

# 6

*Innovative educational practice reveals the secrets to enabling complex learning and self-authorship.*

## Self-Authorship: The Foundation for Twenty-First-Century Education

*Marcia B. Baxter Magolda*

Educators, legislators, and the American public concur that learning outcomes of higher education should include effective citizenship, critical thinking and complex problem solving, interdependent relations with diverse others, and mature decision making. Many students enter college having learned how to follow formulas for success, lacking exposure to diverse perspectives, and unclear about their own beliefs, identities, and values (Baxter Magolda, 2001b). Moving from these entering characteristics to intended learning outcomes requires transformational learning, or “how we learn to negotiate and act on our own purposes, values, feelings, and meanings rather than those we have uncritically assimilated from others” (Mezirow, 2000, p. 8). Extracting themselves from what they have uncritically assimilated from authorities to define their own purposes, values, feelings, and meanings involves far more than information and skill acquisition. It requires a transformation of their views of knowledge, their identity, and their relations with others. Twenty-first-century learning outcomes require self-authorship: the internal capacity to define one’s belief system, identity, and relationships (Baxter Magolda, 2001b; Kegan, 1994).

The preceding chapters emphasize the importance of integrating what we know about learning, development, and educational practice. We know that complex learning outcomes require developing internal belief systems constructed through critical analysis of multiple perspectives. We also know that developing internal belief systems is interwoven with developing

internal values that shape our identities and relations with others. Thus, self-authorship forms a developmental foundation for advanced learning outcomes. We also know that many college environments do not offer learners sufficient guidance to develop these internal systems, and thus learners rely on external formulas for decisions about beliefs and values. Research has identified models of practice, particularly the Learning Partnerships Model (LPM; Baxter Magolda, 2004a), to guide educational practice in linking learning and development toward self-authorship. Assessment research is advancing our ability to identify students' development for the purpose of guiding practice and judging its effectiveness.

In this chapter, I merge previous chapters in this volume with additional research and practice to highlight theoretical advances in linking self-authorship and twenty-first-century learning outcomes, innovative practice to promote self-authorship and twenty-first-century learning outcomes, and research in progress to refine and assess the relationship of self-authorship and learning outcomes.

### **Theoretical Advances in Linking Self-Authorship and Learning Outcomes**

Nowhere are the links between self-authorship and college learning outcomes clearer than in the stories of college graduates who are now managing their adult lives. Participants in my twenty-year longitudinal study of young adult development and learning (Baxter Magolda, 2001b) convey that college learning focused on knowledge and intellect is insufficient for mature adult functioning. Gavin, one of the students in my study, reported, "It's a lot more emotional learning once you get out [of college] because before you always knew you could always just give up and go home. Now you can't give up and you can't go home" (Baxter Magolda, 2001b, p. 285). Mark explained the difference similarly: "In the college classroom there is a focus on intellect and not necessarily the feel of what is going on. It is a much more controlled environment. What you learn after college is how out of control the environment is. Life is about dealing with those particular out-of-control situations" (year 19 interview).

Mark's insight about "out-of-control situations" reflects the complexity these young adults faced daily in their postcollege lives. Whether it was a lawyer winning a legal case, a doctor making wise treatment decisions, a teacher or social worker making decisions about a child's future, a businessperson making significant financial decisions, a parent comforting an infant, or a partner trying to understand how to function in a mutual relationship, complexity was the mainstay of their adult lives.

Dawn articulated more specifically what this "feel" or "emotional learning" involved and how it incorporated knowledge and intellect. At age thirty-seven, she described succeeding in her professional and personal life on the basis of wisdom:

It's starting to feel—more like wisdom than knowledge. To me knowledge is an awareness of when you know things. You know them as facts; they are there in front of you. When you possess the wisdom, you've lived those facts, that information so fully that it takes on a whole different aspect than just knowing. It is like you absorbed that information into your entire being. Not just that you know things. It is something deeper. Knowledge is brain—wisdom comes from a different place I feel like. Something deeper connecting with your brain so that you have something different to draw from. A point where knowing you are going to do something—the knowledge has a deeper level—internal, intuitive, centered in entire being, the essential part of you that just—makes the basic knowledge pale by comparison [year 19 interview].

This inner wisdom, as Dawn called it, combined knowledge with internally derived beliefs, values, emotions, and identity. Mark expressed this combination: “Just because intellect points you in a particular direction doesn't mean that is the right direction. More enduring values are grounded in love, trust, faith. Intellectual calculus may lead you to devalue those things” (year 19 interview). Mark, Dawn, and their peers portrayed their professional decision making as stemming from this internal wisdom. They had come to live the knowledge base of their respective fields, merging it with their internal sense of themselves and their social relations.

Complexity in professional life was accompanied by complexity in personal life. Dawn described how inner wisdom helped her understand and work with having multiple sclerosis:

For the first three years, I've had to be a warrior—that has been my process with the MS thing. Strong, bold, brave, conquer to keep myself going forward. Somewhere in all of that I realized that I could let go of warrior, I'm steady, moving forward, now I kind of feel like my MS is more of a friend that helps guide me, give me information on how to best proceed on my path. A shift in 'okay, I have MS' and I'm going to work with it, it with me, we have a great partnership together. My life has gotten much easier. I know how hard to push myself, know when to say stop [year 19 interview].

Dawn's ability to define her beliefs and values internally, a process she articulated over the course of her late twenties and early thirties, helped her frame what MS meant in her life. Other longitudinal participants used this self-authored inner wisdom to make meaning of personal or familial physical and mental health challenges, loss of loved ones, and a variety of stressful experiences such as a spouse serving in Iraq.

Another layer of complexity for my longitudinal participants came in relationships with family and partners. Building and maintaining mature, interdependent relationships with others while constructing an internal belief system and sense of self required a delicate balance of self and other. Mark offered this example:

There is a point where spouses have to allow the other one individuality. I respect that position and won't interfere with you following it, but I have my own track. If it is a life of love and respect that you are going for, those things have to be minimized. Listen to perspective, come to understand opinion, then there is a mutual respect to allow the other spouse to not go with it. Come to mutual agreement to respect one another's choices [year 19 interview].

Mark emphasized mutual respect as the key to good relationships. Dawn clarified that self-respect stands at the core of this ability when she said, "If you respect yourself, it is pretty much a given that you will respect others. Treating others with compassion and understanding can only happen when you've achieved a certain level of that yourself" (Baxter Magolda, 2004b, p. 20). These perspectives demonstrate that self-authorship of identity, relationships, and knowledge are necessary for mature adult decision making, interdependent relationships, and effective citizenship.

Some students encounter these complexities in the college environment, if not earlier. Those who have been marginalized due to race, ethnicity, social class, gender, or sexual orientation encounter what Jane Pizzolato (2005) calls provocative experiences as they pursue college goals. Students with low privilege sometimes developed their own internal goals contrary to family and cultural expectations in order to pursue college (Pizzolato, 2003). Many were able to solidify their self-authored visions of themselves despite discrimination in the college environment (Pizzolato, 2004). Similarly, self-authored adult learners in an English as a Second Language program were able to critique and reject discriminatory cultural messages in their community college environment because they evaluated these messages on the basis of their internal standards and values (Helsing, Broderick, and Hammerman, 2001). Lesbian college students who were developing self-authorship were better able to decide internally how external contexts influenced their identities (Abes and Jones, 2004). Movement toward self-authorship, particularly in the cognitive dimension, helped Latina college students construct more positive ethnic identities (Torres and Baxter Magolda, 2004).

Many students, however, do not encounter these complexities during college and make important decisions through reliance on external authority. Anne Laughlin and Elizabeth Creamer's research in Chapter Four advances understanding of the earlier phases of the journey toward self-authorship. By using mixed methods and carefully holding multiple possibilities together during analysis of data from 117 college women, Laughlin and Creamer illuminate the intricacies of decision making that appears to be self-authored but is not. Their analysis revealed that consulting with others did not necessarily mean considering multiple perspectives, that confidence to make decisions independently was more likely tied to commitment to unexamined choices rather than an internally generated set of criteria, and that one's relationship with an authority figure was more important than the person's own expertise in decision making. These findings emphasize

that why college women listen to or ignore authorities' advice, why they are confident, and how they regard authorities determine the extent of their self-authorship rather than the act of consulting others or expressing confidence. These nuances are important for theoretically refining the concept of self-authorship as well as for assessing it effectively.

Collectively, this research illustrates that introducing college students to complexity and enabling them to deal with it meaningfully promotes self-authorship. Thus, college is a prime context in which to introduce provocative experiences, portray accurately the complexity of adult life, and guide students through the developmental transformations that lead toward inner wisdom. Innovations in educational practice offer hope that promoting self-authorship during college is a realistic goal.

### **Innovations in Educational Practice**

My longitudinal participants' stories from college, graduate and professional school, diverse employment contexts, and personal lives yielded the dynamics that introduce complexity and promote self-authorship in intellectual, identity and relational development. The resulting LPM (Baxter Magolda, 2004a), already described in this volume, is guiding innovative practice with promising results.

**Curricular and Pedagogical Innovations.** Virginia Tech's Earth Sustainability multisequence course series that Barbara Bekken and Joan Marie described in Chapter Five is organized using the LPM to achieve the foundational goal of self-authorship. Their organization of learning goals in a developmental sequence coupled with learning partnership pedagogy yielded progress on learning goals and self-authorship. The authors observed increased sophistication in thinking, speaking, and writing; recognizing assumptions, bias, and arguments; openness to larger perspectives; tolerance for ambiguity; and translation of learning to personal life. These outcomes were accompanied by increased development of internal voice, beliefs, and values. These data are particularly exciting because the students in Earth Sustainability took the courses in their first two years of college.

Miami University's School of Interdisciplinary Studies (SIS) used the LPM to develop a four-year writing curriculum to enable students to complete their interdisciplinary theses. Organized around the developmental journey toward self-authorship, the curriculum "helps students progress steadily through three phases, from engagement with expressive modes to an increasingly critical awareness of and proficiency in disciplinary forms to interdisciplinary scholarship" (Haynes, 2004, p. 65). Learning goals increase in complexity each semester, gradually introducing the complexity required for self-authorship. Support from the LPM pedagogy resulted in senior theses that reflected creation of new knowledge, comparison of assumptions from multiple disciplines, and understanding of the insights and limitations of particular perspectives or lines of thought.

Encouraged by the learning outcomes gains and thesis success in the SIS writing curriculum, Haynes undertook a reinvention of the university honors program in which students were also struggling with the senior thesis. She and her staff chose the motto “Scholarship, leadership, and service” to integrate the epistemological, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions of development (Haynes, 2006). The curriculum offers a gradual progression from exposure to college-level scholarship in the first year, to deeper engagement in scholarship in the middle years, to building a lifelong commitment to scholarship in the senior year. The cocurriculum offers a gradual progression from identification of values and exposure to diverse others in the first year, to refining values and learning to work effectively with diverse others in the middle years, to reflecting on one’s role as a global citizen and making life plans in the senior year. Increased collaboration among all involved in the honors program, from admission staff to faculty to residence hall staff, and grounded in the LPM provides a consistent balance of challenge and support for dealing with complexity. The results after five years are remarkable. Haynes reported that the high quality of student work, evident in faculty judgments and external awards, is likely related to the quadrupling of faculty volunteering to participate in honors teaching and advising. Students, including students of color, first-generation college students, and diverse socioeconomic-status students, are flocking to the program despite the doubling of curricular requirements and addition of cocurricular requirements. The retention rate has more than doubled, and even with a substantial increase in course offerings, courses are at capacity. Haynes concluded that students seek out rigorous learning opportunities when those opportunities offer holistic development.

The goals of Casa de la Solidaridad, a one-semester immersion experience in El Salvador, resonate with the twenty-first-century learning goals of most college programs. Casa goals include students’ expanding their imaginations and ability to think critically and contextually and becoming global citizens who act consistently with their own beliefs and values, “to become, each in their own way, collaborators in promoting global solidarity” (Yonkers-Talz, 2004, p. 151). The Casa curriculum, pedagogy, field experience in the local community, living-learning community including University of Central America students, and purposeful focus on reflection are all explicitly grounded in the LPM. Complexity is inherent in the immersion in an impoverished country and relationships with diverse others. The supportive components of the LPM are crucial to help students maximize learning from encounters with complexity. Kevin Yonkers-Talz, codirector of the Casa, follows the Casa participants longitudinally to assess the effectiveness of the program. In the six years since the Casa began, he has observed that it is typical of participants to think critically and contextually about poverty, international policy, and their own role in the world as a result of the program. The powerful stories participants share reveal that they engage big questions about their internal beliefs, values, purposes, and relations with others (Yonkers-Talz, 2004).

Many colleges endorse the Casa's learning outcome of developing intercultural maturity. Helping undergraduates achieve this outcome is challenging because intercultural maturity requires a self-authored identity able to engage with diverse others without fear of disapproval (Kegan, 1994; King and Baxter Magolda, 2005). Using the Framework of Multicultural Education (which lays out increasingly complex cognitive goals leading to multicultural outcomes and self-authorship) in conjunction with the LPM in a business course, Anne Hornak and Anna Ortiz (2004) provide evidence that breakthroughs are possible. They structured this semester-length course around five increasingly complex steps: understanding culture, learning about other cultures, recognizing and deconstructing white culture, recognizing the legitimacy of other cultures, and developing a multicultural outlook. The LPM support principles of welcoming students' experience and perspectives and engaging in mutual exploration opened students' minds to the influences of their pasts, how culture is created, and engendered responsibility for learning about other cultures. Students struggled to own white privilege, in part due to lack of exposure to diversity and understanding how it affected their lives. The growth that students reported in the course support the notion that a longer-term curriculum of sequenced challenges similar to those Haynes's and Bekken's teams have developed would be useful in helping students achieve intercultural maturity.

Intercultural maturity is one of the goals of the Urban Leadership Internship Program (ULIP) housed in Miami's honors and scholars program. This ten-week course, followed by a ten-week summer internship, aims to help students define their vocational goals, achieve a deeper understanding of themselves, and explore urban environments. Designed using the LPM, the ULIP challenges students to take responsibility for their work and service, engage with supervisors and coworkers to learn collaboratively, and reflect seriously on their values, beliefs, and vocational goals. Program assessment revealed that experiential learning, partnerships with supervisors, autonomy in work, dissonance, and reflection combined to help interns develop increasingly complex views of themselves as citizens and their role in the larger world (Egart and Healy, 2004).

**Innovations in Academic Advising.** Academic advising often focuses on helping students make good academic decisions; learning goals such as critical thinking, internally defined values, and responsible citizenship are inherent in these decisions. An academic advising program for students in academic difficulty at a large research university integrates these goals by focusing on effective learning strategies, complex ways of knowing, and students' taking charge of their own lives through developing their goals and values. The structure of the program is designed with the LPM. All one-on-one sessions are conducted as conversations in which the advisor raises questions about students' interests, strengths, goals, motivation level, obstacles to reaching goals, and opinions about how these all relate. Mutual conversation that validates students' perspectives and challenges them to choose paths to resolve issues helps them take responsibility for their academic

progress. Studying a diverse group of students who participated in the program for a semester, Pizzolato (2006) reported that participants exhibited greater gains in semester grade point average (53 percent compared to non-program students 28 percent), greater gains in cumulative grade point average (3 percent compared to 2 percent), and less attrition (16 percent versus 34 percent). Although participants did not fully achieve self-authorship, increasing complexity in how they viewed knowledge, their own role in decisions, and how to consider others' wishes contributed to their academic progress. Pizzolato and her research partners began implementing this program in fall 2006 on a larger scale with first-year students in academic difficulty in a TRIO program at another large research university. The history of TRIO is progressive. It began with Upward Bound, which emerged out of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in response to the administration's War on Poverty. In 1965, Talent Search, the second outreach program, was created as part of the Higher Education Act. In 1968, Student Support Services, which was originally known as Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, was authorized by the Higher Education Amendments and became the third in a series of educational opportunity programs. By the late 1960s, the term *TRIO* was coined to describe these federal programs.

This approach to advising resonates with Laughlin and Creamer's suggestions in Chapter Four regarding career advising. They emphasize the need for advisors to help students focus on the process rather than the outcome of career decision making and specifically assist students in working through multiple and contradictory perspectives. Because the relationship with the authority figure was crucial to women in their study, building a strong yet mutual relationship with advisees may help them face the challenges of considering alternatives and incorporating their own voices in these decisions.

**Cocurricular Innovations.** Cocurricular settings offer rich contexts in which to promote twenty-first-century learning goals and self-authorship. The Community Standards Model (CSM), created at University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and used in many residential life divisions in the country, uses the LPM to help students create shared agreements about how they will treat one another in their living environment. The learning goals include developing a mature sense of identity and mature interdependent relations with diverse others. Although intellectual complexity is not an explicit goal, encountering dissonance among diverse perspectives and participating in crafting these into agreements promotes intellectual development. Groups of residents use the model to establish initial standards, refine standards and solve problems as they arise, and hold community members accountable for violation of the standards. Staff guide the process, carefully balancing empowering students with helping them shape civil and safe living environments. Two-thirds or more of students participating in CSM reported increased understanding of themselves, increased willingness to state their opinion and stand up for their beliefs, a greater understanding and openness to others, and more comfort in making their own decisions. Although



not all students achieved self-authorship, those who did not were making progress toward it (Piper and Buckley, 2004).

Honor councils that adjudicate academic dishonesty cases may be another context for promoting self-authorship. Through observing hearings and interviewing honor council members, Cara Appel-Silbaugh (2006) found themes of self-authorship among these members: using ethics and internal values to guide decisions, considering multiple interpretations of a case, upholding policy and procedure despite seeing its shortcomings, and blending integrity, ethics, and emotional sensitivity in decision making. She suggests using the LPM to help students process cases to achieve self-authorship.

Student affairs divisions are exploring self-authorship as an overarching principle to guide their work. The student affairs division at California State University, Northridge, has been guided by a learning-centered vision since 2003. Situated in the context of an overall institutional focus on learning-centered education (Koester, Hellenbrand, and Piper, 2005), the division has worked to define developmental learning outcomes for their practice in each functional area, devise and implement practice to achieve these learning outcomes, and design assessment plans to assess their effectiveness. These efforts are linked to partners outside student affairs. One example is a joint effort of the Career Center and the College of Science and Mathematics that assists students with career exploration to enhance academic success (Koester, Hellenbrand, and Piper, 2005). The University of Michigan is also exploring self-authorship as a foundation for student affairs practice. A committee that was convened to study student climate began to explore the role of development in intercultural maturity. This evolved into using the LPM assessment steps to explore the degree to which various programmatic efforts connected to students' development. The committee is now advancing self-authorship as a guiding principle for constructing optimal learning environments throughout the student affairs division (L. Landreman, personal communication, Mar. 29, 2006).

**Innovations in Graduate Education, Professional Staff, and Faculty Development.** For more than a decade, the LPM has served as the guiding philosophy to promote self-authorship in the college student personnel master of science program at Miami University. The LPM shaped the evolution of eight core values for the program: integration of theory, inquiry, and practice; creative controversy; self-authorship; self-reflection; situating learning in learners' experiences; a shared commitment to inclusiveness; constructive collaboration; and offering adequate challenge and significant support. These values permeate the curriculum, pedagogy, and community-building efforts of the program. Students consistently report learning a great deal about themselves, collaborating effectively with others, learning to critically analyze multiple perspectives, and self-authoring their own professional beliefs. Faculty also report continuing learning from their mutual partnerships with students (Rogers, Magolda, Baxter Magolda, and Knight-Abowitz, 2004).

The higher education and student affairs graduate program at The Ohio State University is also using LPM as its design philosophy to promote students' intellectual, professional, and personal growth. One of its six professional competency categories includes goals that resonate with twenty-first-century learning outcomes such as critical thinking and problem solving, lifelong learning, ethics, and diversity and multiculturalism. They plan to use the LPM assumptions and principles to design and implement instructional plans (Brischke, Hollingsworth, Shilling, and Welkener, 2006).

Use of the LPM for professional student affairs staff development aided the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, in a structural reorganization also designed with the LPM. Reorienting the student affairs organization to promote student learning and using organizational change models to work toward collaborative leadership, the organization's leaders recognized that promoting self-authorship among the staff was crucial. The complexity of shared leadership required that staff develop self-authorship. The LPM guided their explorations of how they constructed themselves and their social relations, as well as how they viewed new ways of doing their work. Sustained work over a year's time enabled the staff to develop mature working relationships in which they negotiated expectations, reflected on values, and forged partnerships. This enabled the division to translate the LPM to working with students to promote their self-authorship (Mills and Strong, 2004).

Just as a new model of practice required self-authorship on the part of professional staff at the university, incorporating student development and the goal of self-authorship in teaching requires self-authorship on the part of faculty. In Chapter Two of this volume, Terry Wildman emphasized that the shape and pace of students' development is dependent on the shape and pace of educators' development. As he noted, the Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching at Virginia Tech has been engaging faculty in dialogue about the role of student development for ten years. The Earth Sustainability course described in Chapter Five is just one of many innovations that emerged from that conversation. Other innovations that emerged, many of which use the LPM as a framework, include a residential leadership community, faculty dialogues about the scholarship of teaching, use of the constructive-developmental framework in teaching and research (see Laughlin and Creamer's study in Chapter Four), and reconceptualization of a core curriculum (Wildman, 2004).

In Chapter Two in this volume, Wildman advances a new model of faculty development, one that addresses the need to counteract a deeply embedded image of teaching and learning that is inconsistent with promoting self-authorship. It is important to recognize that his proposal of assistive dialogue implements the LPM with the aim of faculty self-authoring their own images of teaching and learning. Placing faculty development in real classrooms situates learning in learners' (in this case, faculty) experience. Exploring ways of teaching and conceptions of learning in this process validates learners as knowers, joins novice and mentor faculty in mutual

knowledge construction, and portrays teaching as a complex art form to which one must bring oneself.

In some cases, faculty are predisposed to teach toward self-authorship. Barbara Hooper's work (2006) on the role of faculty members' professional histories revealed that occupational therapy faculty members who had witnessed the importance of self-authorship in their profession brought that vision to their teaching. In these cases, Wildman's advocacy of institutional accommodations to support this kind of teaching is crucial.

## **Research to Refine Linkages Between Self-Authorship and Learning Outcomes**

Despite exciting progress in promoting self-authorship and key learning outcomes across a range of diverse curricular and cocurricular contexts, research to refine linkages between self-authorship and learning outcomes, assessment of self-authorship and learning outcomes, and how self-authorship evolves holistically over time is crucial. Contemporary work in all three categories is underway.

**Self-Authorship and Learning Outcomes.** The Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education is a longitudinal, multi-institution study to explore the institutional conditions, practices, programs, and structures that foster the development and integration of the seven learning outcomes necessary for wise citizenship: the inclination to inquire and life-long learning; leadership; well-being; moral reasoning and character; the integration of learning; effective reasoning and problem solving; and intercultural effectiveness. In-depth interviews conducted on multiple campuses explore students' entering personal characteristics and perspectives, the nature of college experiences students identify as important, how students' initial perspectives and ways of engaging in these experiences combine to help them make sense of their experiences, and how their interpretation of their experiences reflects growth on the seven learning outcomes and the underlying cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions of self-authorship. This study, launched in fall 2006, will provide insights about the relationship between learning outcomes and self-authorship, as well as the educational practices that promote both.

**Assessing Self-Authorship and Learning Outcomes.** As Barbara Bekken and Joan Marie reported in Chapter Five, they are assessing progress on both learning outcomes (critical thinking, scientific reasoning, and student engagement) and self-authorship in the Earth Sustainability course series. Their work demonstrates that course assignments used to promote learning can also be used to assess progress on learning outcomes. Engaging students in reflecting on their previous work near the end of the semester also serves to assess developmental progress. In addition to the assessment reported in Chapter Five, they are assessing self-authorship through the use of the measure of epistemological reflection (Baxter Magolda, 2001a), a short essay questionnaire to measure intellectual development, Pizzolato's self-authorship

survey described in Chapter Three, and in-depth interviews. Their plan to follow participants in Earth Sustainability as well as control group participants longitudinally will provide insights into how an intentionally developmental curriculum and learning partnerships pedagogy promote critical thinking, scientific reasoning, and self-authorship.

The Earth Sustainability series assessment plan also holds promise for clarifying important issues in assessing self-authorship. As Pizzolato notes in Chapter Three, assessing self-authorship is a complex challenge. The questions she raises regarding the combination of reasoning and action in determining self-authorship exacerbate the difficulty in understanding how students view knowledge, themselves, and their relationships. Recognition instruments that accurately assess development have been difficult to create because students often prefer language more complex than what they can freely produce (Baxter Magolda and Porterfield, 1988; Gibbs and Widaman, 1982). Pizzolato's points about how students interpret the language on a questionnaire also complicate educators' ability to acquire a clear picture of students' development. Laughlin and Creamer's commentary in Chapter Four on the nuances they discovered using mixed methods suggests that their interview data offered a window into how students constructed their consultations with others on career decisions that was not evident in their reports of whom they consulted on the questionnaire. Many assessment researchers argue that naturalistic methods best capture self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2001a; Wood, Kitchener, and Jensen, 2002). That said, Pizzolato's continued work on the self-authorship survey is crucial to determining whether recognition instruments can be constructed to assess the complexity of self-authorship, as are mixed-method explorations.

A combination of course assignments, student reflections, educator analysis of student work, and in-depth interviews are the means to assess both learning outcomes and self-authorship. Haynes's revision of the Honors and Scholars program, Yonkers-Talz's ongoing longitudinal study of Casa participants, and Bekken and Marie's longitudinal assessment of Earth Sustainability participants all use this combination.

**Longitudinal Studies.** In addition to the projects described, longitudinal studies of young adult populations' development continue to refine our understanding of the evolution and integration of multiple dimensions of self-authorship. Vasti Torres's multi-institutional study of Latino and Latina college students (Torres, 2003; Torres and Baxter Magolda, 2004) reveals the intersections of familial relationships, cognitive dissonance, and ethnic identity development in the journey toward self-authorship. Elisa Abes's study of lesbian college students informs the complex dynamics of sexual orientation in the evolution of cognitive, identity, and relationship growth (Abes, 2003; Abes and Jones, 2004). My longitudinal study, which began with college student participants who are now approaching age forty, provides a window into how cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal

dimensions of development intertwine as adults engage in the complexity of professional, public, and personal life in the twenty-first century.

## The Promise of Self-Authorship

As Terry Wildman articulated in Chapter Two, helping students achieve twenty-first-century learning outcomes and advanced intellectual growth requires bringing together what we know about learning, development, instruction, and assessment to shape educational practice. This volume highlights what we currently know and ongoing inquiry into all four of these arenas and how they can be intentionally combined to form effective educational practice. Wildman's point about educators' transforming their conceptualizations of learning, development, instruction, and assessment is particularly important. Our understanding of how self-authorship and learning evolve, as well as the necessity of self-authorship for success in college and adult life, makes it imperative for educators to shift from old, controlling designs to new partnership designs. We hope the theoretical and assessment advances and tangible examples of successful innovative practice throughout this volume provide educators the knowledge and motivation to reenvision their educational practice.

## References

- Abes, E. S. "The Dynamics of Lesbian College Students' Multiple Dimensions of Identity." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 2003.
- Abes, E. S., and Jones, S. R. "Meaning-Making Capacity and the Dynamics of Lesbian College Students' Multiple Dimensions of Identity." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2004, 45(6), 612–632.
- Appel-Silbaugh, C. "Acting Out Integrity: Student Honor Council Members and Self-Authorship." Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association, Indianapolis, Ind., Mar. 2006.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. "A Constructivist Revision of the Measure of Epistemological Reflection." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2001a, 42(6), 520–534.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. *Making Their Own Way: Narratives for Transforming Higher Education to Promote Self-Development*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2001b.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. "Learning Partnerships Model: A Framework for Promoting Self-Authorship." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004a.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. "Self-Authorship as the Common Goal of 21st Century Education." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004b.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B., and Porterfield, W. D. *Assessing Intellectual Development: The Link Between Theory and Practice*. Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association, 1988.
- Brischke, K., Hollingsworth, R., Shilling, S., and Welkener, M. "Making a Difference in the Professional Development of Graduate Students." Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association, Indianapolis, Ind., Mar. 2006.
- Egart, K., and Healy, M. "An Urban Leadership Internship Program: Implementing Learning Partnerships 'Unplugged' from Campus Structures." In M. B. Baxter Magolda

- and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Gibbs, J., and Widaman, K. F. *Social Intelligence: Measuring the Development of Sociomoral Reflection*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1982.
- Haynes, C. "Promoting Self-Authorship Through an Interdisciplinary Writing Curriculum." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Haynes, C. "The Integrated Student: Fostering Holistic Development to Enhance Learning." *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience*, 2006, 10(6), 17–23.
- Helsing, D., Broderick, M., and Hammerman, J. "A Developmental View of ESOL Students' Identity Transitions in an Urban Community College." In R. Kegan (ed.), *Toward a New Pluralism in ABE/EDOL Classrooms: Teaching to Multiple "Cultures of Mind"*. Cambridge, Mass.: National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2001.
- Hooper, B. "Teaching for Self-Authorship in Graduate Professional Education: The Role of Faculty Biography." Unpublished manuscript, 2006.
- Hornak, A., and Ortiz, A. M. "Creating a Context to Promote Diversity Education and Self-Authorship Among Community College Students." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Kegan, R. *In over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- King, P. M., and Baxter Magolda, M. B. "A Developmental Model of Intercultural Maturity." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2005, 46(6), 571–592.
- Koester, J., Hellenbrand, H., and Piper, T. D. "Exploring the Actions Behind the Words 'Learning-Centered Institution.'" *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience*, 2005, 10(4), 10–16.
- Mezirow, J. (ed.). *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Mills, R., and Strong, K. L. "Organizing for Learning in a Division of Student Affairs." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Piper, T. D., and Buckley, J. A. "Community Standards Model: Developing Learning Partnerships in Campus Housing." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Pizzolato, J. E. "Developing Self-Authorship: Exploring the Experiences of High-Risk College Students." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2003, 44(6), 797–812.
- Pizzolato, J. E. "Coping with Conflict: Self-Authorship, Coping, and Adaptation to College in First-Year, High-Risk Students." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2004, 45(4), 425–442.
- Pizzolato, J. E. "Creating Crossroads for Self-Authorship: Investigating the Provocative Moment." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2005, 46(6), 624–641.
- Pizzolato, J. "Implementing Learning Partnerships, Assessing Self-Authorship: Implications from a Case Study." Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association, Indianapolis, Ind., Mar. 2006.
- Rogers, J. L., Magolda, P. M., Baxter Magolda, M. B., and Knight-Abowitz, K. "A Community of Scholars: Enacting the Learning Partnerships Model in Graduate Education." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Torres, V. "Factors Influencing Ethnic Identity Development of Latino College Students in the First Two Years of College." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2003, 44(4), 532–547.

- Torres, V., and Baxter Magolda, M. B. "Reconstructing Latino Identity: The Influence of Cognitive Development on the Ethnic Identity Process of Latino Students." *Journal of College Student Development*, 2004, 45(3), 333–347.
- Wildman, T. M. "The Learning Partnerships Model: Framing Faculty and Institutional Development." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.
- Wood, P., Kitchener, K. S., and Jensen, L. "Considerations in the Design and Evaluation of a Paper-and-Pencil Measure of Epistemic Cognition." In B. K. Hofer and P. R. Pintrich (eds.), *Personal Epistemology: The Psychology of Beliefs About Knowledge and Knowing*. Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 2002.
- Yonkers-Talz, K. "A Learning Partnership: U.S. College Students and the Poor in El Salvador." In M. B. Baxter Magolda and P. M. King (eds.), *Learning Partnerships: Theory and Models of Practice to Educate for Self-Authorship*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus, 2004.

MARCIA B. BAXTER MAGOLDA is Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership at Miami University, Ohio.