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). The development of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy depended upon how the audience viewed Student Affairs itself. Because the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy spoke to audiences who viewed it in each way, it was able to meld the continuity and discontinuity into a pathway to the three-pronged approach's combination of discourses. In other words, once the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy functioned to set the stage for the partnership that *Learning Reconsidered* posits, that partnership was able to contain elements of each of the dominant discourses. The partnership that the three-pronged approach described—one in which Student Affairs acted as a specific service entity for Academic Affairs with expertise distinct from Academic Affairs—could not exist without the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy convincing an audience that partnership was necessary, either through the inevitability of change in higher education (continuity) or the education revolution (discontinuity) needed for our new demographic of students.

The cycle with the learning/development doublet. Similar to the way the three-pronged approach perpetuated and was perpetuated by the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, it had a conditioned and conditioning role with the learning/development doublet as well. In Chapter 6, I discussed the learning/development doublet in detail, referring to its relationship with the desired singular identity (and

multiple subjectivities) of Student Affairs and the sense of partnership that having a unified notion of identity would allow Student Affairs to have in the power relations with Academic Affairs. Much like the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, the functions of this doublet could not operate without the conditioning strategy of the three-pronged approach.

The past practices of Student Affairs across three distinct discourses were what provide the necessary conditions for the learning/development doublet. Because Student Affairs had operated as a Student Services entity, a Student Development entity, and a Student Learning entity, the language surrounding its practices shifted throughout history. The language of “development” and the language of “learning” stemmed from the historical practices of Student Affairs. Because the Student Development Discourse and the Student Learning Discourse were the most recent dominant discourses for Student Affairs, they operated out of the same milieu that produced the three-pronged approach, which was the marginalization of Student Affairs in its relationship with Academic Affairs. Student Affairs, throughout its history, shifted its definition of its purpose in order to continually reposition itself aside Academic Affairs and in the discursive environment of higher education. The three-pronged approach within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was created out of that shifting and the multiple subjectivities shaped through those shifts.

As I previously discussed, Student Affairs departments have embraced and embodied each of the dominant discourses of Student Affairs, even contemporarily, depending on local discursive environments. Without acknowledging this disparate nature of the field, the learning/development doublet could not exist. It required a

presumption of multiple subjectivities to employ a strategy that works from the conditions of these subjectivities. In *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), the learning/development doublet operated from both the Student Learning Discourse and the Student Development Discourse. It therefore could not exist if the three-pronged approach did not acknowledge the historical conditions and then work from them to produce a new discursive environment.

The three-pronged approach was then perpetuated by the learning/development doublet because the learning/development doublet reinforced the prongs within the three-pronged approach. While the three-pronged approach combined Student Services, Student Development, and Student Learning, the repeated use of terminology from both the Student Learning Discourse and the Student Services Discourse deployed additional discourse to continue to standardize and normalize both of these separate discourses. By using the terms repeatedly, as I investigated in Chapter 6, the base material for the three-pronged approach was strengthened through this prominent discourse. Consider how *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) was able to speak to the “particular responsibility” (p. 29) of Student Affairs while talking about student learning. It moved between “learning” and “development” in language, so that the three-pronged approach was then able to build upon those two separate discourses to combine them and its argument was then situated within the contexts of both “learning” and “development.”

This normalization of discourse was what made the three-pronged approach disappear within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). The three-pronged approach appeared to be the default for how practitioners should think about Student Affairs, no

matter their paradigmatic leanings, because it drew on (and depended upon) the effects of the learning/development doublet.

The Three-Pronged Approach and Power

In this chapter, I discussed both how the three-pronged approach operated, as well as the cyclical relationship between the three-pronged approach and the other two prominent discursive strategies of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). This cyclical relationship is important because the discourses of *Learning Reconsidered* operated in concert to perpetuate and produce one another. In this way, they operated with the inertia necessary to build *Learning Reconsidered* into a rupture in the standard discourse of higher education.

Were *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) to employ only one of these three strategies, it likely could not be successful because Student Affairs had operated from such a multitude of perspectives and had (and has) three distinct and competing dominant subjectivities guided by discourse—the Student Services Discourse, the Student Development Discourse, and the Student Learning Discourse. The three-pronged approach was both a product of these competing discourses and attempted to meld these competing subjectivities by masking them to seem as one identity through the other two discursive strategies of the learning continuity/discontinuity dichotomy and the learning/development doublet.

In my previous examinations in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 regarding the impact of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and its operation as a rupture for Student Affairs and the discursive context of higher education, I discussed how each of the two other dominant strategies was built as a product of strategies and practices from the history of

Student Affairs and how each of these strategies produced new discursive realities, repositionings for Student Affairs, and shifted the power relations for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. None of these shifts could have been enabled without the three-pronged approach's use of the cracks in its current discursive environment nor would their products be as prominent.

Conclusion

In these last four chapters, I focused primarily on my two first research questions, looking at how the historical conditions formed and deployed these discursive strategies and how each of these strategies enables power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. In Chapter 8, I conclude by examining the implications of these three discursive strategies by expanding further on each of my research questions, but in particular on my third research question, which is looking at how this rupture creates discursive positionings for Student Affairs and how Student Affairs perpetuates those power/knowledge relations further. In the next chapter, I also examine the theoretical, methodological, and practical implications of this project and look to what my analysis means for the future of partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Chapter 8: Conclusions and Implications

In the preceding four chapters, I used the genealogical method I formed through the lens of Foucault to investigate and analyze the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs through discourse. Specifically, I began my interactions with a discursive rupture in the development of Student Affairs, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and moved outward from that document to examine the conditions that led to the formation of *Learning Reconsidered* and the discursive effects of that document. Through my analysis, I landed primarily on three individual strategies of discourse perpetuated from *Learning Reconsidered*.

These strategies—the continuity/discontinuity dichotomy, the learning/development doublet, and the three-pronged approach—each developed in concert with the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and each also perpetuated positionings for Student Affairs within that relationship. In this chapter, I summarize my conclusions on those three strategies, discuss the limitations of this study, and examine at the theoretical, methodological, and practical implications of this study.

Finding an Ending

In looking to the conclusions for this study, the first obvious question I approach is whether or not this an appropriate stopping point. When examining discourse and the strategies and practices that deploy and reinforce various discourses, it is easy for a

project to expand and becoming unwieldy, as I referenced in Chapter 3. Because discourse encompasses everything (MacLure, 2003), it can be frustrating to assume an end. Discourse has no end, nor do power relations. The very idea of an ending to a project is deterministic and enforces an artificial structure upon what is (and has been) (and for that matter, will be) occurring. Unlike a controlled study to examine a distinct treatment on a discrete variable, our knowledge of discourse expands and embraces increasingly more when it is examined rather than becoming pinpointed and narrowed.

Despite those poststructuralist understandings that I bring to my work, this project must have an end, artificial or not. In deciding where to end, I return to Foucault's (1980/1991) thoughts regarding the research process, which were to examine a space, open it up for research, and then move on. I began, like Foucault, with a rupture, and through following the implications and the conditions of that rupture began to feel the web of discursive nodes cycling around several specific items. While other elements of discourse continued to open up, the three strategies that I examined began to show their perpetuation in a loop (as evidenced, for example, by the self-referential literature) and established discursive web.

Though those other discursive pathways and nodes are still being perpetuated, I again am reminded by Foucault (1977) that my purpose is not to examine total history but instead my purpose is to use discourse and history to examine power relations. With that conceptualization of my project in mind, my next step was to look to the methodological considerations with which I began to investigate how my project worked with those considerations to critique power/knowledge in the relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Kendall and Wickham (1999) provided the outline of what is required for a discourse analysis when applying Foucault's methods, and their outline focused on recognizing the sayable and unsayable and how those are perpetuated through rules derived through strategies and practices. In the preceding four chapters, I investigated the ways in which Student Affairs has chosen to (or has been positioned to) define and present itself and how those rules were developed through the literature and practices leading up to the publication of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), as well as how *Learning Reconsidered* shifted or reinforced those subjectivities.

Foucault (1977/1980c) offered the other set of methodological recommendations I used to derive my methodology, and his recommendations primarily focused upon looking at how power was exercised "at the extreme points" (p. 97), as well as how power functioned in a web rather than top-down. As I noted in Chapter 3, Foucault's use of "extreme points" is to indicate that we should look to the peripherals, extremities, and edges of a discursive web rather than at the top of its presumed hierarchy. Through my analysis, I investigated how the discourse of major documents such as *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) has influenced (and been influenced by) the work of practitioners and the "best practices" that they bring forward. Practitioners serve as a functional example of these extremities of power because though Student Affairs itself is a large entity, it is made up of loosely affiliated individuals working on distinct college campuses. These are the individuals who not only help to make more visible the effects of power, but they also represent the web-like structure of power relations. My own personal examples, presented in Chapter 3, fall into this web and this understanding of looking to the extremes of power.

Having followed my initial rupture to tease out the nodes of discourse surrounding its three primary strategies and having checked my contemplation of my methodological guidelines (a strategy congruent with the considerations of both Maxell [2005] and Creswell [2012] that I discussed in Chapter 3), the next step for examining my study under the guise of presenting a conclusion is to look at my results more pointedly through the lens of my initial research questions. Below, I examine my findings in the specific context of each of my research questions to look at how my analysis has satisfied or not satisfied these research curiosities.

Summary of results. To summarize my results, I opt to point back to my initial research questions. Because my analysis did not follow a linear pathway, reviewing my results through my specific research questions helps to clarify the routes of my analysis and the revelations from it. Of importance to my results are Foucault's (1977/1980h) assertion that every discourse embodies obscurities and obfuscations, so although I present this summary, it cannot contain every aspect of the discourses I studied.

Though the goal the interactions and analysis I presented in the previous four chapters is to make discourses more visible, I conducted my analysis with the understanding that it would situate a subject, Student Affairs, within a discursive context and not that it would reveal every aspect of a subject. Similarly, though the focus of my analytical chapters has been on discourse, the primary function of my analysis is not just to reveal discourse, but to examine how discourse operates to create positionings for Student Affairs and how the discursive environment influences the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. With this epistemological understanding, I return to my three research questions:

1. What are the historical conditions that form and deploy the Student Learning Discourse for Student Affairs?

Looking back to my analysis in the previous four chapters, the historical conditions that form (and formed) and deploy (and deployed) the Student Learning Discourse are myriad. The belief of Student Affairs in the need for and struggle to create an identity as an entity was forged from both the historical development of Student Affairs and the discourse that envelopes that development. The combination of the shift in the responsibilities of Student Affairs with its absence in the literature (and practices) of Academic Affairs created the discursive space for the Student Learning Discourse to form.

Although *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) served as a rupture in emphasizing the shift in discourse, it did not do so in a vacuum. Reflections of the environment in which *Learning Reconsidered* was presented are evident in that document and its strategies. Elements of the Student Learning Discourse were clearly already present at the time of the publication of *Learning Reconsidered*, but the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered* were products of the competing discourses and positions of Student Affairs.

All three strategies depend on the various discursive environments in which Student Affairs has operated, and, without those, a unifying document to deploy the Student Learning Discourse as the centering node of discourse for the field would not be possible. Additionally, the strategies within *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), conditioned by the historical power relations between Student Affairs and Academic

Affairs, deploy the Student Learning Discourse as a singular discourse for Student Affairs. The attempt of these strategies is to present Student Affairs with an identity.

In thinking with the idea of a genealogy as a “history of the present” (Foucault, 1977), it follows that the historical power relations are what formed the presently dominant Student Learning Discourse and work to deploy it. The same strategies that perpetuate the discourse through *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) could not exist without the historical power relations in which they were produced. Looking again to Foucault’s (1975/1980a) concept of the power/knowledge doublet, this document is perhaps where this doublet is clearest in positioning Student Affairs. The power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs opened the discursive cracks and fissures for Student Affairs to perpetuate its own sense of identity through the Student Learning Discourse. The knowledge presented through *Learning Reconsidered* is done as a result of the nodes of power in higher education.

Cyclically, the knowledge in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) also perpetuates power structures, both embracing certain kinds of discourse and delimiting others. The constructs of power are then seen in the practices and literature of individual practitioners that follow *Learning Reconsidered*, which is consistent with the feelings I had in my own history and the results of my previous pilot project. The perpetuation of the Student Learning Discourse in those documents that followed *Learning Reconsidered* also suggest that the power/knowledge relationship continued to reinforce the positionality of Student Affairs and the dominance of the Student Learning Discourse within the field of Student Affairs.

2. What power/knowledge relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs are enabled by this discourse?

The power/knowledge relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs that are enabled by the Student Learning Discourse and also by the discursive strategies of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) are a complex web. Based on my interactions with the documents surrounding *Learning Reconsidered*, the power/knowledge relations that are enabled are focused primarily internally for Student Affairs.

The strategies of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) presented an idea of an identity and purpose to Student Affairs. From the power perspective, this is rooted in Student Affairs standing in as a singular entity (or attempting to) in the midst of being formed by a group of disparate practitioners. The practices of these varying practitioners emphasized the subjectivities of Student Affairs and splintered notions of being a unified field. Because of the feelings of marginalization created by the historical context, *Learning Reconsidered* perpetuates a sense of identity as a product of those power relations. This is a primary power/knowledge effect of the Student Learning Discourse and the rupture of *Learning Reconsidered*.

From the Academic Affairs standpoint, at first *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and the Student Learning Discourse do not appear to enable additional power/knowledge relations because their impact is not felt in the Academic Affairs world. Literature suggests that Academic Affairs are not a heavily invested partner simply due to their absence of direct connections to the discursive nodes of *Learning Reconsidered*.

Looking closer, however, reveals that additional power/knowledge relations are enabled by this discourse because of the silence in response and the delimiting of the Student Learning Discourse from an academic side. Because Academic Affairs does not respond in the same fashion as Student Affairs, it continues to perpetuate the marginalization of Student Affairs. Because Student Affairs has unified and rallied around this discourse too, the silence is even more delimiting because it then does not recognize the progress that Student Affairs has presented itself as having made.

In terms of perpetuation of power, the ability of Academic Affairs to ignore the implications of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and build on the inertia of its current power constructs reinforces its discursive position and the marginalization of Student Affairs. Although the strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* can be considered destabilizing to Academic Affairs, with its elevation of Student Affairs and focus on the shortcomings of traditional education, Academic Affairs ignored it for the most part and was thusly not shaken through this rupture. By continuing to remain silent and not respond to the discursive nodes surrounding *Learning Reconsidered*, Academic Affairs asserts its role and independence from Student Affairs as an identity.

Therefore, while the Student Learning Discourse and *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) enabled a sense (or presentation) of identity, the underlying finding of my analysis is that this discursive shift remained internal. My own stories presented in Chapter 3 illustrate this concept as well. The interviewer who corrected my language of “dorm” to “residence hall” was focused on that shifting understanding of the identity and purpose of Student Affairs. My conversations with the Honors College director on how Student Affairs should be deferential and supportive to the learning that takes place on

the academic side, suggest that the Student Learning Discourse did not impact her understanding of our relationship. The combination of the products of this discourse in both a positive and negative light for Student Affairs leads to the third research question regarding the positioning of Student Affairs.

3. How do these power/knowledge relations produce particular discursive positions for Student Affairs? And, in turn, how does Student Affairs further power/knowledge relations and practices?

From the perspective of positionality, Student Affairs is situated in its relationship with Academic Affairs through the rise of the Student Learning Discourse and through the strategies deployed by *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). The three primary discursive strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* all coalesce around one function in particular, and that function is identity. As I discussed in my analysis, professionals have associated the fractured identity of Student Affairs as part of the issue in partnering with Academic Affairs.

The strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* work together to produce a discursive position for Student Affairs that appropriates the discourse of Student Learning from Academic Affairs. This positioning for Student Affairs is designed to give Student Affairs a unified sense of identity and a place from which to operate in equitable partnerships with Academic Affairs.

Considered with a wide-angle lens view, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) appears to represent the totality of Student Affairs, but as the literature following its publication showed, the splintered ideas of learning versus development and of the three dominant historical discourses of Student Affairs both continued after *Learning*

Reconsidered and were able to use that document's rupture to reinforce those ideas.

While *Learning Reconsidered* opened up the discursive space for Student Affairs to have a singular sense of identity, its strategies, in relying on the disparate past of Student Affairs, also continued to perpetuate the competing subjectivities and positions for the field.

The Student Learning Discourse, then, creates positions for Student Affairs, both intentional and unintentional. Though the strategies were pointed at continuing to perpetuate this discourse, as a rupture, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) used elements of each of the singular discourses and used the Student Learning Discourse to also elevate the Student Services and Student Development Discourses. Therefore, the Student Learning Discourse, through its perpetuation, actually perpetuates all of the discourses of Student Affairs.

The result of this perpetuation is that while these strategies in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) opened up discursive possibilities within Student Affairs, they did not have the same implications or products across higher education. Despite the Student Learning Discourse becoming prominent, the literature and descriptions of "best practices" following *Learning Reconsidered* suggest that partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs following this rupture did not position Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as equitable partners or directly create specific plans or resources for professionals who wished to engage in successful partnerships.

Through the continuing conversation that remained present in the literature regarding the Student Learning Discourse, Student Affairs was able to continue to further the discourse and to continue to build toward the internal idea of an identity for the field.

Though the results of the Student Learning Discourse have not yet been the ideal partnership envisioned in the presented discourse, Student Affairs has been able to create the discursive space for itself to be included in learning and to continue to reposition itself and its role in higher education based on that. Considering how much younger a field Student Affairs is than Academic Affairs, this is no small victory.

Rallying around a central purpose—even in the midst of the echoes of the Student Services Discourse and Student Development Discourse—remains a useful task for Student Affairs. Though the discourse suggests that the extremities of the field (the individual practitioners) are not in agreement or alliance as to how the field is presented, the relationship between discourse and practices suggests that creating this space for an identity will help to perpetuate a sense of purpose not just in the field as a whole, but also in individual practitioners who look to connect their practice to theory to justify their work on their own campuses.

Considering a conclusion. At the beginning of this section of the chapter, I asked if this was an appropriate stopping point for my work. Having now examined my methodological considerations and my research questions again, I believe that my analysis of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) has yielded valuable results. While there are additional discourses set outward from these nodes that perpetuate indefinitely, the discursive web with which I have interacted has led me to not only the conclusions to my research questions above, but also to implications for theory, method, and practice. In the section below, I discuss these implications.

Implications of this Study

Because of the unique nature of this dissertation and because poststructuralism has not been applied to Student Affairs in the past, it is important to consider its implications in a variety of manners. In order to look at the implications of this study, I have divided my discussion of its implications into three parts—theoretical, methodological, and practical. I have chosen these three ways to examine my study's implications because I believe they provide multiple entry points for future research and for work in the field of Student Affairs.

It is also critical to acknowledge that the implications for this study will not take the form of recommendations for future practice. While I appreciate the notion such recommendations have, the purpose of my study is to deconstruct the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Deconstruction and a poststructuralist epistemology aim to be both skeptical of common sense assumptions and to trouble current structures of discourse and practice. To provide a set of implications recommended a way forward would be to recenter Student Affairs around my own assumptions and to build new structures. Instead, I will consider my implications in terms of how my analysis makes discourse more visible and how my research process creates tools that can be used to decenter additional structures and considerations through investigating theoretical, methodological, and practical implications with a poststructuralist mindset.

Theoretical implications. There are two ways to think about theoretical implications. The first, and simpler, is to consider the implications of this study for the world of theory in which it is based. My work is rooted in a poststructuralist

epistemology and in a framework derived from both the work of Michel Foucault and document analyses.

When I consider the implications of this work for the theoretical perspective, the primary implication is that it helps to create a space for Foucault's work to inform the practice of Student Affairs. Though Foucault (1975/1980a) did write about universities, his work did not explicitly situate Student Affairs into its context (or likely consider them at all). Additionally, the composition of higher education has continued to shift and change since Foucault's writings. Therefore, though Foucault explored his concept of power/knowledge, it was done in institutions other than Student Affairs and without the same understanding of the changing demographics of higher education and relations that Student Affairs experiences today. Using Foucault's doublet to investigate power/knowledge for the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs expands our analysis of the power/knowledge phenomenon by making it more visible in a differently tangible way than has previously been discussed.

My research also serves to continue to link Foucault's notions of discourse and genealogy to his concepts of power/knowledge. Because, as I discussed in Chapter 3, Foucault did not present his work as a standalone methodology, his methods can be difficult to trace and difficult to connect to one another. By using methods informed by the power/knowledge concept, this study assists in connecting discrete methods of research to poststructuralist epistemology.

In that same sense, it also serves to continue to tether poststructuralist research to physical operations. The relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs plays out every day in institutions of higher education, and this study has theoretical

implications for poststructuralism as a field by bringing it into the discussion of this relationship. Because poststructuralist research focuses often on discourse and because discourse embodies everything (St. Pierre, 2000), poststructuralism as a theoretical framework can be difficult to visualize and conceptualize. This study serves as a tangible manifestation of the use of poststructuralism to convey the impact of discourse on power relations and on real world entities such as Student Affairs.

In the discussion of discourse and power, this study also serves to reinforce the understanding of discourse as productive. As I mentioned in Chapter 3, discourses are productive and produce our understanding of what can be said and not said, done and not done, and even produce our understanding of identity. As Kendall and Wickham (1999) reminded us, medical discourses are what construct our notions of the ill and penological discourses are what create the criminal. My research then also suggests that discourses on learning produce Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and their roles. Discourse creates the rules for how higher education operations, and this study reinforces the concept of productive discourse by making it visible in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

This study's methodological implications would not be possible without the study itself serving as a representation of poststructuralist theory in a practical setting. The links between discourse, the content of this study, and its theoretical framework create the conditions for its methodological effects and serve as the context for those implications. I discuss these implications below.

Methodological implications. In terms of methodological implications, this study opens up many new avenues for research for both poststructuralist researchers and for

Student Affairs professionals. Because Foucault never provided an outline or method for his genealogy, there has not been a clear path to conducting a Foucauldian power analysis through the genealogical method. By combining the methodological considerations of Foucault (1977/1980c) with the discourse analysis guidelines of Kendall and Wickham (1999), this study provides a guiding subset of strategies for discourse analysis.

While this method cannot be replicated in the way that a more traditional study could be, my research does have implications in creating a framework that could be applied to other studies. By developing genealogy from a concept and series of methodological gadgets to an applicable framework for conducting research, future researchers can focus on the individual needs and considerations of their subject matter within a methodological structure that connects genealogy to power analysis while still allowing the flexibility that poststructuralist research requires in its adaptation. Additionally, my study itself serves as a representation of how this framework can be applied in a variant, nonlinear fashion in order to reveal the complex intersections of discourse and power within (and around) a particular relationship.

Examining texts for power. My employment of document analysis texts from outside the realm of poststructuralism to guide my research is perhaps more impactful than the methodological considerations through which this study worked. The lessons from Prior (2004) and Atkinson and Coffey (2004) guided my development of the specific questions I posed to documents to conduct my genealogy. Tying these document analysis methods to my poststructuralist methodological considerations is what helped me to both focus my research and to allow it to expand rhizomatically as required by the content of this study.

In looking to Prior (2004) and Atkinson and Coffey (2004) through a lens of poststructuralism, I applied their concepts on the (artificial) livelihood of documents and the context in which documents are created to the understandings of poststructuralism that I gained from MacLure (2003) and Gannon and Davies (2011). This application is what led me to ask questions of my documents in order to see where they would take me, and this application also led me to development my own series of method questions to conduct this process with each document with which I interacted. As presented in Chapter 3, those questions were as follows:

1. What processes or circumstances (i.e., power relations) produced this document?
2. What is the function of this document?
3. What are the effects of this document?
4. What knowledge is produced by this document and its relevance to the Student Learning Discourse?
5. How does this document influence the sayable? What does it silence?
6. How does this document function as a power/knowledge strategy in Student Affairs or higher education?

These questions not only served to conduct my genealogy, but they also act as potential starting place for future genealogies, as they create a framework for applying the document analysis techniques to a Foucauldian power analysis. Similarly, my method for conducting an audit to find additional documents also serves to help future researchers uncover the networks in which the documents they investigate exist.

My discussion of my personal story through memos and the visibility of my own thought processes within my analysis also could help researchers to examine the relationship that they hold with their subject matter and their research. For my own future research, the combination of the methodological considerations and my document analysis provide me with a framework and starting point with which to investigate other discourses within the Student Affairs realm or its relationship with Academic Affairs.

Implications for research by Student Affairs professionals. This research also has implications for Student Affairs professionals in their research. By opening up a space for poststructuralism and discourse analysis in the field of Student Affairs, this study creates new opportunities for research in the field that before have not been thoroughly considered.

Not only does it provide the opportunity to see how poststructuralism can be applied to Student Affairs, but this study also has specific implications for research in Student Affairs. Many of the factors mentioned in this study have not previously been considered within the context of discourse. For instance, the lack of successful partnerships between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs often came up in the literature, but not through the lens of how the discourse has shaped the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Additionally, the notion of “best practices” that is brought up repeatedly in the work of Student Affairs is centered around presumed understanding for “best practices” but does not explicitly consider the implications for why “best practices” are the way in which Student Affairs professionals write about the work that they do. The poststructuralist investigation this study provided reveals that there are many

conditioning factors to how Student Affairs develops unified ideas of its work and itself, and those can (and should) be investigated within that context.

Furthermore, the often cited Kezar (2001) and Baxter Magolda (2009) findings that little empirical evidence exists to suggest what a successful partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs looks like is situated within the context of the same discursive environment as these “best practices” and the historical conditions that perpetuated the partnerships as they are today. These findings and the lack of partnership do not exist outside the realm of discourse, and this study provides new avenues to examine the reason that partnerships are not as successful as they potentially could be.

Conclusion. In this section I discussed the methodological implications for this study. Together, the methodological considerations and document analysis techniques create opportunity for future researchers to apply my genealogical Foucauldian power analysis to other subject areas and other relationships.

This study also has implications for future research in Student Affairs because the revelations of this power analysis question the results and conclusions of previous studies as to partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The research and relationships discussed in literature regarding the development of this partnership can now be examined within the context of how discourse positions Student Affairs in that research.

In addition, this study has implications for Student Affairs professionals not just as researchers, but also as practitioners. I believe the combination of research and practice is what will bring the most change and create partnerships across higher

education. Accordingly, in the next section, I detail the implications of this study for future practices of Student Affairs professionals.

Practical implications. The practical implications for this dissertation are perhaps the most difficult to predict because of the diverse nature of Student Affairs professionals and the disparate ways in which their power relations manifest. As I stated previously, I cannot center Student Affairs practice on a set of recommendations for how they should do their jobs. Individual practitioners are involved in their own partnership(s) with Academic Affairs, and while these relationships live within the discourse of the field at large, they are also specific to their own contexts.

For example, in my own relationship with the head of the Honors College that I described in Chapter 3, our individual personalities, ranks within the university, and experiences operated in concert with (perpetuating and being perpetuated by) our discursive environment to create positions from which each of us operated within that relationship. That combination of discourse and individuality built our images of one another and of ourselves (subjectivities of ourselves, even), and then our partnership was worked through these understandings and presentations of each other. Each practitioner for Student Affairs will have their own experiences and context such as these, just as each Academic Affairs professional will as well.

This dissertation, however, produces its practical implications through its ability to shine a light on the discursive elements of those relationships. As I detailed in both of my personal experiences in Chapter 3, I was not aware of the power relations through which I worked. At the time of these experiences, I did not think with the idea of the discourse, nor was I even aware of the competing discursive environments. Looking at

only the individual context of that situation limited me as a professional, because it led to my timidity in partnering with Academic Affairs. It led to my misunderstandings of the rules of the sayable and unsayable in my job interviews. Discourse influences (and is influenced by) our individual circumstances. Poststructuralism and my Foucauldian analysis allow for us to examine not only the circumstances in which we work, but also how discourse relates to those circumstances to produce possibilities.

For practitioners in the field, understanding the difference not only in scope of language used by Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, but also understanding the different lexicons, word banks, and definitions is critical to providing an understanding of how to move partnerships past a set of “best practices” or just trying what works.

There is a significant amount of extant literature (some of it cited in this dissertation) regarding the partnership of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, and I believe that the work on discourse in this dissertation provides both the ability to see deeper into that literature and the ability to apply a healthy skepticism to the literature that emerges in the future. The conception of how power and knowledge produce each other for Student Affairs is similar to the revelation about the differences in discourse development for Student Affairs and the Student Learning Discourse versus Academic Affairs. The history of Student Affairs is one that has been presented—as I discussed in Chapter 2—as a linear progression through higher education. The ability to examine how power impacted the growth of Student Affairs and its most recent positionings also provides useful context for practitioners in their work. Being able to understand the origin of the (perceived) imbalance between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is critical to

being able to work as a professional to cross that gap without offending the parties with whom you are attempting to partner.

The oft-repeated claims by Student Affairs professionals that Academic Affairs does not or is not interested in partnering are accompanied by a lack of understanding as to why Academic Affairs would not want to partner or an assumption that they do not know how to interact with students. This dissertation provides implications for professionals by examining how discourse and power have perpetuated the differences between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs over time, as well as the perpetuation of discourse about partnership from Student Affairs and the lack thereof from Academic Affairs.

Though individual practitioners build their relationships on a personal level, they are also unknowingly beholden to departmental, campus, and field-wide politics. For a practitioner to be able to resist the current power structures or shift the discourse, that practitioner must be able to uncover more and more layers of those structures. My dissertation, while not providing specific recommendations for practice due to those contextual pieces, does provide a window into the structures of discourse and power present in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs so that practitioners can operate to reposition themselves within that discursive context rather than just through actions unknowingly ruled by the discourse surrounding that relationship.

Considering a rupture. In this section, I discussed the implications of this dissertation on a theoretical, methodological, and practical level. Though I chose to separate these implications in order to discuss them more deeply, it is important to note

that none of these implications work within a vacuum from the others. The culmination of the implications for this study led me to an additional question, which is whether or not a piece of research pointing to a major document such as *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) could itself be a “rupture” in the discursive schema. Foucault (1972) referred to ruptures as “interruptions” (p. 4) and a break in the “persistence of a particular genre” (p. 4). Genealogy itself is a methodological viewpoint designed to be a reverse mode of analysis and to disrupt and resist the dominant discursive structures.

While *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) itself was a rupture for Student Affairs and its predominant discourses, I believe that the value of the reconsideration provided in this dissertation is that it created new interruptions and new discontinuities through a poststructuralist lens. One of the functions of this research is that it breaks with the progression of thought involving the partnership of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and, through that disruption, provides new discursive positionings from which Student Affairs can operate and from which Student Affairs practitioners can work. While I cannot predict the impacts this dissertation may have in the future, it does decenter the discourse of Student Affairs to provide for new possibilities of partnership by resisting the discursive schema in place.

Limitations

Limitations for a poststructuralist project, such as this one, do not fall under the same lines as they might given a different mode of research. This study was not one derived to “control” for variables or perform research with deterministic rigidity. Instead, the study was formed around flexibility, as needed for the genealogy to uncover power structures through a reverse mode of analysis. This study was also constructed around

Student Affairs documents, purposefully, in order to examine the threads of discursive strategies through the ways in which Student Affairs presented itself as an entity; though other research could have been done with participants or with documents from Academic Affairs, those were not included within the scope of this project in order to examine the prominent strategies of discourse on a national level for Student Affairs and the Student Learning Discourse. It therefore would not make sense to consider those choices as limitations. Instead, I look to what aspects of this project, within its design, are obscured or that the flexible structure for which this genealogy cannot account.

The primary limitations of this project are also aspects that I believe make it an authentic project. Thinking with the concept of limitations as attributes of this study that I could not control, the most obvious limitation is that there are discourses operating that I could not (or did not) observe. Foucault (1977/1980h) cautioned that discourses can be difficult to uncover and that there would always be discourse that was hidden. MacLure (2003) reminded us that we always operate within the fabric of discourse and that it is impossible to access reality except through discourse. The work of Foucault and MacLure (among others) to caution the fleeting nature of uncovering discourse illuminates how trapped this dissertation (and nearly everything, for that matter) is by discourse.

Though I have attempted to deconstruct the power structures deployed by discourse in this dissertation, I operate within a discursive framework of Student Affairs, my relationships with Academic Affairs, and even the requirements of completing a dissertation. Though I have member-checked myself throughout my analysis and by

providing my own practical context within this dissertation, many of the discourses surrounding me may remain hidden or obscured from me.

Similarly, discursive threads, strategies, and practices present in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) and the other articles I examined may remain hidden. My interactions, while authentic, require me and the texts to work together. The discursive strategies that I uncovered were a result of these interactions and therefore are intrinsically intertwined with my subjectivities and my history as a professional and researcher. There will be countless other discursive threads that could be followed or that might have been uncovered by a different researcher or in different circumstances, and those variable circumstances also serve as the basis for potential future research ideas, which I discuss below.

Recommendations for Future Research

As I alluded to in my discussion of the limitations of this project, there are potentially infinite other discursive threads that could be researched and that would enrich the understanding of partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. In particular, I believe that the other side of this relationship, Academic Affairs, deserves more attention in the deconstruction and examination of partnerships in higher education. This dissertation focused on Student Affairs, but, as I discovered through my research in this project, much of the work on partnering Student Affairs and Academic Affairs stems from the Student Affairs side. Looking at where the discursive node for the strategies of *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) stopped, in *Greater Expectations* (AAC&U, 2002), would be one compelling starting point for such a project. That *Greater Expectations* is both tied to the Student Learning Discourse and absent of that discourse

in many ways is perhaps another rupture in the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, or perhaps there are uncovered discursive factors present within that document that could be further explored through expansion.

Another next step in research would be to more deeply examine the relationship between individual practices of Student Affairs professionals and the strategies of discourse present in *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004). Though this project examined practices through what was presented in literature and shared publicly, there is opportunity to look at the impacts of discourse and the power/knowledge relationships present for individual practitioners within these discursive webs. Having professionals share more of their experiences could deepen the understanding of power in those “extreme points of exercise” (Foucault, 1977/1980c, p. 97). In the same way that my pilot project fueled my interest in connecting the experiences I had witnessed as a professional to how Student Affairs interacted as a whole entity, the analysis can then be reverted again and reduced to the individual level for another examination.

From a personal standpoint, I find myself most interested where my analysis revealed the presence of a number of binary narratives to describe the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Though binary logic was not the focal point of this dissertation, it is impossible to ignore the emergence of a gender binary positing Student Affairs as female and Academic Affairs as male. The associations with work type, marginalization, and oppression that come through in regards to gender are perpetuated through the historicized relations of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and a feminist methodological mindset would be helpful in revealing those intersections past the discussion of discourse in this study. Similarly, there is space to open up the

analysis of this relationship from a post-colonial mindset and a master/slave narrative due to the development of Student Affairs as a servant for Academic Affairs and its students. Both of these avenues of research have the opportunity to further deconstruct the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and reveal additional products of power.

Though any number of discursive nodes and webs for Student Affairs (or Academic Affairs) could be investigated, I view the research topics I outline above as most critical and related to the work present in this dissertation. The discussion of Academic Affairs, the continued investigation of the Student Learning Discourse through practices, and the further investigation of binaries in higher education would each provide additional positionings for professionals attempting to make successful partnerships and to make consistent the benefits discussed in Chapter 2 that come with having a holistic education for college students that does link student life and academic life.

Creating a Poststructuralist Leader

In finishing my research for this project, the question I repeatedly found myself asking was how poststructuralism and leadership come together. The doctorate of which this dissertation is a part is in “educational leadership.” Poststructuralism is a critique of logic, skeptical of power structures, and an epistemological lens with which to view the world.

Overall, this project examined the power relations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and how those power relations created certain discursive positionings from which Student Affairs could (or had to) operate. The analysis in my study led to the discovery of three specific discursive strategies present in a significant document for

Student Affairs, *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004), and traced the development and impact of those strategies across a discursive field of other strategies and practices. But when we consider leadership, the ideas and language of poststructuralism present in this dissertation likely do not first come to mind. How then does poststructuralism help to make me a leader and is there a place for poststructuralism in leadership?

In their research on poststructuralism and doctoral work, Clark/Keefe and Miller (2012) troubled the notion of the poststructuralist leader. Clark/Keefe and Miller revealed the poststructuralist leader to be a nomadic subject with a “poly-centric identity” (p. 202). In other words, the poststructuralist leader is one who is constantly uncovering the products of discourse and transposing as a result of those uncoverings. To be a poststructuralist leader is to “still (always) be in draft form” (p. 201) and always shifting and repositioning.

The idea of a poststructuralist leader therefore contrasts greatly with the ideas of leadership that are commonplace. So much of the societal underpinnings to our conception of leadership are rooted in the idea of a Great Leader, or an individual who can swoop in and give us answers. As Clark/Keefe and Miller (2012) put it, “The leader is expected to articulate a well-defined vision, a collective destination to motivate followers to expend energy toward reaching that place” (p. 204). In a similar way to how this study has used Foucault to invert the analysis of power relations for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, the idea of the poststructuralist leader also inverts our ideas of leadership.

My hope is that the poststructuralist perspective helps me as a leader to uncover and deconstruct the relationships that I must navigate in my work. From bureaucracy to

politics to individual partnerships, having the ability to add depth to how we see those relationships is helpful, and I believe that poststructuralism provides a unique lens from which I can analyze my own work. Thinking with this idea of poststructuralist leadership as an inverted form of leadership also allows for me to recognize the historical and political constraints and influences on my own leadership and on the relationships I hold as a leader. The poststructuralist leader resists the binaries that say that a leader must be one type or another and attempts to move within these threads of discourse and these societal expectations. I do not expect that I will do this dexterously all (or even most) of the time, for I am always in the draft form to which Clark/Keefe and Miller (2012) referred. I do expect, however, that the poststructuralist perspective will help me to deconstruct my leadership perspectives and uncover new facets of the relationships in which I work.

Leadership authors and theorists Heifetz and Linsky (2002), who are far outside the realm of poststructuralism, posited a view of leadership that looks at both a dance floor and a balcony. In their book *Leadership on the Line*, they discussed how we do our work on the dance floors, but that we could only see everything that was going on, the connections, and the impacts by being up on the balcony. Poststructuralism provides that balcony to my work.

Heifetz and Linsky (2002) continued on to say that it is not enough to just be on the balcony; our goal as leaders is to be on both the dance floor and the balcony at the same time. The bestriding of these two roles is where I come in as a practitioner. My goal in pursuing my doctorate was to meld the roles of scholar and practitioner, and I believe that poststructuralism provides for me the ability to pull my skepticism of assumptions,

logic, and “best practices” into my work to challenge the university and departmental systems in which I work to approach ideas from less conventional means, to aim for innovation, and to understand the complexities of how our structures, our language, and our practices intertwine to create the results we see and their impacts on students.

The dangers of poststructuralist leadership. I am mindful that my work in this dissertation is not all positives. I believe that while poststructuralism reveals many avenues for positive change through what it unveils, it also has the tendency to coldly express how things function without regard to intent or hopes. Much of my discussion of discourse throughout this dissertation could be construed to be viewing Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, or both as negative entities or shaped by negativity.

Kendall and Wickham (1999) pointed out that revealing how power functions makes people feel “decidedly uncomfortable” by looking at what we “would rather remain hidden” (p. 29). The workings of power are unsettling because we want to believe the best intents and interests in all of the individuals with whom we work. My work with poststructuralism examined the function and presentation of power and discourse, rather than the emotional or spiritual components. A deconstruction is easy to see as negative because, “How can deconstruction possibly be constructive?” (Clark/Keefe & Miller, 2012, p. 197). Though posed as opposites, the binary between deconstruction and construction is what my poststructuralist framework operates to avoid. Through means of continually decentering discourse, we open up infinite new possibilities from which to work. These new possibilities are from where innovation and leadership grow, and the subsequent deconstructions of those newly created constructs will continue to create new innovations from them as well.

Assuming a position as a poststructuralist leader is not without its challenges. Deconstruction does not resonate as productive, and I have experienced negative feelings toward me for offering critique to departmental or universities procedures in my professional career. Clark/Keefe and Miller (2012) referred to a sense of “inbetweenness” (p. 202) that comes with being a poststructuralist leader or an educational nomad. There is undoubtedly the sense of needing to ever improve and to reposition that comes with a poststructuralist mindset. I believe, however, that it is important for practitioners not to operate exclusively either in a land of epistemology or a land of practice. My research informs my work and my work informs my research.

To be a poststructuralist leader is to trouble the common sense and assumed approaches to problem solving, but that skepticism must be coupled with work towards creating positive change from those deconstructions. In other words, constructing new discursive nodes is inevitable and working from those nodes and structures is not a negative either. As a leader, I must be willing to both operate from those structures and then to investigate and challenge those assumptions again.

Despite the possibilities it creates, poststructuralism is also dangerous. Many may misinterpret my results or dismiss them altogether. I am, outside of this research, also a professional in the field who may be asked to partner Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. I was told early in my career that Student Affairs professionals are bridge builders, always positive and ready to form partnerships. Poststructuralism questions the assumptions behind our work and our partnerships, and there is true risk that some may resist the viewpoint that I bring through this research because it appears impersonal in an interpersonal field.

I accept these risks as both surmountable and necessary. Heifetz and Linsky (2002) noted that the resistance to change we often see is not rooted in change itself but instead is rooted in loss. Poststructuralism presents a loss of presumptions and a loss of the privilege to ignore the very power structures and discursive factors that are intertwined with our work. Leadership, I believe, requires the courage of poststructuralism. Leadership and partnership require us to be able to look for infinite new possibilities, and we have to be able to reexamine the structures in which we operate to create those new possibilities.

Though poststructuralism is not an “active” form of research focused on a specific treatment, it does lead me to want to question more and to see what those questions would reveal. Those questions are what I believe educational leaders need to follow. As Clark/Keefe and Miller (2012) discussed, the poststructuralist leader, “aims for a target she cannot see and cannot define for others” (p. 204). We need to take on danger. We need to be scared of the results. We need to be okay with it looking like research is negative at times.

In research, poststructuralist methods are dangerous, unpredictable, and require continual adaptation, and I believe leadership guided by this epistemology will be as well. The type of issues that we face changes constantly as our students, our environment, and the discursive frameworks shift. To provide leadership, we must reject the tenets of the Great Leader theory and reject the longing to wait for someone to tell us the answers. Just as our situations and contexts continually transpose, we must transpose ourselves as leaders. Poststructuralist leadership, while dangerous, provides an avenue for leaders to

investigate their effects (and the effects on them) and to reposition themselves consistently in response.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed my analysis and results through the context of my guiding research questions and methodology, I looked at the implications for this dissertation, and I discussed its limitations and spaces for future research. Most importantly, however, I examined all of these facets through who I am as a researcher and a practitioner. I provide these thoughts in hopes of being able to show a window into how research and practice do combine with a personal understanding of leadership.

A key factor from this dissertation overall is that discourse has shaped the relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs by acting as a vessel and conduit of power, creating and created by the strategies and practices of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs working in higher education. The relationship between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and the surrounding discourses created spaces for the positionings of Student Affairs in its relationship, both providing opportunities and delimiting possibilities. Through the examination of discourse, there now exist multiple new entry points to reposition Student Affairs in its discursive environment and to shift discourse to provide for new opportunities.

References

- Allen, K. E., & Garb, E. L. (1993). Reinventing student affairs: Something old and something new. *NASPA Journal*, 30, 93-100.
- American College Personnel Association (ACPA). (1996). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.acpa.nche.edu/files/acpas-student-learning-imperativepdf>
- American College Personnel Association (ACPA). (2014a). *Mission, vision, and values*. Retrieved from <http://www.acpa.nche.edu/values>
- American College Personnel Association (ACPA). (2014b). *Publications*. Retrieved from <http://www.acpa.nche.edu/publications>
- American College Personnel Association (ACPA) & National Association for Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (1997). *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.acpa.nche.edu/files/principles-good-practice-student-affairspdf>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2002). *Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college*. Washington, DC: AACU.
- American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), American College Personnel

- Association (ACPA), & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (1998). *Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning*. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/cwis/saase/forms/powerful_partnerships.pdf
- Arcelus, V. J. (2011). If student affairs-academic affairs collaboration is such a good idea, why are there so few examples of these partnerships in American higher education? In P. M. Magolda & M. B. Baxter Magolda (Eds.), *Contested issues in student affairs: Diverse perspectives and respectful dialogue* (pp. 61-81), Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Arendale, D. (2005). Terms of endearment: Words that define and guide developmental education. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 35(2), 66-82.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297-308.
- Atkinson, P., & Coffey, A. (2004). Analysing documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd ed.)(pp. 56-75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Banta, T. W., & Kuh, G. D. (1998). A missing link in assessment: Collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs professionals. *Change*, 30(2), 40-46.
- Barone, R. P., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Linder, C. (2007). Preventing sexual assault through engaging college men. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 585-594.
doi: 10.1353/csd.2007.0045
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2009). The activity of meaning making: A holistic perspective

- on college student development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6), 621-639. doi: 10.1353/csd.0.0106
- Beckham, J., & Dagley, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Contemporary issues in higher education law*. Dayton, OH: Education Law Association.
- Biddix, J. P. (2010). Technology uses in campus activism from 2000 to 2008: Implications for civic learning. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(6), 679-693. doi: 10.1353/csd.2010.0019
- Blimling, G. S., & Whitt, E. J. (1998, March/April). Principles of good practice for student affairs. *About Campus*, 10-15.
- Bloland, P. A., Stamatakos, L. C., & Rogers, R. R. (1996). Redirecting the role of student affairs to focus on student learning. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 217-225.
- Bourassa, D. M., & Kruger, K. (2001). The national dialogue on academic and student affairs collaboration. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (pp. 9-38). New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Bové, P. A. (1990). Discourse. In F. Lentricchia (Ed.), *Critical terms for literary study* (pp. 55-58). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bracken, S. J., Allen, J. K., & Dean, D. R. (Eds.). (2006). *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Chakrabarti, R., Bartning, A., & Sengupta, S. (2010). Developing globally compatible institutional infrastructures for Indian higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(2), 183-199. doi: 10.1177/1028315309346452

- Chickering, A. W. (1974). *Commuting versus resident students: Overcoming educational inequities of living off campus*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark/Keefe, K. (2010). *Invoking mnemosyne: Art, memory, and the uncertain emergence of a feminist embodied methodology*. Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.
- Clark/Keefe, K., & Miller, V. (2012). Transpositions toward becoming leading subject. In C. Gerstl-Pepin & J. A. Aiken (Eds.), *Social justice leadership for a global world* (pp. 189-208). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Crafts, R., First, Z., & Satwicz, J. (2001). Building the foundation for collaboration: Seamless learning at a new college. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (pp. 111-118). New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- DeBard, R. (2004). Millennials coming to college. In M. D. Coomes & R. DeBard (Eds.), *Serving the millennial generation*. New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Degen, G., & Sheldahl, E. (2007, Spring). The many hats of teaching in small colleges: The seamless web of student and academic affairs. *New Directions for Student Services, 117*, 47-57. doi: 10.1002/ss
- Doyle, J. A. (2004). Where have we come from and where are we going? A review of past student affairs philosophies and an analysis of the current student learning philosophy. *The College Student Affairs Journal, 24*(1), 66-83.

- Duffy, J. (2010). How women impacted the historical development of student affairs. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 28(2), 235-250.
- Dunphy, L., Miller, T. E., Woodruff, T., & Nelson, J. E. (1987). Exemplary retention strategies for freshman year. In M. M. Stodt & W. M. Klepper (Eds.), *Increasing retention: Academic and student affairs administrators in partnership* (pp. 39-60). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ender, S. C., Newton, F. B., & Caple, R. B. (1996). Contributions to learning: Present realities. In S. C. Ender, F. B. Newton, & R. B. Caple (Eds.), *Contributing to learning: The role of student affairs* (pp. 5-17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Foucault, M. (1973). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences* (R. D. Laing, Trans.) (Vintage Books ed.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1970)
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. M. Sheridan, Trans.). London, UK: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980a). Prison talk (C. Gordon, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 37-54). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Magazine Litteraire*, 101, June 1975)
- Foucault, M. (1980b). Body/power (C. Gordon, Trans.). In M. Foucault,

- Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 55-62). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Quel Corps?*, September/October 1975)
- Foucault, M. (1980c). Two Lectures (K. Soper, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 78-108). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Microfisica del Potere* by M. Foucault, 1977: Turin)
- Foucault, M. (1980d). Truth and Power (C. Gordon, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 109-133). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Microfisica del Potere* by M. Foucault, 1977: Turin)
- Foucault, M. (1980e). Power and strategies (C. Gordon, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 134-145). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Les Revoltes Logiques*, 4, 1977)
- Foucault, M. (1980f). The eye of power (C. Gordon, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 146-165). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Le Panoptique*, by J. Bentham, 1977, Paris, FR: Belfond)
- Foucault, M. (1980g). The history of sexuality (L. Marshall, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 183-193). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Quinzaine Litteraire*, 247, January 1977)

- Foucault, M. (1980h). The confession of the flesh (C. Gordon, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (pp. 194-228). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Reprinted from *Ornicar?*, 10 July 1977)
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality* (R. Hurley, Trans.) (Vintage Books ed.). New York, NY: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1978)
- Foucault, M. (1991). Questions of method (C. Gordon, Trans.). In M. Foucault, The *Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.). (pp. 73-86). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Reprinted from *L'impossible prison: Rescherches sur le systeme penitentiare au XIXe siècle*, 1980)
- Foucault, M. (1997). The ethics of concern of the self as a practice of freedom. (R. Fornet-Betancourt, H. Becker, & A. Gomez-Muller, Interviewers; J. Johnston, Trans.). In M. Foucault, *Ethics: Subjectivity and truth* (P. Rabinow, Ed.). (pp. 281-301). New York: NY: New Press. (Interview conducted 1984)
- Frederiksen, C. F. (1993). A brief history of collegiate housing. In R. B. Winston, Jr., S. Anchors & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life* (pp. 167-183). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fried, J. (2007). Higher education's new playbook: *Learning Reconsidered*. *About Campus*, 12(1), 2-7. doi: 10.1002/abc.197
- Frost, R. A., Strom, S. L., Downey, J., Schultz, D. D., & Holland, T. A. (2010). Enhancing student learning with academic and student affairs collaboration. *The Community College Enterprise*, 16(1). 37-51.

- Fuller, T. M., & Haugabrook, A. K. (2001). Facilitative strategies in action. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (pp. 75-88). New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Gannon, S., & Davies, B. (2011). Postmodern, poststructural, and critical theories. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (2nd ed.). (pp. 71-106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology and social practice*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Guarasci, R. (2001). Recentring Learning: An interdisciplinary approach to academic and student affairs. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (pp. 101-110). New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Hall, S. L., Scott, F., & Borsz, M. (2008). A constructivist case study examining the leadership development of undergraduate students in campus recreational sports. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(2), 125-140. doi: 10.1353/csd.2008.0010
- Hartley, M. (2001). Student learning as a framework for student affairs: Rhetoric or reality? *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 38(2), 235-248. doi: 10.2202/1949-6605.1139
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Henning, G. (2007). Is “in consortio cum parentibus” the new “in loco parentis?” *NASPA*

- Journal*, 44(3), 538-560.
- Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., & Walkerdine, V. (1984). *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London, UK: Methuen.
- Higbee, J. L., & Goff, E. (Eds.). (2008). *Pedagogy and student services for institutional transformation: Implementing universal design in higher education*. University of Minnesota: Minneapolis, MN.
- Hirsch, D. J., & Burack, C. (2001). Finding points of contact for collaborative work. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (pp. 53-62). New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Hunt, A., & Wickham, G. (1994). *Foucault and law: Towards a society of law as governance*. London, UK: Pluto.
- Jackson, A. Y. (2010). Fields of discourse: A Foucauldian analysis of schooling in a rural, U.S. southern town. In K. A. Schafft & A. Y. Jackson (Eds.), *Rural education for the twenty-first century: Identity, place, and community in a globalizing world* (pp. 72-94), University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jaschik, S. (2007, Feb. 12). What Harvard's choice means. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://insidehighered.com/news/2007/02/12/harvard>
- Jewitt, T. O. (1997). Thomas Jefferson and the purposes of education. *The Educational Forum*, 61, 110-113.

- Keeling, R. P. (Ed.). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) & The American College Personnel Association (ACPA).
- Keeling, R. P. (Ed.). (2006). *Learning reconsidered 2: Implementing a campus-wide focus on the student experience*. American College Personnel Association (ACPA), Association of College and University Housing Officers – International (ACUHO-I), Association of College Unions – International (ACUI), National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), National Association for Campus Activities (NACA), National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), & National Intermural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA).
- Keen, C., & Hall, K. (2009). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student outcomes of co-curricular service learning programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(1), 59-79. doi: 10.1353/jhe.0.0037
- Kendall, G., & Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kezar, A. (2001). Documenting the landscape: Results of a national study on academic and student affairs collaborations. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (pp. 39-52). New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Kezar, A., Hirsch, D. J., & Burack, C. (Eds.). (2001). *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs: Collaboration in creating a successful learning environment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2005). A developmental model of intercultural maturity. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(6), 571-592. doi: 10.1353/csd.2005.0060
- Kolb, D. A. (1983). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 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, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(6), 683-706. doi: 10.1353/csd.0.0099
- MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Magolda, P. M. (2005). Proceed with caution: Uncommon wisdom about academic and student affairs partnerships. *About Campus, 4*(6), 16-21. doi: 10.1002/abc.113
- Marin, J., & Samels, J. E. (2001). Lessons learned: Eight best practices for new partnerships. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (pp. 89-100). New York, NY: Wiley Periodicals.
- Martin, J., & Murphy, S. (2000). *Building a better bridge: Creating effective partnerships between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).

- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396. Retrieved from <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCarthy, C. (2015, Feb.). Increase success by partnering with academic affairs. *Student Affairs Today*. doi: 10.1002/say
- Myers, K. A. (2008). Using *Learning Reconsidered* to reinvent disability education. *About Campus*, 13(2), 2-9. doi: 10.1002/abc.246
- Myers, K. A., & Bastian, J. J. (2010). Understanding communication preferences of college students with visual disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 51(3), 265-278. doi: 10.1353/csd.0.0129
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (1987). A perspective on student affairs: A statement issues on the 50th anniversary of the Student Personnel Point of View. Washington, DC: NASPA.
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2012). History. Retrieved from <http://naspa.org/about/history.cfm>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2012) Recent history: 1995-2005. Retrieved from <http://naspa.org/about/history2.cfm>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2013). What is student affairs. Retrieved from <http://naspa.org/career/whatis/default.cfm>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2014a). *About NASPA*. Retrieved from <https://www.naspa.org/about>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). (2014b). *About*

- Student Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://www.naspa.org/about/student-affairs>
- Niesche, R. (2011). *Foucault and educational leadership: Disciplining the principal*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Overland, W. I., & Rentz, A. L. (2011). Orientation. In N. Zhang & Associates (Eds.), *Rentz's student affairs practice in higher education*. (4th ed.). (239-261). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, Ltd.
- Palmer, S. (2013, Jan.). Collaborate with academic affairs to help students succeed. *Student Affairs Today*. doi: 10.1002/say
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pasque, P. A., & Murphy, R. (2005). The intersections of living-learning programs and social identity as factors of academic achievement and intellectual engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(4), 429-441. doi: 10.1353/csd.2005.0041
- Pizzolato, J. E., & Hicklen, S. (2011). Parental involvement: Investigating the parent-child relationship in Millennial college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(6), 671-686. doi: 10.1353/csd.2011.0081
- Pizzolato, J. E., & Ozaki, C. C. (2007). Moving toward self-authorship: Investigating outcomes of learning partnerships. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(2), 196-214. doi: 10.1353/csd.2007.0019
- Pratt, A. V. (2002). Then and now in women's studies: My pedagogical request. *Women's Studies Quarterly: Then and Now*, 30(3&4), 90-98.
- Prior, L. (2004). Doing things with documents. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative*

- research: Theory, method and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 56-75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Salisbury, M. H., Pascarella, E. T., Padgett, R. D., & Blaich, D. (2012). The effects of work on leadership development among first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(2). doi: 10.1353/csd.2012.0021
- Scott, J. (1988). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the use of poststructuralist theory for feminism. *Feminist Studies, 15*(1), 33-50.
- Shumway, D. R. (1999). Genealogies of knowledges. In R. Lecker (Ed.), *Critical essays on Michel Foucault*. (pp. 82-100). New York, NY: G. K. Hall & Co.
- St. Pierre, E. (2000). Poststructural feminism in education: An overview. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 13*(5), 477-515.
- Stodt, M. M. (1987). Intentional student development and retention. In M. M. Stodt & W. M. Klepper (Eds.), *Increasing retention: Academic and student affairs administrators in partnership* (pp. 15-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sturtevant, S., Strang, R., & McKim, M. (1940). *A personnel study of deans of women in colleges, universities, and normal schools*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wawrzynski, M. (2005). Noncognitive assessment: Toward more accurate predictions of student success. *About Campus, 10*(2), 31-32. doi: 10.1002/abc.128

Wildman, T. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2008, Nov.). *Bridging learning and development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Jacksonville, FL.

Willet, L. (2004). Student affairs and academic affairs. In S. A. Holton (Ed.), *Mending the cracks in the ivory tower: Strategies for conflict management in higher education* (pp. 128-140). Boston, MA: Anker Publishing.

Vita

Aaron W. Voyles was born in Mobile, Alabama and raised in Marietta, Georgia. He earned a bachelor of fine arts in creative writing from the University of North Carolina Wilmington in 2007. He later earned his master of fine arts degree in writing from Sarah Lawrence College in 2009 and his educational specialist degree in higher education administration from Appalachian State University in 2011.

Aaron currently works at the University of Texas at Austin in the Division of Housing and Food Service as the Area Manager for Jester Center. Previously, he has worked in Residence Life at both Appalachian State University and Sarah Lawrence College. Aaron has published numerous articles and columns related to leadership, critical thinking, and men's studies and has presented on his work and research for NASPA, ACPA, and ACUHO-I.

Aaron hopes to continue his investigations of discourse and power and looks forward to continuing in conversations with colleagues in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs regarding partnership and leadership in higher education.