



November 2016

Who Wrote the Books: A History of the History of Student Affairs

Anna L. Patton

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.luc.edu/jcshesa>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Other History Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Patton, Anna L. (2016) "Who Wrote the Books: A History of the History of Student Affairs," *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*: Vol. 3 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://ecommons.luc.edu/jcshesa/vol3/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).

Who Wrote the Books: A History of the History of Student Affairs

Cover Page Footnote

Anna L. Patton is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. This work would not be possible without the student affairs scholars cited in the work who contributed their time and expertise through individual interviews. Any correspondence should be sent to alpatton@uncg.edu.

Who Wrote the Books: A History of the History of Student Affairs

Anna L. Patton, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Abstract

This historiography offers a critique of the common narrative of student affairs history by considering the ways in which the history of student affairs is mediated by those scholars writing the texts. Student affairs professionals and scholars are regularly engaged in reflection on current practices, trends, and concerns within the field; however, it is equally important to continue looking back into our professional history. In this paper, I employ a process of historiography to critique the way in which the history of student affairs is mediated by those scholars writing the texts. A historiography seeks to tell the history of a history--the history of the history of student affairs. This historiography first traces the historical development of the field as presented in commonly used student affairs textbooks covering major periods of the profession including student personnel, student development, and student learning. After providing a review of student affairs history as illustrated in professional texts, I then provide contextual research of the individual authors such as their educational pathways and employment credentials. Using a variety of critical theories, I interrogate the common narrative presented in student affairs history texts with intentional consideration to the scholars writing the texts.

Keywords

historiography, student affairs, higher education

ISSN 2377-1305

© 2016

Educators often present history as a collection of fixed dates, names, and facts researched by an expert historian; however, historians would be better understood as storytellers imparting a creative, interpretive act that subject matter authorities (Carr, 1961; Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar, 2006). Within in the field of student affairs, historians of the profession acknowledge the fluidity in narrating historical accounts of the field's development (Coomes, 2006; Rhatigan, 2009); yet, while claiming history as a dynamic process, student affairs historians present a relatively consistent account of how the profession of student affairs emerged within US American higher education. The purpose of this historiography is to interrogate the history of student affairs conceptually from the colonization of US America to the present with added emphasis on the historians authoring the content (Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar, 2006).

I offer this historiography for students in and faculty of graduate preparatory programs as well as current professionals in student affairs. Instead of an assumed, shared knowledge of the content of student affairs history, I loop between presenting traditional materials telling the history of student affairs and my own critical analysis in order to offer a richer perspective of the field's history. I conclude the paper by offering implications and considerations for future directions and dialogue in the field. Utilizing multiple critical lenses, my goal in this paper is to reconcile the fixed historical content I studied in my own student affairs graduate program, which serves as one representation of common practice in the field at large.

Before moving into the content of the analysis, I believe in acknowledging my own positionality regarding this project. I include my own positioning as a phenomenological move to recognize who is behind this project, and I invoke phenomenology as a

philosophical tradition that seeks to unfold the world around us through emphasis of individual experience, intentionality of consciousness, and attending to phenomena that recede into our cognitive background (Ahmed, 2006). I am taking a phenomenological orientation that acknowledges the "I" behind the author of this project by addressing my own positionality. In approaching the history of student affairs phenomenologically, my own background, identities, and experiences are a contributing factor in my motivations and perceptions. I am drawn to this topic because of my own professional background as a student affairs practitioner—especially my time in graduate school.

In my graduate preparation program, our faculty stressed having a clear understanding of the history of student affairs, but I never questioned who wrote our history, whose stories were included, how history was written, and why history was written as it was. I did not question student affairs history as I felt it accurately spoke to me and reflected my identities: a neurotypical, white, cisheterosexual women from a middle class family. For me, the history of student affairs remained a fixed series of dates, names, and publications to memorize lacking any critical analysis into what might be missing. This historiography is an effort to redress the biases my privileged identities create by critically analyzing the ways in which student affairs history privileges and highlights certain voices while erasing or marginalizing others.

While I enter into this project through my own personal experience, I recognize the history of student affairs is a topic addressed by many preparatory programs. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2009) emphasizes that master's level preparatory programs in student affairs should include the history of the profession as foundational curriculum. As one repre-

sentation of a preparatory program's history curriculum, I entered into this inquiry by revisiting my own graduate preparation program historical materials including: *Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession*, *Rentz's Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education*, and *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration*. Nuss (2003) explains that these sources are intended for students in graduate programs preparing to enter the field of student affairs as well as professionals seeking to engage in continual learning.

From the first source, I selected two chapters from *A Handbook for the Profession*. In the first chapter, Thelin (2003) provides a chapter outlining the development of the US American higher education system, and Nuss (2003) focuses specifically on the development of the field of student affairs within US American higher education in the second chapter. Dr. John Thelin is a professor at the University of Kentucky in the Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation program (Derrickson, 2004). Dr. Elizabeth M. Nuss is a retired Vice-President and Dean of Students for Goucher College as well as former Executive Director of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators from 1987-1995 (Komives, Woodard, & Associates, 2003). From the other two books, I included the chapters by Rentz (2004) and Rhatigan (2009), who also outline the history of student affairs professional development. Dr. Audrey L. Rentz retired as an emeritus faculty member of the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs at Bowling Green State University in 1996 (BGSU, online), and Dr. James Rhatigan retired in 2002 as the Vice President of Student Affairs at Wichita State University (WSU, online).

Student Affairs History and Critical Analysis

In this section, I use historiography to analyze the ways in which the history of

student affairs is told within the field as well as how history is impacted by those writing it. Beyond collecting dates and information, historical analysis must focus on context and interpretation. Howell and Prevenier (2001) aptly remind those conducting critical historical analysis that the purpose is not to arrive at an absolute truth about a particular history. Instead, historians retell and redesign historical accounts through each new interpretation (Howell & Prevenier, 2001; Salevouris, & Furay, 2015). By using historiography, historians are charged with analyzing historical sources, as either remains or testimonies of the past (Howell & Prevenier, 2001). Indeed, authors can use historiography to create a critical approach to history as a site of analysis as well to investigate the ways historians choose to tell or not tell certain aspects of the past (Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar, 2006). In implementing this historiography, I acknowledge there are some key assumptions about history I embrace.

These assumptions are the beliefs that history is biased, not neutral, partially constructed, and designed to privilege certain perspectives over others (Carr, 1961; Stewart, 2016; Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar, 2006). I chose to explore the history of student affairs conceptually from the colonization of US America through the turn of the 21st century. A conceptual history organizes an overarching theme across a specified historical period in order to stress patterns in the telling of history (Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar, 2006). In addition to a conceptual analysis of student affairs history, I turn toward analyzing the authors who wrote the texts as a historical data set in and of themselves. Indeed, Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar (2006) hold that research on historians themselves as participants in their own writing contributes to the meta-analysis of historiography. True to a phenomenological style, I focus attention on the authors to prevent their

agency and role in content generation from slipping from conscious analysis. Infusing a commitment to criticality and multilogicality (Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar, 2006), I employ the critical theory lenses of postcolonial analysis, Critical Race Theory as well as related theoretical extensions, feminist theories, Critical Trans*Politics, Queer Theory and CripTheory, to deconstruct and interrogate the history of student affairs before turning toward an analysis of the content's authors. To open up spaces and directions for future inquiries, I include a wide breadth of critical theory perspectives to illustrate the diverse ways critical historical research might be taken up.

Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial perspectives are one critical approach omitted from the history of student affairs. Scholars implementing postcolonial analysis challenge the ways in which Western perspectives and histories permeate, dominate, and silence non-western knowledges, experiences, and realities (Williams & Chrisman, 1994). Far from one cohesive field, postcolonial scholars diverge, wind, and bend to encompass a multitude of concerns including culture, ecology, feminism, economics, and justice (Williams & Chrisman, 1994; Young, 2001). Additionally, Young (2001) notes that postcolonialism addresses tension between colonialism and imperialism. Postcolonial scholars center indigenous experiences and ways of knowing while resisting the ways Western-centric colonialism still impacts people today through oppression, racism, and colorism (Hunter, 2002; Williams & Chrisman, 1994; Young, 2001).

Student affairs historians begin their accounts of the profession with the colonization of US America. Spanning the years 1636-1780 (Rentz, 2004), English colonizers imported the Oxford-Cambridge model

of residential facilities around quadrangles from England with strict control of curriculum and discipline to “transplant and perfect the English idea of an undergraduate education as a civilizing experience that ensured a progression of responsible leaders for both church and state” (Thelin, 2003, p. 5). Identified as those fit to lead the state and church, a very limited, elite population attended colonial colleges. Rentz (2004) describes the colonial college makeup as “private, limited to young male students, residential, and staffed by clerical or lay male faculty and administrators” (p. 29). These male faculty members were charged with enforcing student discipline as surrogate parents, or *in loco parentis*.

As the parties responsible for student conduct, colonial college staff stood in place of students' parents with emphasis on developing appropriate moral, academic, and religious competences (Nuss, 2003; Rentz, 2004; Thelin, 2003). Developing alongside the larger US American system of higher education, historians situate student affairs as a profession growing up alongside higher education broadly. From its colonial beginnings, student affairs professionals emerged within higher education due to the dual focus of academic and character development. Thelin (2003) explains “American higher education was distinctive from the beginning in that it was based on the belief that the student's character as well as scholarship must be developed” (p. 1). Colonial college staff upheld the colonial model until the late 1700s when higher education began to expand and change.

Scholarship using postcolonial theory provides one entry points to retell the origins of student affairs work. The authors present a history of student affairs focused on Euro-centric understandings of US American history with little attention to the voices and stories of colonized peoples. Based on their

telling of history, I draw the conclusion that the authors' formal studies in history did not include critical, postcolonial points of view. Thelin (2003) and Nuss (2003) cite US American colonial colleges as the roots of student affairs work. However, the authors offer no analysis of the implications of importing the Oxford-Cambridge Model from England while colonizing US American. Additionally, the authors benignly name *in loco parentis* as the first philosophical foundation for student affairs as faculty stood in the place of students' parents (Nuss, 2003; Rentz, 2004; Rhatigan, 2009; Thelin, 2003).

However, there is no conversation of the dynamics of colonization in the model of *in loco parentis* as it was adopted from the Oxford-Cambridge model. Further, *in loco parentis* is in place of whose parents? And with whose values? For what aims? The authors of student affairs history craft a colonial historical period of student affairs history that centers the experiences of European white colonizers and omits the experiences of indigenous Native American peoples. Thelin (2003) describes an attempt of colonial colleges to extend access to Native American boys as "noble intentions, but relied on limited planning, and thereby generated extremely limited results" (p. 6). Rather than acknowledging the violent, forced colonization of Native Americans (Spring, 2011), Thelin's (2003) description implies that expansion of higher education would have been successful if only better planned. Even the commonly used phrase 'American Higher Education' (Nuss, 2003; Rentz, 2004; Rhatigan, 2009; & Thelin, 2003) illustrates the dominance of the colonizer in student affairs history. As nothing more than a footnote in colonial higher education, Native Americans are erased from student affairs history as it becomes a white colonizer's history. In addition to postcolonial discourse, complimentary theoretical lenses are available to further decenter prevailing

white, Euro-centric narratives and to highlight the voices, experiences, and knowledges of people of color.

Critical Race Theory

With its beginnings in critical legal studies, scholars of Critical Race Theory work to expose the normalcy of racism in the United States and to foreground the experiences of people of color (Ladson-Billings, 1999). Foundational to the work of CRT, the experiences of people of color challenge the status quo of white supremacy as counternarratives underscoring the pervasive nature of racism in US American (Ladson-Billings, 1999). As argued previously, I hold that the history of US American higher education and student affairs is written from a white, Euro-centric epicenter that supports white supremacy, and I employ CRT to further unpack the whiteness centered in the field's history.

Tellingly, authors first mention African American access to higher education as a component of the major changes taking place in higher education through the late 1800s. Although often starting as secondary schools, Thelin (2003) holds that African Americans had new opportunities through specialized institutions. Additionally, the authors note that the Second Morrill Act provided federal funding to create agricultural and mechanical arts educational institutions for African Americans, institutions that would become Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Nuss, 2003; Rentz, 2004). In a discussion of the passage of the Second Morrill Act in 1890, Rentz (2004) explains the significance of the development of historically black colleges and universities stating, "these early historically Black institutions served an important function within the larger system of colleges and universities, and their courageous students made possible prototypes for additional institutions in the years ahead" (p. 35). Using CRT, I argue that

this recounting of African Americans in US American higher education is a sanitized narrative in support of white supremacy.

By decentering the focus of whiteness in student affairs history, I implement a lens of critical race theory as a second point of analysis. First, the authors position development of predominantly, historically white colleges and universities as the basis for the progression of history with specialized institutions for African American as secondary footnotes (Rentz, 2004; Thelin, 2003). Aligned with the claims of critical race theory, white supremacy keeps the experiences of white people as a centered norm while silencing or minimizing the voices of people of color. I contend that the authors center whiteness in the history of student affairs by relegating the history of African Americans in higher education to a cursory, sterile connection to federal policy changes while ignoring the legacy and impacts of slavery occurring simultaneously in the country. The authors of student affairs history do not provide nuanced, authentic acknowledgement of the atrocities of slavery relegating African Americans to a status of chattel or property. Instead, slavery is omitted altogether within texts on the history of student affairs except for a Rentz (2004) passing note on the exclusion of enslaved Africans and freed African Americans prior to the development of the Second Morrill Act. What would a critical race analysis of student affairs history reveal about the role of slavery in the exclusion of African Americans from higher education? How do legacies of slavery and racism continue to impact student affairs professionals over time and today?

Further decentering white people as the default narrative, what was happening outside of white institutions of higher education? As an example, Rentz's (2004) description of early HBCUs attributes no names or details to those courageous students or pioneer

deans at HBCUs; whereas, Rentz' (2004) includes details about individuals at historically white institutions, such as professor Ephriam Gurney at Harvard. HBCUs are little more than a passing sentence in the history of student affairs. While Rentz (2004) names students at early HBCUs as courageous, there is no research into or recognition of who those individuals were; instead, the author relies on references to African Americans accessing higher education as one, anonymous group. Who were the students at these institutions? Who were the faculty and staff with these students? What was the dynamic of moving from secondary institutions to higher education? How would the telling of student affairs history change if the experiences of students and professionals of color were made to be the focus of historical development rather than an addendum to white history? Critical race perspectives are necessary to unpack the racist elements of student affairs history that support and strengthen white supremacy in student affairs history.

Extensions of Critical Race Theory. Scholars have employed CRT as a foundation for exploring the experiences of other racialized groups. Specifically connected to analyzing the history of student affairs, I incorporate Tribal Critical Race Theory, Latino Critical Race Theory, and Asian Critical Race Theory to provide additional ways to interrogate the centrality of European whiteness in the profession's development. Branching from CRT, scholars of Tribal Critical Race Theory, TribalCrit, focus on the pervasiveness of colonialism in US American society. Brayboy (2005) outlines nine essential tenets of TribalCrit including the assertion that colonization is rampant; legal policies are rooted in imperialism and white supremacy; Indigenous peoples inhabit a liminal space both legal and racially; Indigenous peoples desire tribal sovereignty; Indigenous lenses generate new insights into constructs like

culture and knowledge; policies overwhelmingly aim for Indigenous assimilation; there is a wide range of differences and adaptability among tribal philosophies, beliefs, and lived realities; stories are legitimate sources of data; and theory and practice are connected in deep ways that support social change.

As a second extension of CRT, scholars of Latino Critical Theory, LatCrit, center the experiences, issues, and needs of Latinas/os with a focus on cultural elements such as language and immigration while moving beyond the racial binary of black/white (McCoy & Rodricks, 2014). LatCrit scholars emphasize not only the impact of European colonization but also Spanish colonization creating complex layers of connection among elements such as race, class, gender, physical appearance, and linguistic accents while developing Latina/o panethnicity (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001; Yosso, 2005). A third outgrowth, scholars use Asian Critical Race theory, AsianCrit, as a critical frame to examine the racialized realities of Asian Americans as well as interpreting their experiences on college campuses. Rooted in work creating Asian American Legal Scholarship (Chang, 1993; Liu, 2009), AsianCrit scholarship affirms the prevalence of racism and highlights ways racism influences perceptions of Asian Americans, experiences of immigration, as well as dynamics of inclusion and exclusion of Asian Americans from society and public services (McCoy & Rodricks, 2014; Museus, 2013).

Within student affairs history, Thelin (2003) writes about Native Americans only in reference to colonial colleges, and the authors only mention Latina/o and Asian Americans in higher education is during the years of student activism and change on campus during the 1960s and 1970s (Nuss, 2003; Thelin, 2003). However, Spring (2011) illustrates that Native, Latina/o, and Asian

Americans had been struggling for recognition, participation, and equity in US American education for many years prior to the 1960s and 1970s through movements such as citizenship and voting rights or bilingual education in schools. Taking up a Tribal-Crit lens, how does acknowledging Native Americans only within colonial time frame reinforce the liminal position of Native peoples throughout history? How does the omission of Native Americans after colonization continue to reinforce the erasure of Native Americans as contemporary peoples? Of the violent, forced assimilation of Native Americans into white European ideals through boarding schools (Spring, 2011)? How does Euro-centered history delegitimize Native histories, knowledges, and experiences while propping up white supremacy?

LatCrit and AsianCrit further analyses that unpack Euro-centric whiteness in student affairs history. Latina/os and Asian Americans are first noted in the history of student affairs beginning in the 1960s, but what about the hundreds of years prior to the mid-1900s? By only acknowledging Latina/os during the mid-1900s, I assert that student affairs history ignores the violent colonization of Latina/o peoples by white US Americans, such as militarized seizing of Mexico (Spring, 2011). Additionally, what are the stories of undocumented Latina/o students and staff missing from student affairs history? Coupled with the erasure of Latina/os, I conclude that student affairs history erases the historical presence of Asian Americans in the US relegating their historical appearance to the campus activism of the 1960s and 1970s. What were the processes of arrival and forced assimilation of Asian immigrants? What about historical violence against people of color such as Japanese internment during WWII? The authors provide no recognition of Asian American presence as historical actors in the country's development. Further, how did restricted citizenship through the 1900s

(Spring, 2011) contribute to exclusion of both Latina/os and Asians from higher education? How do historical racial stereotypes impact the experiences of Latina/os and Asians on college campuses? Backed by CRT and additional theoretical perspectives, I claim that the history of student affairs whitewashes the histories, stories, and struggles of people of color in the fight for access to higher education.

Gender and Sexuality¹

Feminist Theories. Feminist theories provide critical approaches to highlighting and interrogating gendered aspects of knowledge construction and narratives such as history. Feminist scholars hold that the world, truth, and knowledge are not fixed, scientific fact but are situated in the embodied experiences and knowledges of individuals (Savin-Baden, & Howell Major, 2010). Further, feminist scholars do not claim one metanarrative of womanhood but seek out nuanced voices from women silenced in dominant perspectives such as non-Western, indigenous, and trans* women (Ardovali-Brooker, 2002; Narayan, 2004). Driving feminist theories, Narayan (2004) affirms that the personal is held as political, reflecting social systems of dominance, power, and oppression. Scholarship incorporating feminist theories explicitly explore and incorporate emotion, embodiment, and positionality in order to critically challenge gendered aspects of experience and knowledge production (Ardovali-Brooker, 2002; Savin-Baden, & Howell Major, 2010).

Women in higher education receive increasing attention in student affairs history during the rise of coeducation, women's colleges, and the beginning of deans of women positions (Nuss, 2003; Rentz, 2004). Rentz

(2004) notes that the aim of women's colleges was to ensure women were "better prepared to assume roles within the domestic sphere, as wives and mothers and, only if needed, as school teachers" (p. 33), which was the primary professional route for women at the time. As college campuses grew, the organizational complexity of increased campus size, enrollments, and student diversity demanded specialized professionals to attend to students' needs. These professionals became the Pioneer Deans that "built our profession from the ground up" (Rhatigan, 2009, p. 3). Deans of women grew in prominence to address appropriate behavior, student safety concerns, and professional ambitions of women students (Rentz, 2004; Rhatigan, 2009). Early deans of men, deans of women, or deans of students were charged with "handling problems dealing with the adaptation of student life to the constantly changing social surroundings" (Rhatigan, 2009, p. 5). Some of the foundational Pioneer Deans included: Professor Ephraim Gurney, first college dean (Nuss, 2003; Rentz, 2004); LeBaron Russell Briggs, first dean of students (Rentz, 2004; Rhatigan, 2009); and Alice Freeman Palmer and Marion Talbot, first deans of women (Rentz, 2004; Rhatigan, 2009). Beyond issues of discipline, deans of women managed the special concerns facing women on campuses such as student safety and personal ambition (Rentz, 2004; Rhatigan, 2009). Focused on leadership and spirituality, Rhatigan (2009) describes the "early deans of men and deans of women... [as a] collection of diverse people with high ideals, warmth, optimism, and genuineness" (p. 4).

Although more prominent than racial dimensions of history, gender is another aspect of student affairs history that is given a superficial treatment. Student affairs

¹ Throughout this work, I employ the terms trans* and queer lives to encompass individuals who experience oppression, marginalization, and/or violence due to their gender and/or sexuality identity and performance. Stewart and Russell (2014) clarify that the use of trans* represents a spectrum of gendered identities that are nonconforming to socially constructed gender binaries while queer speaks to the those whose sexuality and/or gender identities break with dominant societal norms and behavioral expectations.

historians acknowledge the patriarchal, male-centered basis of US American Higher Education (Thelin, 2003; Rentz, 2004), but the authors do not address gendered-dimensions of higher education and student affairs in critical ways. For example, does physical presence on campus necessarily equal progress or equity? The authors present the ability to pursue teaching as a profession as a positive opportunity for women, but the authors do not question the rationale for employing women as teachers, such as offering lower pay (Spring, 2011). Further, Rhatigan (2009) describes deans of women as “nonconformists; not always respected, but through nuance, poise, and skill, they worked to expand opportunities for women students” (p. 6) and notes that the historical roles of deans of women are not well document.

For original deans of women, what constituted poise? What was their experience like entering a decidedly white, patriarchal environment? How did issues of gender performance exist for women on campus—as students and professionals? How did patriarchal values of scientific empiricism influence ways of knowing and philosophical underpinnings of student affairs practice, student development, intelligence testing, or educational pipeline planning during the development of higher education? How did reliance on psychologically-focused theories of student development replicate patriarchal, positivistic epistemological perspectives of human development? Whose development was, and is, centered and affirmed through pervasive use of student development theory? Intersectional feminist scholars speak to the ways in which gender intersects with other aspects of identity like race (Collins, 2000). Continuing the challenge to decenter white experiences, what were the experiences of student and professional women of color in US American Higher education and student affairs? Incorporating feminist theories, I conclude that the history of student

affairs provides a history of women in higher education that is told only in comparison to the experience of men on campus further supporting the patriarchal perspectives pervasive in higher education.

Critical Trans*Politics. Scholars of critical trans* politics work to challenge the premise that trans* politics are simply an ignored branch of queer political strategy (Spade, 2011). Critical trans* politics centers the challenges, threats, and concerns facing the trans* community without privileging legal rights and recognition as the sole focus of trans* liberation (Spade, 2011, Stewart & Russell, 2014). Connecting with the intersections of identities of trans* lives, scholars using critical trans* politics address a wide array of topics such as the prison industrial complex, identification laws, and immigration policy (Spade, 2011, Stewart & Russell, 2014). While legal reform is one pathway for change, scholars of critical trans* politics recognize equality is not synonymous with legal rights within a legal system predicated on systems such as white supremacy, European colonization, and heteropatriarchy (Spade, 2011, Stewart & Russell, 2014). Instead, scholars of critical trans* politics seeks to reimagine a social world no longer based on systems of hierarchy and domination but of democratic communities of healing (Spade, 2011).

Within the history of student affairs, the authors do not mention trans* lives outside their connection to the development of centers for marginalized gender and sexual identities in the 1990s (Nuss, 2003; Rhatigan, 2009). Trans* lives are not ever specifically acknowledged or addressed within student affairs history aside from an offhand connection to the larger umbrella of queer lives. I offer critical trans* politics as an important theoretical lens to incorporate into the history of student affairs in order to trouble pervasive cissexism and trans* oppression.

For example, how did white, European ideals of gender identity influence the development of U.S. American Higher Education, such as the development of separate professional organizations for deans of men and deans of women? Additionally, how might women's colleges be understood as reification of white, European norms of femininity (Stewart & Russell, 2014)? In what ways have national and state policies, such as FERPA, supported cissexism in student affairs history? How have and who are the trans* activists that have influenced higher education and student affairs history? What are the lived experiences of trans* activists on campus? With its emphasis on embodiment and performance, critical trans* politics is also lens to interrogate how campus spaces were gendered and inhabited over time supporting or silencing different and non-conforming gender performances. To address the erasure of trans* lives in student affairs history, I propose critical trans* politics as one path to address and resist cissexism in the develop of student affairs.

Queer Theory. A convergence of threads from many areas, scholars note that queer theory's emergence is not pinned to a specific moment but rather understood through the weaving together of a multiplicity of moments such as feminist movements, AIDS activism, and sexual subaltern populations (Hall & Jagose, 2013). Working to reject fixed disciplinary boundaries, queer scholars challenge socially constructed binaries that limit expression, experience, and knowledge including dichotomies regarding gender and sexuality (Hall & Jagose, 2013; Jagose, 1996). Queer theory scholarship explicitly takes up the construction of normalcy seeking to trouble, deconstruct, and queer what dominant societal perspectives identify as normal while simultaneously choosing not to redefine or identify any new ideal of normal (Britzman, 1998; Hall & Jagose, 2013). Queer theory scholars not only explore the lives

of queer people or queer subject matter but also bring about the notion of queering as an action of (re)formation, fluidity, and creativity (Britzman, 1998). Notably, queer theory scholars take up analysis of the multiple ways in which queer identity intersects with other aspects of identity such as race, class, ethnicity (Hall & Jagose, 2013; Jagose, 1996).

Within student affairs history, the authors first acknowledge students who identify as queer as populations gaining specialized services during the 1990s (Nuss, 2003; Rhatigan, 2009). However, there is no further discussion regarding queer or trans* lives in U.S. American or student affairs history. I hold that queer theory is one option for unraveling reliance on socially constructed binaries and ideals of normalcy within student affairs history. For example, how might employing queer theory retell or resituate the dichotomy between Deans of Men and Deans of Women during the early 1900s? How can queer theory be used to tease out the historical threads of compulsory heteronormativity and cissexism with regards to expectations for normal gender expression and sexual behavior on campus? How is normal development reified through student development theory? How do expectations of normalcy continue to manifest themselves in student affairs practices and policies, like housing? How might a queer history of student affairs speak to ways to queer college campuses? Where are the stories of student and staff who identify as queer within the history of student affairs practice? How can queer theory shift history of student affairs to a fluid, developing process rather than fixed dates and names? What other constructed dichotomies, such as the separation between student and academic affairs, could be challenged by queering student affairs history? With no incorporation of queer or trans* histories, voices, or experiences, I assert that student affairs history serves to reaffirm performance of cisgender heteronormativity.

Crip Theory

With a theoretical affiliation to queer theory, Crip theory scholarship challenges the ways in which ableism is associated with normalcy thus constructing binaries between bodies deemed disabled and those that are not (McRuer, 2006; Sandahl, 2003). Crip theory scholars work from the margins to trouble the normalization of ability while reclaiming the term crip as political, powerful, and empowering (McRuer, 2006). Additionally, scholars using Crip theory give special attention to the role of performance in resisting, confronting, and contesting dichotomies between constructions of ability and disability (Cosenza, 2010; Sandahl, 2003). Crip theory scholarship is intentionally intersectional addressing the interconnectivity between dis/ability as well as identities such as race, gender, sexuality and leveraging the rich traditions of activism with marginalized communities (Cosenza, 2010; McRuer, 2006; Sandahl, 2003). Within student affairs history, the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s resulted in a variety of legislative changes with direct impacts for populations previously excluded from higher education. Notably, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act prohibited public services, such as public higher education, from excluding individuals with disabilities (Rhatigan, 2009; Thelin, 2003). However, that is the extent to which individuals with disabilities are named and recognized within student affairs history texts. With little attention given to the lives of individuals with disabilities, I assert that Crip theory should be incorporated into the history of student affairs to redress privileging of ableism in the profession's development.

Transformative methods that center marginalized voices (McCoy & Rodricks, 2014), such as use of Crip Theory, question the shallow presence of these populations in the history of student affairs. How would

student affairs history be told if centering the experiences of individuals with disabilities? For example, who were the individuals and activists leading the struggle for legal recognition and access to higher education? What traditions, systems, and structures reflect and support ableism through affirmations of normalcy in ability? Additionally, issues of performance such as physical access, standards of assessment, and the role of accommodations are totally absent in the history of student affairs. How have college campuses, schedules, services, and assignments been designed over time to perpetuated ableism? Coupled with accounts of individuals with physical disabilities, what are the historical accounts of students with chronic illness, invisible disabilities, or learning disabilities over the history of student affairs? What about staff members? Further, how do experiences of disability overlap, intersect, and interact with other areas of identity such as race, gender, and sexual orientation? Student affairs historians give no mention to the breadth of experiences, abilities, and knowledges that individuals with disabilities represent; instead, student affairs historians group the disability community into one unit whose needs are addressed through federal policy changes. By ignoring the complexities of the histories of individuals with disabilities, the history of student affairs reaffirms a history of ableism by positioning abled bodies as the historical norm.

Intersectionality

In this paper, I have presented a variety of critical theory lenses applicable to the analysis of student affairs history with the aim of opening up a multiplicity of pathways for critical investigation. While organized as separate dimensions of analysis for clarity, I believe in a commitment to intersectionality, acknowledging that identity is multi-faceted, interlocking, and complex. Intersectionality attends to the ways multiple identities

may amplify privilege or marginalization such as the intersections of race and gender (Crenshaw, 1989; Collins, 2000), disability and sexuality (McRuer, 2006), or race and sexuality (Anzaldúa, 1987). I hold that critical retellings of student affairs history must also attend to the intricacies of identity through incorporation of intersectional analyses. How can theoretical lenses be woven together to create vibrant, intersectional understandings of student affairs history? How can intersectional projects highlight interlocking systems of oppression reified through the dominant narrative of student affairs history? For example, Thelin (2003) holds that the years following WWII became “higher education’s ‘golden age,’ one marked by an academic revolution in which colleges and universities acquired unprecedented influence” (p. 14), but that the peaceful campuses of the 1950s were rocked with student activism and unrest during the 1960s and 1970s. How might intersectional analyses make sense differently of campus climate post-WWII? For whom was this the Golden Age of Higher Education? What activism was already happening prior to the 1960s that is omitted from student affairs history? While a wealth of theoretical tools are available, I support the need for intentionally intersectional analyses of student affairs history.

Analyzing the Authors

In addition to the historical content defining the history of student affairs, I also turn to researching the texts’ authors to better situate the historical accounts they provide on student affairs history. As a component of historiography, it is vital to examine not only historical content but also historical authors to highlight the ways in which authors play an active role in curating historical narratives (Carr, 1961; Villaverde, Kincheloe, Heylar, 2006). Indeed, historical accounts do not simply materialize into text; while writing

within temporally-situated social systems, authors with biases, positionalities, and their own histories make decisions about how to tell history in a certain way. Additionally, I chose to acknowledge the authors as agents in the creation of history as a turn against phenomenological bad faith. Seen phenomenologically, bad faith is the practice of avoiding recognition of one’s self, one’s freedoms, and one’s responsibilities (Gordon, 1995). In this project, I have exercised my freedom in undertaking a critical historical analysis of the history of student affairs, but I would stand in phenomenological bad faith by not also owning my responsibility for analyzing the authors who developed the content of my historiography. As a phenomenological move against bad faith, I bring the authors to the foreground for consideration and analysis as the agents telling a particular history (Ahmed, 2006). By drawing conscious attention to the authors, and the systems of knowledge creation they may represent, the perspectives and identities of those telling history cannot fade out of attention into the background. The intention of this section is to highlight the authors as a data set in their own right and to begin asking how common systems and practices of knowledge construction and proliferation highlight certain authors while excluding others.

The first author is Dr. Elizabeth M. Nuss, retired Vice-President and Dean of Students from Goucher College (Komives, Woodard, & Associates, 2003). Since Dr. Nuss is retired, I was not able to locate any current contact information, so I could only pull additional information from online resources. Dr. Nuss received her BA from the State University of New York at Albany in Secondary Education in Spanish (Baltimore Sun, online). She received her M.Ed. from the Pennsylvania State University and a Ph.D in Higher Education, Administration from the University of Maryland (Komives, Woodard, & Associates, 2003). At Goucher College,

there is now a leadership scholarship in her name for a first- or second-year student who has demonstrated involvement with the campus community (Goucher, online).

The second author is Dr. John Thelin, who is a current faculty member at the University of Kentucky in Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation (UK, online). Dr. Thelin received his B.A. from Brown in 1969 in European History followed by an M.A in American History and Ph.D in History of Education at University of California at Berkley (UK, online).

The third author was Dr. Audrey L. Rentz. Dr. Rentz passed away in 2010, so my research is based on third-party reports of her work. Dr. Rentz received degrees from the College of Mount St. Vincent, the Pennsylvania State University, and Michigan State University (Peinert Funeral Home, online). Dr. Rentz joined Bowling Green State University faculty in the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs in 1974 until she retired in 1996 (BGSU, online). Dr. Rentz is known for her work advocating for women's issues as well as her relentless commitment to professionalism and etiquette (BGSU, online).

The final author is Dr. James J. Rhatigan, who is also retired with no current contact information. Dr. Rhatigan received his B.A. from Coe College, M.A from Syracuse in American History, and PhD in University Personnel Administration from the University of Iowa (WSU, online). When he was hired at Wichita State University in 1965, he became the youngest Dean of Students in the nation at only 30 years of age (WSU, online). Dr. Rhatigan became the Vice-President for Student Affairs in 1970, had a leadership scholarship established in his name in 1995-1996, and had the student center named after him in 1997 (WSU, online). He has also had a lasting impact at the national level winning

the two highest awards available from NASPA, serving as the organization's president, and developing travel scholarships for graduate students in his name (NASPA, online).

Taken together, these authors represent a relatively uniform, highly-educated group of student affairs professionals. For example, each author holds terminal degrees, has been employed in either upper-level administrative positions or faculty roles, and has had access to publication outlets such as textbooks. The authors have been able to successfully navigate many levels of schooling through to terminal degrees and gain highly-esteemed employment that other individuals have not. Without personal claims of specific identities by the authors themselves, I hesitate to ascribe any other privileged positions outright. However, the set of authors generates a number of additional speculations about the intersections of personal identities, such as whiteness and heteronormativity, and constructions of history. What identities are represented by the set of authors, and which are excluded? To what impact? How are the individual identities of the authors reflected in the biases within student affairs history? What social systems support the appearance of these voices as the curators of student affairs history over or instead of others? How else can the authors be read as a data set that represents the systems influencing how student affairs history is written? How have these authors been selected to write and publish? What conclusions can be made about the authorship and publication process within student affairs?

Additionally, I wonder how history is reaffirmed as fixed, unchangeable when many of the authors are no longer accessible sources in the discussion. Ultimately, I hold that analyzing the authors as a set makes their identities points of conscious attention in order to illustrate the ways in which individuals serve

to represent power structures and systems of dominance in publishing processes. Within this history of the history of student affairs, there are a number of spaces, stories, and voices that have been omitted from the common narrative. The history presented in student affairs preparatory textbooks reflects the identities privileged by those systems directing the development and publication of content while positioning other narratives as exceptions. How might critical student affairs authors pushback against traditional publishing processes? Where are the publishing spaces for historically silenced perspectives? It is incumbent upon current student affairs professionals to consider the ways we need to reframe and retell student affairs history to better prepare future student affairs practitioners with a critical, nuanced understanding of the field's history.

Implications and Future Directions

A critical analysis of the history of the history of student affairs yields a number of implications and future considerations. I focus on implications for three areas of student affairs practice: future professionals enrolled in graduate programs; current faculty members and student affairs professionals; and national professional organizations. First, the history of student affairs presented in graduate textbooks follows a common, fixed narrative that pays minimal attention to diverse voices. Lacking a contextualized, critical perspective of history, graduate students in student affairs preparatory programs are not receiving divergent, marginalized perspectives on the history of US higher education and student affairs. Graduates are then entering the field of student affairs without exposure to how systems of power have operated historically for or against various student populations.

The Student Affairs History Project (Coomes,

2006) may provide an alternative presentation of student affairs history for student affairs preparatory programs. Rather than the static nature of a textbook, *The Student Affairs History Project* is a digital repository for a variety of sources to support historical research. In 2006, Dr. Michael Coomes and Sally Click, a doctoral student at the time, began collecting and structuring *The Student Affairs History Project* as a research database for future research into the history of student affairs. Dr. Michael Coomes retired in 2015 as an emeritus faculty member in Higher Education and Student Affairs at Bowling Green State University. With finding guides and a variety of contributors, graduate students could be encouraged to explore the site for areas of interest, omissions, or places of critique to construct individual historical narratives that challenge or resist the grand narratives of student affairs history's past to revision the field's future. For students already enrolled in graduate preparatory programs that did not present a critical student affairs history, student can seek out texts that are more critical of the history of US American education such as *Schooled to order: A social history of public schooling in the United States* (Nasaw, 1979) or *Ebony and Ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's universities* (Wilder, 2013).

In addition to the students who are not receiving critical historical content in preparatory graduate programs, a critical analysis of student affairs history has valuable implications for current student affairs faculty and staff members. First, current student affairs faculty and staff members should consider how to incorporate previously neglected perspectives on the history of higher education and student affairs. One option would be to adopt a practice of bricolage in constructing student affairs history. Bricolage seeks to break traditional disciplinary boundaries of knowledge and research by incorporating tools from diverse, distinct, and creative per-

spectives (Denzin, 2010; Steinberg, & Canel-la, 2010). Outside of student affairs, there are a number of other academic disciplines that could inform student affairs history. For example, folklore scholars have explored how campus traditions have developed over time through student stories (Bronner, 2012). As an additional example, Cobb (2000) crafts the history of the Bloomfield Academy for Chickasaw women during the mid-1800s to mid-1900s, which connects secondary education to higher education for American Indian students. Coomes asserts that professionals responsible for presenting student affairs history must begin seeking stories outside the traditional narrative (personal communication, 23 November 2015). Through an approach of bricolage, faculty and staff could include sources from outside the student affairs canon that interrupt the homogenous narrative of student affairs history included in student affairs textbooks. Incorporation of bricolage speaks to a larger need for inclusion of postmodern curriculum approaches to developing course content as well as a commitment to implementing critical pedagogy in our classrooms.

In addition to bricolage, faculty can adopt critical pedagogical methods. Critical pedagogy is a critical orientation to education that is curious about and attentive to dynamics of dominance and oppression that seeks to develop more equitable alternatives through critical consciousness (Freire, 1993; Freire, 2014; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2010). Due to its analytical focus, critical pedagogy is one way to actively resist hegemonic, oppressive histories. Even while providing direct criticism of the institution of education, including history, critical pedagogy also incorporates a commitment to hope for change that minimizes human pain. As an important component of critical pedagogy, hope also serves as the force that encourages and stimulates creative inquiry about education (Freire, 1993; Freire, 2014; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2010). Critical pedagogy not only

serves as a foundation for identifying and resisting current oppression and hegemonic histories in education; it also becomes an ethical orientation for future practice that proactively considers potential impacts of educational practice.

Kincheloe and McLaren aptly acknowledge this future-orientation in that “critical pedagogy seeks to enact a situationally contingent ethic...it blends intention with consequences” (Kincheloe & McLaren, p. 133, 2010). Incorporating critical pedagogy into the history of student affairs is one possibility for identifying and resisting hegemonic historical accounts of the profession’s development while also committing to developing alternative narratives. Within the field of student affairs, faculty can engage critical pedagogy as a method to develop professional histories that are fluid, inclusive, and concerned with alleviating erasure and marginalization. As a component of critical pedagogy, postmodern curriculum development represents one way to enact critical pedagogy in analyzing, constructing, and teaching the history of student affairs.

In alignment with critical pedagogy’s aims, faculty should incorporate postmodern curriculum development into curriculum regarding student affairs history. Postmodern curriculum employs an intentionally political, justice-oriented paradigm in understanding the role of curriculum, which can be applied to developing curriculum about the history of student affairs. In defining the scope of postmodern curriculum development, Slattery (2013) explains that postmodern curriculum “must address the continuing ignorance, greed, and bigotry that perpetuate sexism, racism, heterosexism, and ethnic divisions; everything we teach is incomplete if we do not constantly foreground issues of prejudice and violence in our schools and society” (p. 150). Postmodern curriculum additionally recognizing curriculum as more than neutral facts disconnected

from students' lives. While curriculum does contain elements of "traditional knowledge... it must be seen as knowledge in relation to the learner" (Walker & Soltis, 1997, p. 45). In postmodern curriculum approaches, traditional knowledge is distinguished from embodied, autobiographical experiences as sources of knowledge with links to larger curriculum concepts.

Further, postmodern curriculum fully centers curriculum as the process of looping between reflecting on one's own lived experiences in order to bring those understandings back to the present, or *currere* (Davis, Sumara, & Luce-Kapler, 2008; Slattery, 2013). Taking a postmodern approach, how might student affairs history unfold through the students in student affairs preparation programs rather than simply starting in a decontextualized past moving forward? By affirming the unique experiences of individual perspectives traditionally left out of student affairs history, focusing on the autobiographical as a place of knowledge and interpretation pushes against curriculum that defers to privileged perspectives of Euro-centric white history. Through the decentering of hegemonic historical narratives, marginalized perspectives are given space to be vocalized, recognized, and heard (hooks, 1994). Resisting hegemonic power structures, postmodern curriculum weaves the personal into the global by highlighting the interconnectivity between people's lived experiences in the learning environment (Davis, Sumara, & Luce-Kapler, 2008; Slattery, 2013). By using a variety of tools and perspectives, critical pedagogues addressing the history of student affairs can act as bricoleurs to develop curriculum that is multifaceted, open to complexities and tensions, and highlights historically and socially silenced perspectives in the field.

Finally, a critical analysis of student affairs history has implications for student affairs

national professional associations. Student affairs practitioners' major professional organizations, ACPA and NASPA, have played prominent roles in situating the profession since their beginnings in the early 1900s (Nuss, 2003; Rentz, 2004). As such, ACPA and NASPA are in prominent places to push for critical changes in student affairs history. NASPA, for example, has a historian as a member of the executive council (Coombes, personal communication, 23 November 2015) and sponsors publication of *Handbook of Student Affairs Administration* by McClellan, Stringer, & Associates (2009). These organizations could leverage their organizational outreach to support more critical perspectives on student affairs history. Additionally, ACPA and NASPA could connect with historians working in other professional organizations such as the Association for the Study of Higher Education, ASHE.

Beyond a narrow focus on student affairs practice, ASHE aims, "to facilitate communication among individuals concerned with teaching, curriculum, research or professional service in the study of higher education" (ASHE, online). Dr. Combes shared that the most active historical investigation are being conducted by historians within ASHE at their annual conference (personal communication, 23 November 2015). Student affairs professionals in ACPA and NASPA could connect with higher education researchers in ASHE to co-construct new historical narratives that speak to multiple vantage points, give attention to issues of dominance and oppression, and incorporate previously disregarded stories. These new histories could also feed back into the content of graduate preparation programs exposing future professionals to accounts from outside of student affairs practice. A critical analysis of the history of student affairs reveals a number of opportunities for future work for students, professionals, and professional organizations. History is never a finished, fixed

product, so individuals within the student affairs profession must seriously commit to Rhatigan's (2009) assertion that history is not a spectator sport in order to continue contextualizing our profession.

Note

Throughout this work, I employ the terms trans* and queer lives to encompass individuals who experience oppression, marginalization, and/or violence due to their gender and/or sexuality identity and performance. Stewart & Russell (2014) clarify the use of trans* represents a spectrum of gendered identities that are non-conforming to socially constructed gender binaries while queer speaks to the those whose sexuality and/or gender identities break with dominant societal norms and behavioral expectations.

Footnote:

Anna L. Patton is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. This work would not be possible without the student affairs scholars cited in the work who contributed their time and expertise through individual interviews. Any correspondence should be sent to alpatton@uncg.edu.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. doi:10.1215/9780822388074
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: aunt lute books.
- Ardevini-Brooker, J. (2002, Spring). *Feminist Epistemology: The Foundation of Feminist Research and its Distinction from Traditional Research*. Advancing Women, online. Retrieved from <http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/spring2002/ARDOV~CG.HTM>
- Association for the Study of Higher Education. (n.d.). *Member benefits: Welcome!* Retrieved from <http://www.ashe.ws/?page=169>
- New positions: Goucher appoints Nuss dean, vice president. (1996, May 20). *The Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved from http://articles.baltimoresun.com/1996-05-20/business/1996141038_1_goucher-college-signet-university-of-maryland
- Bernal, D. D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 105–126. doi:10.1177/107780040200800107
- Bowling Green State University. (2011). *HESA News: Dr. Audrey L. Rentz, 1941-2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/education/higher-education-student-affairs/documents/newsletters/2011-summer-hesa-newsletter.pdf>
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 425–446. doi:10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y
- Britzman, D. P. (1998). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum: Toward new identities* (pp. 211–231). New York, NY: Garland. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.1995.00151.x
- Bronner, S. J. (2012). *Campus traditions: Folklore from the old-time college to the modern mega-university*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi. doi:10.14325/mississippi/9781617036163.001.0001
- Carr, E. H. (1961). *What is history? The George Macaulay Trevelyan lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge January-March 1961*. Cambridge, MA: University of Cambridge Press.
- Chang, R. S. (1993). Toward an Asian American legal scholarship: critical race theory, poststructuralism, and narrative space. *California Law Review*, 19, 1243–1323. doi:10.2307/3480919
- Cobb, A. J. (2000). *Listening to our grandmothers' stories: The Bloomfield academy for Chickasaw females 1852-1949*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. doi:10.5860/CHOICE.38-5166
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Coomes, M. D., & Click, S. (2006, October). *Student affairs history project*. Retrieved from http://www2.bgsu.edu/sahp/pages/guide_essay.html
- Cosenza, J. (2010). SLOW: Crip theory, dyslexia, and the borderlands of disability and ablebodiedness. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies*, 6(2), 1–11.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2009). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (7th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139–167.
- Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2008). *Engaging minds: Changing teaching in complex times*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Denzin, N. K. (2010). *The qualitative manifesto: A call to arms*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Derrickson, R. (2004). *Professor writes history of American higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.uky.edu/Education/news/04/John_Thelin.html
- Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of commitment*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.5860/choice.185665
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: continuum.
- Gordon, L. R. (1995). *Fanon and the crisis of the European man: An essay on philosophy and the human sciences*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goucher College. (2015). *Goucher spring leadership awards: Elizabeth M. Nuss emerging leader award*. Retrieved from <http://www.goucher.edu/student-life/getting-involved/leadership/goucher-spring-leadership-awards>
- Hall, D., & Jagose, A. (Eds.). (2013). *The Routledge queer studies reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Howell, M. C., & Prevenier, W. (2001). *From reliable sources: An introduction to historical methods*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. doi:10.5860/CHOICE.39-2942
- Hunter, M. L. (2002). "If you're light you're alright": Light skin color as social capital for women of color. *Gender & Society*, 16(2), 175–193. doi:10.1177/0891243022104895
- Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Komives, S. R., Woodard, D. B., Jr., & Associates (2003). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. J. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Education Research*, 24, 211–247.
- Liu, A. (2009). Critical race theory, Asian Americans, and higher education. *Interactions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 5(2), 1–12.
- McClellan, G. S., Stringer, J., & Associates (2009). *The handbook of student affairs administration* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCoy, D. L., & Rodricks, D. J. (2014). Critical race theory in higher education: 20 years of theoretical and research innovations. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 41(3), Wiley Online Library. doi:10.1002/aehe.20021
- McRuer, R. (2006). *Crip theory: Cultural signs of queerness and disability*. New York: New York University Press.
- Museus, S. D. (2013). *Asian American students in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203753002
- Narayan, U. (2004). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nasaw, D. (1979). *Schooled to order: A social history of public schooling in the United States*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- NASPA. (2010). *James J. Rhatigan*. Retrieved from <https://naspa10legacy.wordpress.com/2010/02/24/james-j-rhatigan/>
- Nuss, E. M. (2003). The development of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 3–22). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Peinert Funeral Home. (2010). *Audrey L. Rentz: May 1, 1941-November 25, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.peinertfuneralhome.com/Obituaries/Text/audrey-l-rentz/168436>
- Rentz, A. L. (2004). Student affairs: An historical perspective. In F. J. D. MacKinnon & Associates (Eds.), *Rentz's student affairs practice in higher education* (3rd ed., pp. 27–57). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Rhatigan, J. J. (2009). From the people up: A brief history of the student affairs administration. In G. S. McClellan, J. Stringer, & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (3rd ed., pp. 3–18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Salevouris, M. J., & Furay, C. (2015). *The methods and skills of history: A practical guide* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Sandahl, C. (2003). Queering the crip or crippling the queer? Intersections of queer and crip identities in solo autobiographical performance. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 9(1–2), 25–56. doi:10.1215/10642684-9-1-2-25
- Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (Eds.). (2010). *New approaches to qualitative research: Wisdom and uncertainty*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Slattery, P. (2013). *Curriculum development in a postmodern era*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(4), 471–495. doi:10.1080/09518390110063365
- Spade, D. (2011). *Normal life: Administrative violence, critical trans politics, and the limits of law*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Spring, J. (2011). (8th ed.). *The American school: A global context from the puritans to the Obama era* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Steinberg, S. R., & Canella, G. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical qualitative research*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Stewart, D.-L. (2016). Race and historiography: Advancing a critical-realist approach. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/dhe000017

- Stewart, D.-L., & Russell, E. I. A. (2014). Visibly invisible: Federal educational policy regarding queer students, faculty, and staff during the Obama administration. In E. M. Zamani-Gallaher (Ed.), *The Obama Administration and Educational Reform* (pp. 291-312). doi:10.1108/S1479-358X2013000010015
- Thelin, J. R. (2003). Historical overview of American higher education. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 3-22). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- University of Kentucky College of Education. (2016). *John R. Thelin, Ph.D. University of California, Berkeley, 1973*. Professor. Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation Faculty. Retrieved from <https://education.uky.edu/epe/epe-faculty/dr-thelin/>
- Villaverde, L., Kincheloe, J., & Heylar, F. (2006). Historical research in education. In K. Tobin & J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Doing educational research* (pp. 311-345). Rotterdam, NY: Sense.
- Walker, D. F., & Soltis, J. F. (1997). *Curriculum and aims*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.
- Wichita State University. (2013). *James J. Rhatigan Leadership Scholarship/Fellowship*. Spirit of the gift biography project: Histories of the men and women behind WSU's scholarships and fellowships. Retrieved from <http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=foundation&p=/spiritofthegiftbiographyproject/biographies/jamesj.rhatiganleadershipscholarshipfellowshi/>
- Wilder, C. S. (2013). *Ebony and Ivy: Race, slavery, and the troubled history of America's universities*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.
- Williams, P., & Chrisman, L. (1994). *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A Reader*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Young, R. J. C. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Yosso, T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 8(1), 71-93. doi:10.1080/1361332052000341006

Suggested Citation:

Patton, A. L. (2016). Who wrote the books: A history of the history of student affairs. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs*, 3(1), 41-59.