

COLLEGE STUDENT BEHAVIOR: A QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION
OF STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE AND FUTURE BEHAVIOR
RELATED TO THE STUDY CONDUCT PROCESS

A Dissertation
Submitted to
Temple University Graduate Board

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

by
Kevin W. Williams
December 2015

Examining Committee Members:

Dr. James Earl Davis, Advisory Chair, Educational Leadership, Temple University
Dr. Catherine C. Schifter, Psychological Studies in Education, Temple University
Dr. Stephanie Ives, AVP for Student Affairs & Dean of Students, Temple University
Dr. Maia Cucchiara, External Member, Urban Education, Temple University

©
Copyright
2015

by

Kevin W. Williams
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

High profile behavioral problems have motivated a national call for accountability by colleges and universities to better manage these issues to maintain safe and supportive campus communities. The current literature supports the use of the student conduct process as the main student behavioral intervention, but limited research has been published that examine the outcomes associated with the process. This study examines the experiences of students who participated in the conduct process and influence on their learning and future behaviors. The study also compares the experiences of students to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process.

This study utilizes a qualitative research design to provide a reflective understanding of administrators' desired outcomes pertaining to the conduct process and students' experiences and meaning-making after participating in the same process. The study exams students' perceptions of learning and ways future behaviors are influenced due to participating in the conduct process. This study takes place at a large four-year public urban institution located in the Northeast and includes interviews with students who participated in the student conduct process between August 2012 and September 2014 and of administrators that oversee the disciplinary proceedings at the same university.

The findings from this study reveal similarities and differences between administrators and students that may provide useful in exploring ways to further prevent disciplinary issues and support students when behaviors occur beyond what is already being offered. Additionally, findings demonstrate that learning is occurring, which students attribute to interactions with administrators, active sanctions involving peer

interactions, and learning to critically think through future decisions before making them. Furthermore, students' claims that the conduct process is educational aligns with responses shared by administrators, but are not fully substantiated, due to a lack of formal outcomes and assessment measures that could validate the overall effectiveness of the conduct process.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents and late grandmother Nona, who have always supported me, and to my husband Brett, who supported, pushed, and made me laugh every step of the process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must start off by thanking my advisor and chair, Dr. James Earl Davis. Dr. Davis' support and encouragement were endless and filled with ways to improve my understanding and overall doctoral work. I greatly appreciate his time, energy, and willingness to push me further in movements of great doubt and frustration. My success would not have been possible without Dr. Davis' long talks in his office and over the phone, many edits and revisions of my writing, and text message responses that encouraged me to "push through." I am very grateful for all that Dr. Davis has done to make my doctoral experience a success.

Also, I would like to thank Dr. Stephanie Ives, Dr. Catherin C. Schifter, Dr. Maia Cucchiara, and Dr. Keith Witham for mentoring, guiding my graduate studies, and serving on my dissertation committee. I am greatly appreciative of their countless hours reading, editing, and guiding my work. Special thanks, to Dr. Schifter and Dr. Cucchiara for teaching me the value and use of qualitative research methods. Their engaging teaching methods and supportive interaction in and outside the classroom helped guide my interest in qualitative research.

Additionally, I would like to thank my many friends, family, and colleagues for their unconditional love and continuous support, encouragement, direction, and insight over the course of my entire doctoral program. I greatly appreciate their patience and flexibility while I missed countless obligations and social gatherings to spend time working on course assignments and writing my dissertation. Additionally, I am grateful for the countless hours asking about my well being, sending cards, breaking bread, attending outings, laughing, and encouraging me to relax.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Dr. Brett A. Krutzsch. Brett's support at every stage of the process was extraordinary and unrelenting. We spent numerous hours together at our dining table working on our doctoral course work and our dissertations. Our engaging conversations concerning our studies, family and friends, pop culture, the latest Netflix or reality television shows, and our pet drama were highlights of our time working side-by-side that kept me motivated and grounded. I could not have done this without Brett and greatly appreciate all his unconditional support. I love Brett greatly and look forward to sharing my life with him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xxi
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem.....	3
Purpose of Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Theoretical Perspectives	6
Definition of Terms.....	9
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Historical Origins and Current State of Student Conduct.....	15
Colonial Era	15
Post-Revolutionary/Civil War Era.....	17
20 th Century.....	20
Current State of Student Conduct	24
Student Conduct Process Effectiveness	25
Student Development and Student Conduct	30
Moral Development Theory.....	31
Evolution of Consciousness Theory	35
Additional Relevant Literature	39

Desired Outcomes and Perceptions of Learning.....	47
Summary of Findings and Gaps in the Literature.....	58
3. RESEARCH METHODS	60
Research Questions.....	61
Study Design.....	61
Participants and Site Locations	63
Data Sources and Interview Protocol.....	79
Data Analysis and Interpretation	80
Researchers Role.....	81
Conclusion of Methods.....	82
4. ADMINISTRATOR FINDINGS.....	83
Research Question – Administrators	83
Category One: Overall Purpose of the Conduct Process	83
Category Two: Student Behavior Influences.....	87
Category Three: Student Conduct Process and Consistency	89
Process Review Meeting.....	90
Hearing Process	93
Sanctions.....	95
Category Four: Supportive Student Experience	100
Category Five: Student Learning.....	106
Summary of Findings.....	111
5. STUDENT FINDINGS.....	113
Research Questions – Students	113

Category One: Behavioral Choices.....	114
Types of Violations.....	114
Behavioral Influences	118
Category Two: Students’ Experiences.....	130
Anxiety Provoking and Stressful	130
Fairness	135
Supportive.....	139
Category Three: Student Learning.....	144
Behavioral Polices and Student Conduct Procedures	144
Behavioral Consequences	148
Taking Responsibility	154
Thinking Before Acting	160
Summary of Findings.....	168
6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	172
Summary and Comparison of Findings	172
Basic Tenets – Conduct Process	172
Behavioral Influences	173
Students’ Experiences.....	175
Learning Opportunities	178
Implications for Policy, Practice, and Future Research.....	183
Limitations of the Study.....	186
Conclusion	187
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	190

APPENDICES

A. EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER FOR ADMINISTRATORS	201
B. ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	202
C. STUDENT CONDUCT REPORT REQUEST EMAIL	205
D. EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER ONE FOR STUDENTS	206
E. EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER TWO FOR STUDENTS	207
F. EMAIL FOLLOW UP LETTER FOR STUDENTS	208
G. STUDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	209
H. IRB APPROVAL	211
I. IRB MODIFICATION APPROVAL	212

LIST OF TABLES

3.1	Student Conduct Administrator (SCA) Participant Characteristics.....	64
3.2	Student Participant Characteristics.....	67
3.2	Student Participant Characteristics <i>Continued</i>	68

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Higher education's inability to adequately respond to problematic student behaviors continues to fuel public scrutiny about disciplinary proceedings and influence the demand for greater accountability. High profile conduct concerns from the past decade, as well as recently trending national headlines, include hazing scandals creating dangerous emotional and physical circumstances for those involved (Allan & Madden, 2008 & Vendituoli, 2014). Also, numerous academic dishonesty incidents at reputable institutions have created mistrust with academic rankings and published performance standards (Ganim, 2014; Ganim & Sayers, 2014; Murphy, 2013, & Thomason, 2014).

Further student conduct concerns involve several campus shootings that have killed and wounded multiple individuals (Botelho, Karimi, & Valencia, 2014; Dohn, 2008; Ellis & Sidner, 2014; Hauser, 2007; Kang, 2013; K12 Academics, 2014; Martinez & Hanna, 2014), and extensive incidents involving sexual misconduct that have created a culture of fear and institutional mistrust (Erdely, 2014; Kingkade, 2014a; Kingkade, 2014b; Kreps, 2014; Mazza, 2014; Taylor, 2014a; & Taylor 2014b). These and other behaviors have motivated a national call for accountability for institutions to better manage and support students struggling with disciplinary problems to maintain safe and supportive campus communities.

Now more than ever, institutions of higher education are being held to higher standards to address student conduct actions. An example of this is President Barack Obama's national policy agenda focused on top issues associated with access, affordability, quality, and accountability (American Association of State Colleges and

Universities (AASCU), 2012). President Obama's policy agenda calls for colleges and universities to provide a quality post-secondary education that is accessible, affordable, attainable, and safe for all wishing to attend (The White House, 2014). Specifically, President Obama is determined to hold colleges and universities more accountable by creating a new federal rating system that ranks institutions based on cost and outcomes, as well as competency-based educational reform that measures learning through individuals demonstrating proficiency in a specific area of study regardless of the amount of time required to complete.

Furthermore, the national policy agenda focuses on addressing sexual misconduct as a leading behavioral issue occurring on college and university campuses (Hefling, 2014; Taylor, 2014a; Taylor 2014b & The White House, 2014). National efforts to combat sexual misconduct thus far include a federal investigation of more than 85 institutions involved in allegedly mishandling sexual misconduct on their campuses (Kingkade, 2014a & Kingkade, 2014b) and a White House task force to protect students from sexual assaults. The U.S. Departments of Education and Justice continue to explore ways that college and universities can more effectively manage sexual misconduct by better understanding and specifically improving the student conduct process (Hefling, 2014; Taylor, 2014a; Taylor 2014b & The White House, 2014). Governmental efforts to understand and improve the conduct process related to sexual misconduct may offer broader implications for further supporting students with disruptive and problematic behaviors and may prove instrumental in holding institutions of higher education more accountable for maintaining safe and supportive campus communities.

Statement of Problem

Historically, institutions of higher education are rife with struggles and disruptive behaviors between students, faculty, and administrators (Dannells, 1997; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Paterson & Kibler, 2008; & Smith, 1994). These issues began as early as the colonial period and include major campus rebellions that took place in response to “oppressive rules and bad food” (Paterson & Kibler, 2008, p. 176). Concerns about college student behavior continued throughout the early 19th century, ranging from “destruction of property at Princeton University to the death of a professor at the University of Virginia” (Magolda & Magolda, 1988, p. 7). There has been an increase and complexity of types and frequency of student behaviors occurring on campuses and significant changes in the ways that institutions respond, but limited information has been published on the effect of the student conduct process as the main behavior intervention (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999: & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

Today’s college students continue to struggle with problematic behaviors, which may be directly related to their transition to college issues, lack of conflict resolution skills, mental health issues, economic hardship, and the inability to negotiate complex issues without the assistance from their parents (Paterson & Kibler, 2008). Current disruptions noted earlier have resulted in hospitalizations, student death, incarceration, lawsuits, and removal from on-campus living and/or the institution (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007 & Paterson & Kibler, 2008). It is critical in a time of higher demand for accountability and complex student behavioral issues that colleges and universities gain a better understanding of what students are experiencing and how the conduct process influences learning and future behaviors (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999: &

Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). The conduct process is the main behavioral intervention, but little has been published on ways students experience the process and how it influences their future behaviors (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999: & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

An abundance of research has been published that explores student discipline from a historical perspective, characteristics of students involved and causes of behaviors, developmental issues, rights and due process, and perceived fairness. However, limited research is available that demonstrates ways the conduct process influences learning and future behaviors, which is the purpose of this study (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001; Lancaster & Waryold, 2008; O'Reilly & Evans, 2007; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; Stimpston & Stimpson, 2008). Additionally, there is limited information from the perspective of students who participate in the student conduct process, which, if examined, may illuminate whether desired learning outcomes are being met and behaviors modified (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999: & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). The overarching learning outcomes associated with the conduct process consist of students' "understanding of community standards, recognizing responsibility as a community member, and taking personal responsibility for choices and actions," but limited information is available from students to know if these outcomes are being met (Goldstein & Stimpson, 2013, p. 43). The majority of the research uses quantitative methods and is lacking the experiences of students that have participated in the conduct process (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005). This study was designed to explore the experiences of students who participated in the conduct process

and compare these to that of the outcomes held by conduct administrators overseeing the disciplinary proceedings.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and influence on their learning and future behaviors. The study also compares the experiences of students to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. The information obtained aids in enhancing the existing disciplinary literature and begins to fill the gaps associated with understanding the effectiveness of the conduct process from the perspective of student participants and administrators who oversee disciplinary proceedings at the research site (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Additionally, the findings associated with this study may aid administrators in evaluating prevention programs to reduce behaviors and further educate students about healthy decision making before disruptions surface. Finally, the results of this study may aid administrators in exploring the development of desired outcomes associated with the conduct process and assessment strategies to continually measure the effectiveness of the disciplinary system.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to examine the perspectives of administrators that oversee the conduct process and the students that participated in it, while exploring the gap and similarities between the two groups.

1. What are the basic tenets of the student conduct process from the perspective of conduct administrators?

2. What are the experiences of students that have participated in the conduct process?
 - a. How do students describe their experience with the conduct process?
 - b. What meaning do students make of their conduct experience?
 - c. What aspect of the conduct process provides more meaning? Why?
3. How does the conduct process influence future decision-making and behaviors?
 - a. What are students learning by participating in the conduct process?
 - b. How have students applied their learning from the conduct process?
 - c. What aspects of the process influence future decision-making and behavior?
4. What are the similarities and differences between conduct administrators' desired outcomes and the actual impact of the conduct process on students?

Theoretical Perspectives

Moral Development and Evolution of Consciousness theories were used to guide this study and provide meaning to students' experiences of participating in the student conduct process. Both theories focus on understanding students through cognitive-structural frameworks and will provide a way to explain in depth how students navigate complex behaviors. Each theory is briefly discussed below and more thoroughly in chapter three.

Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development centers on "moral reasoning/judgment and the cognitive component of moral behavior" (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1997, p. 54). Kohlberg defines moral development as embodying "the transformations

that occur in a person's form or structure of thought regarding decision-making behavior about what is good or bad behavior" (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1997, p. 54).

Kohlberg's theory emphasizes that two influences contribute to moral stage development: a) exposure to higher-stage thinking; and b) disequilibrium (Walker, 1988). Individuals encounter disequilibrium during situations affecting inner contradictions in their reasoning constructions. Additionally, disequilibrium occurs when individuals find their reasoning is dissimilar from that of others. Exposure to conflict, in both opinions and reasoning, leads to moral development (Walker, 1983, 1988). Exposure to higher-stage thinking and disequilibrium are critical aspects of moral development that directly relate to students' experience with the conduct process (Baldizan, 1998; Mullan, 1999 & King, 2012). According to Kohlberg, moral reasoning increases through stage development and consists of a six-stage process that is more thoroughly explained in chapter three (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1997).

The use of Moral Development as a theoretical framework proved useful in understanding how students make meaning of their experience and in what ways the conduct process influences learning. This theoretical framework proved useful in exploring the experiences of students' abilities to navigate the conduct process while being exposed to aspects of "higher-stage thinking and disequilibrium." Finally, Kohlberg's theory proved useful as a guide to understanding how students make decisions and think about ways their behavior impacts others. It is through this reflection that participants revealed whether the discipline process influences aspects of Moral Development and influences future decision-making and behavior.

Evolution of Consciousness is the second theoretical structure that helped frame the study. Robert Kegan's theory focuses on "the growth or transformations of ways people construct meaning" (Kegan, 1994, p. 199). Specifically, Kegan's theory focuses on the "evolution of consciousness, the personal unfolding of ways of organizing experience that are not simply replaced as we grow, but subsumed into our complex systems of mind" (Kegan, 1994, p. 9). Kegan's theory focuses on "meaning-making (the way an individual sees the world)" with growth and development being influenced by movement through increasingly more complex ways of understanding something new and application of the new knowledge to future lived experiences (Evens et al., 2010, p. 177). The movement through complex ways of understanding involves periods of certainty and uncertainty that force the individual to redevelop relationships to their surroundings (Evens et al., 2010). It is this very process students experience while going through the student conduct process. Kegan calls the movement through increasingly complex ways of knowing and understanding the "orders of consciousness" and describes this as a lifelong stage process that starts at infancy and moves through adulthood (Evens et al., 2010, p. 177).

Kegan's research emphasized that ongoing growth is painful since it involves altering an individual's ability to maneuver in their surroundings (Evans et al., 2010). Kegan introduces the concept of a "holding environment," which provides support for individuals working through growth and change (Winnicott, 1965, p. 116). According to Kegan, the "holding environment has two functions: supporting individuals in their current stage of development and encouraging movement to the next evolutionary truce" (Kegan, 1994, p. 43). The holding environment is associated with an "evolutionary

bridge, a context for crossing over from one order of consciousness to the next, more developed order” (Kegan, 1994, p 43). Kegan’s order of consciousness consists of multiple orders/stages ranging from zero to five, and is more thoroughly explained in chapter three (Evans et al., 2010).

It is through the holding-bridge concept that Kegan’s Evolution of Consciousness theoretical framework provided insight into the lived experience of students participating in the conduct process. The use of Kegan’s orders of consciousness provided ways that students created meaning based on where they were developmentally. Similarly to Moral Development, Kegan’s Evolution of Consciousness proved useful as a guide to understanding how students make decisions and think about ways their behavior impacts others. It was through this reflection that participants revealed if the student discipline process influences aspects of the evolution of consciousness and how the process influences future decision-making and behavior.

Definition of Terms

This section identifies and defines significant terms that recur in this study.

1. ***In Loco Parentis:*** *In loco parentis* refers to everyday law that gave institutions of higher education the ability to act in the place of parents while students attended colleges and universities, in the areas of moral and character development, social matters, and conduct (Dannells, 1997; Leonard, 1956; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; & Smith, 1994).
2. **Student Behavior:** Student behavior refers to student conduct that may be in violation of a college or university’s published behavioral expectations, is unlawful, may cause harm to self or others, or may interfere with the rights of

others. Different types of problematic behaviors consist of, but are not limited to: bullying, disorderly conduct, hazing, substance use and intoxication, stealing, sexual misconduct, and violence.

3. **Due Process:** Due process rights include written notification of alleged behavioral violations and a conduct hearing, the chance to be present and heard at the conduct hearing and the opportunity to present evidence and have an advisor. (Barr & Associates, 1988; King, 2012; Pavela, 2006; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004).
4. **Model Code:** The model code provides a framework for defining student behavioral expectations for college and university conduct problems and provides standards for holding students accountable through a conduct process that ensures fair and equal treatment for all (Stoner & Lowery, 2004).
5. **Code:** The code refers to the student behavioral expectations and processes established by colleges and universities to manage policy violations and maintain civility. This may or may not be based on the Model Code.
6. **Student Conduct Administrator (SCA):** A designated administrative person who oversees designated conduct cases and can meet with students to determine whether a student is responsible for alleged Code violations. The SCA also serves as a campus resource for students, faculty, and administrators.
7. **Student Conduct Case Management System:** A secured web-based case management system that tracks student behavioral issues through the entire student conduct process. At the school identified in this study, this system is maintained by the Dean of Students Office and complies with FERPA regulations of security and confidentiality.

8. **Student Conduct Process (SCP):** The student conduct process (SCP) is a behavioral intervention administrative process used to educate and adjudicate student conduct that may violate community standards and institutional policies (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Pavela, 2006; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004). The following components make up the student conduct process at the research site and are aligned with the model code.
- a. **Charge Notification** –Written notification used to inform students of alleged code violations and expectations for attending a process review meeting with an SCA to discuss the alleged allegations and the student conduct process. The charge notification also informs the student that a personal advisor may attend the process review meeting and any other aspect of the conduct process in a non-active advisory role.
 - b. **Process Review Meeting** –A meeting between an accused student and an SCA within the Student Conduct Office. The meeting is intended to educate the student about the conduct process and review the summary of alleged violations, possible sanctions, and hearing options. Campus resources are offered if applicable, and may include services focused on physical and mental health, academic support, and conflict mediation.
 - c. **Administrative Hearing** –A process during which the SCA reviews the charges with the accused student and determines level of responsibility based on evidence presented during the administrative hearing. The student is given the opportunity to take responsibility or present their side of the story with supporting evidence, if desired. Evidence for both the

accused student and SCA may include physical or verbal evidence, and/or witnesses with relevant information pertaining to the charges. At the site chosen for this study, this type of hearing is held in private and is reserved for first-time lower-level violations including substance use, academic dishonesty, theft, and disorderly conduct violations. Campus resources are offered if applicable, and may include services focused on physical and mental health, academic support, financial aid, and mediation.

- d. **Board Hearing** –A formal process where board members explore the charges with the accused student and determine level of responsibility based on evidence presented during the board hearing. Board members are selected and trained faculty, administrators, and students. The accused student is given the opportunity to take responsibility or present their side of the story with supporting evidence if desired. Evidence for both the accused student and board may include physical or verbal evidence and/or witnesses with relevant information pertaining to the charges. At the study site, board hearings are reserved for high-level cases and repeat violations, including substance use, academic dishonesty, theft, disorderly conduct, physical violence, weapons, and sexual misconduct. Campus resources will be offered if applicable and may include services focused on physical and mental health, academic support, and mediation.
- e. **Sanctions** – These are assigned to any student found responsible for violating the Code and vary depending on the severity of violation. At the study site, sanctions included, but are not limited to: a letter of

reprimand, probation, loss of privileges, a fine, restitution, suspension from housing or the university, expulsion from housing or the university, admission and/or degree revocation, mandatory minimums set by the university, and other sanctions such as psycho-educational workshops, reflective essays, community service, and other related assignments.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REIIEW

The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and influence on their learning and future behaviors. The study also compares the experiences of students to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. An abundance of research has been published that explores student conduct from a historical perspective, including rights and due process, characteristics and causes of behaviors of students involved, developmental issues, effectiveness of the conduct process, and perceived value and fairness as it relates to the actual student conduct process (SCP) used to manage policy violations (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001; Lancaster & Waryold, 2008; O'Reilly & Evans, 2007; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; & Stimpston & Stimpson, 2008). Likewise, an abundance of time and resources is spent managing conduct issues and little is known about the impact of these efforts. There is also scant attention in the literature about ways the SCP, as the main behavioral intervention, influences learning and future behaviors (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999: & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

This chapter begins by examining the historical origins of college student conduct processes in the United States from the colonial era to the 21st century, including causes of conflict and behavioral issues, student rights and due process, and the current purpose and trends related to student conduct in relation to issues of accountability. Additionally, this chapter explores the SCP as it relates to research focused on desired outcomes and perceptions of learning, student development, moral development, and effectiveness of the SCP. Finally, this chapter concludes with the summary of findings, including gaps in

the research and ways this study attempts to add to the current body of student disciplinary research.

Historical Origins and Current State of the Student Conduct Process

The purpose of this section is to explore the historical complexities associated with the student conduct field and demonstrate how issues of student rights and a call for accountability has been a significant part of the continual turmoil. This section is organized using a chronological narrative process to highlight significant historical origins and the evolutions of the SCP.

Colonial Era

Scholars agree that the history of college student conduct can be traced back to the beginning of higher education in the United States and is rich with conflict and disruptions between students, faculty, and administrators (Dannells, 1997; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). Colleges in the United States were established in the colonial period, mainly to prepare men for civic and cleric leadership roles (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). Harvard was the first college of higher education established in 1636 and focused on educating affluent young male students on issues of morality in order to further promote Christianity (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). Students during this period were expected to be well educated and of respectable character. This was accomplished by high standards focused on moral development. It was through enforcement of stringent rules and higher standards with little freedom that behavioral disruptions emerged and paralleled the growth of higher

education (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). During the colonial era, live-in faculty/tutors managed students with firm control both in and outside the classroom (Dannells, 1997; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; & Smith, 1994). “Proper decorum, etiquette, respect for elders, good personal hygiene, neatness in one’s residence, proper attire and regular attendance in chapel are examples of extent to which student life was regulated” (Paterson & Gregory, 2013, p. 45). Physical admonishments, public admonitions, fines, suspensions, and expulsions were assigned to students breaking the rules and publicly displaying behaviors related to teen adolescent development and responses to strict rules (Dannells, 1997; Leonard, 1956; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994).

Students attending Harvard and other emerging colleges were governed by *in loco parentis*, or in place of a parent, which was molded after British common law (Baldizan, 1998; Bostic & Gonzalez, 1999; Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Dublon; 2008; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; & Smith, 1994). Laws during the colonial period gave wide authority to colleges and universities through their charters, allowing institutions to take the actual place of parents in the area of moral and character development, social matters, and conduct (Dannells, 1997; Leonard, 1956; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; & Smith, 1994). Students had no rights in the conduct process and were disciplined frequently by live-in faculty/tutors, presidents, and board of trustee members (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1988; Lancaster & Waryold, 2008; Leonard, 1956; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994). The SCP during this time existed to maintain order, build character, and administer punishment for bad behavior

(Paterson & Gregory, 2013 & Smith, 1994). Campus rebellions took place throughout the colonial period and were in direct response to the “oppressive rules and bad food” as students fought back to gain freedom from *in loco parentis* and to improve their quality of life (Paterson & Kibler, 2008, p. 176).

Post-Revolutionary/Civil War Eras

The management of student behavior began to slowly change after the Revolutionary War, as faculty struggled to manage behaviors where students were continually challenging the autocratic rules and use of corporal punishment (Dannells, 1997; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). Presidents took on more of the role of discipline, but still maintained order with strict rules and hard-handed punishments for students involved with disciplinary disputes (Dannells, 1997; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; Thelin, 2004). Students responded with uprisings throughout the early 19th century ranging from “destruction of property at Princeton University to the death of a professor at the University of Virginia” (Magolda & Magolda, 1988, p. 7). Slowly but surely, the SCP continued to change as concepts of democracy, equality, and freedom were infused into the lives of citizens and universities (Dannells, 1997 & 1988; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; & Smith 1994). Students still had very few rights, but the use of corporal punishment began to subside (Paterson & Gregory, 2013 & Smith, 1994). Student rebellions were finally getting the attention of faculty and university presidents, and things were beginning to slowly change.

The influence of the German model of university education after the Civil War became more prevalent in the United States and focused mainly on intellectual education and the production of knowledge, leaving very little time for faculty and presidents to

manage issues that happened outside the classroom (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). This new model of education moved educational priorities away from preparing affluent men for civic and cleric leadership roles to a broader education curriculum. It was also during this time that the belief emerged that higher education should be available for common men (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). Up until this time, institutions of higher education were only the right of the elite and affluent class. The introduction of the land-grant movement, named the Morrill Act of 1862, opened colleges to the working class as a way to support the increasing requirements of the new industrialized movement (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). The new model of education required dedicated attention to the expansion of curriculum and the need for faculty to focus more time on teaching, conducting research, and publishing their work (Paterson & Gregory, 2013 & Smith, 1994). The management of conduct issues was about to see one of its first major shifts since higher education started in the U.S.

Presidents began appointing specialized faculty in response to these changes and required them to focus on the out-of-classroom experience, which including discipline oversight (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). The appointment of the new dean role initiated the journey toward a more humane approach to the student judicial process, focusing on an individual approach to solving conduct

challenges (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). The autocratic rules that governed student conduct began to shift from an extremely controlling and corporal punishment approach to a more humanistic view offering more support to students struggling with discipline (Dannells, 1997 & 1988, & Smith, 1994). *In loco parentis* was still in effect, but change was on its way. For the first time in the history of higher education, there were finally dedicated positions called deans that were responsible for supporting students outside the classroom.

The first Dean of Men, “LeBaron Russell Briggs, was appointed in 1870 at Harvard University” and was responsible for overseeing “advising, moral development, and behavioral issues” of the male student body (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978, p. 13). Years later, the first Dean of Women, “Alice Freeman Palmer, was appointed at the University of Chicago,” and in her role she was responsible for addressing discipline and advocacy for female students (Bordin, 1993, p. 5). The development of both dean positions opened the door to the field of student affairs and served as a way to assist students with co-curricular situations, including advising, moral development, and discipline (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). This was a significant time in student discipline history, as university presidents and faculty were no longer overseeing conduct and morality. The birth of the field of student affairs had arrived, and more support was finally available to address co-curricular challenges; specifically conduct (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004)

20th Century

Higher education experienced a major flux of enrollment in the early 20th Century caused by the demand of post-World War II veterans returning from war and the promise of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act passed in 1944, known as the G.I. Bill (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Leonard 1956; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler; 2008; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). This increase of students and veterans dramatically shifted enrollment and caused unparalleled growth within higher education (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). Disciplinary challenges continued to increase as “shifting trends and relationship issues between students, faculty and administration began to emerge” (Thelin, 2004, p. 1). This new population of students was not accepting of rules established for traditional-aged younger students, as they were older and more mature and wanted to be treated as adults. The push to gain freedom from *in loco parentis* was on the rise and students demanded self-governance, a voice at the table, and that rules and regulations be relaxed (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Bostic & Gonzalez, 1999; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004).

The era of the 1960s and 1970s was filled with major “protest, sex, drugs, and rock and roll” (Paterson & Kibler, 2008, p. 176). Protests would commonly turn violent and incidents included shootings at South Carolina State University, Kent State University, and Jackson State University, killing a total of nine students and wounding thirty-eight others (K12 Academics, 2014 & Paterson & Kibler, 2008). Issues of power,

control, inequality, and freedom emerged and surfaced right in the middle of the Civil Rights Movement (Bickel & Lake 1999; Dublon, 2008; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; & Smith, 1994). Protests continued to surface due to the “Vietnam War and the draft, and the Civil Rights Movement led to campus protests of conduct regulations and conduct sanctions” (Paterson & Gregory, 2013, p. 47). Students were focused on changing regulations associated with the ability to speak freely and protest on campus, dress codes, differential treatment and rules for women, on-campus living requirements, and disciplinary sanctions, including suspension and expulsion by deans (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Dannells, 1997; Leonard 1956; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004).

It is during this period that *in loco parentis* came to a halt and students gained their constitutional right of due process and were finally treated as adults (Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Bostic & Gonzalez, 1999; Leonard 1956; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). The strict rules and unjustified sanctions were no longer allowed as universities scrambled to respond to the landmark 1961 United States Federal Court decisions of *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*, which ruled that public institutions of higher education could no longer act *in loco parentis* when disciplining students for conduct and needed to provide due process rights for disciplinary issues in the accordance with the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution (Bracewell, 1988; Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Bostic & Gonzalez, 1999; Dannells, 1997; *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*, 1961; Leonard 1956; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). The transition from *in loco parentis* to

due process was underway, but it was left up to institutions to determine the definition of due process as it related to student discipline (Bracewell, 1988; Brubacher & Rudy, 1997; Bostic & Gonzalez, 1999; Dannells, 1997; Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 1961; Leonard 1956; Magolda & Magolda, 1988; Rudolph, 1962; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004).

Student Affairs administrators were left questioning the association between institutions and students: “What rules governing student behavior could be written? How is notice provided for these regulations? What procedures must be adapted to meet the due process standards? Who can decide when a rule has been violated? What are the proper penalties for violations” (Paterson & Gregory, 2013, p. 47)? The 1980s brought answers to the due process questions and provided a framework that was widely referred to as “student judicial procedures” (Paterson & Gregory, 2013, p. 48). Specialized student judicial administrators emerged in the student affairs profession and were expected to create student conduct policies, due process procedures, and administrative and board disciplinary hearings processes to develop hearing officers, and educate the broad campus community concerning student conduct-related issues (Dannells 1997 & 1988; Paterson & Gregory, 2013, & Smith, 1994).

Additionally, the 1980s and 1990s brought an increased consumerism perspective to higher education, and the relationship between student, parents, and institutions once again changed. Parents became more involved in the affairs of higher education as institutions raised costs to replace financial support from state and federal governments; they demanded that they receive their money’s worth, which was especially important when it came to campus safety challenges related to student behavior and discipline.

Parents, now as consumers, insisted that institutions of higher education hold up their contractual agreement and provide a quality education for their students in a safe and supportive environment (Dannells, 1997; Janosik, 2004 & Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004). Special interest groups become involved by advocating with parents for governmental support in maintaining campus safety and preventing campus crime related to students with behavior issues. The most well known is the Campus Security Act of 1990 (Clery Act), which requires institutions to report statistics associated with campus crimes (Clery & Clery, 2011; Gregory & Janosik, 2003; Janosik, 2004; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994; & Thelin, 2004).

The 1990s also brought the development of the first published model disciplinary code, which served as a framework that institutions could use to create and/or update their existing student conduct codes and conduct processes used to adjudicate student behaviors (Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Pavela, 1997 & 2006; Smith, 1994; Stoner, 2000; Stoner, 2008; Stoner & Cerminara, 1990; Stoner & Lowery, 2004). Edward Stoner and Katy Cerminara created the model code in 1990, which provided standards focused on a student-friendly disciplinary practice that differed from “criminal proceedings” (Paterson & Gregory, 2013, p. 49). The model code provided a clear framework for disciplinary processes to ensure all students participating received fair and equitable treatment (Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Pavela, 1997 & 2006, Stoner, 2000; Stoner, 2008; Stoner & Cerminara, 1990; Stoner & Lowery, 2004). It delineated behavioral expectations and the process for holding students accountable when challenges surfaced (King, 2012), and also afforded students defined rights aimed at ensuring due process (Footer, 1996; & Lowery, 2008). Due process rights included written notification of alleged violations and

a conduct hearing, the chance to be heard at the conduct hearing, and the opportunity to have an advisor (Stoner, 2000; Stoner, 2008; Stoner & Cerminara, 1990; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004).

Current State of Student Conduct

The new millennium brought a new model code for student conduct, offering clear standards, public and government scrutiny, and an expansion of complex behaviors, setting higher education on an unprecedented course of compliance and accountability (Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Stoner & Lowery, 2004; & Thelin, 2004). The development of a new model code in 2004 offered stronger guidelines and standards for colleges and universities, including clearer language concerning policy violations and role definitions, a student conduct hearing script, and instructions on ways to periodically review and improve an institution's student codes of conduct (Stoner & Lowery, 2004). These new standards further prepared colleges and universities to "treat all students with equal care, concern, honor, fairness, and dignity" with regard to conduct (Stoner & Lowery, 2004 p. 15). Additionally, the new model code better delineates college authority in behavioral issues as it relates to campus policies and issues of legality (Stoner & Lowery, 2004).

Public and government scrutiny continues to grow as college and universities navigate student discipline and find ways to meet the demands of new compliance and accountability standards (King, 2012; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004). Current challenges consist of bullying, disorderly conduct, hazing, substance use and intoxication, stealing, sexual misconduct and violence. Many of these may result in hospitalization, student death, incarceration, lawsuits, and removal from on-campus living and/or possibly the university (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; O'Reilly & Evans, 2007;

& Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler, 2008; & White House 2014). These and other conduct concerns have sparked national debate around ways colleges and universities should respond more firmly to prevent future issues and provide a safe campus community conducive to learning (Paterson & Gregory, 2013 & White House, 2014).

This extensive historical background and the current state of student conduct clearly establishes a span of over 300 years of colleges managing discipline and demonstrates varying ways such challenges were addressed. The historical literature supports that student conduct processes offering students' rights and an educational focus did not emerge until the 1960s and is lacking research that verifies the impact on students participating in the process since that time (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). This section of literature plainly demonstrates a lack of historical perspective of how the student conduct process prevented future discipline, helped students take responsibility for their behaviors, and learn from the conduct process experience. The historical origins and the current state of the student conduct process are clearly missing students' experiences and perceptions of how the process influences learning and future behaviors. The outcomes of this study provided useful information in addressing student behavioral issues, meeting increasing demands for accountability, and adding new information to the current body of research to better support student conduct concerns.

Student Conduct Process Effectiveness

Student conduct process effectiveness surfaced during the review of literature and mainly focused on recidivism. Prior research supports that effectiveness can affect

overall outcomes associated with the SCP and, once addressed, may support demands for higher education to be more accountable in the area of educating and supporting students (Bostic & Gonzalez; Dollar, 1969; Emmanuel & Miser, 1987; Kuh, 1979; & O'Reilly & Evans, 2007). The use of assessment and evaluation measures are critical processes needed to determine if programs are effective and meeting intended outcomes (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) 2012 & Zacker, 1996). Additionally, reasons for conducting assessment and evaluation include ensuring suitable financial resources, identifying and improving quality of service, policy development, meeting accreditation expectations, strategic planning, measuring satisfaction, and measuring learning outcomes (Upcraft & Schuh, 2000). The literature below demonstrates efforts to measure the effectiveness of the SCP.

Two studies surfaced during the review of literature that explores the effectiveness of the SCP. Each study is discussed in detail below and designated by a sub-heading including author's last name and date of publication.

Kompalla and McCarthy (2001)

Sharon Kompalla and Margaret McCarthy (2001) explored the effectiveness of the SCP in their study focused on “examining the effect of active and passive judicial sanctions on college student recidivism and retention” (p. 223). The quantitative study consisted of 54 students with active sanctions and 74 students with passive sanctions totaling 138 students from a large, private institution with 10,000 plus students in the Southeast. According to Kompalla and McCarthy (2001), active sanctions consisted of educational classes, community services, and educational papers. Passive sanctions consisted of warning or suspension from on-campus housing or the university.

Kompalla and McCarthy (2001) searched each participant's conduct record stored in the university's student conduct management database for repeat behavior, once sanctions were complete, to determine recidivism. Retention was defined as participant's ability to maintain enrollment for at least three consecutive academic quarters after sanctions were completed or the student graduated.

Kompalla and McCarthy (2001) found comparable rates of recidivism for students assigned to both active and passive sanctions. Additionally, this study found that a third of the students assigned to educational classes for an active sanction were responsible for violating other policies later within the timeframe of this study. These findings question the effectiveness of active sanctions that may have been too narrowly focused and failed to address broader conduct. Students given both active and passive sanctions that focused on basic skills were less likely to repeat similar behaviors if they repeated behaviors at all.

In terms of retention, this research discovered that students who were assigned active sanctions were not retained at higher rates compared to students who were assigned passive sanctions. Students assigned to educational classes focused on coping skills and managing inappropriate behaviors had higher retention rates than those assigned to educational classes focused on sexual misconduct and substance use. The sexual misconduct and substance classes were designed to support students with complex high-level issues, but did not meet the expected levels of effectiveness. Additional research on retention in relation to the student conduct process was encouraged.

The findings from this study suggest that a combination of active and passive sanctions may prove more effective. These findings can be significant if supported by

other studies. This limited focus on one private institution impacts the generalizability of the results (Creswell, 2009). A comparison study consisting of a larger sample size at a similar-sized public college would provide greater outcomes, due to the ability to account for the difference in private and public college demographics and types of behavioral issues adjudicated. This type of comparison would offer much-needed literature to support a broader understanding of active and passive sanction usage.

Additionally, this study could have been improved by exploring the learning associated with students being assigned active and passive sanctions. This study was quantitative in nature and could be enhanced with qualitative methods describing students' experiences with active and passive sanctions (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman 2010). The use of qualitative methods was encouraged for future research to gain better insight into students' overall experiences, and that of repeat offenders. Overall, the findings from this study illuminate the need to further explore effectiveness through the use of active and passive sanctions, which was included in the current study.

O'Reilly and Evans (2007)

O'Reilly & Evans (2007) also studied student conduct process effectiveness by exploring three student conduct processes at 210 private Catholic institutions to determine the most effective in terms of preventing/impacting recidivism. The three student conduct processes consisted of administrative, majority-peer, and minority-peer.

The three processes were defined as:

Administrative discipline/judicial processes are a hearing body or any person authorized by the college or university to determine first whether a violation of code of conduct occurred, and then to recommend and/or impose sanctions. Majority-peer processes refer to those employing a judicial body or hearing board composed of faculty and/or staff, where students constitute fifty percent or more of this board's membership. Minority-peer processes also involve a judicial body

or board composed of faculty and/or staff, yet here students constitute less than fifty percent of the board's membership (p. 2).

O'Reilly & Evans (2007) discovered that the administrative process had 3,521 repeat offenders out of 12,712 adjudicated cases. The minority-peer process had 78 repeat offenders out of 409 adjudicated cases; and the majority-peer process had 356 repeat offenders out of 959 adjudicated cases. The total repeat offenders for all three processes consisted of 3,955 out of 14,080 adjudicated cases, which was 28% of all cases.

According to O'Reilly & Evans (2007), the findings suggested a 28% recidivism rate for all discipline/judicial processes offered at the institutions participating in the study and accounted for one out of four students repeating behavioral issues. The use of minority-peer processes was found to be the most effective process for adjudicating students, which means the use of majority-peer discipline process was the least effective in this study. The study went one step further and explored which discipline/judicial processes student conduct administrators (SCA) thought was most effective. Their responses did not match the findings of this study, and were most revealing, considering SCAs favor administrative processes due to their expediency and ease of use.

The results of this study suggest that SCAs rethink their discipline/judicial philosophies and processes to better incorporate hearing boards with combined student, faculty, and staff members. Additionally, SCAs were encouraged to spend more time up front training their boards effectively to help support students with behavioral problems and reduce repeat violations. O'Reilly & Evans (2007) recommend that additional research explore this similar topic through longitudinal studies while measuring comparison between large private and public institutions. The exploration of actual learning by participating in the conduct process was a limitation of this study and was

encouraged for future research. Additionally, the use of qualitative methods was encouraged to “provide a voice to any student involved in the conduct process, either as an accused, the complainant, or as a member of a discipline/judicial board” (p. 7).

The literature on student conduct effectiveness revealed that a combination of active and passive sanctions support lower levels of behavioral recidivism (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001). Additionally, the prior research supports the use of student, staff, and faculty-combined discipline/judicial boards to better support students in conduct proceedings and reduce recidivism (O’Reilly & Evans 2007). These two findings are significant, as they provide insight into ways SCAs can adapt the current system to reduce possible recidivism issues and reduce the overall caseload of conduct issues.

The studies discussed in this section are significant to this research as they continue to confirm the need for qualitative methods to reinforce quantitative findings (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman 2010). Additionally, both studies missed the opportunity to explore aspects of learning and students’ experiences associated with the different types of hearings and active and passive sanctions that this study has now explored. This concludes the research that has been published exploring the effectiveness of the SCP. Student development, as it relates to the SCP, is explored next.

Student Development and Student Conduct

College student development and students’ abilities to make meaning of their experience surfaced during the review of literature focused mainly on educational value and fairness. Student development theory refers to a body of theoretical knowledge that focuses on young adults continually maneuvering through psychosocial and cognitive stages of student development, which are intensified during the college years (Evans,

Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). Psychosocial development consists of stages in which young adults explore their identity, their interactions with others, and the direction of their lives (Evans et al., 2010). Cognitive development describes ways young adults “think, reason, and make meaning of their experiences” (Evans et al., 2010, p 43).

Specifically, Moral Development and Evolution of Consciousness theories guided this study and provided a context to understand students’ experiences in the conduct process. Both theories focus on understanding students through cognitive-structural frameworks and provide in-depth explanation of ways that students navigate complex behavior issues. Each theory and its relationship to the student conduct process are discussed below. Additionally, student conduct literature focused on student development is discussed thereafter. This section concludes with an assessment of overall findings and relevance to this study.

Moral Development Theory

Lawrence Kohlberg’s theory of moral development centers on moral reasoning/judgment, the cognitive element of moral behavior (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977). Kohlberg defines moral development as embodying “the transformations that occur in a person’s form or structure of thought regarding decisions-making behavior about what is good or bad behavior” (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977, p. 54). Kohlberg saw moral judgment as having three qualities: “1) an emphasis on value rather than fact, 2) an effect on a person or persons, and 3) a requirement that an action be taken” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 101). Three criteria framed Kohlberg’s stage model: “1) structure, 2) sequence, and 3) hierarchy,” which is a hard stage model, meaning that all criteria are critical for development to occur (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977).

According to Kohlberg, the structure criterion is the most necessary of the three. The structure criterion indicates that individuals exhibit similar patterns of moral reasoning, regardless of experience and setting. Kohlberg emphasized that not all individuals will move through all stages, nor will they move through each at the same rate of understanding. However, the stages are sequenced and fixed, with the final at the top of the hierarchy. Progression through each stage is accomplished by incorporating learned knowledge from current and previous stages, never at a higher stage where information has not yet been mastered (Evans et al., 2010).

Kohlberg's theory emphasizes that two influences contribute to moral stage development: a) exposure to higher-stage thinking; and b) disequilibrium (Walker, 1988). Individuals encounter disequilibrium during situations affecting inner contradictions in their reasoning. Additionally, disequilibrium occurs when individuals find their reasoning is dissimilar from that of others. Exposure to conflict, in both opinions and reasoning, leads to moral development (Walker, 1983, 1988). This is a critical point when thinking about the disequilibrium that takes place when a student is challenged to think about their behavioral in relation to policy violations.

According to Kohlberg, moral reasoning "cultivates through stage development and consists of a six-stage sequence grouped into three levels" (Evans et al., 2010, p. 103). The levels are "Level 1: Pre-conventional Morality, Level 2: Conventional Morality, and Level 3: Post-conventional Morality" (Evans et al., 2010, p. 103). Level 1: Pre-conventional Morality represents individuals who struggle to comprehend and manage "societal rules and expectations" when making decisions (Evans et al., 2010). Levels 1: Individuals only focus on themselves and are not concerned with how their

behavior and decisions impact others (Evans et al., 2010). Level 2: Conventional Morality represents individuals who begin to understand their role as a “member-of-society” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 103). Level 2 individuals begin to identify with “rules and expectations of others, especially authorities” when making their decisions (Evans et al., 2010). Level 3: Post-conventional Morality is the final level and represents individuals that make the choice to disconnect their decision-making from others and begins to make decisions based on determined values (Evans et al., 2010). Each level of Moral Development theory has two stages. These stages focus on “judgment of rightness and obligations” and are defined as follows (Evans et al., 2010, p. 103).

Level 1: Pre-Conventional Morality - Stage 1: Heteronomous Morality (Punishment Avoidance & Obedience Orientation) – In the first stage, individuals makes decisions and obey social norms to avoid “punishment and physical harm” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 103). Individuals in this stage “do not consider the rights or concerns of others” when making decisions (Evans et al., 2010, p. 103). Stage 2: Individualistic, Instrumental Morality (Mutual Benefit Orientation) Individuals at this stage make decisions to follow rules if their interests are met and the outcome of their decision is self-beneficial (Evans et al., 2010). Individuals in this stage understand that others have needs that may conflict with their own; therefore decisions of right and wrong are framed by “what is fair, and equal exchange, or an agreement” (Evans et al., 2010, pp. 103 - 104).

Level 2: Conventional Morality – Stage 3: Interpersonally Normative Morality (Interpersonal Expectations: Good Boy – Nice Girl Orientation) – Individuals at this stage define right and wrong as meeting the expectations of close relationships, such as family, friends, and teachers. Individuals in this stage are concerned with “maintaining

an image of being a good person and gaining others' approval" (Evans et al., 2010, p. 104). Stage 4: Social System Morality (Law & Order Orientation) – Individuals in this stage view social norms and systems “as made up of consistent set of rules and procedures applying equally to all people” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 104). Right and wrong are defined by following rules and laws. “Individuals behave in a way that maintains the societal obligations” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 104).

Level 3: Post-Conventional Morality – Stage 5: Human Rights and Social Welfare Morality (Legal Principles: Social Contact Orientation) – Individuals in this stage evaluate laws and societal norms and systems based on the “extent to which they promote fundamental human rights and values” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 104). Social systems and behavioral norms are understood as a “means to protect the rights and ensure the welfare of all” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 104). Stage 6: Morality of Universalizable, Reversible, and Prescriptive General Ethical Principles (Universal Moral Principles – Ethics Orientation) – Individuals in this final stage are involved in decision-making that takes the perspectives of others into consideration when navigating difficult situations (Evans et al., 2010). “Decisions are based on universal generalizable principles that apply in all situations, for example, the equality of human rights” (Evans et al., 2010, pp. 104 – 105).

The use of Moral Development as a theoretical framework was useful in understanding how students make meaning of their experience and in what ways the conduct process influences learning. Additionally, the use of the theoretical framework was useful in exploring the lived experiences of participants' ability to navigate the discipline process while being exposed to aspects of “higher-stage thinking and disequilibrium.” Finally, this use of Kohlberg's theory provided a guide to understanding

how students make decisions between “right and wrong,” and think about ways their behavior impacts others.

Evolution of Consciousness Theory

Evolution of Consciousness is the second theoretical framework that helped guide the study. Robert Kegan’s theory focuses on “the growth or transformations of ways people construct meaning” (Evens et al., 2010, p. 177). Specifically, Kegan’s theory focuses on the “evolution of consciousness, the personal unfolding of ways of organizing experience that are not simply replaced as we grow but subsumed into our complex systems of mind” (Kegan, 1994, p. 9). Kegan’s theory focuses on “meaning-making (the way an individual sees the world)” with growth and development being influenced by movement through increasingly more complex ways of understanding something new and applying the new knowledge to future lived experiences (Evens et al., 2010, p. 177). The movement through complex ways of understanding involves periods of certainty and uncertainty that force the individual to redevelop relationships to their surroundings (Evens et. al., 2010). Kegan calls the movement through increasingly complex ways of knowing and understanding the “orders of consciousness” and according to Kegan, it is a lifelong stage process that starts at infancy and moves through adulthood (Evens et al., 2010, p. 177).

Kegan’s research emphasized that ongoing growth is painful since it involves altering an individual’s ability to maneuver in their surroundings (Evans et al., 2010). Kegan introduced the concept of a “holding environment,” which provides support for individuals working through growth and change, specifically the modern day complexities associated within the context of managing personal and work life

experiences (Winnicott, 1965, p. 116). According to Kegan, the “holding environment has two functions: supporting individuals in their current stage of development and encouraging movement to the next evolutionary truce” (Kegan, 1994, p 43). The holding environment is associated with an "evolutionary bridge, a context for crossing over from one order of consciousness to the next, more developed order” (Kegan, 1994, p 43).

Kegan’s orders of consciousness consist of multiple orders/stages ranging from zero to five. Order zero is the developmental stage of infants, as they exist in the “objectless world,” meaning everything is a part of the infant. Infants begin to move out of this stage as they begin to “recognize objects outside themselves” (Kegan, 1982, p 78). Order one is the developmental stage of children that are discovering reflexes and are aware of objects outside themselves (Kegan, 1982 & 1994). This is a time of development when thinking is fantastic and tends to be imaginative and unreasoned with feelings spontaneous and fluid, and social interactions are self-centered (Evans et al., 2010).

Order two is named the *instrumental mind*. Thinking in this stage “becomes more logical and organized, feelings are more enduring, and individuals relate to others as separate and unique beings” (Evans et al., 2010, pp. 178 - 179). Structure for daily life is created through the establishment of expectations, guidance, and rules. This is the time in an individual’s life that sense of self and desires are developed. “Competition and compromise are characteristic themes of this stage and play-out with other children” (Kegan, 1982, p 163).

Order three is named the *social mind* and thinking in this stage is “more abstract, individuals are aware of their feelings and the internal processes associated with them,

and they can make commitments to communities of people and ideas” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 178). In this stage of development, the influence of others is a cause of “internal validation orientation, or authority” (Kegan, 1994, p 5). Being accepted by others including peer groups is a critical aspect of the social mind, and this stage is where entry-level college students are generally situated in terms of development and ways in which they make meaning of their surroundings (Evans et al., 2010). Challenges arise in this stage when individuals begin “resisting codependence and moving to make their own decisions and establishing independent lives” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 179).

Order four is named the *self-authoring mind* and in this stage, self-authorship is the emphasis. “Individuals have the capacity to take responsibility for and ownership of their internal authority” (Kegan et al., 2001, p. 5) and create self-identified morals and ideas about relationships and the world around them (Kegan, 1994). Individuals’ existence begins to be defined by self and relationships and is no longer focused on social pressure from peer groups (Evans et al., 2010). “Individuals’ independence and self-regulation” is key for this stage and for further development when relationships and situations change, providing the opportunity to find more intimate and mutually rewarding experiences and relationships (Evans et al., 2010, p. 179).

Order five is named *self-transforming mind*. In this stage, “individuals finally see beyond themselves, others, and systems of which they are a part to form an understanding of how all people and systems interconnect” (Evans et al., 2010, p. 180). Individuals in this stage are finally able to engage in long-lasting intimate relationships, and according to Kegan, this stage is not reached before the age of forty (Kegan, 1994).

According to Kegan, most college students approach learning and decision-making from order three and universities approach teaching and support through order four causing misalignment (Evans et al., 2010). Universities expect students to be “self-reflective, engaged, independent, self-directed, critical thinker[s],” which are skills that only surface in order four (Kegan, 1994, p. 278). This point, Kegan stresses, is where students need major support which can be fulfilled by creating a “consciousness bridge” that holds students where they are until they are ready to move forward with regards to how they are expected to perform (Kegan, 1994, p. 278). This can be from order two to three, order three to four, and so on. It is critical that students understand expectations and intended outcomes for learning and behavior, and understand how to access support and resources to help them make meaning of their development (Evans et al., 2010).

It is through the holding-bridge concept that Kegan’s Evolution of Consciousness theoretical framework provided insight into the lived experience of students participating in the student conduct process. Additionally, the use of Kegan’s orders of consciousness provided perspectives on ways in which students create meaning based on their developmental stage. Similarly to Moral Development, the use of Kegan’s Evolution of Consciousness provided a guide to understanding of how students make decisions between “right and wrong,” and think about ways in which their behavior impacts others.

Three studies surfaced during the review of literature that explores student development issues and students’ ability to make meaning while participating in the conduct process. Each study is discussed in detail below and designated by a sub-heading including author’s last name and date of publication.

Additional Relevant Literature

Mullan (1999)

Susan Mullan's (1999) research is the first study that focused on the relationship between students' perceptions of educational value and fairness, and moral development after participating in the conduct process. Mullan (1999) explored "fairness, educational value, and moral development in the SCP" during a quantitative study of 73 undergraduate students who participated in the SCP at a private university in the Southeast with an enrollment of approximately 14,000 students (p. 86).

Mullan's (1999) study utilized the Defining Issues Test (DIT), which is a standardized instrument that measures moral development, and a questionnaire to measure students' perceptions of fairness and educational value. The DIT is a multiple-choice instrument exploring six short narratives around moral development (Rest 1979). The fairness and educational value questionnaire asked demographic, yes and no, Likert, and open-ended questions related to students' perceptions of the SCP.

Mullan's (1999) results indicated that there is a relationship between students' perception of educational value and fairness, and moral development after participating in the SCP. This study found that those students scoring higher levels of moral development on the DIT considered the SCP more educational, valuable, and fair. The students scoring with lower moral development on the DIT considered the SCP less educationally valuable, even if they considered the process fair and just.

Mullan (1999) encouraged student affairs administrators to use these findings to focus more energy on educational and programmatic opportunities in and outside the SCP to increase moral development. It was suggested that students with lower moral

development may be more likely to struggle with modifying behaviors, understanding policies, and recognizing consequences of their actions, and may need additional support to be successful. The recommendation for increased educational opportunities, focused on ethical and moral decision- making was highly encouraged.

Mullan (1999) recommended additional research to focus on student perceptions of learning outcomes associated with the conduct process, and educational value and fairness associated with different aspects of the conduct procedures. Finally, it was highly encouraged for future research to explore students' perceived learning in relation to developmental levels and tailored approaches to campus resources and educational sanctions.

Mullan's study demonstrates that moral development levels may play a part in a student's ability to make decisions and discern between right and wrong (Evans et al., 2010). Additionally, Mullan's study provides clear evidence that students find more educational value with their SCP if they feel their voice is heard and the process is fair (1999). Unfortunately, Mullan (1999) did not explore what students actually learned by participating in the process; that was a limitation of the research that will be thoroughly explored in the current study.

Additionally, utilizing qualitative methods to further explore the relationship between students and the SCAs could have enhanced Mullan's (1999) study. The use of qualitative methods would have provided more complex awareness about how SCAs influence students' perceptions of educational value and fairness (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman 2010). Finally, Mullan's (1999) study could have been enhanced through the use of a comparison study with an increased sample size from a comparable public

university, as the research only focused on private colleges and missed the opportunity to address the shortage of information pertaining to public universities. This shortage of research reinforces the need for the current study to utilize qualitative methods to explore students' experiences and perceptions of learning at a large public university.

Additionally, perceptions of educational value and fairness within the conduct process were explored as part of this study to create broader awareness of the topic from a public university.

Cooper and Schwartz (2007)

Similarly, Merryl Cooper & Robert Schwartz (2007) explored student moral development as it relates to the conduct process through quantitative methods. Cooper & Schwartz (2007) investigated 123 student conduct participants found responsible for violating university policies and 113 non-student conduct participants, to determine whether different levels of moral development existed between each group. A large public institution in the Southeast with an enrollment of 34,000 was the selected site for this study, with the majority of student participants living off-campus and in close proximity to the university.

The study was conducted utilizing the Defining Issues Test 2 (DIT2) that is similar to the DIT utilized in Mullan's (1999) measurement of moral development. Both the DIT and DIT2 measure moral development levels by introducing participants to five moral dilemmas to which they respond. Specifically, participants rate issues associated with the dilemmas and conclude by ranking the top four issues of importance (Rest, 1979 & Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999b). The DIT2 is an updated version of the DIT

that includes new moral dilemmas, a new method for determining untrustworthy participants, and shorter questions (Rest et al., 1999b).

Similar to Mullan (1999), Cooper and Schwartz (2007) discovered that student conduct participants found responsible for violating university policy exhibited lower levels of moral development than students who had never been referred for an alleged conduct violation. This finding suggests that students found in violation of university policy were reasoning with lower levels of moral development, making it more challenging for them to manage their behaviors. Additionally, Cooper and Schwartz (2007) explored age, class level, gender, GPA, and Greek involvement as variables that may have influenced these outcomes for both groups, but found no statistical significance.

Cooper and Schwartz's (2007) study reinforces the findings of prior research that students found responsible for violating university policies have lower levels of moral reasoning than non-student conduct participants. This study, and other research, supports that students with lower levels of moral development may benefit from more supportive interactions and sanctions focused on critical thinking and reflection (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999: & Mullan, 1999). These findings suggest that SCAs need to continue to understand the importance of student characteristics, including student developmental needs, and identify ways to align violations with active sanctions that create opportunities for students to critically think and reflect on their behavior (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999: & Mullan, 1999).

Future recommendations for research included the need for larger samples and longitudinal studies. The exploration of differences between first-year and upper class

student violations and level of moral reasoning was also recommended for future research. Finally, Cooper and Schwartz (2007) expressed the need for more overall research on the SCP to find ways to better support students and meet the accountability demands placed by stakeholders.

Cooper and Schwartz's (2007) study is significant, as it is the first to build on someone else's research by using similar measurement methods at a large public institution. These findings demonstrate that students at both private and public large institutions are reporting similar responses to the SCP, based on measures of moral development. Similar to previous studies, Cooper and Schwartz's study (2007) did not include students' experiences and perceptions of learning, which is a major limitation of their study that was explored in the current study. Furthermore, Cooper and Schwartz (2007) expressed the need for more overall research on the SCP to find ways to better support students and meet the accountability demands placed by stakeholders. Finally, this study built on Cooper and Schwartz's (2007) research by using qualitative methods to explore students' perceptions of their experience and ways their sanctions provided opportunities for critical thinking and reflection, to better understand how to support future student behaviors more effectively.

King (2012)

Rachel King (2012) conducted a quantitative study building on the findings of Mullan (1999) that focused on undergraduate students' perceptions of "educational value and procedural fairness of the conduct experience" at three public universities in a Western state with 13,000 plus students each (p. 563). Specifically, King's (2012) research concentrated on the relationship between four categories: "discipline

circumstances, value of sanctions, educational values and fairness, and demographic data and participating in the student conduct process” (p. 568).

King’s finding revealed that “55% of the 1,451 students attending a conduct hearing with an SCA reported the conduct process was fair” and that they learned to make better decisions, understood the impact of their behavior on others, and learned how to access campus resources such as counseling services and academic advising (King, 2012, p. 570). These findings affirm other literature concerning learning outcomes associated with the SCP (Allen, 1999; CAS, 2012; Goldstein & Stimpson, 2013; Howell, 2005; Kibler, 2013; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

Additionally, this study revealed that students’ perceptions of educational value and fairness correlated with conduct recidivism and demographic characteristics. King’s (2012) research demonstrates that 20-year-old students found the conduct process less educational than 18-year-old students. This finding may be related to the fact that 20-year-old students are less likely to participate in the SCP, and when they do it may be perceived as less valuable, compared to first-year students (King, 2011).

Consistent with previous research about gender (Gilligan, 1982 & 1993; Harper, Harris, & Mmemeje’s, 2005; Janosik, Davis, & Spencer, 1985; Janosik, Dunn, & Spencer, 1986; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011), significant correlation was found between gender and perceived educational value and fairness (King, 2012). Women perceived their student conduct experience as more educationally valuable and fairer than men (King, 2012). This may be due to women approaching moral decision-making through a more care-oriented and less competitive approach than their male counterparts (Harper, Harris, & Mmemeje, 2005; & Polomsky & Blackhurst, 2000). Additional characteristics that

correlated with educational value and fairness consisted of students living on-campus, higher cumulative GPAs, and duration of time away from the SCP, to which King (2012) recommended additional research was needed to better explain.

Importantly, students reported gaining the most from their conduct experience when afforded active sanctions, including community service, papers, mediation, educational classes, and counseling. It was discovered that students only receiving passive sanctions, including fines, warning, and/or probation, were more likely to engage in repeat behaviors or behaviors involving alcohol, drugs, and disorderly conduct. These findings suggest the need to assess the effectiveness of sanctions once the conduct process is completed. The recommendation for sanctions follow up within six months after the conduct process concluded was highly encouraged.

King's (2012) study illuminates the need for SCAs to pay more attention to student development needs and characteristics when creating conduct processes, active sanctions, and campus resources. Creating opportunities and environments for students to be heard and treated fairly directly relates to SCAs understanding and utilizing student development theory (Kegan, 1994; King, 2012; & Walker, 1998) and reinforces Mullan's (1999) similar findings. Additionally, this study reinforces other literature that demonstrates that the relationships developed between the student and SCA are a high predictor for educational value and fairness (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

Furthermore, future research recommendations include exploring what students believe they should be learning by participating in the SCP, how student development needs and characteristics influence student learning and future behaviors, and how

alternative approaches to managing student behaviors differ from traditional approaches. King (2012) encouraged future research to address issues of generalizability, homogenized demographics, and self-reporting instruments that were limitations for this study.

King's (2012) findings are significant, as they added to the scarce conduct research that has been conducted utilizing public institutions. Additionally, King's (2012) findings reinforce the need to pay closer attention to student characteristics and developmental needs that are supported in Allen's (1999) and Stimpson and Janosik's (2011) research that are discussed later in this chapter. These same findings were not confirmed by Cooper and Schwartz (2007) and require further exploration to better understand the overall relationship between student characteristics and the conduct process.

King's (2012) study could have enhanced findings of learning by incorporating qualitative methods. The exploration of students' meanings of their learning and ways the SCP influences future decisions were missing, and would have provided new insights for SCAs if explored. Finally, King's (2012) findings reinforce the need to explore students' perceptions on what they believe they should learn to better understand the connection between perceived and intended outcomes associated with the SCP that this study will also explore.

Overall, the literature on college student development and students' abilities to make meaning of their experiences revealed significant correlations between the SCP and the following areas: student development and characteristics (King, 2012); supportive relationships and active sanction (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; King, 2012;

& Mullan, 1999); and lower moral development skills and learning occurring (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999: & Mullan, 1999).

The studies discussed in this section are significant to this research, as they continue to confirm the need for qualitative methods to reinforce current quantitative findings (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman 2010). Additionally, these studies confirm the need for additional insight into how student development and characteristics, supportive relationships and active sanctions, and students' perceptions of their conduct experience influence learning and future behaviors. Finally, the need for future research focused on public universities was highly encouraged, and was the focus of the current study to meet this demand. This concludes the research that has been published associated with college student development and students' abilities to make meaning of their experience.

Desired outcomes and student learning associated with the SCP is explored next.

Desired Outcomes and Perceptions of Learning

This final section of the literature explores the SCP from the perspective of desired outcomes associated with learning and students' reported perceptions of learning. Specifically, this section explores the research that illuminates desired outcomes associated with the field of student conduct and ways the process influences learning and future behaviors. This section ends with a brief assessment of overall findings and influence on this study.

Scholars agree that the primary outcomes or purpose for the student conduct field consist of maintaining a civil and safe campus environment to support an educational mission, while promoting the education and development of citizenship (Association for Student Judicial Affairs, 1998; Dannells, 1997; Hoekema, 1994; Howell, 2005; King,

2012; Miller, 2003; Pavela, 2006; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004). This is accomplished through holding students accountable for their conduct and utilizing an educational focus to prevent future behavioral issues (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Pavela, 2006; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004). The overarching learning outcomes associated with the SCP consist of students “understanding community standards, recognizing responsibility as a community member, and taking personal responsibility for choices and actions” (Goldstein & Stimpson, 2013, p. 43). These outcomes, and the need for an educational approach to student conduct work, are reinforced by the Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA) (Kibler, 2013) and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (2012), but are not widely researched to determine if students are actually meeting outcomes. The limited research that does explore student learning related to the SCP is discussed in detail throughout this next section.

Three studies surfaced during the review of literature that provides evidence that students are learning something through participation in the SCP. Each study is discussed in detail below and is designated by a sub-heading including author’s last name and date of publication.

Allen (1994)

Susan Allen’s (1994) research explored the learning outcomes associated with students participating in the conduct process from the perspective of SCAs and students that participated in the process from 67 private liberal institutions. The study revealed that the most important learning outcomes held by SCAs associated with the SCP were (a) participants would acknowledge responsibility for their actions; (b) participants would

understand the gravity of their behavior; (c) participants would understand the impact of their actions on others; and (d) participants would change behaviors based on participating in the conduct process. SCAs shared that confronting students with the penalties associated with their decision-making and engaging in meaningful discussion during the conduct process provided the vehicle for meeting desired learning outcomes.

Students from Allen's study reported different perceptions of learning after participating in the SCP. Students identified (a) a greater awareness of thinking before acting; (b) the ability to take ownership of and think through actions; and (c) the importance of abiding by policies and community standards in the future. These same students shared that a reasonably quick response to address behaviors and the ability to discuss their conduct provided a higher likelihood that learning outcomes are met. Allen's (1994) research also identified that female students rated their experience in the conduct process more positively than males. This finding does not directly relate to learning, but a positive experience may influence a student's perception of value and fairness, which may increase the willingness and ability to learn, which was supported by King's (2012) research exploring a similar topic. Additionally, this type of discovery demonstrates that gender may influence perceptions of the SCP at the institutions that participated in Allen's (1994) research, and is consistent with other literature about gender (Cooper and Schwartz, 2007; Gilligan, 1982 & 1993; Harris, & Mmeme's, 2005; Janosik, King, 2012; Davis, & Spencer, 1985; Janosik, Dunn, & Spencer, 1986; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

Allen's (1994) study is significant, as it is one of the first to measure and determine that students are learning by participating in the SCP. Allen (1994) could have

enhanced her study by exploring students' meaning of their experience and application of their learning on future behaviors. This use of qualitative methods could have substantiated Allen's (1994) findings and provided a deeper understanding of students' experiences and influence on future behaviors.

Additionally, Allen's (1994) research is significant as it demonstrates that SCAs commonly agree with the outcomes supported in the student conduct literature and that educational approaches to managing student conduct issues are the preferred method. This finding is compelling since administrators and students had somewhat different perceptions of intended learning outcomes and actual learning obtained that has not been captured in previous literature discussed in this study. Allen (1994) missed the opportunity to fully explore the rationale associated with these different perspectives of learning outcomes that substantiate the need for future research focused on student perception and application of learning obtained that this study will explore.

Finally, Allen (1994) discovered that the relationship between SCAs and students was a strong aspect of the conduct process, but failed to explore how the relationship influenced the overall experience, learning, and future behaviors. The current study explored students' perceptions of their relationships with the SCA to create a broader awareness of overall influence on learning and possible ways to enhance this influence.

Howell (2005)

Martin Howell (2005) built on Allen's (1994) work by further exploring learning from a student perspective. Howell (2005) explored "students' perceived learning and anticipated future behaviors" during a qualitative study of 10 students attending three different public research institutions in the Southeast, who participated in an

administrative hearing between a student and SCA (p. 374). The goal of the research was to measure student perceptions of learning and the influence the conduct process had on their future behavior through the use of observations and interviews (Howell, 2005).

Howell (2005) discovered that learning does occur during the SCP based on student self-reporting and observations. The majority of students reported learning (a) the impact of behavioral consequences; (b) empathy about how their behavior impacted others; and (c) a greater understanding of the student conduct code and the conduct process. Howell's (2005) findings concerning behavioral consequences directly relate to Allen's (1994) research that students are learning the ability to take ownership of, and think through, actions. This relationship between Allen (1994) and Howell's (2005) findings clearly demonstrates that students participating in these two studies are learning to recognize the consequence of their behaviors and the ability to take ownership for their behaviors. This directly connects to the overarching outcomes for the SCP described earlier by Goldstein & Stimpson (2013).

Howell's (2005) finding of empathy and greater understanding of the student conduct code and the conduct process differs from previous research, and may directly relate to students' moral development. According to Howell (2005), "one of the prerequisites for moral development is perception taking – the capacity for understanding what another person is experiencing and thinking" (p. 387). Howell's (2005) findings that "empathy is consistent with perception taking" mean that students demonstrating empathy may be at a higher level of moral development than others. Howell's (2005) findings are consistent with other literature discussed previously concerning moral

development and students' abilities to learn in the SCP based on levels of moral development.

Additionally, a majority of the students reported a greater understanding of campus resources as a result of participating in the SCP, including academic and mental health resources related to advising, tutoring, identity development, substance use, and stress. However, Howell (2005) revealed that a few students reported that little or no learning occurred during the conduct processes (2005). According to Howell (2005), these are the students that are at greater risk for future conduct. Additionally, these are the students who reported they would not discontinue behaviors or are more careful not to get caught (Howell, 2005). Alcohol was considered a different situation and students reported they would not discontinue drinking, but indicated they would be more careful and find different locations for consuming alcohol (Howell, 2005). Howell encouraged future studies to more broadly explore issues of alcohol and drug use as it related to learning from the SCP and impact on future behaviors (2005).

Furthermore, Howell's (2005) study revealed that students were willing to share their experience with others. The majority of participants reported that they would tell others to (a) show remorse, (b) tell the truth, and (c) tell the student conduct administrator what they want to hear. These findings illuminate that students may be adapting their behaviors to appease SCAs to gain a favorable outcome and maintain some sense of control throughout the process. Howell (2005) failed to fully explore the rationale for this type of advice that the current study will explore to gain a broader understanding.

The use of a small sample size and lack of diverse demographic representation of students participating in the SCP was a limitation of Howell's (2005) study. The current

study's use of broader demographic representation will augment the dearth of literature that currently exists. Despite the limitations, Howell's (2005) findings provide significant insight into student learning that administrators can use to further address and work toward preventing conduct concerns. Recommendations include student conduct administrators creating additional developmental approaches during interaction with students to more fully explore concerns of empathy, behavioral consequences, behavioral expectations, and academic adjustment (Howell, 2005). Additionally, Howell's (2005) recommendations incorporate sanctions that reflect the behavioral challenges and developmental needs and the full exploration of taking responsibility by SCAs. Howell's findings are significant as they substantiate other research findings utilizing a student development approach for creating and assigning sanctions (Cooper and Schwartz, 2007; King, 20012; & Mullan, 1999).

Howell's (2005) research clearly demonstrates that some learning is happening and that students are indicating behaviors will change. Howell (2005) failed to fully explore the skills students acquired by participating in the conduct process and ways these skills are applied to prevent future behaviors. This study will broaden knowledge in this area by exploring students' perceptions of their learning and ways they intend to use their new knowledge to prevent future behaviors. Finally, Howell's study only focused on first-time offenders and missed the opportunity to compare relationships that exist between students with repeat behaviors. Comparing students with different frequencies of violations may illuminate aspects of the SCP that hindered learning and contributed to recidivism that the current study did explore.

Stimpson and Janosik (2011)

Allen (1994) and Howell's (2005) research findings support that some learning is occurring for students participating in a SCP and that future behaviors may be altered. Matthew Stimpson and Steven Janosik's (2011) research builds on these findings and increases broader knowledge by exploring students' perceived learning by selected student characteristics. Stimpson & Janosik (2011) utilized findings from the broader student conduct literature that identified common characteristics of student offenders. Males, sophomores, and on-campus students living in large residence halls appear more often in the student conduct literature than other student characteristics (Janosik, Davis, & Spencer, 1985 & Janosik, Dunn, & Spencer, 1986). Stimpson & Janosik's (2011) exploration of the relationship between student characteristics and reported learning stems from literature that supports other student attributes that link to several other outcomes.

Stimpson & Janosik's (2011) research explored the relationship between "attributes of age, credit hours completed, cumulative GPA, gender, race and residential status, and reported learning as a result of participating in the SCP" through quantitative methods (p. 21). The participants consisted of 510 student conduct participants from five institutions located in the Southeast. Three of the participating institutions were public with 10,000 plus enrolled students, and two were private with 3,000 plus enrolled students. Each participant completed the Student Conduct Adjudication Processes Questionnaire (SCAPQ) that measured the SCP's effectiveness, learning outcomes due to participating in the conduct process, campus culture, and demographics.

Stimpson & Janosik's (2011) study concluded that learning is occurring for students participating in the SCP, but it "varies based on student characteristics" (p. 25).

The most significant outcome of this study revealed that gender has a significant influence on learning (Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). The study revealed that females reported greater levels of learning related to understanding consequences of their behaviors and greater learning related to “not violating polices in the future than men” (Stimpson & Janosik, 2011, p. 25).

Stimpson & Janosik’s (2011) research supports previous findings that males appear more often in SC processes and are more likely to repeat behaviors than females (Janosik, Davis, & Spencer, 1985 & Janosik, Dunn, & Spencer, 1986). Stimpson & Janosik (2011) articulated that male students might be more prevalent in conduct concerns due to socialization and social constructs of masculinity. Harper, Harris, and Mmeje (2005) support these notions through their theoretical model that explains why SC processes are filled with more males. Harper, Harris, and Mmeje (2005) theorized that males are more prevalent in the SCP due to issues of “male gender role conflicts, precollege socialization, social constructors of masculinity” and other aspects of male identity that make them more likely to present behaviors (p. 568). Similarly, Carol Gilligan (1982 & 1993) theorized that gender does play a major part in student decision-making and learning from their behaviors, which was discussed earlier in the student development section.

Additionally, Stimpson and Janosik (2011) stated there were no additional significant correlations for student characteristics and perceived learning. They reported that limitations to the study included missing data and relying on students self-reporting perceived learning. According to Stimpson and Janosik (2011), the use of direct measures would strengthen additional research exploring students’ actual learning from

participating in the SCP instead of mainly relying on perceived learning. Stimpson & Janosik (2011) recommended that SCAs' "focus on creating learning outcomes centered on community standards and increasing understanding of the consequences of behavior should be incorporated in existing programs and services" (p. 26). Finally, Stimpson & Janosik (2011) recommended that future research explore the relationship between student conduct learning and fundamental fairness; and the relationship between student learning and the campus environment. Stimpson & Janosik (2011) argued that new research in these areas would continue to strengthen the overall student conduct literature and provide practitioners with ways of strengthening learning outcomes, conduct processes, and the actual conduct setting environments.

Stimpson & Janosik's (2011) study is significant as it represents the only research that explored students' experience and perceived learning after participating in the SCP from both private and public institutions. Stimpson & Janosik's (2011) adds to the much-needed body of research focused on the SCP, but failed to draw any comparisons between students' experiences at different institutions. Broader comparisons between different types of institutions would allow for greater generalization and increased knowledge concerning student behavioral needs.

Similar to others (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; & King, 2012), Stimpson & Janosik's (2011) did discover that students are learning new knowledge by participating in the conduct process, but like Mullan (1999), failed to fully explore what students were learning. The ability to fully understand the actual learning that is occurring or not occurring in the conduct process would aide administrators with enhancing conduct processes and support services to reduce recidivism (Dannells, 1997). This study will

broaden knowledge in this area by more fully exploring students' perception of their learning and ways they intend to change future behaviors by applying their new knowledge. This use of qualitative methods for this study will reinforce current quantitative findings and provide actual meaning from students who participate in the conduct process (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman 2010).

Overall, the literature on desired outcomes associated with learning and students' reported perceptions of learning revealed significant relationships between the SCP and the following areas: supportive interactions (Allen, 1994); student characteristics, i.e. gender (Stimpson & Janosik (2011); perceptions of learning and reported behavioral changes based on educational value and fairness (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

The studies discussed in this section are significant to this research, as they continue to confirm the need for qualitative methods to reinforce current quantitative findings (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman 2010). Additionally, these studies reinforce the need for additional insight into how supportive relationships, perception and application of learning, and types and frequencies of violations influence learning and future behaviors that this study will explore. Finally, the need for future research focused on public universities was highly encouraged and is a focus of the current study to meet this demand.

This concludes the research that has been published that explores the desired outcomes associated with learning and students' reported perceptions of learning in relation to the SCP. This clearly illuminates a need for additional research, on which this study provided. A brief discussion of literature relevance is presented next.

Summary of Findings and Gaps in the Literature

Overall, the review of literature demonstrates that learning is occurring in the SCP (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011) and that a combination of passive and active sanctions supports lower levels of recidivism (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001). Additionally, the research supports the use of student, staff, and faculty-combined hearing boards to enhance students' experiences in conduct proceedings and reduce recidivism (O'Reilly & Evans 2007). Furthermore, the review of literature revealed significant correlations between the SCP and the following areas: student development and characteristics (King, 2012 & Stimpson & Janosik); supportive relationships and active sanctions (Allen, 1994; Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; King, 2012; & Mullan, 1999); lower moral development skills and learning occurring (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; & Mullan, 1999); and perceptions of learning and reported behavioral changes based on educational value and fairness (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

The review of literature also exposed numerous gaps that this study attempted to address to enhance and expand the current literature. This study adds to the broader body of research by exploring the SCP through the use of qualitative methods at a large public institution to reinforce current quantitative findings mainly from private institutions (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman 2010). Additionally, this study broadened the prior research by exploring students' perception of learning and influence on future behavior in connection to student development, supportive relationships, and active sanctions that surfaced as areas that needed further exploration. Furthermore, this study broadened the literature by exploring students' direct experience with the SCP and ways they make

meaning from their experiences. Finally, the overall outcomes of this study broadened the scant research that is already published and provided awareness for addressing student behavioral issues that better support students and communities impacted by their behavior.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and influence on their learning and future behaviors. The study also compares the experiences of students to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. The literature is rich with quantitative studies examining the SCP, but limited research has been conducted that explores the direct experience of participants and desired outcomes of conduct administrators (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

O'Reilly and Evans (2007) contend that the use of qualitative research would give “a voice to those students who are intimately involved with the discipline/judicial processes as an accused” (p. 7). The addition of students’ voices to the literature provides a greater understanding of what they are learning, retaining, and applying from participating in the conduct process. Furthermore, the addition of administrators’ perspective concerning desired outcomes provides greater awareness of whether students are meeting these outcomes. This information is clearly missing from the current literature and is required to have a broader understanding of the effectiveness of the conduct process and whether desired outcomes are being met.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the methodology and the design of the study. Additionally, this chapter discusses the selection of participants and the research site location. This section also discusses semi-structured and face-to-face interviews as the data collection method. Finally, this chapter concludes with a discussion of data analysis and the role of the research.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to examine the perspectives of administrators who oversee the conduct process and the students who participated in it, while exploring the gap and similarities between the two groups.

1. What are the basic tenets of the student conduct process from the perspective of conduct administrators?
2. What are the experiences of students that have participated in the conduct process?
 - a. How do students describe their experience with the conduct process?
 - b. What meaning do students make of their conduct experience?
 - c. What aspect of the conduct process provides more meaning? Why?
3. How does the conduct process influence future decision-making and behaviors?
 - a. What are students learning by participating in the conduct process?
 - b. How have students applied their learning from the conduct process?
 - c. What aspects of the process influence future decision-making and behavior?
4. What are the similarities and differences between conduct administrators' desired outcomes and the actual impact of the conduct process on students?

Study Design

This study examined the experience of students participating in the conduct process and addressed the relationship between the students' conduct process, learning, and future behaviors by comparing their experiences to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. This study used qualitative methods with

interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), which allowed for an understanding of participants' lived experiences through their self-identified understanding of said experience associated with the student disciplinary process (Creswell, 2009).

Specifically, the use of qualitative exploratory research design provided an opportunity to capture reflective understanding of participants' lived experiences and meaning-making after participating in the student disciplinary process (Creswell, 2009). Additionally, the design allowed for exploration of participants' behavior and changes associated with said behavior or future behavior due to participating in the student disciplinary process (Bogdan & Biklen 2007). Finally, the use of qualitative research design provided the opportunity to conduct research in participants' natural setting, allowing for further exploration and understanding of their lived experience with the student disciplinary process (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

The desire to explore the shared experiences of individuals that participated in the student disciplinary process afforded itself to interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), which allowed for the opportunity to reflect and understand the experience and meaning-making for participants (Creswell, 2009; Bogdan & Biklen 2007; & Lichtman, 2010). IPA provided a non-university approach to research, awareness of social constructs, understanding of context, and multiple ways of collecting data (Creswell, 2009; Bogdan & Biklen 2007; & Lichtman, 2010). This was of importance as I explored the experiences and meaning making of students that participated in the student disciplinary process, and the possible influence the process has on their future behaviors, by comparing their experiences to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. Issues of subjectivity were not explored due to the studies focus

of participants experience and not the focus of verifying responses. The use of qualitative methods with IPA guided the development of questions that were asked of participants, data collection process and analysis, and final outcomes (Creswell, 2009; Bogdan & Biklen 2007; & Lichtman, 2010).

This study followed all standards set forth by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subject research at Temple University (2014), including approval of the project through the Social and Behavioral Protocol document, Researcher Personnel Signature form, and use of the Informed Consent for Minimal Risk Social Behavioral Research document for all individuals participating in the research project and being interviewed.

Participants and Site Location

Research participants consisted of 18 respondents (three administrators and 15 students) that joined in the study. The first group of participants included three administrators who worked directly with students involved in the conduct process in the main disciplinary office due to alleged violations of university policies at a large four-year public urban institution located in the Northeast. The main conduct office only employs three SCAs and all three agreed to participate based on their role of working with the discipline process after receiving an email request (Appendix A). University administrators working with student conduct issues from the on-campus housing office were not selected to participate due to my role serving as the senior administrator of the organization.

The three participants ranged in age from 30 – 47, with two self-identifying as males and one female. All three SCAs selected pseudonyms to protect their identity and

self-identified as Caucasian. Additionally, all three reported that they had worked for multiple years with varying conduct systems and conduct issues. Two of the SCAs reported meeting regularly with students to determine level of reasonability for possible Code violations. Similarly, both of these SCAs work directly with students to offer support, determine level of reasonability, and offer campus resources when needed. The third SCA reported directly overseeing and managing the student conduct office. This included, “overseeing the Code and conduct process, charging conduct cases, managing the appeals process, and directly supervising and supporting the staff working in the conduct office” (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015).

Table 3.1 includes the self-selected pseudonyms, demographic information, years working in the field of student conduct, and highest educational degrees obtained.

Table 3.1

SCA Participant Characteristics

Pseudonym	Age	Race	Gender	HE *	Field **	Role ***	Degree
1. KU	33	Caucasian	Male	7 Years	4.5 Years	3 Years	Masters
2. Stacy	30	Caucasian	Female	8 Years	3 Years	2 Months	Masters
3. Madison	47	Caucasian	Male	19 Years	19 Years	10 Months	Masters

* Years in higher education

** Years in the field of student conduct

*** Years in current role working with student conduct at the research site

The second group of participants included 15 undergraduate students from the same institution who were found responsible for violating university policy from August 2012 – September 2014. The participant recruitment process required two attempts before adequately securing enough students to conduct the research. The recruitment pool included students that participated in the conduct process from August 2012 –

September 2014, but excluded those found responsible for sexual misconduct and students expelled from the university. These groups were eliminated from the pool of participants due to the severity of their violations, possible legality issues, and issues associated with their restricted access to the campus. The entire participant recruitment process was managed by the conduct office to maintain the confidentiality of sensitive student records related to behavioral issues and requested by email (Appendix C).

The first recruit attempt consisted of inviting approximately 650 students through email to participate in the research study without any incentive (Appendix D). This first recruitment attempt yielded five students interested in the study, but only if there were incentives. The recruitment process was evaluated due to the low response rate and students' unwillingness to participate in the study without some type of an incentive. A \$25 gift card incentive was added in hopes of increasing students' interest in participating in the research study, based on previous incentives used in other studies and my financial limitations. Once approved by IRB, the second attempt consisted of inviting the same 650 students from the original recruitment request and adding a \$25 gift card incentive for their participation through email (Appendix E). The second recruitment attempt yielded 103 students interested in participating in the research study.

The next part of the process was to verify that all 103 students went through the SCP in the actual student conduct office and not with administrators overseeing conduct in on-campus housing, information, which only the conduct file could verify. The purpose of the study was to explore the experiences and learning associated with students participating in the conduct process in the student conduct office. As such, students participating in the conduct process living in on-campus housing were removed.

Additionally, there was a need to create a diverse participant pool that would allow broad representation of students, which required access to demographic, different types of violations, hearings, and sanctions, information, which only the conduct file could provide. A follow up communication was sent directly from me to the 103 students, requesting permission to access their conduct records, to which 69 responded granting access. These 69 names were sent to the conduct office and a master list with the following information was received and used to verify above listed requirements for the selection of the final 20 student participants: (*Master List Heading: Incident Number, Incident Status, Respondent ID, Respondent Full Name, Date Of Birth, GPA, Gender, Email Address (Primary), Respondent Permanent Address at time of incident, Incident Date, Incident Time, Referral Date, Hearing Officers, Incident Location, Incident Specific Location, Incident Referrals, Incident Witnesses, Respondent Violations, Responses to Violations, Hearing Findings, Hearing Type, Hearing Location, Hearing Notification Date, Hearing Actual Date, Respondent Hearing Sanctions, Hearing Decision Made On, Hearing Decision Letter Mailed On, Living On Campus, Major/Minor, and Major/Minor at time of Incident*).

The next step consisted of identifying 20 students through purposive sampling that were invited through email (Appendix F) to participate in a 60-minute semi-structured individual face-to-face interview. Only 25 out of the 69 students met the final criteria and were invited to schedule a time for the actual interview, of which 20 responded. The 20 students were scheduled, but only 15 actually attended and participated in the research study. The remaining five students missed their pre-

scheduled interview and failed to respond to additional correspondence offering alternative interview times.

All 15 students selected pseudonyms to protect their identity and ranged in age from 19 – 23 with six self-identifying as female and nine male. The majority of students self-identified as Caucasian and on average maintained a cumulative GPA of 3.24. A majority of the students (11 out of 15) participated in the SCP only once, three participated twice, and one student participated three times. A majority of the violations were alcohol/drug related (18 out of 29 violations) with two academic dishonesty and two disorderly conduct/intimidation violations; the others were low-level as defined below. All reported violations were typical of offenses shared in the conduct literature.

Table 3.2 includes the self-selected pseudonyms, demographic information, educational information, types of violations, hearings, and sanctions, living situation, and socio economic information pertaining to class and family educational levels.

Table 3.2

Student Participant Characteristics

Pseudonym	Age	Gender	Race	Class Standing During Research	Major	Cum GPA	Number of Incidents	Class Standing During Incident	Type of Violations	Level of Responsibility – Plea	Level of Responsibility – Found	Sanction	Living Situation During incident	Socio Economic Status	First Generation Status
Mike	20	M	C	4 th	Econo.	3.1	1	3 rd	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	Off	M	N
Rox*	21	F	MA	3 nd	Public Health	3.9	1	2 nd	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	Off	M	Y
Judy	21	F	C	3 rd	Nursing	2.8	1	1 st	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	On	M	N
									Noise	N	N	N/A			
									Drugs	N	N	N/A			

Table 3.2 – Continued

Student Participant Characteristics

Clark	23	M	AF	4 th	Busines s	2.6	2	2 nd	AD	N	R	CFP	Off	L M	N
								3 rd	Alcohol	N	N	N/A			
									Disorde rly Conduct	N	R	CMP 2			
Xavier	19	M	C	2 nd	Philos./ Spanish	3.2	2	1 st	Failure to Comply	R	R	P4	Off	U M	N
								2 nd	Indecen cy	N	R				
									Alcohol	N	R	MM1 & IPE			
Sarah	21	F	C	4 th	Crim. Justice	3.2	1	3 rd	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	Off	M	Y
Andy	20	M	C	3 rd	Pre- Med	3.3	1	2 nd	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	Off	U M	N
Emily **	22	F	A	2 nd	Unde.	3.4	1	1 st	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	Off	L M	N
Ross	21	M	C	4 th	Inter. Busines s	2.7	3	1 st	Alcohol	R	R	MM1 & FM	Off	U M	N
								1 st	False ID	N	R	MM2			
									Alcohol	R	R				
3 rd	Alcohol	R	R	MM1 & IPE											
Tom	19	M	C/H	2 nd	Finance	3.8	1	1 st	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	Off	M	Y
Jimmy	21	M	C	3 rd	Film	3.0	1	1 st	AD	R	R	CFP	Off	M	N
Matt	22	M	C	4 th	Psy.	3.2	1	3 rd	Intim.	N	N	CMP 1	Off	M	N
								Propert y Damage	N	R					
Amber	20	F	C	2 nd	Metals	3.3	1	1 st	Alcohol	N	R	MM1	Off	M	N
Naomi	19	F	C	2 nd	Psy.	3.3	2	1 st	Alcohol	R	R	MM1	On	L C	N
								1 st	Smokin g	R	R	MM2			
									Drug	R	R				
3 rd	Noise	R	R												
David	20	M	C	2 nd	Adverti sing	3.6	1	1 st	Drug	R	R	MMI & IPE	On	U M	N
								HU Drug	R	R					

* Rox = Roxeanne

* *Emily is an International Student & Transfer Student

Chart Explanation:

1. Gender: F = Female & M = Male
2. Race: C = Caucasian, MA = Mexican American, AF = African American, C/H
Caucasian/Hispanic, & A = Asian
3. Level of Responsibility – Plea: R = Responsible & N = Not Responsible

4. *Level of Responsibility – Found: R = Responsible & N = Not Responsible*
5. *Living Situation During the Incident: Off = Off-Campus & On = On-Campus*
6. *Socio Economic Status: UM = Upper-Middle Class, M = Middle Class, & LM = Lower-Middle Class*
7. *First Generation Status: Y = Yes & N = No*

Type of Violations:

1. *AD (Academic Dishonesty): Academic dishonesty includes helping, procuring or encouraging plagiarism and academic cheating.*
2. *Alcohol: Unlawful use, possession, manufacture, or distribution of alcoholic beverages (except as expressly permitted by university regulations), or public intoxication. Alcoholic beverages may not, in any circumstance, be used by, possessed by or distributed to any person under twenty-one (21) years of age.*
3. *Disorderly Conduct: Engaging in disorderly conduct. Disorderly conduct may include disruption of programs, classroom activities or functions and processes of the university. This includes but is not limited to: unreasonable noise; creating a physically hazardous or physically offensive condition; inciting or participating in a riot or group disruption; failing to leave the scene of a riot or group disruption when instructed by officials; or obstruction of the free flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic on university premises or at university sponsored or supervised functions.*
4. *Drug: The illegal or unauthorized use, possession, cultivation, distribution, manufacture, or sale of any drugs(s), including prescribed medication.*
5. *HU (Housing) Drug: Being present where any drug policy violation is occurring in University Housing, including possession of drug paraphernalia.*
6. *Failure to Comply: Failure to comply with directions of university officials or law enforcement officers acting in performance of their duties and/or failure to identify oneself to these persons when requested to do so.*
7. *Indecency: Any lewd or indecent act, including public urination, which the student knows is likely to be observed by others.*
8. *Intim. (Intimidation): Any act or threat of intimidation or physical violence toward another person including actual or threatened assault or battery.*
9. *Providing False Information: Providing false or misleading information, verbally or in writing, to the university or university personnel.*
10. *Smoking: Smoking inside residence hall and within 25 feet of entrance and exit to any facility.*

Types of Sanction:

1. *CFP = Course Failure & Probation (4-months)*
2. *CMP1 = Conflict Resolution & Probation (4-months)*
3. *CMP2 = Conflict Resolution & Probation (12-months)*
4. *FM = Student Conduct Administrator follow up meeting*
5. *IPE = Individual psycho-educational session counselor/psychologist*
6. *MM1 = Mandatory Minimum 1st Offence: Parent notification, psycho-educational class and on-line tutorial, \$250 fine, and probation (4-months)*
7. *MM2 = Mandatory Minimum 2nd Offence: Parent notification, psycho-educational class and on-line tutorial, \$500 fine, and probation (9-months)*
8. *P4 = Probation (4-months)*

Below are descriptions/profiles of the 15 undergraduate students that expound Table 3.2 and provide more specific demographic information, types of violations, influences on behavioral issues and decision-making, outcomes of hearings, and types of sanctions.

Mike

Mike was a 20-year-old graduating senior studying economics with a 3.11 cumulative GPA. He was charged with underage drinking in an on-campus bar during his junior year. Mike reported that his peers and wanting to be social played a role in his decision-making. He pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with a student conduct administrator (SCA). For his violation, Mike received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parental notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Mike completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Roxeanne

Roxeanne was a 21-year-old junior studying public health with a 3.97 cumulative GPA. She was charged with underage drinking and having an open container of alcohol at an off-campus party during the first weekend of her sophomore year. Roxeanne reported that living on her own for the first time and the influence of peers played a role in her decision-making. She pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For her violation, Roxeanne received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Roxeanne completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Judy

Judy was a 21-year-old junior studying nursing with a 2.8 cumulative GPA. She was charged with using drugs, causing a noise disturbance, and being underage and drinking in on-campus housing where alcohol and drugs are prohibited during her freshman year. Judy reported that her peers and wanting to be social during Valentine's Day played a role in her decision-making. She pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy pertaining to alcohol after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. Judy pled not guilty for all the other charges and was also not found responsible. For her violation, Judy received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Judy completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Clark

Clark was a 23-year-old graduating senior studying business with a 2.6 cumulative GPA. He participated in the SCP twice for separate violations during his sophomore and junior years. For the first incident, Clark was charged with academic dishonesty related to cheating on a paper during his sophomore year. Clark was not able to identify any factors that influenced his decision-making. He pled not guilty, but was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, Clark received disciplinary probation for four months and failed the course.

For the second incident, Clark was charged with public intoxication and disorderly conduct during his junior year. He reported that his peers, being intoxicated, and wanting to be social played a role in his decision-making. Clark pled not guilty for

both charges, but was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy pertaining to only disorderly conduct after participating in a hearing board. For his violation, Clark received a conflict resolution sanction and a 12-month probation, of which Clark completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Xavier

Xavier was a 19-year-old sophomore studying philosophy and Spanish with a 3.25 cumulative GPA. Xavier participated in the SCP twice for separate incidents during his freshman and sophomore years. For the first incident, Xavier was charged with public indecency (urination) and eluding campus police during his sophomore year. Xavier reported that his peers and needing to urinate played a role in his decision-making. He pled not guilty, but was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. Additionally, Xavier pled responsible for failure to comply with campus safety and was found responsible during the same administrative hearing. For his violation, Xavier received disciplinary probation for four months.

For the second incident, Xavier was charged with underage drinking and public intoxication at an on-campus sporting event during his sophomore year. Xavier reported that his peers, being intoxicated, and wanting to have a good time played a role in his decision-making. Xavier pled not guilty, but was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy pertaining to underage drinking and intoxication after participating in an additional administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, Xavier received an alcohol 1st offense mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250

fine, and four-month probation. Additionally, Xavier was required to complete a one-hour individual psycho-educational session with a counselor/psychologist in the campus-counseling center. Xavier completed all sanctions during the timeframe assigned.

Sarah

Sarah was a 21-year-old graduating senior studying criminal justice with a 3.2 cumulative GPA. Sarah was charged with underage drinking and having an open container in a public venue during her junior year. She was not able to identify any factors that influenced her decision-making. Sarah pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For her violation, Sarah received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Sarah completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Andy

Andy was a 20-year-old junior studying kinesiology/pre-med with a 3.3 cumulative GPA. He was charged with underage possession of alcohol during his sophomore year. Andy reported that his peers and wanting to be social played a role in his decision-making. He pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, Andy received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Andy completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Emily

Emily was a 22-year-old sophomore who had an undeclared major with a 3.4 cumulative GPA. She was charged with underage drinking and public intoxication during her freshman year. Emily reported that her peers and wanting to be social played a role in her decision-making. She pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For her violation, Emily received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Emily completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Ross

Ross was a 21-year-old senior scheduled to graduate the following fall studying international business with a 2.7 cumulative GPA. Ross participated in the SCP three times for separate violations during his freshman and junior years. For the first incident, Ross was charged with underage drinking and public intoxication his freshman year. Ross reported that his peers and his perception of how other college students partied played a role in his decision-making. He pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, Ross received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation. Additionally, Ross was required to meet and follow up with an SCA once his sanctions were completed to

check in and determine if Ross needed additional support. Ross completed all requirements, and no additional support was determined necessary.

For the second incident, Ross was charged again with underage drinking and public intoxication, and false identification (fake ID) a few weeks after the first incident his freshman year. Again, Ross reported that his peers and his perception of how other college students partied played a role in his decision-making. Ross pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. Additionally, Ross pled not responsible for providing a fake ID, but was found responsible during the same administrative hearing. For his violation, Ross received 2nd offence mandatory minimum sanctions, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center and on-line tutorial, \$500 fine, and 12-month probation.

For the third incident, Ross was charged again with underage drinking at an on-campus bar his junior year. Ross reported that his peers and his living situation played a role in his decision-making. He pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in a hearing board. Additionally, Ross pled not responsible for providing a fake ID, but was found responsible during the same board hearing. For his violation, Ross received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation. Additionally, Ross was required to complete a one-hour individual counseling session in the campus-counseling center. Ross completed all sanctions during the timeframes assigned.

Tom

Tom was a 19-year-old sophomore studying finance with a 3.89 cumulative GPA. Tom was charged with underage drinking and public intoxication during his freshman year. He reported that his peers, wanting to be social, and intoxication played a role in his decision-making. Tom pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, Tom received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Tom completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Jimmy

Jimmy was a 21-year-old junior studying film with a 3.0 cumulative GPA. Jimmy was charged with academic dishonesty related to cheating on a paper during his freshman year. He reported that his peers and not wanting to write a final paper on a topic he had no interest in played a role in his decision-making. Jimmy pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, Jimmy received disciplinary probation for four months and failed the course, which was part of the overall sanction determined in conjunction by the SCA and Jimmy's faculty member.

Matt

Matt was a 22-year-old graduating senior studying psychology with a 3.2 cumulative GPA. He was charged with intimidating and property damage when involved in an argument with his roommate during his junior year. Matt reported that his frustration with his roommate's constant nagging about the cleanliness of their apartment

played a role in his decision-making and pushed him over the edge during the night of the incident. Matt pled not guilty for both violations, but was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, Matt received a conflict resolution sanction and a 12-month probation, which he only completed after his university account was placed on hold for failing to complete the sanction during the assigned timeframe. Matt was not able to register for class due to the hold on his account, which was removed when Matt finished his required conflict resolution course.

Amber

Amber was a 20-year-old sophomore studying metals with a 3.33 cumulative GPA. Amber was charged with underage drinking and public open container during her freshman year. Amber reported that her peers, being rebellious, and intoxication played a role in her decision-making. Amber pled not guilty, but was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For her violation, Amber received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation, of which Amber completed all requirements during the timeframe assigned.

Naomi

Naomi was a 19-year-old sophomore studying psychology with a 3.35 cumulative GPA. Naomi participated in the SCP twice for separate violations during her freshman year. For the first incident, Naomi was charged with underage drinking and open container of alcohol during the second day arriving on campus her freshman year. Naomi

reported that her peers and wanting to drink and be social played a role in her decision-making. Naomi pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For her violation, Naomi received an alcohol 1st offence mandatory minimum sanction, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation.

For the second incident, Naomi was charged with possession and use of drugs, causing a noise disturbance, and smoking in undergraduate housing just two months after her first incident. Naomi reported that her peers and her desire to smoke marijuana played a role in her decision-making. Naomi pled guilty for all three alleged violations and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For her violations, Naomi received 2nd offence mandatory minimum sanctions, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational class with the campus wellness center and on-line tutorial, \$500 fine, and 12-month probation. Naomi completed all sanctions during the timeframes assigned.

David

David was a 20-year-old sophomore studying advertising with a 3.6 cumulative GPA. He was charged with possession and use of drugs and drug paraphernalia in on-campus housing during his freshman year. David reported that his peers and living on-campus played a role in his decision-making. David pled guilty and was ultimately found responsible for violating university policy after participating in an administrative hearing with an SCA. For his violation, David received drug 1st offense mandatory minimum sanctions, which included parent notification, a psycho-educational

class with the campus wellness center, \$250 fine, and four-month probation.

Additionally, David was required to complete a one-hour individual psycho-educational session with a counselor/psychologist in the campus-counseling center. David completed all sanctions during the timeframe assigned.

Data Sources and Interview Protocol

Each administrator and student participated in a 60-minute semi-structured and individual face-to-face interview. The interview protocol for both administrators and students consisted of several questions so to provide flexible responses (Appendixes B & G). Semi-structured interviews were selected as they provide a series of structured and open-ended questions that afford the opportunity to define the topic being explored and the ability to discuss some topics in more detail (Hancock, 2002 & Willis, 2007).

Additionally, semi-structured interviews provided the opportunity for further conversation when additional clarification was needed or the desire to follow a line of inquiry arose, which was valuable when participants had difficulty with questions and needed further assistance in answering the questions (Hancock, 2002 & Willis, 2007).

All participants reviewed and signed the IRB – Informed Consent for Minimal Risk Social Behavioral Research document (Temple University, 2014). Additionally, interviews were documented through an audio-recording device and handwritten notes were transcribed into individual interview transcripts. Finally, all audio-recorded interviews and interview transcripts were securely stored in order to maintain privacy and confidentiality (Creswell, 2009 & Lichtman, 2010).

Transcribed interviews were submitted to each participant for confirmation of data reliability. Additionally, participants were asked to read over their interview

transcription and check for accuracy of responses (Lichtman, 2010). Students received their \$25 gift card once they sent back their reviewed transcript.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Interview transcripts were adjusted if needed based on feedback, and uploaded into ATLAS.ti once received from each participant to search for codes, concepts, and categories that convey meaning of the shared behavioral phenomenon of the administrators and students that participated in the study (Creswell, 2009 & Bogdan & Biklen 2007). The coding process consisted of a search of initial broad themes/codes from a bottom-up/inductive approach allowing data to speak for itself. These themes/codes were revisited for redundancy, defined, and grouped into broader concepts. The concepts were also checked for redundancy and defined to reduce less important concepts. The final stage of the coding process consisted of translating the concepts into categories that reflect the richness of the data collected (Lichtman, 2010)

The categories that emerged for administrators were (a) overall purpose of the conduct process; (b) student behavior influences; (c) the actual conduct process and need for consistency; (d) a supportive student experience; and (e) focus on student learning. The categories that emerged for students were (a) behavioral choices; (b) students' experiences in the SCP; and (c) identified learning and influence on future behaviors. Each category and subthemes from both administrators and students are defined, discussed, and compared to the current student conduct literature in chapters four and five.

Finally, a comparison between students and administrators is discussed in chapter six demonstrating similarities and differences between administrators' desired outcomes and students' actual perception of their conduct process.

Researcher's Role

I have worked as an administrator in the field of higher education for 16 years in various on-campus student housing and residential life organizations. I currently serve as a director of Residential Life managing approximately 5,600 on-campus students and approximately 325 professional and paraprofessional staff at a large four-year public urban institution located in the Northeast. Addressing and managing student behavioral issues, including the disciplinary process for on-campus students, is a functional area of my portfolio and at the forefront of my work as issues continue to increase and become more complex and litigious. I oversee the implementation of the Code and the conduct processes for on-campus students, but have no direct impact on conduct decisions.

My knowledge and experience related to student behaviors and the SCP is extensive, and I have developed some bias, awareness of which I kept at the forefront during the study to remain objective and refrain from acting in an administrative role (Lichtman, 2010). I assumed that administrators and students would be openly willing to share their understanding and experience with the SCP. Additionally, I assumed that I have a solid understanding of behavioral influences and students' decision-making abilities before violations occurred. Furthermore, I assumed that students are gaining new knowledge and applying it to their future decision-making to prevent additional conduct violations. Finally, I assumed that I have extensive understanding of what

happens in a conduct meeting with a student even though I have never conducted a conduct meeting with students at the research site.

These assumptions were kept in check by extensive conversations with my committee and administrative colleagues and my doctoral cohort. Additionally, it was important that I establish trustworthy and transparent relationships with all participants to make sure they felt safe and open to sharing their experiences concerning their behavioral issues (Lichtman, 2010). This was accomplished by participant-identified pseudonyms for all 18 respondents. Additionally, I shared with all participants that my role as a researcher had no impact on employment or future student disciplinary outcomes and ability to live on-campus under the standards set forth by the IRB process. I believe my authentic approach, attentive listening skills, and compassion proved helpful in developing supportive and trustworthy relationships where administrators and students felt comfortable in opening up and sharing their story (Lichtman, 2010).

Conclusion

This concludes the discussion of phenomenological methodology, study participants and site location, data collection through semi-structured and face-to-face interviews, the overall approach for analysis and interpretation of findings, and my role as the research. Findings from administrators and students are discussed next in chapters four and five. A final comparison between students and administrators is discussed in chapter six demonstrating similarities and differences between administrators' desired outcomes and students' actual perception of their conduct experience.

CHAPTER 4

ADMINISTRATOR FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and influence on their learning and future behaviors. The study also compares the experiences of students to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. This chapter presents the findings associated with the research question concerning the basic tenets of the conduct process from the perspective of the three SCAs interviewed for this study. Additionally, this chapter discusses the five categories that emerged in the coding process and their relation to the current body of student conduct literature. The categories are (a) overall purpose of the conduct process; (b) student behavior influences; (c) the actual conduct process and need for consistency; (d) a supportive student experience; and (e) focus on student learning. Finally, this chapter concludes with a summary of findings.

A final comparison between students and administrators is discussed in chapter six demonstrating similarities and differences between administrators' desired outcomes and students' actual perception of their conduct experience.

Research Question – Administrators

1. What are the basic tenets of the student conduct process from the perspective of conduct administrators?

Category One: Overall Purpose of the Conduct Process

The category of overall purpose of the conduct process emerged very early in the coding process and was related to ways SCAs thought about the conduct process from a global perspective. The SCAs described the overall process as a systematic way to

maintain campus civility and address behavioral issues when they surfaced. The SCAs described the importance of keeping the overall purpose at the forefront of their work as they managed varying types of conduct violations prevalent in their work, in order to support students at different developmental levels, and find ways to help students learn from their mistakes. Each SCA freely shared their understanding of the overall purpose and connected it back to the expectations related to their current role and that of the field of conduct work.

KU, a 33-year-old Caucasian male, reported working in his SCA role for three years; making KU the most tenured member of the team of the SCAs interviewed. According to KU, “upholding the standards that the university has set out in regards to not only the individual at the university, but the community it is trying to create, is the main purpose of the conduct process.” (KU, interview, 1/21/2015) Additionally, KU claimed,

Understanding that we are an educational institution and that our process needs to allow for the fact that sometimes mistakes that students make are not just in the classroom. We need to address situations when they occur and maintain the standards of the community, but also allow people to learn from their experience. (KU, interview, 1/21/15)

KU emphasized during his interview the notion that a university is an educational community where students are going to make mistakes and should be able to learn from these mistakes. KU described his role in the overall process as an “educator focused on helping students learn from their mistakes” (KU, interview, 1/21/2015). The concepts of community and students learning from their experience surfaced throughout all three interviews and the student conduct literature, which will be discussed in more detail below.

Both Stacy and KU serve in similar roles meeting with students regularly to administer the SCP. Stacy, a 30-year-old Caucasian female, shared a very similar experience concerning the overall purpose of the SCP, but, unlike KU, who had worked in his role for three years, had only been working in her current role and at the university for two months, making Stacy the newest SCA interviewed. According to Stacy,

The purpose of the student conduct process is for students to know their rights and responsibilities as a student, how those affect the University community, what happens when they violate the student code of conduct, and what they should learn from the process. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

Similar to KU, Stacy describes the purpose of the conduct process as a way to communicate behavioral expectations for students and ways to hold them accountable if they violate university policy. Stacy emphasized the importance of students needing to learn from their experience so not to repeat similar behaviors in the future. Even after only serving in her role for two months, Stacy had a very similar understanding of the purpose, which she attributes to the way she has been able to witness KU administer the SCP when working with students as a part of her onboarding and ongoing training. Both KU and Stacy revealed that their understanding of the SC purpose is fundamental in the student conduct field and further shaped by their current institution through the current Code, trainings, and conversations with their supervisor.

Madison, a 47-year-old Caucasian male, reported working in his SCA role for over ten months and is the manager of the overall SC process. Additionally, Madison reported supervising the entire SC office, which includes KU, Stacy, administrative support staff, and student workers. Madison recounted similar information concerning the purpose of the SCP and reaffirmed the importance of protecting the community,

addressing issues, and educating students to prevent future behaviors. Specifically, Madison shared,

There are lots of purposes for the student conduct process. Primarily, we educate students about civics and ethics. The student conduct process is designed to protect the community and offer a way to address issues of student behavior when they surface. It is then our responsibility to teach a student when students find themselves in violation of the student conduct code about why the code exists, the actual conduct process, and community values and expectations. Additionally, it is our role to have a conversation with students that allows them to be introspective about things they did. Hopefully in the end, we are changing behavior. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

Madison's specific response about helping students is "introspective" illuminate that the three SCAs subscribe that a large portion of the SCP is educational, supportive, and future oriented (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015).

Similar to the three SCAs, scholars agree that the primary purpose for the student conduct field consists of maintaining a civil and safe campus environment to support an educational mission, while promoting the education and development of citizenship (Association for Student Judicial Affairs, 1998; Dannells, 1997; Hoekema, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Miller, 2003; Pavela, 2006; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004). The literature supports that this is accomplished through holding students accountable for their conduct and utilizing an educational focus to prevent future behavioral issues (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Pavela, 2006; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004). This connection to the literature directly speaks to the findings of this study and broadens the body of conduct literature by offering further evidence that there is an overall belief in a purpose for disciplinary work. Each SCA argued that understanding the purpose was not enough and that it was just as important for them to understand types and causes of behavioral

issues and how to work with different developmental needs of college students, which is discussed in the next section.

Category Two: Student Behavior Influences

Student behavioral influences emerged as a significant category and were reported by SCAs as a basic tenet of the overall SCP. The SCAs argued that student behavioral influences consist of factors that may cause a student to engage in behavior that violates university policy. These may include developmental levels, environmental influences, substance use, mental health, peer influences, access to resources and financial means, and family of origin. All three SCAs agreed that student behavioral influences vary based on a broad category and many times are connected to family, peers, environments, and moving from adolescent to adult developmental stages of independence.

KU shared that college student behavior is influenced by many variables that he has witnessed during his time working in the field of SC. Specifically, KU shared,

Student behaviors are influenced by (a) New Environments – this is the first time students can test their limits without anyone telling them what to do. They are being told the rules, but there is no one there to watch over them or enforce the new rules 24/7 like when they were at home with their parents. This is mainly if they live on-campus or around campus away from their parents. (b) Taking classes with new and different people. (c) Peer influence. (d) False Expectations - students come to college with the expectation that college is supposed to be x, y, or z and it does not turn out that way. (e) Independence – managing time and schedules for the first time on their own. (f) Accountability – for some students they have never been held accountable and this is their first time. (g) Mental Health - issues present themselves for students during the age of 18, which can have a major impact on behavior issues. (KU, interview, 1/21/2015)

Madison added to the conversation by sharing, “students raised in a strict environment can struggle with the freedom they receive at college and just cut loose” (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015). KU and Madison’s description of possible student behavioral influences illuminates the variability of causes and the complexities associated with fully

understanding and supporting students struggling with behavioral issues. The complexity of behavior influences reported by the SCAs is supported by similar findings in the SC literature.

Historically, college student behavioral influences were thought to emerge due to teen adolescent development and responses to strict rules (Dannells, 1997; Leonard, 1956; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Smith, 1994). Today's literature supports that college students continue to struggle with behavior issues, which may be directly related to their lack of conflict resolution skills, transition to college issues, major mental health issues, economic hardship, and the inability to negotiate complex issues without the assistance from their parents (Paterson & Kibler, 2008). Gilligan (1982 & 1993) and Harper et al., (2005) support that gender is a major behavioral influence. Specifically, Gilligan (1982 & 1993) theorized that gender plays a major part in student decision-making and learning from their behaviors, which can influence college student behavior. Harper et al. (2005) theorized that males are more prevalent in the SCP due to issues of "male gender role conflicts, precollege socialization, social constructors of masculinity" and other aspects of male identity that make them more likely to present behavioral issues (p. 568). These claims in the literature fully support the information found in this study and broaden the literature by adding possible new behavioral influences associated with family, which has not been fully discussed in the current literature.

The reported SCAs' perception of college student behavioral influences is supported by the literature, but was missing the evidence from the perspective of students to substantiate their claim. The SCAs were not fully able to substantiate their examples of how they understood behavioral influences, but were able to share that they gained this

insight from years of experience. A comparison of SCAs' insight into this category and students' perceptions of their behavior influences will be discussed in a later chapter.

Student developmental issues were a recurrent behavioral influence that surfaced in the conduct literature and that SCAs discussed most frequently. The SCAs were very clear that they approach their work by recognizing that all students are going to be at different developmental levels. According to the literature, college students are maneuvering through psychosocial and cognitive stages of development, which intensify during the college years (Evans et al., 2010). Psychosocial development consists of stages in which young adults explore their identity, interactions with others, and the direction of their lives (Evans et al., 2010). Cognitive development describes ways young adults "think, reason, and make meaning of their experiences" (Evans et al., 2010, p 43). All three SCAs spoke of helping students work through their issues by understanding where students were in their development, but no evidence was presented of how this was accomplished. This is an area of limitation of the study that could be broadened with more specific questions allowing further inquiry concerning how SCAs understand where student are in their development. This concludes the discussion on student behavioral influence as it relates to conduct issues. Each phase of the SCP and need for consistency of the SCAs is discussed next.

Category Three: Student Conduct Process and Consistency

Understanding, following, and maintaining a consistent SCP also emerged as a significant category and was reported by the SCAs as a basic tenet of the overall process. All three SCAs claimed that the SCP consisted of multiple parts that made up the disciplinary system ranging from the actual conduct notification letter to process review

meeting, hearing, sanction, and appeal process. According to the SCAs, the SCP holds students accountable for their behaviors and helps them to gain an understanding of what is expected, ask questions, and tell their side of the story. Finally, according to all three SCAs, the SCP also consists of checks and balances determined by the Code. The description and purpose of the process review meeting, hearing, and sanctions is discussed by the SCAs next in the sequence by which students experience and travel through the SC process.

Process Review Meeting

According to all three SCAs, the process review meeting (PRM) is the first stage and opportunity in the SCP to interact with students charged with allegedly violating university policies. The PRM is a meeting between accused students and an SCA within the main student conduct office. The PRM is intended to educate students about the conduct process, review the summary of violations, and discuss students' rights and responsibilities, hearing options, and possible sanctions, while allowing students the opportunity to ask questions. Campus resources may be offered if applicable, and may include the services focused on physical and mental health, academic support, and conflict mediation.

Madison revealed during his interview that he oversees the SCP, but does not have direct responsibility for meeting with students or conducting PRMs. Madison stated that PRMs are the responsibility of KU and Stacy, while explaining his understanding and expectations of a PRM. Specifically, Madison shared,

The PRM is an introduction to the conduct process and introduction to the person that will be helping students through the process. During the course of the PRM, the student will have the opportunity to learn about the process, their rights and responsibilities in the process, be provided all the information the office has

concerning the case, and the charges that have been created based on the information that has been received. Additionally, the charges will be explained so that students have an understanding of why they are being charged, possible outcomes, and answer any questions students may have. The PRM can also be the place where the student takes responsibility, which is not required at the time of the PRM, but happens to be the place where many students do take responsibility. The PRM is also the place where students can learn about other resources on-campus. Finally, the PRM provides an opportunity for students to feel that they are being supported and heard. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

According to Madison, “each PRM is much like the next one. There are some differences where the SCA may be having a more personal conversation with a student. Largely it is a step-by-step process of what needs to happen” (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015).

KU’s understanding of the PRM was similar to Madison’s, but he described it through the lens of creating an environment where students could learn and feel that the process was fair. Specifically, KU shared,

The goal of the process review meeting is to educate the student about the student conduct process, what they have been charged with, possible outcomes, and really answer any questions the student has pertaining to the process. If you want to make it an educational process, you can’t have students just walk into a conduct hearing and expect them to get anything out of it. All they will learn from this is that it stinks to be unprepared for stuff. The goal is to create an environment for students to understand that the process is going to be as fair as it possibly can. It does not mean the students will like the outcomes, but it will be fair. Fair and liking the outcomes is not the same. It is important during the part of the conduct process that this is shared. It is important to explore the student’s rights and how to exercise those rights. On a personal level, this is the time that I get to develop rapport with students. Outside of the letter they received from our office, I’m usually the first person they talk to when they come into the office. I try to address any expectations and offer support. (KU, interview, 1/21/2015)

KU’s description of creating an environment that is fair is directly supported by the literature and is believed to play a major role in supporting student learning and behavioral changes. According to previous research, there is a perceived relationship between the SCP and perceptions of learning and reported behavioral changes based on

educational value and fairness (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Both Mullan (1999) and King's (2012) research supports similar evidence that students find more educational value with their SCP if they feel their voice is heard and the process is fair. According to Mullan (1999) and King (2012), students are more inclined to think the SCP is fair if they play an active role in the process, understand the process, and have the opportunity to share their side of the story.

Stacy described the PRM as the opportunity for students to understand their rights, responsibility, charges, and the SC process as a whole, and to ask questions. Similar to KU, Stacy's explanation of the PRM is consistent with literature and supports the perceptions of learning and reported behavioral changes based on students understanding behavioral expectations, SCP, and being able to ask questions (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Mullan, 1999; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Both Stacy and KU's explanation of the PRM is consistent with Madison's explanation and reveals that there is a clear and defined purpose for the first interaction with students through the use of the PRM.

All three SCAs discussed that the PRM was the first opportunity during the conduct process to build rapport. According to the SCAs, rapport was a major outcome of the PRM and represents the ability to build a trusting and supportive relationship with students in the SCP. Stacy specifically described rapport as "developing a connection with students to allow them to feel more comfortable in the process" (Stacy, 1/22/2015). The concept of rapport is directly supported by the literature and referred to as creating supportive interactions (Allen, 1994 & King, 2012).

The literature demonstrates that the relationship developed between students and the SCAs are a high predictor for educational value and fairness (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Additionally, prior research supports that students have a higher probability of making meaning of their experience if provided a supportive relationship created through rapport building (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; King, 2012; & Mullan, 1999). The literature did not directly relate to student learning, but according to Allen (1994) and King (2012), a positive experience may influence a student's perception of value and fairness, which may increase the willingness and ability to learn.

Hearing Process

According to the SCAs, a hearing is the next stage of the SC process. A hearing can either be administrative or referred to a hearing board. Either hearing option provides the opportunity for students to share their side of the story, while a single administrator or hearing board renders a recommendation of responsible or not responsible based on information presented in the hearing. The SCAs shared that administrative hearings are informal, held in private, and are reserved for first-time lower-level violations including substance use, academic dishonesty, theft, and disorderly conduct violations. Board hearings are more formal, closed to general public, and reserved for repeat violations and high-level cases, including substance use, academic dishonesty, theft, disorderly conduct, physical altercations, weapons, and sexual misconduct.

Madison revealed again that he only oversees the SCP and does not have direct responsibility for meeting with students or conducting hearings. Madison stated that

conducting hearings are the responsibility of KU and Stacy, while explaining his understanding and expectations of the hearing process. Specifically Madison shared,

The hearing outcome is to move the students to take responsibility, if that is in fact how they feel. Similar to the PRM, we reinforce students understanding of the process and their rights/responsibilities in the process. Additionally, we maintain that the process is fair and just, and that students have a chance to share their side of the story. During the administrative process it is important to have students be introspective about their actions, their role in the community, and how their action impacted the community/ affected others. This is all done through conversation with the student and SCA or board members. This is also the place that sanctions will be recommended if the student is found responsible. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

Both KU and Stacy shared similar understandings of the hearing process and explained that this part of the process was an opportunity to help students advocate for themselves by sharing their side of the story and presenting information that would support their point of view. Additionally, KU and Stacy shared that the hearing was also a place where rapport was an important part of the process that would continue to grow if the students feel supported. According to KU,

Part of the student conduct process is giving students choices in the process. This gives students a voice and empowers them to take an active role in making their own decisions. Students have the option to decide if they want me to be their hearing officer and if they want to complete their process after process review meeting. Additionally, students get the choice to decide if they want to share their story and what their story is going to be. This can include their narrative, documentation from others, and witnesses. It is a chance for students to critically think about not only the situation they were in, but also how to best represent themselves in the process. Developing strong rapport is important to help students feel comfortable during this part of the process. (KU, interview, 1/21/2015)

The findings from all three SCAs interviews reveals that the hearing process is meant to determine the level of student responsibility for their alleged behavior violation and assign appropriate sanctions that will help prevent similar future violations. The findings also reveal that SCAs hope that students will experience a fair and just process

where they have the opportunity to learn self-advocacy by sharing their side of the situation if so desired. SCAs shared that creating a fair and just process is accomplished through establishing a supportive and transparent experience and answering students' questions. Similar to PRM findings, the findings concerning the hearing process demonstrate a strong connection to the literature focused on fairness and rapport, while broadening the understanding of how SCAs view the actual hearing process in relation to stated conduct outcomes (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

Sanctions

The SCAs explained that sanctions were the next stage of the SCP if a student pleaded responsible or was found responsible for violating university policies. According to the SCAs, sanctions included, but were not limited to: a letter of reprimand, probation, loss of privileges, a fine, restitution, suspension from housing or the university, expulsion from housing or the university, admission and/or degree revocation, mandatory minimum fines set by the university, and other sanctions. Other sanctions refer to psycho-educational workshops, reflective essays, community service, and other related assignments.

Madison reiterated that he only provided oversight of the SCP and had limited responsibility for meeting with students or determining sanctions. Madison stated that recommending sanctions are the responsibility of KU and Stacy during administrative hearings and boards during board hearings while explaining his understanding and expectations of the sanction process. Additionally, Madison explained that all sanctions

recommendations are reviewed and approved by his supervisor, which is prescribed by the university's behavioral code. Specifically Madison shared,

Sanctions are sometimes penalties, which we try very hard to not use them in this way. Any time you give a student a fine it represents a penalty. Sanctions are largely supposed to be educational opportunities for students. This can be probation, where behavior is supposed to be above approach. This could be going to see a person to learn something new about how to change behavior. For alcohol, we have an alcohol related educational sanction. Sanctions can also consist of giving someone service opportunities where the student needs to give back to a community. Community type sanctions come in handy when working with students who violate community standards of living off-campus and their behavior is impacting the local community surrounding the University. Service back to the community is key and helps rebuild the relationship the community has with the University. Sanctions are designed to be educational in nature. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

Madison's explanation of sanctions highlights the idea that sanctions are supposed to be educational in nature and provide opportunities for students to learn from their behaviors. According to Madison, outcomes associated with sanctions consist of students learning ways to change behavior and make better decisions. Specific behavioral changes and ways to make better decisions were not discovered. Furthermore, Madison shared that the current sanctions have not been reviewed and are not assessed for effectiveness beyond tracking behavioral recidivism rates. Overall learning and the assessment are discussed in more detail later in a section dedicated to the SCP as a learning opportunity.

Stacy and KU shared similar understanding of the sanction process and emphasized that all sanctions are intended to teach students how to make better decision and take responsibility for their actions. Specifically, Stacy shared, "if there are experiential sanctions then they should be learning connected. If there are punitive sanctions then students should recognize the need to take responsibility for their action. For every action there is a reaction" (Stacy, interview, 1/22/15). Both Stacy and KU

describe experiential sanctions as an opportunity for students to actively engage in an activity or meeting that provides learning opportunities and new self-awareness.

Additionally, KU shared,

Educational sanctions can provide insight into ways students can improve their lives and learn ways to manage future behavior. If the sanctions are properly designed with the idea of making sure students have a chance to learn from that situation hopefully future decision-making is influenced. Also, educational sanctions connect students with campus resources that can support students in other areas throughout their academic career. Even if students don't think the sanction is applicable to their current situation, they may find other value in it. (KU, interview, 1/21/2015)

Examples of experiential sanctions used by SCAs were “reflective essays, presentations, community service, and educational, which were designed to focus on anger management, alcohol and drug issues, sexual misconduct, or conflict resolution” (KU, interview, 1/21/2015).

The use of passive/punitive sanctions was described as helping students learn to take responsibility for their behavior and that there are consequences for bad decision-making. Examples for passive/punitive sanctions used by SCAs consisted of probation, suspension, and fines. KU and Stacy described passive/punitive sanctions as ineffective alone, but effective with active sanctions. Specifically, Stacy shared,

I think the punitive sanctions can hinder the process for sure because there is not much learning associated with them. I think that most of the time that we match a punitive sanction with an experiential sanction. I guess sometimes we give disciplinary probation by itself, but most of the time we give disciplinary probation with something active/experiential. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

The combination of active and passive sanctions were discussed in prior research and revealed that behavior recidivism was higher when students only received passive/punitive sanctions (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001). Behavior recidivism was lower when combinations of active and passive sanctions were applied and

developmental levels were taken into consideration (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001 & King, 2012). Additionally, the literature supports that sanctions should be tied to intentional learning outcomes focused on students actively engaging in learning ways to critically think and reflect on their behavior (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999: & Mullan, 1999). Furthermore, the literature is clear that assessment and evaluation are instrumental in determining overall program effectiveness, including the purpose, types, and use of sanctions, which seems to be missing as a basic tenet of the SCP at the research site beyond anecdotal measurements (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

The information presented in this section broadens the understanding of how SCAs view sanctions and illuminates an opportunity to strengthen the overall SCP by assessing and evaluating current sanction effectiveness. Overall learning and assessment are discussed in more detail later in a section dedicated to the SCP as a learning opportunity.

Constancy also emerged as areas described by the SCAs as important when working with the overall SCP. Each SCA referenced that the entire SCP was scripted and aligned with the university's behavioral code. Madison described the behavioral code as "student behavioral expectations and processes established by the university to manage student behavioral issues and maintain civility" (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015). According to Madison, the behavioral code is based off the model code, which is an industry best practice standard for addressing student behavioral issues. According to Stoner & Lowery (2004), the model code provides a framework for defining student behavioral expectations for college and university conduct and provides standards for

holding students accountable through a disciplinary process that ensures fair and equal treatment for all students.

The SCAs reported numerous ways of maintaining constancy, which included case review meeting including all the SCAs, procedural scripts, case-notes/files for each student, and an electronic tracking database that all SCAs and other approved university administrators access to manage and track policy violation charges, procedural progress, sanction completion, and recidivism. KU shared,

This entire process is called due process, doing what the university's code of conduct says. This is my checkpoint list. It does not do me any good if I said I was going to do all the following in a process review meeting and not do it. If you are going to build trust with students you need to do what you said you are going to do. The beauty of the process is that I have a code that provides an outline of a process that I need to follow. We have to use handwritten case notes for every case, but it does not mean there will be a lot of notes. Case notes are just a standard document that we have to keep in the file with the case and it provides a sign-off sheet that verifies that we have met with the student. Additionally, we use an electronic tracking database that holds all cases and information pertaining to these cases. We have to enter all information pertaining to a case into the database, which includes sanctions, hearing dates, appeals, etc. (KU, interview, 1/21/2015)

Stacy shared a similar understanding of the value of being consistent and provided a specific example of when a lack of consistency is problematic. Stacy added,

I think the consistency piece is important when it comes to sanctions. For example, if two students come in for the same situation, you can't give one the mandatory minimum and the other the next student twice as much of whatever that may mean. It is important that we are staying consistent on each charge, but also understanding that different situations and different people may or may not require different sanctions. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

The SCAs explanation of the need for constancy when working with the overall SCP is supported by the conduct literature. According to previous research, the model code was created to provide a clear framework for disciplinary processes to ensure all students participating in the disciplinary process received fair and equitable treatment

(Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Pavela, 1997 & 2006, Stoner, 2000; Stoner, 2008; Stoner & Cerminara, 1990; Stoner & Lowery, 2004). The model code defines behavioral expectations and the process for holding students accountable when issues surface (King, 2012). It also affords students defined rights aimed at ensuring due process (Footer, 1996; & Lowery, 2008). Due process rights included written notification of alleged behavioral violations and a conduct hearing, the chance to be heard at the conduct hearing, and the opportunity to have an advisor (Stoner, 2000; Stoner, 2008; Stoner & Cerminara, 1990; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004). The consistency provided by the model code in the literature aligns with the findings from the SCAs experience administering the SCP at the research site.

The overall findings in category three demonstrate that there is a strong correlation between the SCA description of the SCP and that of the best-practice model code. Additionally, the SCA emphasized that learning is an important part of the SCP, which is influenced by creating an experience during the conduct process that is consistent, supportive, fair, and just. Furthermore, the SCAs revealed that the effectiveness of the SCP is not currently being assessed or evaluated beyond types and frequency of violations. This discovery provides a possible opportunity to explore the overall effectiveness through the use of assessment and evaluation. This concludes the discussion on the SCP and the need for consistency in the process. The SCP as supportive experience from the perspective of the SCAs will be discussed next.

Category Four: Supportive Student Experience

Creating a supportive experience for students also emerged as a significant category and basic tenet of the overall SCP. According to the SCAs, a supportive

conduct experience is important so students feel that the process is fair and just. A supportive SC experience consists of creating an environment where students feel supported and heard, and where information is transparent throughout all aspects of the SCP. All three SCAs argued that creating a supportive experience for students was essential to the overall success of the SCP. The components of creating a supportive experience, rationale of importance, and how successes are measured are discussed next from the perspective of the SCAs.

The SCAs describe the use of a supportive experience for students participating in the SCP as an approach to alleviate anxiety and confusion about the discipline proceedings. According to the SCAs, a supportive experience is about creating a welcoming and helpful environment where students feel comfortable, supported, and heard. This can be created through transparency, and answering questions based on the information shared by the SCAs. The SCAs described support as a process of checking in with students to see how they are doing, answering questions, listening, and offering words of affirmation, physical contact (handshake, pat on back, or hug), and campus resources that may help students through their difficult situation.

KU described creating a supportive experience for students through rapport building, which he argued was fundamental for students to feel like the conduct process was fair and just. KU defined rapport as the experience of building a trusting and compassionate relationship with students. KU called this “developing a connection” through which he explained that his relationship was a big influence on students’ perception of the SCP (KU, interview, 1/21/2015). According to KU, “students associate

the person that they are meeting with as the SCP. Students don't buy into what we are doing unless there is strong rapport" (KU, interview, 1/21/2015).

Additionally, KU argued,

Rapport is important as it helps me better understand and get to know the student to more fully support them throughout the student conduct process. Some students think you can't hold them accountable and offer support at the same time. Some students think that this is a giant university and they are not going to get any say in their process. Rapport helps break all this down and helps students understand that I do care and that we are here to offer support while holding them accountable. Rapport is critical as it helps ease a student's anxiety as they navigate the student conduct process. (KU, interview, 1/21/2015)

KU described creating rapport by offering a friendly greeting to every student he meets going through the process, explaining the student's rights in the process, and by making sure the student understands the actual SCP. KU also emphasized that it is importance to make sure that all aspects of the SCP are a supportive experience for students, including the initial office greeting, process review meeting, hearing, sanctions, and sub-sequential interactions.

Similarly, Stacy explained that creating a connection with students was the main way she creates a supportive experience. According to Stacy,

We want students to definitely get something out of this as far as an experience. Possibly a personable one...this depends on the personality of the student. Maybe the student does not connect with me, but maybe they connect with the administrative assistant working the reception when they come into the office. Maybe they connect with a student worker when they call in to discuss their sanctions. Students are more likely to think the process is fair if they have a good experience with the people overseeing the process. Making a connection is key and we strive for this to be one of the main experiential outcomes. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

Stacy described creating a strong connection through rapport building, which she described as making sure students are informed throughout the entire process, answering any questions, allowing students to share their side of the story, continually checking to

gauge students' comfort and stability, and explaining the rationale for charges and decisions. Stacy described rationale sharing as "helping students understand the why factor" (Stacy, interview, 1/21/2015). Specifically, Stacy elaborated:

I think explaining the why is a way to reinforce outcomes. Why the policy, why sanctions, and why we hold students accountable. Again, I think if students can understand the background or how their behavior affects the community or themselves, then the sanctions don't feel as harsh and they may feel a little bit better about the overall process. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

Both Stacy and KU described that "explaining the why" was a critical part of creating the supportive experience and allowed student too more quickly lower their guard and relax in the process.

Madison reinforced the findings presented by KU and Stacy by sharing the importance of creating a supportive conduct experience and the connection to student learning. Specifically, Madison argued,

If the interaction the SCAs are having with students is open, helpful, and welcoming it increases the likelihood that the student will learn from the process, feel comfortable in the process, and will give the opportunity for the education process to take form. If the SCAs are unable to make this type of connection for some reason, everything becomes much more difficult very quickly and it is a lot harder for any other part of the process to work well. It is a very critical point to make connection and make things work. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

All three SCAs agreed that providing an environment where students understood the why, and felt supported and comfortable, assisted students in feeling that the conduct process was fair and just. The importance of creating a supportive experience for students participating in the SCP was also supported by the current SC literature.

The literature demonstrates that the relationships developed between students and the SCAs are a high predictor for education value and fairness (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Additionally, the literature supports

that students have a higher probability of making meaning of their experience if provided a supportive relationship created by through rapport building (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; King, 2012; & Mullan, 1999). The literature did not directly relate to student learning, but according to Allen (1994) and King (2012), a positive experience may influence a student's perception of value and fairness, which may increase the willingness and ability to learn. Furthermore, the literature is also clear that assessment and evaluation are instrumental in determining program effectiveness and whether overall experiential outcomes have been achieved. Such formal assessment seems to be missing based on the findings shared by the SCAs beyond anecdotal measurements of students feeling supported or not supported (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

The SCAs revealed that creating a supportive experience was an important aspect of the SCP, but disclosed that there were no formal experiential outcomes and no formal assessing of how students felt about their experiences beyond the SCA checking in with the student during parts of the SCP. All three SCAs did share similar experiential outcomes connected to creating a supportive experience, but did not disclose how their understanding of what was expected developed. Additionally, KU and Stacy did share that they both use anecdotal feedback and observations of students to measure if they felt supported and to determine the level of connectedness with students. Specifically, Stacy explained,

Meeting the experiential outcomes starts with building rapport from the beginning of the process review meeting. I continually ask students if they have any questions during our interactions. This happens after every third topic covered. Additionally, I ask if what was covered makes sense and explain at the end of a meeting that students can call or email if they have any questions. I also open the option of calling or emailing me to the parents and advisor so everyone has the same information if needed. We don't formally measure students' experience in the student conduct process. For me personally, I keep a spreadsheet of all the

students I met with and I put notes on it that help me track how students are doing. I personally follow up with students when I know they are having a hard time. Typically, this is a quick email or phone call. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

Stacy's explanation reveals a similar approach to KU through creating a supportive conduct experience, but illustrates an inconstancy with formally measuring the effectiveness of the overall experience.

Madison shared similar insights concerning the lack of assessing the overall program effectiveness and actual student experience. According to Madison,

At the moment and to my knowledge there is no measurement of the supportive experience. There is some anecdotal measurement through observations of how a student felt and reacted to the process while going through the process. I hope to assess this in the future through a follow up survey at the minimum. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

The lack of formal outcomes and assessment of the experiential effectiveness discloses a possible disconnect between the literature and the SCP at the research site. A clear understanding of consistent and measurable outcomes seems to be missing based on the findings provided by the SCAs and possibly provides an opportunity to improve the process by realigning with outcomes, assessment, and industry standards (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

The overall findings in category four demonstrate that the SCAs perceive that creating a supportive student experience is important to the overall success and basic tenets of the SC process. The SCAs asserted that a supportive disciplinary experience is important so students feel that the process is fair and just. Additionally, the SCAs emphasized that creating a welcoming and supportive environment reinforced learning, which is developed by rapport building, allowing students to ask questions, and explaining the SCP. However, the SCAs also revealed that there might be a lack of

consistency in the area of formal experiential outcomes and measurement of overall program effectiveness based on the lack of formal assessment beyond anecdotal feedback from students. This discovery provides a possible opportunity to explore the overall effectiveness through the use of assessment and evaluation. This concludes the discussion of creating a supportive experience for students as a basic tenet of the SCP. The SCP as a learning opportunity from the perspective of the SCAs is discussed next.

Category Five: Student Learning

Utilizing the conduct process as a learning opportunity also emerged as a significant category and basic tenet of the overall disciplinary process. According to the conduct administrators, students have the opportunity to gain new information and insight on ways to critically think about their decision-making and hopefully change behaviors to prevent future issues, by participating in the conduct process. Specifically, SCAs argued that students participating in the SCP learn about the actual process, their rights and responsibilities, impact of behaviors, self-advocacy, critical thinking and problem-solving skills, and campus resources. The overarching learning outcomes associated with the conduct process and how actually learning is assessed from the perspective of the SCAs is discussed next.

The SCAs described during several points during their interviews that the disciplinary proceedings are intended to be educational and that students are expected to learn a variety of outcomes by participating in the overall process. Each SCA shared similar, but in some cases, different learning expectations for students. KU shared that he expected students to learn “self-advocacy, critical thinking and problem-solving skills needed to make better future decisions” (KU, 1/21/2015). Additionally, KU argued that

learning was one of the fundamental components of the SCP and that his role was to “help students learn from their mistakes by challenging their thinking and providing sanctions that helped them explore their behaviors” (KU, interview, 1/21/2015).

Similarly, Stacy emphasized that learning was a key outcome of the disciplinary system and that her role was to support students as they navigated the process. Stacy shared that students participating in the SCP should learn the actual process and their rights and responsibilities in the process. Stacy argued that it was important for students to learn how the actual SCP worked and what was expected of students in the process so they would feel more comfortable and open to taking responsibility for their actions. Additionally, Stacy emphasized that it was important to her that students participating in the SCP understood how their actions impacted themselves and the broader community. Specifically, Stacy stated, “I strive to help students learn what they did was wrong or how other community members perceived their actions as unsafe or unwanted. This helps students begin to think about others differently and allows students to better understand how their actions have negative consequences for others” (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015). Moreover, Stacy disclosed that there are different learning outcomes associated with different sanctions, Specifically, Stacy argued,

I think the learning depends on the situation and sanctions. For our alcohol sanctions we have students participate in an online “Under The Influence” program and go to an in-person CHOICES program/class. For a lot of alcohol cases, I want the student to learn how alcohol affects their body and how the choices they are making around alcohol could possibly affect other parts of their life. These and other sanctions help students to learn how to make better decisions and at times ways their decisions impact the community around students. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

Furthermore, Stacy shared that she hoped that students learned from their mistakes and gained an understanding of campus resources that were available for future support.

According to Stacy, campus resources consist of “counseling and health services, and wellness, housing, and academic support offices” (Stacy, interview, 1/22/15).

Stacy’s explanation of the learning associated with the SCP was similar to KU’s, but revealed a broader explanation that incorporated the actual conduct process, campus resources, and community impact as learning outcomes. Additionally, Stacy disclosed that sanctions have different learning outcomes associated with different types of behavior, but that all sanctions were intended to help students with future decision-making by learning critical-thinking and problem-solving skills. For example, students assigned sanctions related to alcohol consumption were expected to learn ways to reduce the risk associated with drinking, and students assigned conflict resolution sanctions were expected to learn ways to manage anger. Stacy also expected these same students to gain overall critical-thinking and problem-solving skills while learning to reduce risk associated with drinking and ways to manage anger. According to Stacy, students that are able to learn broad critical-thinking and problem-solving skills were less likely to repeat the same behaviors.

Madison disclosed similar perceptions of learning obtained by students after participating in the SCP. Dissimilar to KU and Stacy, Madison linked learning associated with the SCP to what he described as formal learning outcomes (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015). Madison shared that the formal learning outcomes were developed over the past year, but had not been fully implemented or assessed for effectiveness. According to Madison, the formal outcomes were created to make sure “SCAs focused on specific predetermined content, and that student understood the intended end results of

the SC process (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015). As shared by Madison, the formal learning outcomes of the SCP at the research site are:

1. Students will demonstrate the ability to reflect on their ethical development and explore their decision-making process.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to take responsibility for their behaviors and decisions, and explore the impact of their behaviors and decisions on others in the community.
3. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the Student Conduct Code and Community Living Standards.
4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of, and ability to utilize, campus resources.
5. Students will demonstrate an understanding of how the Student Conduct Code supports the university community. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

Madison, Stacy, and KU's explanation of the conduct process as an opportunity for student learning is supported by the current conduct literature.

The literature clearly supports that the disciplinary proceedings are and should be a learning opportunity for students with intentional outcomes (Allen 1994; Howell, 2005; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). According to Goldstein and Stimpson (2013) "the overarching learning outcomes associated with the SCP consist of students' understanding of community standards, recognizing responsibility as a community member, and taking personal responsibility for choices and actions" (p. 43).

Additionally, the literature supports that the conduct process and actual sanctions should be tied to intentional learning outcomes focused on students learning how to critically think, problem-solve, and reflect about their behavior to prevent similar future behavioral issues (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; & Mullan, 1999). The literature is also clear that assessment and evaluation are instrumental in determining whether overall learning outcomes have been achieved and program effectiveness. This type of

assessment seems to be missing based on the findings shared by the SCAs beyond anecdotal measurements (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

The SCAs revealed that learning is an important aspect of the conduct process, but disclosed that they were not formally assessing the effectiveness of the process beyond tracking types and frequency of violations. KU and Stacy did share that they both use anecdotal feedback and observations of and from students to measure learning. Specifically, Stacy explained,

I don't know if we measure outcomes. This is a better question for my supervisor. The biggest measure for me of whether a student gets it, is if they become a repeat offender. So if we see them in our office again for the exact same thing that feels like a failure to us as we feel the student did not learn anything. (Stacy, interview, 1/22/2015)

Madison shared similar insights concerning the lack of assessing the overall program effectiveness and actual student learning. According to Madison,

At the moment and to my knowledge there is no measurement of our outcomes. There is some anecdotal measurement through observations of how a student felt and reacted to the process while going through the process. Also, we can look at repeat offenders and make some determinations from that. We don't have a high recidivism rate, which is a wonderful thing, but we don't know if that is because the student learned something or because they figured out a better way to not get caught. I want to look at this in the future, but there is not any type of systematic way of looking at this right now. I hope to assess this in the future through a follow up survey at the minimum. (Madison, interview, 2/3/2015)

The lack of consistent formal outcomes and assessment of program effectiveness illuminates a possible disconnect between the literature and the conduct process at the research site. According to Dannells (1997), the ability to fully understand the actual learning that is occurring or not occurring in the conduct process would aid the SCAs in enhancing conduct processes and support services to reduce behavioral issues and possibly recidivism. A clear understanding of consistent and measurable outcomes seems

to be missing based on the findings provided by the SCAs and possibly provides an opportunity to improve the process by realigning with assessment outcomes and industry standards (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

The overall findings in category five demonstrate that the SCAs perceive that learning is important and is a basic tenet of the SC process. The SCAs argued that students participating in the SCP learn about the (a) disciplinary proceedings; (b) their rights and responsibilities; (c) impact of behaviors; (d) self-advocacy, (e) critical thinking and problem-solving skills; and (f) campus resources. These conclusions are supported by the current literature. Additionally, the SCAs asserted that creating a welcoming and supportive environment reinforced learning, which was developed by rapport building, allowing students to ask questions, and explaining the SCP. However, the SCAs also revealed that there may be a lack of consistency in the area of learning outcomes and measurement of overall program effectiveness based on no formal assessment beyond anecdotal feedback from students. This discovery provides a possible opportunity to explore the overall effectiveness through the use of assessment and evaluation. This concludes the discussion of categories and basic tenets of the SCP from the perspective of the student conduct administrators. A brief discussion of overall research findings based on the relevance of the interviews with the SCAs is presented next.

Summary of Findings

Overall, the research involving conduct administrators revealed five categories that emerged as the basic tenets of the conduct process at the research site, which directly answers question one of this study. According to the SCAs, the basic tenets of the conduct process are (a) understanding the overall purpose of the conduct process; (b)

student behavior influences; (c) the actual conduct process and need for consistency; (d) a supportive student experience; and (e) focus on student learning. These findings illuminate that the SCAs believe that all five basic tenets are critical for the SCP to be impactful. Additionally, these findings demonstrate a strong correlation between the SCA's description of the process and that of prior research findings (Allen 1994; Chassey, 1999; Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Mullan, 1999 Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Pavela, 1997 & 2006; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; Stoner, 2000; Stoner, 2008; Stoner & Cerminara, 1990; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004).

Additionally, this research revealed that the SCAs emphasized that learning is a foundational and important part of the SCP, which is influenced by creating a supportive experience during the disciplinary proceedings that is consistent, supportive, fair, and just. However, the SCAs also revealed that there might be a lack of consistency in the area of formal learning and experiential outcomes and measurement of overall program effectiveness based on no formal assessment beyond anecdotal feedback from students. This discovery provides a possible opportunity to explore the overall effectiveness through the use of assessment and evaluation, which the current literature emphasizes, is important for an effective conduct process (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

The findings discussed in this chapter reveal strong connections to the conduct literature, but demonstrate a need for broader understanding to determine overall SCP effectiveness. The effectiveness of the SCP influence on student learning and future behavior is discussed next from the perspective of fifteen students that participated in this study after being found responsible for violating university policy from August 2012 – September 2014.

CHAPTER 5

STUDENT FINDINGS

The purpose of this study is to examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and influence on their learning and future behaviors. The study also compares the experiences of students to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. This chapter presents the findings associated with the research questions concerning 15 students' perceptions of their conduct experience and influence on future decision-making. Additionally, this chapter discusses the three categories that emerged in the coding process and their relation to the current body of student conduct literature. The categories are (a) behavioral choices; (b) students' experiences in the conduct process; and (c) identified learning and influence on future behaviors. Furthermore, Robert Kegan's theory of Evolution of Consciousness and Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of Moral Development are used to help explain ways in which "students think, reason, and make meaning" of their experience in the conduct process and future-decision making related to misbehavior (Evans et al., 2010, p. 43). Finally, this chapter concludes with a summary of findings.

A final comparison between students and administrators is discussed in chapter six demonstrating similarities and differences between administrators' desired outcomes and students' actual perception of their conduct experience.

Research Questions – Students

1. What are the experiences of students that have participated in the conduct process?
 - a. How do students describe their experience with the conduct process?

- b. What meaning do students make of their conduct experience?
 - c. What aspect of the conduct process provides more meaning? Why?
2. How does the conduct process influence future decision-making and behaviors?
- a. What are students learning by participating in the conduct process?
 - b. How have students applied their learning from the conduct process?
 - c. What aspects of the process influence future decision-making and behavior?

Category One: Behavioral Choices

The category of behavioral choices emerged in the coding process and encompassed the varying types of violations and possible behavioral influences that required students to participate in the conduct process. This category illustrates the complexities of student behavioral issues and why the study participants made decisions to engage in activities associated with violating university policies. The type of violations, possible influences, and additional behavior shared by students not addressed by the conduct process are discussed in this section.

Types of Violations

The students from the study reported participating in varying types of policy violations, the majority of which took place off-campus, but near the main campus of the research site. There were a total of 20 reported incidents involving 29 alleged violations of university policy. The alleged violations described by the students included possession and use of alcohol and drugs, underage drinking, public intoxication, disorderly conduct and intimidation, indecency, failure to comply, providing false identification, academic dishonesty, smoking, and noise. Like many of the students in

the study, 21-year-old nursing student Judy described getting in trouble for underage drinking during her freshman year and being forthright in claiming responsibility for her actions involving excessive noise and underage use of alcohol. Judy was also adamant that she and her friends were not smoking marijuana and argued that the policy charge misrepresented the situation. Judy shared,

The violations were alcohol, noise, and drug incidents that took place on-campus in a first-year residence hall. The drug violation was not really ours, as we were only drinking in the room, not using drugs. I think the drug charge was due to someone else smoking in the hall and it was just placed on us since we were drinking and having a good time. (Judy, interview, 3/3/2015)

Similarly, Clark, a 23-year-old business management student, shared that he was also charged with an alcohol violation, but explained that the incident took place off-campus and involved a fight with another student. Clark argued that everything was a misunderstanding and that he was in the wrong place at the wrong time when the police arrived. Specifically, Clark said,

There was an off-campus house party and someone thought I was choking a girl friend of mine and called the cops. After the cops had broken up the party, I was walking away and some guy blew cigarette smoke in my face. I got heated, started to curse, and yell at him for blowing the cigarette smoke in my face. The guy called me a name and walked away. I ran after him and grabbed him by the back of his hair trying to rip off his sunglasses. Right then the same cops that broke up the party saw all of this and arrested me. (Clark, interview, 3/2/2015)

Judy and Clark described experiences related to varying levels of violations, but both reported that alcohol was the core violation. Another student, Ross, a 21-year-old international studies major, explained similar experiences, but was found responsible for violating university policy through three separate incidents during different time periods involving alcohol. According to Ross,

All three incidents involved the use of alcohol, underage drinking, intoxication, and false identification. The false identification was bought at a local

establishment near main campus. The campus bar used to be really relaxed about identification, but now they are really strict and I got busted. (Ross, interview, 3/13/2015)

Unlike Judy, Clark, and Ross, Andy, a 20-year-old kinesiology/pre-med student, was not involved with alcohol, but did report being found responsible for plagiarizing on a paper. Andy explained that he did not want to complete the required work for a class in which he was no longer interested and thought a little help from the Internet would not be noticed. Andy claimed,

I plagiarized on a paper for my history class. In high school, I never had any challenging papers and I came to college thinking I wanted to study journalism. I realized right away that I did not want to pursue journalism, but I was not able to get out of the classes I was taking. I was in a history class where the final assignment was on the Boston Tea Party. I hate history and wanted nothing to do with the final paper. My friend and I did the paper together and used information from the Internet. I did try to make it work and not just copy and paste everything I found. I did do some work on it, but copied a lot from online articles. (Andy, interview, 3/16/2015)

Overall, after participating in the SCP, students reported violating and being found responsible for 25 out of the 29 violations. Sixteen of these violations were directly related to alcohol and drug use and were reported to take place mainly during participants' first year of attending the research site university. The types of violations described by the students reveal that alcohol use was at the core of a majority of behavior issues described in this study. Additionally, the study illuminated that the use of alcohol allows students to unwind, connect with peers, and have a good time. Students' inability to connect with peers and relax without alcohol illustrates a need for further understanding of how college students develop and make decisions, which will be discussed at the close of this category.

The types of violations reported by the student participants are typical of offenses found in the conduct literature. Previous research agrees that current college disciplinary problems consist of academic dishonesty, underage alcohol use and intoxication, recreational and prescription drugs, disorderly conduct and violence (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; O'Reilly & Evans, 2007; & Paterson & Gregory, 2013; & Paterson & Kibler, 2008). The literature also finds that college student disciplinary problems may consist of bullying, hazing, stealing, sexual misconduct and major violence, which this study did not encounter due to the participants that responded or issues of sexual misconduct that were avoided (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; O'Reilly & Evans, 2007; & Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler, 2008; & White House 2014). According to the literature, college disciplinary problems may result in hospitalization, incarceration, lawsuits, academic failure and removal from campus living and/or possibly the university, fines, and student death (Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; O'Reilly & Evans, 2007; & Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Paterson & Kibler, 2008; & White House 2014). None of the students interviewed reported being kicked out of on-campus housing or the university, but did emphasize that they were exceedingly scared of similar outcomes when being notified that they had to participate in the SCP. The findings presented in this section reveal that the research participants were engaging in similar types of violations as those discussed in the conduct literature mentioned above and in some cases experienced similar negative consequences. These results are significant as they highlight the need for administrators to further explore ways to create proactive opportunities to prevent said behaviors beyond what is already being offered. Additionally, these findings highlight the need for continual evaluation and assessment of

current conduct systems to determine effective methods to address similar complex disciplinary concerns as presented in these findings (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996). Finally, the results related to the broad types of behavioral violations provide insight into the need for a comprehensive approach from across the university to address behaviors that seem to continue on campuses across the globe. Reported behavioral influences are discussed next and illustrate students' rationale for engaging in behaviors that lead to the conduct process.

Behavioral Influences

Behavioral influences emerged as a possible rationale for why students engage in behaviors that violate university policy. Students that participated in this study exposed varying factors that may have encouraged them to engage in activities that violate university policy and require them to participate in the conduct process. According to the students, behavioral influences involved college transition and academic issues, peers and social interactions, living arrangements, being rebellious, and inebriation. These subcategories are discussed next and illustrate the complexity of behavioral influences reported by the students, which, if better understood, may provide college and universities greater insight into ways to support students before behavioral issues occur.

Emily, a 22-year old international student with an undeclared major and Tom, a 19-year-old domestic student from a rural community studying finance, described similar experiences with struggling to navigate college transition and challenging academic issues. Both reported being first year students during the time of their incidents and feeling overwhelmed with transitioning from high school to college. According to Emily, transitioning to a new country, the desire to find friends and fit in, and her struggle with

academics significantly influenced her behaviors and caused her to make bad decisions.

Emily shared,

I was going through a lot of pain in my life when all this happened related to academics, finance, and issues related to my family. My parents and I were working through some personal conflicts that made life really overwhelming, especially as an international student. I was taking really hard and high-level English courses that I should not have been taking. It was my first time in a different country, different language, and different culture. It was really hard and intense. Additionally, I was getting bad grades and making bad decisions. My parents kept saying that the family fund was not that much and I better not waste any of the money. My social life was going through a rough time and I was still figuring out who were my friends. I was trying to be social and finding a group. Going out and drinking was my way to meet people and decompress. (Emily, interview, 3/12/2015)

Likewise, Tom explained that his transition from a rural community to an urban environment was overwhelming and provided ample opportunities for Tom to acquire alcohol. Tom also described that his challenging course load and wanting to unwind played a major role in his decision to drink irresponsibly. Tom conveyed,

This was my first semester of my first year of college. I did not drink as much in my small town before college. When you hit college it is like a culture shock and you adjust to a life style where you tend to go overboard a bit. Being on your own around so many people with such a large social network makes drinking easy. I grew up in a small town and went to a small high school. There were not a lot of parties around. I would just drink with a small group of friends and there were no reasons to go overboard. Going to college where there are over 30,000 kids makes it really hard not to drink more. I just walked out of my dorm and the parties were everywhere. It was easy to find a party and alcohol. I really think that what got me to black out that evening was that I had a really hard week at school. Additionally, I was around people pre-gaming and wanted to keep up with them. (Tom, interview, 3/13/2015)

Tom and Emily's account of their experience with college transition and managing challenging academic issues reveal that both students were possibly ill prepared and lacked adequate coping skills and support needed to navigate such issues as first year students. Additionally, Tom and Emily's explanation of their similar experiences

illuminates the insurmountable stress that both students endured while struggling to navigate and manage living away from home and being on their own for the first time. The use of alcohol seemed to be the main coping mechanism that helped both students manage their stress and ease their anxiety about trying to fit in and meet their peer expectations. References to the type of information provided by Tom and Emily concerning behavioral influences were limited in the conduct literature, but are supported by the broader literature concerning first year college student transition. College student transition literature exposes that that many first year college students lack adequate skills needed to manage the nuances associated with college, including, but not limited to, navigating new environments and relationships, academic pressure, greater personal freedom, time management, and physical/mental changes related to moving through adolescent development into being an adult (Ishler, 2005 & Tinto, 1993). Additionally, the literature suggests that colleges and universities combat such issues by providing programs and services that support students learning ways to cope and navigate similar issues before and after issues arise (Ishler, 2005; Ishler & Upcraft, 2005; & Hirsh, 2013). Examples of such programs and services consist of providing students with opportunities to develop social skills, critical thinking, self-awareness and reflection, meaningful relationship and awareness of others, collaboration, and decision-making (Ishler, 2005; Ishler & Upcraft, 2005; & Hirsh, 2013). The information presented related to college student behavior may better assist administrators in exploring ways to further support students navigating transition issues to help prevent and/or manage behavioral issues before or after they occur. This data demonstrates the need for a broader understanding

of ways in which first year college students navigate transition issues, which when unchecked and unsupported may lead to disciplinary concerns.

Emily, Amber, and Tom described similar experiences and described peer and social interactions as a major influence on their behavioral actions. Each individual described the need to be accepted by peers and fitting in as being of significant importance to their college experience, which influenced decisions to just go along with the crowd and engage in risky behavior. Emily, the only international student in the study, was adamant that her behavior was directly related to the pressure she felt from her peers during the night of her incident. Emily asserted,

The people at the party influenced me to drink. Everyone was doing it and I thought I needed to do it too. I wanted to be liked and fit in with others, so I got in the line to get my drink. Your peers will not accept you as one of them if you don't do certain things like drinking or going to parties. People think you are not social if you don't participate. It is important to be seen as social and as one of the group. It is important to be seen as one of the group or you will just need to stay home. People will not want to hang out with you if you are not in the group. Being part of the group is seen as important for college students. (Emily, interview, 3/12/2015)

Emily's insight into peer pressure revealed that her decision-making was heavily influenced by her peers and exposes Emily's strong desire to belong and connect with others. Emily's struggle to make decisions without the influence of her peers and the need to belong exposes significant opportunity for colleges and universities to explore ways to support similar students struggling to fit in and connect with others.

Additionally, Emily's experience as an international student provides insight into a specific group of students who may be experiencing similar issues associated with trying to fit in and connect with peers that may be more difficult due to being in a new environment away from familiar friends and support systems.

Amber, a 20-year-old art student, reported similar findings to Emily and expressed feeling significant pressure from peers to do things that she would not normally do in order to fit in. Amber communicated that she just wanted to not be seen as an outsider or outcast. Like Emily, it was imperative for Amber to be seen as going along with the crowd and fitting in with her peers. Amber claimed,

Sometimes people are really pushy and pressure you to do things you would not normally do. If you don't give in to the peer pressure, people will degrade you and treat you differently. You have to prove them wrong, but in reality it is probably not the way to go. (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Similar to Emily and Amber, Tom, the finance major, reported a strong desire to fit in and go along with his peers in social settings. Tom expressed the need to keep up with his peers when drinking so as not to stand out as different and unwilling to go along with the crowd. Tom reported,

If others are drinking you want to keep up with them. You don't want to be the kid that does not drink or only drinks a little. You want to be at everyone else's level of drinking and intoxication. You don't want to be the kid not following along. (Tom, interview, 3/13/2015)

Tom, Amber, and Emily all reported struggling to make informed and well-thought-out decisions when influenced by peers. Their similar experiences and those of the other 12 students that participated in the study reveal that college students may not be fully equipped during their first couple of years to think independently and may require more support to learn how to navigate similar complex issues.

Previous research supports that being accepted by others including peer groups is a critical aspect of college student development and transition (Evans et al., 2010). College student development theory supports that students are moving from relying on parents and moving toward understanding their surroundings, seeking support through

external validation, and intimacy through peer interaction (Evans et al., 2010, Kegan, Broderick, Drago-Severson, Helsing, Popp, & Portnow, 2001; Kohlberg 1975 & 1976; & Paul & Kelleher, 1985). Both Kegan et al. (2001) and Kohlberg's (1976) theoretical frameworks emphasize that that students' development at this phase are driven by the need for creating social roles by pleasing and seeking approval from others. Both theorists argue that students are better able to manage their emotions than at previous stages of development, but rely heavily on validation from others (Colby, Kohlberg, and Kauffman, 1987, Kegan, 1994; Kegan et al., 2001; & Kohlberg 1975 & 1976).

Tom, Amber, and Emily's experiences directly correlate with the current body of literature focused on peer influence related to influencing behaviors, especially those connected to alcohol use. Additional research focused on social norms emphasizes that college student behavior is persuaded by misjudgment of what peers may be doing (Berkowitz, 2004). The thought process for students is that they need to give in to peer pressure because others are doing the same thing (Berkowitz, 2004). Research conducted by Berkowitz & Perkins (1986) supports that this is evident with college students and their drinking behaviors. Berkowitz & Perkins (1986) supports that college students habitually misjudge behavior related to alcohol consumption, and, therefore increase consumption based these assumptions, which has been reported to be disproportionate to how much peers are actually drinking.

The evidence presented demonstrates the need for colleges and universities to focus attention on helping students learn ways to positively navigate social interactions without the use or moderation of substances. Developing alternative ways for students to meet and socialize may help them connect and learn to fit in without needing to engage in

high-risk behavior. The need to fit in was extremely high for all participants in the study and demonstrates a basic need for positive peer influence and messaging that normalizes positive decision-making and moderation of behaviors such as substance use.

Living arrangements were an additional factor that students reported influenced their behavior. A majority of the student participants reported living off-campus during the time of their incidents, which they described as providing freedom from adult supervision and the opportunity to engage in behavior that would not have been permitted while living in on-campus housing or at home. Roxeanne, a second-year student during the time of her incident, studying public health, and living off-campus for the first time, reported engaging in numerous situations she may not have experienced living on-campus or at home. Roxeanne shared,

This was the first time that my friends and I had our own apartment's off-campus and so we were having big parties with lots of people. This was our first time that we were able to openly drink without being worried about adults being around. I think that I just did not understand that I needed to stay in the house when I was drinking and instead walked across the street with my wine. I did not know my limits. I was not even thinking. I was just going from one house to the next house with my wine. I was not used to any of this and just made decisions without thinking. (Roxeanne, interview, 2/27/2015)

Roxeanne described not feeling prepared to live on her own and confused about ways to navigate her newfound freedom of living without adult supervision.

Ross, an international business student who reported being involved in three separate incidents, shared similar struggles of managing his freedom of living away from adult supervision and living in an environment with little or no accountability. Ross described,

I was living in an off-campus apartment complex as a first year student and could do whatever the fuck I wanted. Students and the management were smoking weed together with their doors open. My roommates were 21 and could drink in

their room. We could do whatever we wanted, which were nothing like on-campus living dorms where there were rules and people to enforce the rules. (Ross, interview, 3/13/2015)

Roxeanne and Ross's description of their experiences illustrates that similar students living off-campus and without adult supervision may struggle with newfound freedom and decision-making. These findings provide further insight into ways living arrangements influence decision-making; especially when there are little or no community behavioral expectations and when accountability measures are absent. Additionally, these findings reveal that living arrangements without structure and accountability may lead to more frequent disciplinary concerns for students ill-equipped to live on their own or in environments lacking structure and support.

Prior research supports the results associated with living arrangements and students feeling inadequately prepared to navigate the freedom of being on their own and without adult supervision (Evans et al., 2010). The literature supports that students need high-levels of support and structure in managing new complex situations that, if not obtaining, may result in similar issues presented by Roxeanne and Ross (Kegan, 1994). Kegan (1994) and Ignelzi (2000) argued that entry level college students struggle more to make decisions on their own, and need intentional support and time to fully mature to adulthood. This requires students to move from viewing the world and making decisions through a codependent relational approach to making meaning and decisions independently while taking responsibility for their actions (Kegan et al., 2001; & Kegan, 1994). Kegan refers to this as moving from order 3: socialized mind to order 4: self-authoring mind (Kegan et al., 2001; & Kegan, 1994).

Additionally, the research establishes that the required type of support needed to help college students successfully navigate issues requires a “consciousness bridge,” which is when direct and intentional support from administrators, faculty, and peers may help students move from one developmental level to another (Kegan, 1994, p. 278). The “bridge” is where students can safely exist while learning new ways of thinking through situations, and gain structure and guidance while performing new tasks (Kegan, 1994). Love and Guthrie (1999) argue that to help students move from order 3 to order 4, students need to have clear understanding of behavioral expectations and their responsibilities in meeting these expectations, while self-reflecting on ways others perceive their actions compared to their own views.

The evidence presented on living arrangements provides valuable insight that may assist administrators when creating programs and services for students preparing to manage similar issues with navigating newly found freedom. Additionally, these findings demonstrate the need for a broader use of intentional support that recognizes that all students are at different developmental levels, which needs to be taken into consideration when creating similar “bridges” as referenced in the literature findings. Furthermore, these results demonstrate a need to better understand ways students currently navigate living on their own and manage decisions associated with limited structure, supervision, and support, in order to better understand ways to offer assistance.

Inebriation is the final subcategory that students reported as a behavioral influence. A majority of students explained that being inebriated lowered their inhibitions and may have caused them to engage in high-risk behavior, including challenging authority, being rebellious, and being verbally/physically aggressive. Many

of the students explained that underage drinking and being inebriated were part of the college experience, and reported thinking they would never get caught breaking the rules.

Specifically, Amber, a 20-year-old art student, said,

It was my birthday weekend and I was walking around with a friend looking for a party. I'm not sure why, but we were rebellious and had open cans of alcohol out while we were walking around the streets near, but off-campus. I felt like I did not care because it was a shitty night and we could not find a party. It was my birthday weekend and the evening was not going well. I was being rebellious that evening, which is how I am when I'm drunk or mad. My friend was in town and I did not want to disappoint my friend because it was her first time visiting me at college and in the city. I did not want to disappoint my friend and plus I did not think we would get caught. I think all college students think they will not get caught and that they're invincible. That was not the case the evening I got busted. (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Amber's description of her experience exposes that Amber thought she was above reproach since she was drunk, it was her birthday, and because she thought she was never going to get caught breaking the rules. Amber's inability to take ownership of her actions while inebriated reveals that inebriation becomes an excuse for behavior. Amber's thought process exposes how inebriation may impact others students in similar situations who, according to Amber, believe they "are invincible and never going to get caught engaging in underage drinking and being intoxicated" (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Like Amber, Clark, a 23-year-old business management student, experienced a similar situation that he believed was mainly caused by being inebriated. Clark shared that during his actual incident that he thought the alcohol and someone else provoked his behavior. Similar to Amber, Clark was not able to take ownership for his behavior and blamed being intoxicated as justification for acting out. Clark claimed,

I was drinking and somewhat intoxicated. I guess the alcohol made me more aggressive. I would have probably told the other student off because he was in my business. I think alcohol made me more aggressive during the second situation making me put my hands on the guy that blew smoke in my face. The

kid that called the cops on me made me really mad. I got pissed since the cops were called on me and I was told to leave the party. I think the alcohol, party atmosphere, and the guy not drinking may have influenced me, but I really think the environment was fun and the guy had no business being in my business. The guy influenced my behavior and made me mad. He was not drinking and not feeling good like the rest of us. (Clark, interview, 3/2/2015)

Clark and Amber's reported experiences highlight that they used being inebriated as a rationale for their decision-making. This type of thinking reveals that similar students may also view being inebriated as an excuse for similar conduct.

Similar thinking related to rationalization was supported by previous research that suggest that this type of thinking is related to cognitive development and the ways students "think, reason, and make meaning of their experiences" (Evans et al., 2010, p. 43). Kegan's (1994) evolution of consciousness theoretical framework emphasizes that colleges expect students to be self-sufficient, which is sometimes not possible based on their developmental readiness. Kegan's (1994) framework suggests that some college students may not have the ability to take ownership for their behaviors, which may lead to rationalization and blaming others. As discussed previously, Kegan's "bridge" is a way to support students taking responsibility and where students can safely exist while learning new ways of thinking through situations, and gain structure and guidance while performing new tasks (1994).

The findings associated with inebriation and rationalization of decision-making illustrate that some students may be operating at a developmental level where they are unable to take responsibility for their actions. The results illuminate the potential of implementing Kegan's "bridge" as a way to support students moving from rationalizing their drinking to considering ways to drink more responsibly and take ownership of their actions (1994). These findings provide an opportunity for colleges and universities to

enhance efforts to support students struggling with behaviors that occur while students are under the influence of substances and/or inebriated. Such knowledge may help parents better prepare their students for substance use and assist colleges and university administrators in more fully supporting students struggling with similar discipline due to inebriation.

Overall, students described varying factors that they believed influenced their behaviors. These factors included students (a) struggling to manage college transition and difficult academic issues; (b) high levels of peer pressure and social interactions; (c) unstructured living arrangements; (d) lack of expectations and accountability; and (e) the use of being inebriated as a rationale for conduct. Similarly, these findings are supported by the literature shared in the section. Scholars agree that today's college students continue to struggle with behavioral issues, which may be directly related to their lack of conflict resolution skills, transition to college and major mental health issues, economic hardship, and the inability to negotiate complex situations without the assistance from their parents (Hirsch, 2013; Paterson & Kibler, 2008; & Tinto, 1993). The literature and the information shared by study participants reveals the need for greater emphasis on intentional services and programs designed to help students navigate college transition, decision-making, and academic difficulties, which may help prevent behaviors.

The category of behavioral choices demonstrates the types of behaviors that participants reported engaging in and possible influences of their behavior for violated university policy. The research presented in this section supports the importance of understanding the types and influences of college student behavior to determine appropriate approaches and learning outcomes needed to address behaviors. The findings

in this section illuminate that students are struggling with transition issues and substance use, which may help administrators better assess the effectiveness of current efforts to address similar issues. Additionally, the findings in this section review the importance of taking developmental needs into consideration when creating ways to support students before and after disciplinary issues arise. This concludes the behavioral choices category. Perceptions of students' experiences after participating in the conduct process are discussed next.

Category Two: Students' Experiences

The category of students' experiences emerged in the coding procedures and includes the ways study participants experienced and made meaning of the SCP. This category reveals that students from the study have varying experiences, which they attribute to (a) their limited understanding and timeliness of the conduct process; (b) being able to verbally share perspective of their alleged incident; (c) being able to ask questions; and (d) the significant relationship and interactions established by the SCA. Anxiety and stressfulness of the process, and perceptions of fairness and support, emerged as the most significant student experiences in the conduct process, which are each discussed in this section.

Anxiety Provoking and Stressful

Anxiety provoking and stressful emerged as one of the ways many of the students described their experience in the conduct process, which is discussed in depth next. Students ascribed this anxiety and stress to not fully understanding the overall process and the possible outcomes associated with their violations. Additionally, students emphasized that the amount of time required and on a few occasions, the lack of

timeliness during the conduct process prolonged issues of anxiety and stress, which students reported distracted them from academic and personal obligations. Tom, Andy, Amber, and Jimmy were selected because their findings are most reflective of the anxiety and fear associated with going through the conduct process.

Tom, a student charged with an alcohol violation after a blackout off-campus, asserted that the lack of timeliness in being notified of his alleged violation created prolonged anxiety and stress. Tom described working through his own concerns with his behavior and believing that he had gotten away without “getting in trouble” with the university. Tom was notified that he needed to participate in the conduct process a month after the original incident, which Tom claimed caused his anxiety and stress to resurface. Particularly, Tom shared that he had taken a hard look at his behavior after his incident and was finally getting over the shame and embarrassment of getting “busted by the cops” when he was notified of the conduct process. Tom said,

I thought to myself, wow, you really screwed up and you can't be doing this. This is not like you. By the time I was finally notified, I was feeling better about getting in trouble because I had forgotten about it. I remember the process being really stretched out because I was not notified for over a month. I've heard from other students that they received the conduct email much closer to the time of their incident. I did not get my email until a month after my incident stating that I needed to meet with someone. I was like, that was a close call. Then I got the email and thought, guess it was not a close call and I am actually in trouble. I'm not sure and no one ever explained why my notification was so late. The lateness of the process made me think I had gotten away with it. I was like, damn it; I did not get away with that. It created more stress since I had already put it somewhat behind me. It would have been more helpful if they had let me know sooner so I was not worrying about it. (Tom, interview, 3/13/2015)

Similarly, other students explained that the conduct process from start to finish required multiple meetings with administrators causing what was described as undue prolonged anxiety and stress. Andy, a student involved in an underage alcohol violation

described feeling annoyed and nervous that his conduct process took multiple visits. Andy shared, “it was frustrating that I had to go back to meet with the SCA multiple times. The entire process took 10 different days and was spanned out over 3-4 months. The entire process lingered for months” (Andy, interview, 3/11/2015).

Andy and Tom’s experience with the lack of promptness and amount of time required for the conduct process reveals that students are seeking a quick response from administrators when needing to address behavioral issues. The findings presented illustrate that some students from this study view the conduct process as taking longer than expected, which may help administrators find ways to further inform students about the conduct experience and improve the timeliness associated with completing the actual disciplinary process. Additionally, these findings reveal that delays in the conduct notification process may create undue anxiety and stress for students, which may help administrators improve ways students experience the conduct process through exploring the timeliness of notifications to students. Students from the study agreed that a quick and straightforward process would be more beneficial when helping alleviate overall stress and anxiety associated with participating in the disciplinary process.

Jimmy and Amber were two additional students who described their conduct process experience as stressful and anxiety provoking, which they attributed to having limited information pertaining to the SCP and the possible outcomes connected with their specific violations. Jimmy, a student charged with academic dishonesty, claimed that his feelings of anxiousness and stress were associated with being unfamiliar with the disciplinary process expectations and the possible outcomes related to his behavior. Jimmy claimed,

I went into the conduct meeting thinking I was going to get kicked out of the university. I was like shitting myself I was so scared. While in the process, I chose an administrative hearing so I could get everything over with quickly. I wanted to expedite the process if at all possible and did not want to make it into something bigger than it needed to be. I just wanted to keep moving everything forward so I would not be consumed with thinking about everything. It stresses you out. My mind gets all stressed out with things like this and I did not want to prolong the stress and anxiety. I just wanted to move forward and not relive things over and over again in my mind. It made me stressed and anxious, which distracts from other stuff that I was supposed to be doing. (Jimmy, interview, 3/16/2015)

Similarly, Amber, a student charged with an alcohol related violation, shared her trepidation with the conduct process and associated it with not fully understanding the overall process. Specifically, Amber revealed,

The conduct meeting was a one-on-one meeting with an older adult woman. I remember feeling scared and guilty. I was thinking, shit, what is going to happen to me? The meeting with the SCA was like meeting with an older person that you are worried they are frowning upon you and just going to treat you like a kid. Going through the process made me feel like I was a bad person. I did not feel great about it. I made jokes with my friends to cover up how I was feeling. I did not want them to know how I was really feeling. (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Amber and Jimmy's description of their anxiety and fear supports that the disciplinary process can be overwhelming for some students and especially those unaware of what to expect from their experience and possible outcomes associated with the overall process. Additionally, Amber and Jimmy's experiences emphasize the importance of students quickly gaining information about how the conduct process works and possible outcomes to help alleviate undue anxiety and stress. These findings provide greater insight about ways students perceive their conduct experience, which may help administrators further develop opportunities for students to learn about the overall process before violations occur.

Overall, this study reveals that the students interviewed here are experiencing anxiety and stress associated with having participated in the conduct process. Additionally, this study shows that timing connected to the process, and students' limited knowledge about the actual process and possible outcomes, are linked to creating an experience that is anxiety provoking and stressful. Previous research supports that students experienced heightened levels of stress and anxiety associated with going through the conduct process (Howell, 2005). Howell's research found that a majority of students that participated in their study experienced heightened levels of stress and anxiety related to "confusion and uncertainty" about the actual conduct process and possible impact on "their academic careers" (2005, p. 387). Additional literature associated with the actual conduct process' connection to anxiety and stress is limited. According to Hudd, Dumlao, Erdmann-Sager, Murray, Phan, Soukas, & Yokozuka (2000) the overall body of adolescent literature supports that increased levels of stress and anxiety have direct impact on suicidal thoughts (Hirsch & Ellis, 1996); tobacco use (Naquin & Gilbert, 1996), and alcohol consumption (Morgan, 1997 & McCormack, 1996). Additional research supports that mental health issues in general, with which stress and anxiety are associated, may impact concentration levels and consequently academic performance (Dickstein & Christensen, 2008; Lumley & Provenzano 2003; & Struthers, Perry, & Menec, 2000).

These findings are significant as they provide information that may help administrators further explore ways to create a more positive experience void of undue anxiety and stress for students participating in the conduct process. Further emphasis focused on a timelier conduct process and additional educational efforts on the conduct

system and behavior expectations may help alleviate undue stress associated with the findings in this section.

Fairness

Fairness emerged as another way students described their experience in the conduct process, which is discussed in depth next. Many of the participants reported being treated fairly while going through the SCP, which they attributed to being able to share their side of the alleged violations and ask questions. Having a voice and being able to tell his side of story was a vital aspect of the process for Xavier, which he described as creating a fair process for his experience. Xavier, a student studying philosophy and Spanish, had multiple encounters with the conduct office and explained in his interview that it was extremely important for him to have the opportunity to tell his side of the story, be heard, and ask questions. Specifically, Xavier shared,

It was important to have the opportunity to share my side of the story since they already had the cops' [side of the story]. You can't get to an understanding of something unless you have all the information. Sharing my side of the story provided that additional missing information. It was important that I got to share my story and not someone else because it was my story. I think it is also important to be able to ask any questions and feel that you are not going to get judged for not knowing something. (Xavier, interview, 3/9/2015)

Xavier's emphasis on being able to share his story was echoed by the majority of other participants, and was described as being able to be heard and have a voice in the SC process.

Similarly, Tom, a finance student, conveyed that being able to have a voice was of major importance in the disciplinary process. Specifically, Tom claimed,

The conduct person went over the facts of the case and asked my side of the story. They remained neutral and allowed me to share my experience, which was helpful to be able to talk and process the incident. At that point, I made sure I was honest and refrained from sharing a conflicting story. I was not trying to save myself. It

was really helpful to share my side of the story so that I felt heard. I felt that what I had to say mattered, even if I was going to found guilty. I could have lied, but I just wanted to be honest. (Tom, interview, 3/13/2015)

Tom's experience with being able to tell his side of the story while the "SCA remained neutral" reveals that SCAs may have a significant role in how students experience the conduct process. Tom was not able to fully explain why it was important to be able to share his side of the story, but argued that it was vitally important that the "SCA listened and refrained from talking down to [him]" (Tom, interview, 2015). Tom's explanation of needing to be respected and not patronized illustrates the benefit of when SCAs fully understand the gravity of their role and create an experience that is open to students sharing their perspective of alleged incidents without verbal or nonverbal signs of ridicule.

Judy, a nursing student, had a similar experience, but was better able to articulate the importance of students having the opportunity to share perspective during the SCP. Judy claimed that having a voice and being heard helped her open up to the process and made her less likely to shut down. Judy shared that she experienced a fair SCP, which she attributed to being able to describe in detail her side of the alleged violations to a hearing board, and that the board seemed to be attentively listening to her story without interrupting. Specifically, Judy said,

The chair listening made me more open instead of shutting down. I would have just shut down and been like whatever if the chair would have kept talking or talked over us. So by her not speaking, it made me share the events of the night better. I was able to get my side of the story out. Telling my story was important. It is frustrating when you read the RA's report because my side of the story is missing. The hearing allowed me to tell my side of the story. Additionally, in the process the chair would listen to us tell our story and then tell us to be quiet so the RA could tell their side of the story. This went back and forth allowing each side to ask follow up questions. I thought this felt really fair that everyone was able to share their side of the story and allow the other side the ability to question said

side of story. The chair and board were listening to both sides and writing things down. It felt balanced and fair. (Judy, interview, 3/3/2015)

Judy's description of being open to the process provides valuable insight into ways future hearing boards and administrators may gain similar students' interest and trust by actively engaging in the listening process. Judy added that being able to have a voice in the SCP helped her feel a part of the process and possibly had an influence on the overall outcomes of the SC case. Judy shared,

I liked the process because I thought my voice was heard. I would not have liked the process if I meet with the SCA and he just said you are guilty now pay up. I liked it because I got to be involved since it was all about me. Having a say in the process was important. (Judy, interview, 3/3/2015)

Judy's explanation of her experience highlights the importance of SCA helping students feel comfortable in the disciplinary proceedings by allowing them to feel a part of the actual process through verbally sharing their side of an incident. Judy and Tom's explanations of their experiences further clarifies ways students from this study experience the process and the importance of giving them voice in an environment void of judgment and ridicule.

Clark, a student found responsible for academic dishonesty, also described that fairness was an important part of the SCP, but argued that he did not experience a fair process. Clark argued that his experience in the SCP could have been improved if administrators would have allowed him to be part of the process. Clark was frustrated that a decision about an alleged academic dishonesty incident was rendered without Clark being present. Like others, Clark argued that it was important for him to be able to verbally share his version of the incident. Specifically, Clark shared

The incident involved cheating in a class. I never had a full hearing on this case, but was found responsible over the summer. I presented all my information to the

SCA, but was told that there would be a hearing. A hearing never happened, but I was still found responsible. I guess they just looked at everything and made a decision without hearing my side of the story. I was placed on probation and failed the class. I didn't think this process was fair as I was not part of any hearing. The decision was made without me. (Clark, interview, 3/2/2015)

Clark's explanation of his experience in the conduct process supports the claims made by other students that fairness is a major value of the overall experience. All the students that participated in the study described being able to be heard, respected, and the ability to ask questions, as being of great importance to their experience. Regardless if students described their SCP experience as fair or unfair, they still wanted to be treated with respect, be given the opportunity to explain their understanding of the conduct allegations, feel listened to, and ask questions.

Prior research supports that students regard their experience as positive if they interpret their interaction in the conduct process as fair (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Additionally, research supports that students are better able to be open to the process and possibly learn if they feel heard and feel that the process was fair (Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Being treated with respect, provided the opportunity to ask questions directly, and work through changing issues relates to Kegan's evaluation of consciousness's use of a "consciousness bridge" where students are provided more support to help them manage and navigate complex new situations (1994).

The findings related to fairness provide additional evidence that supports the overall body of literature exploring issues of fairness. These findings support the need for continued efforts to focus on making sure the conduct process is fair, which, based on this study, has to do with students having a voice/being heard and being treated with

respect. Finally, these are important findings that illuminate ways administrators can consider to further enhance the conduct process by developing more intentional efforts focused on issues of fairness such as the students in this study described.

Supportive

Supportive emerged as the final way students described their experience in the conduct process, which is discussed in depth next. Many of the participants reported feeling supported in the disciplinary proceedings, which they explained helped them relax; feel comfortable; and trust the conduct administrators. The students attributed feeling supported to SCAs being perceived as nice, welcoming and approachable, nurturing and non-confrontational, informative, and generally caring about their overall wellbeing.

Support was especially important for the following students, which they attribute to influencing their positive experience in the overall conduct process. David, an advertising student involved in a drug related incident in on-campus house, described feeling fully supported by the conduct administrator during his experience. David shared during his interview that his interactions with the on-campus housing staff during the initial incident made him feel like a criminal, which he reported never experiencing during his interactions with the conduct administrator that oversaw his disciplinary process. David was very appreciative of being treated like an “adult” by the administrator and described being fully comfortable in the conduct process due to the supportive approach taken by the SCA. Specifically, David shared,

The SCA was really good and nice. He did not make me feel like a criminal, which was my experience with the Resident Assistant (RA) and Resident Director, which work for housing. I think the RD had it in for me. The SCA treated me like an innocent person until I took responsibility, which was not the

case with the RD and RA. I never felt uncomfortable with the SCA, but did with the RA and RD. I can never look them in the face again, but the SCA was really nice. (David, interview, 3/18/2015)

David's experience, like others in the study, reveals that David felt more comfortable in the SCP due to the relationship established and approach used by the SCA. Additionally, David's experience demonstrates that the way students are treated in the process may impact their overall perception of their experience and possibly their ability to be open to learning about ways to reduce future behaviors (Allen 1994 & King 2012). David and others reported that the conduct administrators were one of the most meaningful aspects of the conduct experience due to their "ability to provide information and offer an inclusive environment" where students felt welcomed and supported (David, interview, 3/18/2015).

Judy, a nursing student, claimed a similar experience and described her interaction with the SCA as comforting and informative, which she explained as being supportive. Judy expounded that it was important that the SCA was approachable and patient, which helped her to relax and more fully understand the conduct process. Judy stated that the approach of the SCA helped her feel comfortable in what she described as a "very stressful situation" and allowed Judy to "open up to actually listening" to what the SCA was describing as the SCP. Specifically, Judy elaborated,

I met with the SCA with other people and I think he knew we were scared because we did not know what to expect. The SCA was very comforting and explained that everything was going to be okay. He explained the policies, the steps of the process, steps we were going to have to complete, and possible outcomes. I remember the SCA made me feel very comfortable. The SCA just laid it all out for us, including dates, location, and expectations for the hearing. I remember feeling very comfortable when I saw him in the hearing. (Judy, interview, 3/3/2015)

Judy's explanation of her experience supports others' claims that the SCP at the research site was supportive, which students from the study attribute to the SCA creating a welcoming, comfortable, and non-confrontational environment. Related to David's experience, Judy's interview illuminates that support is important for students going through the SCP and that the SCA plays a main role in making this happen, which was most meaningful for Judy and others. Additionally, Judy's description of her experience highlights that students are more comfortable when they feel supported, and, therefore open to listening to what the SCA is sharing, which was supported by previous literature (Allen 1994 & King 2012).

Similarly, students from the study also characterized support as having their experience normalized by the SCAs. Many of the students reported feeling abnormal and frustrated that others were not getting in trouble and/or getting caught violating university policy. One particular student, Andy, described being very frustrated and nervous attending the initial process review meeting because he was unaware of anyone else going through the SCP, felt his peers were just getting away with underage drinking, and that somehow his situation was unique. Andy, a kinesiology student, described feeling reassured and supported once the SCA explained that other college students had similar experiences with alcohol use and policy violations. Specifically, Andy shared,

The SCA sharing with me that I was not the only person going through this type of situation, which was reassuring. The SCA alleviated all my fears by explaining that my type of incident was not going to get me kicked out of school or cause anything bad to happen to me. She explained if this type of incident was my one and only violation that it was not going to be the end of the world. The SCA really normalized the overall experience and what I could expect. She made me feel better about the process, but it was still strict in the sense that I was going to get the same punishment as other first time offenders. I experienced a simple process that was laid out pretty clearly. It was pretty straightforward and

supportive. The process was supportive and non-confrontational. It was easy for the most part and seemed fair. (Andy, interview, 3/11/2015)

Andy's description and information for other study participants illustrates that students want to know that they are not alone and that other college students are experiencing similar issues with violating university policy. Additionally, the findings focused on students needing to feel supported in the SCP reveal that they are more open to listening and retaining information if the conduct environment is welcoming, comfortable, and non-confrontational. These findings continue to corroborate that conduct administrators play a major role in the overall conduct experience, which may prove useful in helping colleges and universities further explore the role of SCAs in the overall SCP to further improve the experience for students.

Overall, this study reveals that students are partaking in a variety of experiences while participating in the SCP. The majority of students reported that the process was anxiety provoking and stressful, but that understanding the overall process, being able to share their stories and ask questions, and being offered support helped create a positive experience. Many of the students emphasized that the time frame of the SCP impacted their overall experience and added undue anxiety and stress when the process was delayed without notification and lingered longer than expected. Additionally, students described being more open to conduct administrators when administrators were approachable, nurturing and non-confrontational, informative, and generally caring about their overall wellbeing. Finally, students' reported being more open to the conduct process, and actually listened and retained information, when they felt the process was timely, informative, fair, and supportive.

The findings reported by students are supported by those established in the current student conduct literature. Scholars agree that perceptions of fairness, and the need for positive and supportive relationships with conduct administrators, are critical for students to open up and feel comfortable in the overall process (Allen, 1994; Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Mullan, 1999, & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Additionally, the literature clearly supports that students' perceptions of their conduct experience were more positive if students had the opportunity to share their voice and be heard in the SCP (Mullan, 1999).

Similar to previous research, this section of results found that a positive experience might influence a student's overall perception of the process and, therefore, increase the willingness and ability of students to learn and reduce future behavioral issues (Allen 1994 & King 2012). Additional research is still needed to further substantiate the link between the student conduct experience and reported learning, which this study and the overall body of literature have just started to explore. Students' perceptions of the conduct process being anxiety provoking and stressful due to issues of timeliness and lack of understanding the overall process were not supported by the literature and, therefore, is new information.

Finally, the finding associated with students' experience provides further insight into ways students perceive their conduct experience, which may help colleges and universities rethink how they educate students about the actual process. Additionally, these findings demonstrate the importance of continually reviewing conduct processes to improve overall effectiveness and efficiency (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996). Finally, these findings providing insight into ways conduct offices may direct ongoing

training, development, and management of SCAs to continually focus on creating a timely, informative, fair, and supportive disciplinary experience. This concludes the student experience category. Perceptions of student learning and influence on future behaviors are discussed next.

Category Three: Student Learning

The category of student learning emerged in the coding procedures and includes new knowledge study participants gained by participating in the SCP and ways the said knowledge influenced future decision-making. (a) Gaining a greater understanding of behavioral policies and the conduct process; (b) impact of consequences; (c) taking responsibility; and (d) critically thinking through actions before making decisions emerged as the most significant knowledge students gained by participating in the conduct process. Descriptions of new knowledge gained, aspects of the SCP that were most influential, and students' application of this knowledge is discussed next in this section.

Behavioral Policies and Student Conduct Procedures

Gaining a greater understanding and the importance of the behavioral policies and the conduct process emerged as key information students obtained by participating in the SC process, which is discussed in depth next. Many of the students described gaining a greater understanding of expectations through learning that the university had behavioral standards, which all students were expected to follow. Study participants argued that going through the overall conduct experience and meeting with a conduct administrator taught them the actual policies, their value, and the process for addressing behavioral

issues, which they attribute to playing a major role in preventing future policy violations and making better decisions.

Emily, a female international student found responsible for violating the alcohol policy, described the conduct process as “informative and eye-opening.” Emily argued that she was not fully aware of the university’s behavioral standards and the significance of the policies until she participated in the SCP. Emily explained,

Going through the conduct process made me curious about all the university’s behavioral policies. I have since looked up the behavioral policies and read them. This would not have happened if I had not gone through the conduct process. I now have a better understanding of policies and what is expected of me at the university related to my behaviors. I wish I would have known this information sooner. (Emily, interview, 3/12/2015)

Xavier, a student studying philosophy and Spanish who was found responsible for violating the alcohol and lewd/indecent exposure policies, disclosed a similar understanding of behavioral policies and procedures after participated in the conduct process. Specifically, Xavier said, “I did not really like going through the SC process, but have a better understanding of what is expected of me and why that is important. I learned that there are a lot of rules that I did not know before, which would have been helpful to know before getting in trouble” (Xavier, interview, 3/9/2015).

Both Xavier and Emily’s reported learning demonstrates that students are gaining an understanding of behavioral expectations, the reasons for them, and the process that addresses issues when violations occur. Xavier and Emily argued that learning about behavioral expectations and the conduct process influenced their future decision-making related to drinking and other potential behavioral issues. Both students reported still engaging in the use of alcohol, but reported being more responsible for their actions,

reducing the amount and frequency of alcohol use, and engaging in healthier relationships that better support positive behaviors.

Judy, another student found responsible for violating the alcohol policy, described the conduct process as “informative and helpful.” Judy claimed,

I learned how the SC process is and did not know that is what we have to go through if we break a policy. I learned about the different policies that I knew nothing about. I had never learned the student policies and now am aware of them. (Judy, interview, 3/3/2015)

Judy shared that she was less likely to engage in violating university policy since gaining a greater understanding of behavioral expectations and university policies. Additionally, Judy shared that she was not going to “stop drinking,” but was more aware of “drinking responsibly and making better decisions.” Finally, Judy argued that she was less likely to violate university policy to avoid going through the “time-consuming conduct process again,” which she claimed required an enormous amount of time and financial resources that she did not have.

Similar to Xavier and Emily, Judy’s findings demonstrate that study participants may be less likely to engage in violating university policy if given the opportunity to learn and understand behavioral expectations, the rationale for said standards, and procedures used during their conduct experience. Additionally, these findings reveal that negative behaviors may be more preventable if students have opportunities to gain a broader understanding of behavioral expectations, the rationale for their existence, and conduct procedures, before issues arise. These findings may assist administrators in exploring ways to further educate students about behavioral expectations and the conduct process beyond new student orientation opportunities already being offered, which the students from this study argued were not really effective for them.

Previous research supports that students are gaining a greater understanding of actual conduct expectations and of the conduct process after participating in disciplinary proceedings (Howell, 2005). Allen (1994) found that students are learning the importance of abiding by policies and community standards in the future. Howell (2005) and Allen (1994) suggested that student discipline problems might be lessened if students had a clearer understanding of what is expected and the impact of community standards, which was substantiated by participants from this study. Additionally, the literature supports that some students need higher levels of support and structure in managing new complex situations that, if not obtained, may result in similar issues presented in this section (Kegan, 1994). Students from this study reported a reduction in their behavior after gaining a broader understanding of behavioral expectations, but were not fully willing to change all behavior that was related to alcohol consumption. Howell (2005) found similar results concerning alcohol use, which students from both Howell and this study emphasized was a rite of passage and way to socialize, which may be related to developmental factors described by Kegan (1994).

Overall, the results concerning policies and procedures demonstrate that students are learning about behavioral expectations and procedures by participating in the conduct process, which study participants' link to improved future decision-making and reduction of issues that may create behavioral violations. Additionally, these findings demonstrate that participants may be less likely to engage in behavioral that violate the Code if provided a fuller understanding of behavioral policies and proceedings beyond current educational opportunities being offered. These results are significant as they provide information that may help administrators create, cultivate, and evaluate efforts to educate

students about behavioral expectations and the conduct process before issues arise. Finally, these findings are important as they provide valuable insight into the need for student conduct learning outcomes to be centered on students' learning about behavioral standards and procedures, which was supported by prior research (Allen 1994; CAS, 2012; Goldstein & Stimpson, 2013; Howell, 2005; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011).

Behavioral Consequences

Learning about behavioral consequences also emerged as key knowledge students obtained by participating in the conduct process, which is discussed in depth next. Study participants described behavior consequences as the results of their actions. Behavior consequences consisted of (a) the requirement to participate in the conduct process; (b) time spent in meetings and completing sanctions; (c) probation; (d) fines; (e) class failure; (f) removal from extracurricular activities; (g) removal from on-campus housing; (h) university removal; and (i) mental/physical harm to self and others. Study participants shared that discussing conduct violations with the SCA was most significant in helping to understand the consequences of their actions, which they attribute to supporting better decision-making and possibly preventing future policy violations.

Amber, an art student who was found responsible for violating the alcohol policy, shared that she “gained valuable insight into ways to be an adult” by recognizing that her actions had serious consequences. Amber claimed,

I learned to be an adult and to take my actions more seriously. I learned how others see me. I also learned how there are consequences for all my actions. If I do something then there may be a repercussion if my actions are bad. I kind of felt bad about myself in the process. I don't want to be a person that gets into trouble and felt bad that I did get into trouble and caused a lot of people to worry about me. I'm less likely now to get into trouble because I've gone through the process and understand the consequences. I don't want to go through all of it

again and make future decisions based on the consequences that have greater impact on me. (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Amber learned that her actions could lead to negative consequences, which forced her to rethink future decisions associated with alcohol use and other behaviors that could lead to possible policy violations. Similar to others, Amber was not willing to completely abstain from underage drinking, but explained that knowing the consequences of her behaviors influenced her decisions to not attend large parties and drink outdoors in public where there was a “higher risk of getting in trouble.” According to Amber and other students, the influence of consequences varied based on students’ discernment of consequential impact. For Amber, consequences associated with repeating the conduct process, causing mental distress to others that worried about her behavior, managing the stress associated with being on probation, and paying additional fines influenced Amber’s future decision-making.

Roxeanne, a public health student found responsible for violating the alcohol policy, described a similar experience related to learning about behavior consequences. Roxeanne shared that she gained “valuable insight” by learning that her actions also had consequences. Specifically, Roxeanne explained,

I learned overall that your behavior has consequences. Also, just because everyone is drinking and thinks they won’t be that kid that gets in trouble for drinking does not mean that is actual reality. I feel a lot of times others feel that nothing will happen to them, but it does happen. It is real and there are consequences to every action. I wish I would have known this before. I wish I would have known that I was going to need to pay a large fine and be placed on probation for getting in trouble. Learning about consequences now helps me think through situations before acting on impulse. (Roxeanne, interview, 2/27/2015)

Roxeanne explained that the conduct process “forced her to look at her behavior” in order to learn that her actions had major consequences that could ultimately impact her ability

to remain at school if not addressed and better managed. Roxeanne's interactions with the SCA were regarded as "most helpful" and "insightful" and provided Roxeanne the opportunity to discuss her behavior and consequences associated with violating university policy. For Roxeanne, consequences associated with repeating the conduct process, managing the stress associated with being on probation, paying additional fines, and possibly being kicked out of school influenced Roxeanne's future decision-making.

Similar to Amber, the impact of Roxeanne's consequences varied based on the level of importance to or influence over her. Roxeanne was not willing to give up using alcohol, but did make major changes to reduce the amount of alcohol consumed weekly, while learning to drink in moderation during parties. Additionally, Roxeanne admitted to using marijuana regularly before going through the conduct process and reported reducing her usage significantly after, which she attributes to discussing the consequences of her alcohol and drug use with a conduct administrator. Roxeanne shared that her conduct violation was for alcohol use, but the impact of the process and possible future consequences associated with "bad behavior" influenced her to explore other aspects of her life such as marijuana use, unhealthy relationships, and career aspirations.

Naomi, another student found responsible for violating the smoking, alcohol, and drug policies on two separate occasions, described a different experience associated with behavior consequences. Unlike Roxeanne and Amber, Naomi was found responsible for violating university policy on two separate occasions during a two-month period of time. Naomi claimed she did not take the first incident seriously enough since her father had "made things go away in the past." Naomi revealed that she was "busted" for underage drinking and public intoxication that involved law enforcement when she was 17 and 19.

Naomi shared that her father managed and took care of everything during the two pre-college incidents, which allowed Naomi to “walk away from the incidents with very few consequences” (Naomi, interview, 2015). According to Naomi, her pre-college experiences with behavioral issues and her father’s support reinforced that there were very few consequences for Naomi’s actions.

Naomi claimed that she was continually worried about getting in trouble after her first conduct interactions, but was only willing to make minor changes to her decision-making concerning alcohol and drug use. For Naomi, the consequences associated with paying a fine, attending an alcohol class, being on probation, and prolonged mental anguish did not provide enough incentive to more fully alter her behavior. Naomi claimed that she was only willing to alter her drinking patterns slightly because she really enjoyed the way alcohol made her feel; these alterations included not drinking on campus, not carrying open containers or bottles of Gatorade mixed with vodka, and not going back to the “dorm intoxicated.”

During the second conduct proceeding, Naomi claimed she experienced higher levels of “humiliation and anxiety” than during the first conduct proceedings due to needing to repeat the entire conduct process. Specifically, Naomi shared,

The conduct person seemed really sad for me. I was really distraught and upset that I had to go through the process again. I was also embarrassed that I had gotten into trouble again. The conduct person was like, hi Naomi in a very low and somewhat disappointed voice. I felt like I had let the conduct person and myself down. The conduct person was the same guy that I really like and clicked with from my first incident related to alcohol. I was really upset with myself for allowing the incident to happen. I finally learned that I could be kicked out of college for my behavior, which was eye-opening. (Naomi, interview, 3/18/2015)

Naomi clarified that she took the second conduct experience more seriously because the consequences were higher. The consequences associated with paying an additional fine

and attending an additional alcohol class, counseling appointment, extended probation, parent notification, and the possibility of university expulsion was the incentive needed to change Naomi's future decision-making related to alcohol and drug use. Naomi argued that she made more changes to her decision-making, but was still not willing to completely give up the way drinking and alcohol made her feel.

Naomi shared,

I learned to stop smoking and especially to stop smoking weed in the dorms. I learned that I needed to lay low with all my behavior. I thought I needed to cut everything out, but I did not completely. I did stop smoking weed, but did not stop drinking. I was really worried that I was going to get kicked out of college. I did not stop drinking altogether, but did not drink in the dorms. I thought I needed to do something, because I keep getting into trouble, but I did not know what to do. I was worried that I was going to continue to get into trouble if I did not do something. I was really thinking about why I kept getting into trouble and just thought it was weird that I did not know what to do. (Naomi, interview, 3/18/2015)

Naomi's experience with the conduct process reveals that it may take longer for some students to fully grasp the gravity of their behavior based on developmental levels and possible mental health issues associated with drinking and drug use (Dickstein & Christensen, 2008; Evans et al., 2010; Kegan, 1994; & Kohlberg, 1976). One type of sanction may not work for everyone, which illuminated that administrators have an opportunity to fully explore a variety of ways to meet different developmental and mental health needs. Naomi revealed that some of the behavioral consequences influenced her future behaviors, but the "fun and gratification" Naomi experienced from the use of alcohol and drugs "overruled" the desire to completely stop similar behaviors that could still lead to future negative decision-making (Naomi, interview, 2015).

Earlier studies support that students are learning about consequences by participating in the conduct process. Both Howell (2005) and Allen's (1994) research

supports that students have a greater understanding of consequences after participation in the conduct process and are more apt to make future behavior changes based on knowing that their behavior has consequences and being held accountable. Participants from this study disclosed that the greater the consequence, the greater behavior change would occur; however, this was not necessarily the case with alcohol use.

A majority of students participating claimed that they were going to continue to drink regardless of the overall consequence, which was also directly supported by Howell's (2005) findings. Kegan (1994) and Kohlberg's (1976) research supported similarly findings that students may not be ready to think outside themselves until they are ready to move from one developmental level to another. Kegan (1994) argues that this is where students may benefit from the "consciousness bridge," which is where administrators and others can help students safely exist while learning new ways of thinking through situations, and gain structure and guidance while performing new tasks. Offering extensive support and challenging students to move forward may prove helpful in encouraging students to change behavior (Kegan, 1994 & Kohlberg, 1976).

The findings presented in this section reveal that learning about possible consequences may assist students with informed decision-making concerning behavioral issues. Additionally, these findings are significant as they provide insight into ways administrators can further explore proactive efforts that may help students better understand consequences before issues appear. Furthermore, these findings provide critical insight into ways that behavioral outcomes vary by student, which may help administrators explore a variety of consequences that are adaptable to different

developmental needs. Finally, these findings presented in this section offer additional evidence of the positive impact of the SCA role on students in the conduct process.

Taking Responsibility

Learning to take responsibility for actions also emerged as key knowledge students obtained by participating in the SCP, which is discussed in depth next. Study participants reported that the discipline proceedings taught them to take ownership and be accountable for their actions, which they claimed was taking responsibility. Participants shared that being able to discuss their violations and rationale for decision-making with a conduct administrator and peers in an alcohol education class was critical in learning to take responsibility for their actions. Additionally, study participants revealed the conduct process helped them access campus resources, which they credit for supporting better decision-making, helping them become more responsible, and possibly preventing future policy violations.

Jimmy, a film student who was found responsible for violating the academic dishonestly policy, described that he learned a “very hard and valuable lesson” when caught cheating on a final paper (Jimmy, interview, 3/16/2015). Jimmy explained that he learned that his actions had repercussions, which led Jimmy to fail a class and be placed on disciplinary probation. Jimmy explained that the conduct process taught him to be more responsible for his decision-making and provided insight into ways he could take greater responsibility for his actions by asking for help and utilizing campus resources when classes became difficult. Jimmy said,

I admitted upfront that I cheated because I saw no way out and thought honesty would be the best way to get through the discipline meeting. I was scared, but realized that I had broken the rules and needed to take responsibility for my actions. I would have never admitted that I cheated if I would not have been

caught and forced to go through the discipline process. The experience taught me to be responsible with my schoolwork and time management, which were some of my issues leading up to me cheating on the final paper. I've also learned to be reasonable for my choices of classes, so not to select a boring class. My lack of interest in the class made me disinterested in the content and assignments, which led me to not care and look for a quick way to get through the boring assignments. I've since learned to take more responsibility for my actions and have not cheated since. I now use the tutoring lab to help with difficult classes and challenging homework assignments. (Jimmy, interview, 3/16/2015)

According to Jimmy, the interactions with the SCA during the conduct proceedings provided Jimmy the opportunity to explore his behaviors and gain a better understanding of needing to take greater responsibility for his overall actions. Jimmy also claimed that the SCP and his interaction with the SCA provided him a greater awareness of campus resources related to writing and tutoring. Jimmy's claims reveal that the SCP helped Jimmy to understand the importance of how to take ownership of decisions and actions while making Jimmy aware of campus resources beyond the conduct office.

Similarly, Tom, a male student found responsible for violating the alcohol policy, described that he learned to "be more responsible" for his actions and "not blame" others when caught participating in underage drinking and publicly intoxicated. Tom explained that he realized from the very beginning that he was "busted" and could not foresee any way out of the situation. Tom claimed that going through the SCP forced him to explore his behavior and the type of person he wanted to eventually become. Tom maintained this would not have been possible without the accountability associated with the conduct process. Tom explained that he wanted to be an honest person and discussed,

I feel bad lying about things and especially something that I'm really guilty of. I also did not want to lie to myself that I had done something that was okay, because it wasn't. In my own head, I knew it was a bad decision. It sucked getting a \$250 fine, but I did not want to lie and wanted to be accountable for my

actions and behavior. This experience still influences my decisions and me now. I've never gotten as drunk or blacked out since and it really taught me to act more responsible. It was one of those life events that really teach you to reflect and learn from your mistakes. It taught me to take more responsibility for my actions and think before even making my decisions. I really learned to take responsibility and learn from my decisions and mistakes. (Tom, interview, 3/13/2015)

Tom and Jimmy's description of taking responsibility reveals that the SCP provided an environment for them to explore their actions and gain a broader understanding of how said actions were impacting them and others, while learning ways to be more responsible for future decision-making through access to campus resources.

These findings are important as they demonstrate that students are learning to consider their actions before acting on impulses, which may alter future decisions connected to policy violations. Additionally, these findings reveal that students were provided an opportunity to explore their behavior, decision-making, and campus resources, which may not have occurred without going through the conduct process. Both Tom and Jimmy explained that being a responsible adult meant taking ownership of their actions and not blaming someone else, which was supported by many of the other study participants.

Amber, a female student also found responsible for violating the alcohol policy involving public intoxication and underage drinking, shared that she was required to participate in an alcohol education class as a sanction, which taught her to be accountable for her actions and to take responsibility for her behavior. Amber described the educational class, which she attributes to influencing the changes in her decision-making related to alcohol use, as "real and supportive." Amber shared that the class taught her to be a "more responsible person" and it "normalized" her experience with other peers navigating similar issues. Specifically, Amber argued,

I learned how to be a better responsible person in terms of my drinking and to help others when they have had too much to drink. I've reduced what I've been doing in terms of drinking. The alcohol class helped me feel normal and that I was not the only one struggling with drinking. This was really helpful for me. I was worried that I was the only one. (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Additionally, Amber shared that learning to be more responsible has helped her think through actions before making decisions that may lead to negative behaviors.

Amber claims that the conduct alcohol education class provided her with new knowledge to reduce her alcohol use and be more aware of her surroundings when drinking.

Specifically, Amber argued,

I definitely did less drinking after the incident and conduct process. I became more cautious about drinking and about the places I would go to party. I kind of changed my scene and avoided big house parties. I started to attend smaller and casual gatherings hosted by friends and people I knew. I became the person watching after people, which was a switch from me needing to be the person being watched. I was the person that my friends had to watch because I would get drunk and they would have to play mom. My tendency in the past was to be the one that got drunk. I've since changed that and I'm now the one helping others and not getting drunk all the time. The class taught me to be more responsible for your actions. The class helped me to better understand to help my friends and to stop being the person that needs the help all the time. The class taught me to not walk home by myself, but I have done it many times in the past. I don't walk home anymore by myself. (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Similar to Jimmy and Tom, Amber reported that her experience was a “wake up call,” which might not have been possible without being “busted” and “held accountable” for underage drinking. Amber claimed that the SCP, and especially the alcohol education class where she interacted with peers found responsible for similar conduct violations, were most impactful in helping her take responsibility for her own decision-making.

These findings provided by Amber demonstrate that students are able to take responsibility for their behavior when held accountable and given the opportunity to discuss rationale for decision-making. Additionally, Amber's findings provide insight

into how conduct sanctions involving peer interactions may help students normalize their experience by realizing that other peers may be managing similar behavioral challenges.

The student conduct literature supports similar findings concerning students learning to take responsibility for their actions after participating in the SCP. Allen's research found that students were also learning to take responsibility for their actions, while taking ownership and thinking through their actions (1994). These findings also directly connect to the overarching outcomes for the SCP described earlier by Goldstein & Stimpson (2013). Furthermore, Kegan et al. (2001) describe that students that are able to take responsibility for and ownership of their actions have moved from only thinking about themselves to thinking about others. Individuals' existence begins to be defined by self and relationships and is no longer focused on social pressure from peer groups (Evans et al., 2010).

Additionally, Kegan's research emphasized that ongoing growth is painful since it involves altering an individual's ability to maneuver in their surroundings (Evans et al., 2010). Kegan's introduction of a "holding environment" provides support for individuals working through growth and change specifically that of the modern day complexities associated within the context of managing personal and work life experiences (Winnicott, 1965, p. 116). According to Kegan, the "holding environment has two functions: supporting individuals in their current stage of development and encouraging movement to the next evolutionary truce" (Kegan, 1994, p 43). The holding environment is associated with an "evolutionary bridge, a context for crossing over from one order of consciousness to the next, more developed order" (Kegan, 1994, p 43). The SCAs'

ability to offer support while challenging students to take responsibility for their action may help students move from one developmental level to another.

The findings presented in this section reveal that learning to take responsibility may assist students in understanding the impact of decision-making and ownership of personal actions. Additionally, the findings in this section revealed that study participants reported a greater awareness of campus resources and surroundings, and reduction in risky alcohol consumption associated with blackout drinking and public intoxication, after participating in the conduct process. These findings are significant as they provide insight into ways administrators can further explore proactive efforts that may help students learn to make responsible decisions and access campus resources before issues appear.

Furthermore, these findings provide critical insight into ways the alcohol education class supported learning through peer interaction, which helped students normalize their experience with alcohol use. The notion of learning being increased by peer interaction directly relates to prior research that supports the idea that college students are moving from relying on parents and moving toward understanding their surroundings, seeking support through external validation, and intimacy through peer interaction (Evans et al, 2010, Kegan, et al., 2001; Kohlberg 1975 & 1976; & Paul & Kelleher, 1985). The findings associated with peer learning may provide useful information for administrators when exploring ways to further incorporate peer learning/interactions into the sanction process. Finally, the findings presented in this section offer additional evidence of the positive impact of the SCA role and their impact on students in the conduct process, which directly correlates with Kegan's research

focused on creating a supportive environment for students to help them successfully navigate issues from one developmental level to another (1994).

Thinking Before Acting

Learning to critically think before acting on impulses also emerged as key knowledge students obtained by participating in the SCP, which is discussed in depth in this section. Participants reported that the overall SCP and specifically educational sanctions provided awareness of thinking before acting and practical skills needed to change behavior and/or avoid getting in trouble, and directly influenced future decision-making. Participants shared that conversation with the SCA and active sanctions were the most influential for learning risk and harm reduction methods, including but not limited to: time management, study skills, conflict resolution, anger management, and moderation of substance use. Additionally, study participants disclosed that they learned to modify behaviors to avoid getting “caught or busted” for issues that would be considered a violation of university policies, which they also considered risk-reduction.

Many of the students revealed that the overall conduct process and especially the sanctions taught them to think before acting on their emotions and impulses to react to situations. Matt, a male student found responsible for intimidating his roommate and causing property damage, shared that he learned “new skills to keep calm” when dealing with challenging people that would normally make him angry. Matt explained that he and his roommate had a “major disagreement that turned into a heated verbal argument” and ended with Matt breaking items in their apartment. One of Matt’s sanctions was to attend educational sessions focused on conflict mediation and anger management. Matt

shared that he learned to think differently about “reacting and blowing up” when situations caused him to get angry. Specifically, Matt disclosed,

I learned how to not let things bother me and to ignore my roommate. I learned to not let my voice elevate past a certain level, which could be perceived as hostile or angry. I learned about anger, passive aggression, and how to manage situations without getting heated. I learned to identify when I’m getting angry and ways to let out my frustration without getting in trouble. I learned how to work through similar situations by walking away, breathing, taking a timeout, allowing others to share their side of a situation, being able to disagree, to lower my voice, to not let things build up, and how to let things go. The process helped me see that I need to mature a little bit, remain calm, cool, and collected in all my situations, and just not do anything that will not get me in trouble. (Matt, interview, 3/16/2015)

Matt emphasized that being able to meet with a peer educator in a private location was extremely important and helpful for Matt to feel comfortable, which allowed him to relax and open up to the information that was shared. Matt’s experience reveals that the SCP and specifically Matt’s meeting with a peer educator provided Matt with the skills needed to better manage his emotions and think through future decisions before reacting irrationally to situations. Additionally, Matt’s experience emphasizes the importance of a one-on-one interaction utilizing a peer educator in a private and safe space where Matt could feel comfortable to learn and practice skills he was learning. These findings are important and can help administrators further explore the value and use of peer educators in the sanction process and private meeting space for conduct and sanctions meetings. Additionally, these findings illuminate the opportunity for administrators to explore ways to proactively provide similar learning outcomes before issues surface.

Similarly, Amber, a female student found responsible for public intoxication and underage drinking, disclosed that she gained the ability to think through her actions and specifically gained knowledge concerning “moderation and risk reduction” related to alcohol use after participating in an alcohol education class that was part of her sanctions.

Amber emphasized that the class was impactful and attributed her more informed decision-making consuming alcohol use to the class. Specifically, Amber said,

I guess I've gained the ability to think through a situation before I get into it. I've learned to think about the type of environment that we are going to be attending. I learned about ways to reduce my risk when drinking since we all are going to continue to drink. It was important to me that the class was not preachy and seemed to understand the ways college students spend time and socialize. I learned to think about where I was drinking and to make sure I was not drinking in a public venue and to make sure I was with people I know. I learned how to think about my drinking by monitoring the amount of alcohol I was putting into my body and to make sure to consume food before and during drinking. I also learned to make sure I'm aware of what I'm drinking and to make sure I know the people serving the drinks. (Amber, interview, 3/17/2015)

Roxeanne, another female student also found responsible for violating the alcohol policy, described a similar experience related to thinking through actions before making decisions. Roxeanne also participated in the alcohol education class and claimed that she learned how to drink in moderation and reduce her overall risk associated with college age drinking. Specifically, Roxeanne explained,

The staff member took a risk-reduction approach to the class and never really told us not to drink. This was really helpful. The class helped me think about my drinking and ways to drink more responsibly so not to hurt others or myself. It was never don't drink at all, but find ways to drink safely. This was a more realistic way to approach the problem. It was really important for me to just have the steps presented to help other and me make better decisions. These types of approaches are more meaningful and make more sense in my life. Since I got in trouble and throughout the entire year I've substantially lowered the amount of alcohol I drink and the amount of tobacco I smoke because I feel that I want to be more of a productive adult. It sounds kind of lame, but I want to be a good member in society and be a good role model. I think alcohol impairs me so I should not partake in it excessively or a lot at all. It is something that is not enjoyable when you have to deal with going to court or getting in trouble. (Roxeanne, interview, 2/27/2015)

Roxeanne and Amber's experience reveal that students are learning to think through actions by gaining new information to reduce high-risk behavior associated with substance use. Additionally, these findings reveal that study participants are retaining the

information gained from their sanctions and specifically information from active sanctions where they were required to participate and learn with peers. Furthermore, these findings disclose the realization that study participants involved with substance use were less likely to completely alter their behavior and were still willing to participate in underage drinking, but were also willing to implement risk-reduction measures or find ways to reduce getting caught.

Many of the study participants also associated thinking through their actions as findings ways to not get caught, which they claimed were risk-reduction measures. Participants explained that they changed the location of their behavior, found ways to reduce noise when partying, and found other methods to transport alcohol without being caught.

Naomi, the female student found responsible for violating the smoking, alcohol, and drug policies on two separate occasions, described thinking of ways to be more careful to not get caught. Naomi shared that she thought through the situation before making the decision to party so to not get “busted.” Naomi argued,

I learned to be careful in my surroundings and be aware of my actions. I learned to think about my actions before acting on them and to really think about the type of people I was hanging with. I stopped smoking weed and drinking in the dorms. I did not even like having a beer can in my hand. I was extra careful, but did not really reduce my use. I just went somewhere else. I just tried to be careful. I stopped bringing alcohol with me when I left my dorm. I would no longer carry bottles with alcohol in them like Gatorade bottles. I stay away from cops when I see them. I would just try to be more careful when coming in and out of the dorms so to not get into trouble with guards at the front doors. I try to make sure I don't have too much to drink or allow myself to get so bad to get caught. I started monitoring how much I was drinking so that I could at least make it home safely to get in the dorm without getting into trouble. (Naomi, interview, 3/18/2015)

Naomi's explanation of thinking through her actions to “not get caught” reveals that she changed her behavior based on getting “busted and needing to go through the conduct

process.” These findings suggest that Naomi has learned to avoid some situations and reduce her risk of getting into trouble. As discussed previously, Naomi was not willing to change all of her behavior due to highly enjoying the overall effect she described as “fun and gratification,” which “overruled” the desire to completely avoid all the risk associated with using alcohol and using drugs.

Similarly, Andy, a kinesiology student who was found responsible for possession and underage drinking, shared that he had learned to think through his actions and come up with a better plan to not get “busted” when transporting alcohol while underage. Andy argued, “I bought a better backpack and went under the radar more so than in the past. I don’t walk around with anything and [I’m] being more careful” (Andy, interview, 3/11/2015). Andy shared that his new approach helped him think through making the decision to drink and “reduced [his] risk of getting in trouble” (Andy, interview, 3/11/2015). Andy’s description reveals that he was thinking through his actions and making different choices that seem to prevent him from getting in trouble. Andy learned to make better decisions that obviate calling attention to his behavior and have since prevented him from getting caught for underage drinking and possession of alcohol.

Additionally, Sarah, a criminal justice student who was also found responsible for public open container and underage drinking, described thinking through her decision and changing her behavior to “not get caught again” (Sarah, interview, 3/11/2015). Sarah explained that she learned to reduce her risk by changing the way she travels with alcohol to avoid attention and getting caught. Sarah argued, “I learned to not carry alcohol in a bag and have switched to a water bottle in my purse. I did not stop drinking or reduce my drinking at all. I learned to not stand out” (Sarah, interview, 3/11/2015). Similar to Andy

and Naomi, Sarah shared that she learned from participating in the conduct process to reduce her risk of getting in trouble, which she rationalized as finding ways to not get caught.

Data provided by Sarah, Andy, and Naomi reveal that a few students reported thinking through their actions to find new ways of engaging in similar behavior without getting “caught” or “busted.” These results are important as they demonstrate that not all the study participants gained the same knowledge from participating in the SCP associated with alcohol use. Additionally, these findings suggest that learning is going to vary for each student and impact future decision-making differently. This information provides the opportunity for administrators to explore intentional learning outcomes associated with different types of violations, which may enhance overall risk-reduction associated with changing behavior to improve decision-making and not just the avoidance of getting “busted” violating university policy. Furthermore, these findings review the need for ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes associated with the SCP to determine if students are learning and retaining information, which may help administrators adjust the conduct process and sanctions to meet desired outcomes.

The interview results presented in this section reveal that study participants are learning to think through actions before making decisions, which they mainly attribute to their positive interaction with the conduct administrators and being afforded active sanctions involving peer interaction. Additionally, these findings illuminate that a majority of the study participants are utilizing and retaining information gained from the SCP and specifically the alcohol/drug education and conflict mediation classes. Students reported that the educational classes that offered opportunities for engagement (active

sanctions) with peers and administrators were the most influential for learning risk and harm reduction methods, including but not limited to: time management, study skills, conflict resolution, anger management, and moderation of substance use. Furthermore, study participants reported learning to reduce their risk of getting in trouble by finding new ways to avoid getting “caught and/or busted,” which they argued was an appropriate approach to managing their future behaviors.

These findings are significant as they provide insight into the need for overarching conduct learning outcomes and sub-category learning outcomes associated with specific violations and corresponding sanctions to maintain consistency and provide overall purpose of the process. Additionally, these findings demonstrate the need for continual assessment measures to determine if students are learning and applying the desired information gained after participating in the discipline process. Furthermore, these findings support previous information that conduct administrators positively impact student learning, which may help administrators continue to explore ways to enhance the SCA role to better support student learning in the conduct process. Finally, these findings support SCAs working with other university administrators to further explore ways to proactively educate students about substance use, managing emotions, adjustment to college, and campus resources in hopes of preventing and/or reducing the amount and frequency of behavior issues.

The overall findings reported by participants associated with student learning are supported by those established in the current student conduct literature. Previous research suggests that the disciplinary process is and should be a learning opportunity for students, which this research demonstrates is happening at the research site (Allen 1994;

Howell, 2005; Kibler, 2013; Goldstein & Stimpson, 2013; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Study participants reported gaining a greater understanding of (a) behavioral policies/expectation; (b) the actual conduct process; (c) impact of consequences; (d) taking responsibility; (e) thinking through actions before making decisions; and (f) ways to avoid getting in trouble, which substantiates previous findings and aligns with the overarching learning outcomes associated with the conduct process and those emphasized by professional higher education standards (CAS, 2012; Howell, 2005; & Kibler, 2013)

Additionally, these findings support previous research that conduct administrators had significant influence on actual learning when participating in the conduct process (Allen, 1994). Students reported that their (a) positive, (b) supportive, (c) helpful, and (d) insightful interactions with a conduct administrator helped them to relax, understand the conduct process, and be more open to listening and gaining new knowledge. Furthermore, students reported that the conduct process and the interactions with the conduct administrator provided greater awareness and access to campus resources, which substantiates findings previously discovered by Howell (2005). The conduct administrators were one of the major factors that, according to students, influenced the overall experience and students' willingness to engage and be open to learning.

The majority of the conduct literature provided limited information pertaining to future decision-making after students participated in the disciplinary process, which was discovered during this research project. Overall, students reported a reduction or modification of their behavior was due to participating in the disciplinary process. Specifically, students reported thinking through their actions before acting on impulse and desires to fit in, being more responsible for the decisions and actions, reducing the

amount and frequency of substance use, and engaging in healthier relationships that better support positive behaviors. Additionally, students reported engaging in risk and harm reduction approaches, including but not limited to: implementing time management and study skills, conflict resolution and anger management techniques, and moderation of substance use. These findings add to the overall body of conduct literature and provide new insight for administrators to consider when creating intentional learning outcomes and assessment measures. The use of intentional learning outcomes and assessment measures were highly supported in the literature and reinforced as a best-practice approach to fully providing a learning opportunity, changing behavior, and measuring the effectiveness of the overall SCP (CAS, 2012; Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; Kuh, 1979; Mullan, 1999; & Zacker, 1996).

Summary of Findings

This chapter illuminates that study participants had varying levels of experiences during their conduct proceedings, which they described variously as anxiety provoking and stressful, fair, and supportive. A majority of the students characterized their experience as positive overall once the process concluded. Students attributed their experience to such factors as their limited understanding and timeliness of the process, being able to verbally share their side of their alleged incident, having the ability to ask questions, and the significant relationship and interactions established by the student conduct administrator.

Students disclosed that their interactions with the SCA were the most meaningful aspect of their SCA experience, which was due to SCAs' ability to provide information about the SCP and campus resources, and offer an inclusive atmosphere where students

felt welcome and supported. Students reported being most open and listening to their SCAs when they were approachable, nurturing and non-confrontational, informative, and generally caring about the students' overall wellbeing. Finally, students reported being more open to the overall SCP, actually listening, and retaining information when they felt the experience was timely, informative, fair, and supportive.

The overall findings associated with the student conduct experience provide evidence that students are more open to listening and possibly learning from their process if provided a positive experience, which was reported to be mainly developed by the interactions with the SCA. These findings highlight the significance that SCAs play in the overall experience, which may help administrators further explore ways to assess current SCA roles, provide appropriate training, and improve overall outcomes associated with the student conduct experience. Additionally, these findings associated with conduct experience reveal the opportunity for proactive efforts for further education about what student can expect from going through the SCP before issues arise. Finally, the evidence presented pertaining to the overall conduct experience supports the ongoing evaluation of the process to address issues of outdated procedures and policies, as well as issues impacting perceptions of timeliness, fairness, and support.

This chapter also reveals that study participants have gained new knowledge by participating in the SCP, which they attributed mainly to their positive interactions with the SCA and to engaging in active sanctions that provided the opportunities to learn from peers and gain skills that could be easily applied. Students reported learning about (a) behavioral policies and the conduct process; (b) impact of consequences; (c) taking responsibility; and (d) critically thinking through actions before making decisions.

Additionally, this chapter illuminates that student learning and behavioral changes varied based on students' willingness to apply the information gained and consequences associated with behaviors that violate the Student Conduct Code.

Additionally, these findings associated with learning also reveal the opportunity for proactive efforts to further educate students about ways to manage and navigate college transition, manage conflict, reduce risk associated with substance use, and access campus resources before issues arise. Finally, the evidence presented pertaining to the overall conduct learning supports the ongoing evaluation of the SCP to address issues of effective sanctions that actually provide learning and not just punitive sanctions such as fines and probation that provided little or no learning as reported by the students.

Furthermore, this chapter demonstrates that students from this study are actually applying the new information gained from participating in the SCP to their future decision-making. Students reported a reduction or modification of their behavior was due to participating in the SCP. Specifically, students reported thinking through their actions before acting on impulse and the desire to fit in, being more responsible for their decisions and actions, reducing the amount and frequency of substance use, and engaging in healthier relationships that better support positive behaviors. Additionally, students reported engaging in risk and harm reduction approaches, including but not limited to: implementing time management and study skills, conflict resolution and anger management techniques, and moderation of substance use. Finally, students also reported engaging in similar substance use activities, but altered their behavior somewhat to avoid getting caught.

Finally, the findings discussed in this chapter reveal strong connections to the conduct literature and provide the qualitative aspect of the process that has been mainly missing up until this point. These findings add to the overall body of literature and provide new insight for administrators to consider when creating recommended best-practice intentional learning outcomes, assessment measures, and ongoing development and training opportunities for conduct administrators. A comparison between SCAs and students, overall limitations and recommendations, and conclusions will be presented in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study examined the basic tenants of the student conduct process from the perspective of three administrators who oversee the disciplinary proceedings at a large four-year public institution located in the Northeast. This study also examined the experiences of 15 students who participate in the conduct process and the influence the conduct process had on their learning and future behaviors at the same institution from August 2012 – September 2014. Findings from both students and administrators are summarized and compared next to demonstrate the similarities and differences between conduct administrators' desired outcomes and the actual impact of the conduct process on students, which addresses the final research question. Furthermore, this chapter presents the implications of findings for practice, policy, and future research, limitations of this study, and concludes with an overall summary of significance.

Summary and Comparison of Findings

The extensive findings discussed in this study reveal that administrators and students have similar and unique understanding of the conduct process at the research site. The comparative findings are discussed next using four themes that distinguish the major findings from both administrators and students, which directly connect the overall research questions and included: (a) basic tenets of the conduct process; (b) behavioral influences; (c) students' experience; and (d) learning opportunities.

Basic Tenets – Conduct Process

The administrators shared that there are basic tenets of the conduct process, which make the overall disciplinary system successful and consist of (a) understanding the

overall purpose of the conduct process; (b) student behavior influences; (c) the actual conduct process and need for consistency; (d) a supportive student experience; and (e) focus on student learning. The SCAs believe that all five tenets are critical for the SCP to be impactful. Additionally, these findings demonstrate a strong connection between the SCAs' description of the conduct process and that of prior research findings (Allen 1994; Chassey, 1999; Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Mullan, 1999; Paterson & Gregory, 2013; Pavela, 1997 & 2006; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011; Stoner, 2000; Stoner, 2008; Stoner & Cerminara, 1990; & Stoner & Lowery, 2004).

Furthermore, this study illuminated that SCAs emphasized that learning is a foundational and important part of the SCP, which is influenced by creating a supportive experience during the disciplinary proceedings that is (a) consistent, (b) supportive, (c) fair, and (e) just. However, the SCAs also revealed that there may be a lack of consistency in the area of formal learning and experiential outcomes and measurement of overall program effectiveness, based on there being no formal assessment beyond recidivism rates and anecdotal feedback from students. This discovery provides a possible opportunity to explore the overall effectiveness through the use of assessment and evaluation, which, the current literature emphasizes, is important for an effective conduct process (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996). This is an important finding that is discussed more in depth below.

Behavioral Influences

Students who participated in the study shared varying rationales for decision-making that led to disciplinary problems and differing levels of experiences and learning after participating in the SCP. Similar to the conduct administrators, students describe

numerous factors that they claimed influenced behaviors, which included: (a) struggling to manage college transition and difficult academic issues; (b) high levels of peer pressure and social interactions; (c) unstructured living arrangements; (d) lacking expectation and accountability; and (e) inebriation. As one of the basic tenets of the conduct process, student behavioral influences consisted of (a) developmental levels; (b) environmental influences; (c) substance use; (d) mental health; (e) peer influences; (f) access to resources and financial means; and (g) family of origin. SCAs explained that their understanding of behavior influences was acquired over years of extensive experience and anecdotal evidence.

These similarities connect to previous research finding that disciplinary problems may be directly related to the lack of conflict resolution skills, transition to college issues, major mental health issues, economic hardship, and the inability to negotiate complex issues without the assistance from their parents (Hirsch, 2013; Paterson & Kibler, 2008; & Tinto, 1993). These similarities between behavioral influences add to the limited body of literature and demonstrate evidence to support SCAs' claims about acquired influences based only on their years of extensive experience and anecdotal evidence.

Furthermore, both administrators and students describe similar causes of disciplinary concerns due to college transitional problems, conflict resolution, and overall inability to negotiate complex issues, which according to prior research is related to developmental transition from adolescence to adulthood that students experience while in college (Evans et al., 2010). Research conducted by Kegan et al. (2001), Kegan (1994) and Kohlberg (1975 & 1976) emphasizes that adequate support and structure must be provided to students through programs and services to help them navigate development

issues. These findings are significant and demonstrate that some college students may not be able to manage their transition from adolescence to adulthood without highly structured support and encouragement, which administrators may be able to utilize when creating programs and services to prevent disciplinary concerns.

Information from students did not fully support SCAs' claims that family influenced behavior before incidents occurred, but supported that parents played a significant role in encouraging them to learn from the overall conduct experience in hopes of preventing or reducing future issues. More research is needed to fully understand the influence of family, which was not fully explored in this study or previous research. The SCAs implication that family of origin influenced negative conduct is new to the body of literature and should be further explored to determine overall significance. Furthermore, the prior research supported by Gilligan (1982 & 1993) and Harper et al. (2005) claims that gender is a major behavioral influence, which was not discussed by administrators or students as significant in influencing disciplinary issues. The influence of gender is missing from this study, which may be a limitation that needs further exploration to better understand the ways gender influences overall behavior in similar studies.

Students' Experiences

Student participants described conduct experience as an important component of the actual process with varying levels of experiences during their disciplinary proceedings, which they described as (a) anxiety provoking and stressful; (b) fair; and (c) supportive, all at the same time. A majority of the students characterized their experience as positive overall and supportive once the process concluded. Students attributed their

experience to (a) their limited understanding and timeliness of the process; (b) being able to verbally share their side of their alleged incident; (c) having the ability to ask questions; and (d) the significant relationship and interactions established with the conduct administrator.

Additionally, students disclosed that their interactions with the SCA were the most meaningful aspect of their SCP experience, which was due to the SCAs' ability to provide information about the conduct process and campus resources, and offer an inclusive atmosphere where students felt welcome and supported. Students reported being most open and able to listen to their SCAs when they were (a) approachable, (b) nurturing, (c) non-confrontational, (d) informative, and (e) generally caring about their overall wellbeing. Finally, students reported being more open to the overall SCP, actually listening, and retaining information when they felt the experience was (a) timely, (b) informative, (c) fair, and (d) supportive.

SCAs emphasized that, as one of the basic tenets of the conduct process, creating a supportive experience is important so that students feel that the process is fair and just, which relates with what a majority of students experiences and previous findings in the conduct literature (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). According to SCAs, a supportive conduct experience consists of creating an environment where students feel (a) supported, (b) heard, and (c) that information is transparent throughout all aspects of the conduct process. All three SCAs argued that creating a supportive experience for students was essential to the overall success of SCP.

The SCAs describe the use of a supportive experience for students participating in the SCP as an approach to alleviate anxiety and confusion about the discipline

proceedings. According to the SCAs, a supportive experience is about creating a welcoming and helpful environment where students feel comfortable, supported, and heard, which directly connects to Kegan's (1994) "holding environment" and "conscious bridge" (p. 43). This supportive environment is where students can safely exist while learning new ways of thinking through situations, and gain structure and guidance while performing new tasks (Kegan, 1994). The SCAs described support as a process of checking in with students to see how they are doing, answering questions, listening, offering words of affirmation, physical contact (handshakes, pat on back, or hug), and making students aware of campus resources that may help students navigate their difficult situation.

These similarities connect with previous research that explored the importance of the overall student experience in the conduct process and possible implication for learning. Prior research validates that students are more open to the process and able to learn if they feel heard and that the process was fair (Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Furthermore, scholars agree that perceptions of fairness, and the need for positive and supportive relationships with conduct administrators, are critical for students to open up and feel comfortable in the overall process (Allen, 1994; Cooper & Schwartz, 2007; Chassey, 1999; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; Mullan, 1999, & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Additionally, the literature clearly supports that students' perceptions of their conduct experience are more positive if students have the opportunity to share their voice and be heard (Mullan, 1999). Finally, Allen (1994) and King (2012) found that a positive conduct experience might influence a student's overall perception of the process and

thereby increase the willingness and ability of students to learn and reduce future behavioral issues.

Students' perceptions of the conduct process being anxiety provoking and stressful due to issues of timeliness and lack of understanding the overall process were not supported by administrators and were only supported by one other study in the conduct literature (Howell, 2005). Students reported that delays and length of the overall process and lack of understanding the actual disciplinary expectations created prolonged anxiety and stress. These findings are noteworthy as they support and add to Howell's (2005) research and support the need for broader exploration of ways to address timeliness issues and further educate students about behavior expectations and the conduct process beyond what is already being offered.

The current conduct literature concerning students' experiences also suggests that clear experiential outcomes and assessment measures are significant to determine if students are actually gaining the intended experience, which SCAs illuminated is missing from the research site (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996). Each SCA is left to determine the desired experiential outcomes and currently have no way to measure effectiveness, which is a disconnect with the literature (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996). These findings are also meaningful and support the need for further exploration and development of intended experiential outcomes to maintain consistency between SCAs, which then can be assessed to determine this aspect of the conduct process' effectiveness (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

Learning Opportunity

Student participants reported that the conduct process was a learning opportunity where they gained new knowledge to support future decision-making, which they attributed mainly to their positive interactions with their SCA and engaging in active sanctions that provided the opportunities to learn from peers and gain skills that could be easily applied to everyday living. Students reported (a) gaining a greater understanding of behavioral policies and the conduct process; (b) impact of consequences; (c) taking responsibility; and (d) critically thinking through actions before making decisions. This emerged as the most significant knowledge students gained by participating in the conduct process. Specifically, critically thinking through actions before making decisions included students' learning risk reduction skills associated with substance use and making healthier choices; time management and study skills; and conflict resolution and anger management techniques. According to students, learning varied based on the consequences associated with behaviors and students' willingness to apply the information obtained from the disciplinary proceedings, which according to the prior research may be directly linked to developmental factors associated with the ways young adults "think, reason, and make meaning of their experiences" (Evans et al., 2010, p 43).

Utilizing the conduct process as a learning opportunity is a major similarity shared by SCAs. As learning is one of the basic tenets of the conduct process, SCAs emphasized that students have the opportunity to gain new information and insight on ways to critically think about their decision-making and hopefully change behaviors to prevent future conduct issues. Specifically, SCAs shared that students participating in the SCP learn about (a) the actual process, (b) their rights and responsibilities, (c) impact of

behaviors, (d) self-advocacy, (e) critical thinking and problem-solving skills, and (f) campus resources, through interactions with peers, and active and passive sanctions.

Significant learning associated with self-advocacy and campus resources beyond the Wellness Center were not fully discussed by students and may be a disconnect between desired outcomes and what students are actually obtaining. Some of the students discussed being given a list of campus resources, but did not fully share how these resources were used and/or if they were effective. Further research on students' gaining new knowledge about self-advocacy and campus resources is needed to determine overall relevance to students.

Furthermore, students agreed that learning occurred through positive interactions with administrators that were previously discussed in depth, and experiential/active sanctions tied to peer learning that provided the opportunity for students to engage in reflection of their behaviors while learning new skills to prevent future issues. Students reported that learning risk-reduction skills and ways to think through decisions before making them were the most helpful form of education due to being practical, easy to remember, and allowing a student to make up their own mind on how much of the information they were going to apply. However, students did not find major significance in passive sanctions (fines and probation), which they argued, seemed more like a punishment and only gave the appearance of being a deterrent. Students were less critical of passive sanctions when paired with active sanctions. A combination of active/passive sanctions were found more useful in preventing similar issues and encouraged by the prior research (Allen, 1994; Howell, 2005; King, 2012; & Stimpson & Janosik, 2011)

Students emphasized that active sanctions tied to peer learning were most influential due to learning that others were going through similar situations, and discovering that perceptions that peers were engaging in high-risk behavior were inaccurate. Students shared that the Wellness Center was a major influential aspect of the conduct process due to class-like educational opportunities involving peer interactions and instruction. The impact of peer interactions is supported by prior research that emphasizes that college students are moving from relying on parents and moving toward understanding their surroundings, seeking support through external validation, and intimacy through peers' interaction (Evans et al, 2010, Kegan, et al., 2001; Kohlberg 1975 & 1976; & Paul & Kelleher, 1985). Findings associated with active sanctions and peer interactions are significant and support that learning outcomes may be more effective if aligned with sanctions that engage students to actively participate in learning together with peers to modify behavior. Aligning learning and support for students with a developmental approach was highly encouraged by prior research and is at the core of the theory that supports this study (Evans et al., 2010, Kegan, et al., 2001; Kohlberg 1975 & 1976; & Paul & Kelleher, 1985).

The SCAs reported taking a developmental approach with students, but specifics were not disclosed and were reported to be inconsistent between each SCA, which is disconnected from the literature and with what students reported worked best for them. Prior research highly encourages that conduct administrators utilize developmental approaches during interaction with students to more fully explore concerns of empathy, behavioral consequences, behavioral expectations, and academic adjustment (Howell, 2005). Additionally, the conduct literature recommended that sanctions reflect the

behavioral challenges and developmental needs of students participating in the process (Cooper and Schwartz, 2007; King, 20012; & Mullan, 1999).

Student participants reported learning and applying their new knowledge when making future decisions, but, according to the data gathered in this study, the learning is happenstance since there was no overall evidence of formal learning outcomes or a subscribed developmental approach shared by all SCAs. These findings provided an opportunity for administrators to further evaluate and align the conduct process with intentional learning outcomes and assessment in order to measure the overall effectiveness. As discussed earlier, prior research strongly suggests that clear learning outcomes and assessment measures are significant to determine if students are actually gaining the intended learning (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker, 1996).

Overall, the findings from this study reveal important similarities and differences between SCAs and students that may prove useful in exploring ways beyond what is already being offered to further prevent disciplinary issues and support students when behaviors occur. Additionally, the findings from this study demonstrate that learning is occurring, which according to students is strongly connected to their experience with the SCAs, the ability to engage in sanctions that are active, interactions with peers, and being provided the opportunity to explore problems while learning new skills that help students critically think before making future decisions.

Furthermore, students' claims that the conduct process is educational aligns with the verbal outcomes shared by administrators, but is not fully substantiated due to a lack of formal outcomes and assessment measures which could validate the overall effectiveness of the conduct process. This is a noteworthy finding that may help

administrators further explore the need for intentional outcomes and assessment measures to determine if outcomes are being met and identify ways the SCP may be strengthened and improved. Finally, the findings from this study add to the limited literature concerning the student conduct process, especially that deriving directly from students by using a qualitative approach. The use of qualitative methods provides more complex understanding of the effectiveness of the conduct process and gives added voice to students' experiences that is missing from the prior research.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Future Research

The findings from this study have multiple implications related to college about campus civility, discipline practice, policy, and further research, which are discussed next. First, the findings can aid universities in developing campus wide expectations and educational efforts focused on civility and global citizenship. The literature and this study support the need for proactive educational efforts tied to campus wide civility connected to intuitional mission, values, and culture. Helping students learn and understand the importance of being positive contributing community member in every aspect of university life may further support civility and prevent discipline. Additionally, the findings can aid administrators in further exploring ways to prevent conduct problems through the use of the reported behavioral influences and insight students provided related to the need for more education about the conduct process and behavioral expectations before issues occur. Possible changes may include further educating students about conduct expectations beyond what is already being offered, the role of the SCP, and what students can expect if discipline problems arise. Additionally, the findings from this study may aid administrators in more broadly aligning programs and

support services to focus on student developmental needs, transition issues, and awareness of campus resources that can better assist students moving from adolescence to adulthood while navigating the difficulties associated with the college experience.

In addition, the findings from this study illuminate the significance of the SCAs in the conduct process, which may assist in further exploring ways to assess and improve current SCA roles, supervise and/or manage SCAs, provide appropriate training, and implement ongoing development to maintain consistency and overall effectiveness. Possible changes to the SCA role may include broader understanding and application of student development theory and best practice strategies to further support students struggling with transition issues and behavioral problems. Furthermore, findings from this study may aid administrators in improving the overall conduct process through the development and implementation of intentional outcomes and continual assessment measures, which could provide more consistency between SCAs, better alignment with best practice standards, and evidence of overall program effectiveness and areas that need strengthening (CAS, 2012; Kuh, 1979; & Zacker 1996).

Moreover, implications for the student conduct practice directly connect to the development and implementation of educational and active sanctions focused on students' developmental needs, rather than generalized across-the-board sanctions. Specifically, the use of Kegan's (1994), Kegan et al. (2001), and Kohlberg's (1975 & 1976) theories may aid administrators in better understanding ways students make meaning of their experiences and move from adolescence to adulthood with peer interaction and approval being the main support. Offering students sanctions that involve

peer learning and instruction may aid administrators in meeting some of the demands of said developmental needs.

Implications related to policy may include possible changes to the overall Code, which governs students' behaviors at the research site and issues of accountability demands from policy makers. The findings from this study may aid administrators when reviewing the Code to make sure processes are timely, supportive and fair, which according to students were factors of high importance. Additionally, the use of these findings may support the review of current passive sanctions to determine the effectiveness of fines and probation. Furthermore, the findings may help administrators address ongoing public scrutiny related to increased disciplinary issues and the demand for greater accountability, by demonstrating that student behavior issues are being taken seriously, students are being held accountable, and that students have reported learning new information that helps them critically think through actions before making decisions.

Implications related to future research include adding to the current body of literature and future research opportunities that can continue to build on this study and prior research. The findings add to the overall body of student conduct literature and more specifically, add a qualitative lens from the perspective of administrators and students who experienced the conduct process at a large four-year public urban institution located in the Northeast, which is currently missing from prior research (Dannells, 1997; Howell, 2005; Mullan, 1999; Stimpson & Janosik, 2011). Furthermore, research to strengthen and build on these findings may include additional qualitative studies focused on exploring the experience of students that participate in the SCP at similar urban and non-urban institutions with a large sample size. Future studies may explore the

similarities and differences between students that participate in the main SCP and those going through similar disciplinary proceedings managed by housing and residential life departments, where both follow the same Code. Finally, future research may strengthen the overall student conduct literature by comparing similar findings to this study to those of institutions that have clearly defined outcomes and assessment measures to determine which program has a greater impact on students.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations were evident during the design and completion of this study including the following: one research site and lack of comparison between other similar institutions; small sample size of administrators and students, which may have been impacted by my affiliation and being seen as an authority figure at the research site; and my role as a senior university administrator, which prevented a broader comparison with the students going through the SCP in on-campus housing, of which my administrative office has direct oversight. Additionally, two of the SCAs were not employed during the period students reported participated in the SCP, which may have influenced the comparison between both students and administrators. Future research is encouraged between SCAs and students that actually interaction to determine if this discrepancy is significant. Finally, an additional limitation is that students only agreed to participate in the study after being offered a \$25 incentive, which may have influenced their ability and willingness to be open and honest about their experiences. These limitations demonstrate issues that may in part have been avoided if the research had been conducted at another institution where my role had no influence; however, the fact

still remains that students may not be willing to discuss their conduct experience since it can be painful and embarrassing.

Even through all these limitations, there are aspects of the researchers' positionality and the incentives that can be seen as positive. The positionality of the researcher role afforded valuable insight into how the conduct process worked and ways to support students while examining the sensitive topic of their experiences in the disciplinary proceedings. Additionally, the positionality afforded access to SCAs and students that participated in the conduct process that an outsider may not have been able to acquire. Furthermore, the use of only students that received an incentive provided consistency and prevented the need to create a comparison between students that participated with and without an incentive. Finally, the use of findings from this study still adds to the current limited research and provides much needed qualitative insight into the conduct process.

Conclusion

This chapter presented a summary of findings and shown the similarities and differences between students, administrators, and prior student conduct research. Additionally, this chapter demonstrated the implications associated with student conduct practice, policy, and future research, which these findings directly support. Furthermore, this chapter presented the limitations that were directly linked to this study, which mainly surfaced due to students not being willing to share their experiences without monetary incentive and the positionality of my role as a senior administrator at the research site. The overall significance of this study is presented next.

The significance of this study directly relates to increasing awareness of students' experience in the college conduct process and insight into ways the process influences learning and future student behavior. Additionally, the outcome of using a qualitative approach to this study provides a much-needed voice of students who experience the conduct process, and that of a comparison between students and administrators, which only one other study thus far has explored. Furthermore, the study provides clear evidence that the SCAs, active sanctions, and peer interaction and instruction influenced students' willingness to be open to the process and ability to experience the process as fair, supportive and just, which substantiates prior research.

Moreover, the findings of this study provide insight into ways universities can enhance student conduct policies, procedures, educational sanctions, and campus resources to more fully support students struggling with disciplinary problems, through the use of programs and services that consider students' developmental needs and transition issues. Likewise, the findings from this study provide valuable insight into ways administrators can enhance the experience and learning of students participating in the SCP by aligning intentional outcomes with industry standards and best practice methods that are assessed annually to determine overall effectiveness. Finally, the significance of this study is that it begins to address public scrutiny and demand for greater accountability for the prevention and management of student disciplinary issues.

Additional research is needed to further substantiate these findings and provide an overall voice to students that participate in the student conduct process. Efforts from administrators and researchers are needed to fully understand ways to better support students as they navigate similar issues to those presented in this study. Furthermore, the

demand to further support students is great and may only be achieved if additional studies focus on the experience of students in comparison of desired outcomes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, E. & Madden, M. (2008). Hazing in view: College students at risk. Initial findings from the National Study of Student Hazing. Retrieved from http://www.stophazing.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hazing_in_view_web1.pdf
- Allen, S. E. (1994). The college disciplinary program as a catalyst for learning (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 834-1026.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2012, November). *Higher Education and the 2012 Elections*. Retrieved from <http://www.aascu.org/policy/publications/policy-matters/higheredandelections2012.pdf>
- Appleton, J. R., Briggs, C. M., & Rhatigan, J. J. (1978). Pieces of eight: The rites, roles and styles of the deans by eight who have been there. (p. 13). Portland, OR: NASPA
- Association for Student Judicial Affairs. (1998). The state of student judicial affairs: Current forces and future challenges. College Station, TX.
- Clery, H. & Clery, C. (2011). What Jeanne didn't know? *Security On Campus, Inc.* Retrieved from <http://clerycenter.org/our-history>
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Kauffman, K. (1987). Theoretical introductions to the measurement of moral judgment. In A. Colby & L. Kohlberg (Eds.), *The measurement of moral judgement: Vol. 1. Theoretical foundations and research validation (pp. 1-67)*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Cooper, M., & Schwartz, R. (2007). Moral judgment and student discipline: What are institutions teaching? What are students learning? *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(5), 595-607. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/195181688?accountid=14270>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dollar, R. J. (1969). Disciplined College Students' Opinions of the Discipline Process." *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 10 (41, 219-222).
- Baldizan, E. M. (1998). Development, due process, and reduction: Student conduct in the 1990s. In D. L. Cooper & J. M. Lancaster (Eds.), *Beyond law and policy: Reaffirming the role of student affairs: New directions for student services* (No. 82, pp. 29-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Barr, M. J., and Associates. (1988). *Student services and the law: A handbook for practitioners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bickel, R. D., & Lake, P. F. (1999). *The rights and responsibilities of the modern university: Who assumes the risks of college life?* Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education
- Bordin, R. (1993). Alice Freeman Palmer. The evolution of a new woman. (p. 5) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan
- Bostic, D., & Gonzalez, G. (1999). Practices, opinions, knowledge, and recommendations from judicial officers in public higher education. *NASPA Journal*, 36(3), 166. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/223508457?accountid=14270>
- Botelho, G., Karimi, F., & Valencia, N. (2014, November 21). Gunman opens fire in Florida State University library; 3 wounded. *CNN*. <http://www.cnn.com/2014/11/20/us/fsu-incident/index.html>
- Bracewell, W. R. (1988). Student discipline. In M. J. Barr and Associates, *Student Services and the Law: A Handbook for Practitioners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2004). An overview of the social norms approach. In L. Lederman & L. Stewart (Eds.), *Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated health communication campaign*. Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Berkowitz, A. D., & Perkins, H. W. (1986). Resident advisers as role models: A comparison of drinking patterns of resident advisers and their peers. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 27, 146-153.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities (4th Ed.)*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Chassey, R. A. (1999). A comparison of moral development of college student behavioral offenders and non-offenders. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 435943).
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (2012). *CAS professional standards for higher education: Student conduct programs* (pp. 438-446). Washington, DC.
- Dannells, M. (1988). Discipline. In A. L. Rentz & G. L. Saddlemire (Eds.). *Student*

affairs functions in higher education (pp. 127-154). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.

- Dannells, M. (1997). From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vol. 25, No. 2). Washington, DC: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.temple.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=507546066&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Dannells, M., & Lowery, J. W. (2004). Discipline and judicial affairs. In F. J. D. MacKinnon & Associates (Eds.), *Rentz's student affairs practice in higher education (4th ed.)*, pp. 178-217). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Dickstein, G., & Christensen, A. N. (2008). Addressing student well-being and mental health. In J. M. Lancaster & D. M. Waryold (Eds.), *Student conduct practice: The complete guide for student affairs professionals*, 216-240.
- Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F. 2d. 150 (5th Cir. 1961).
- Dublon, F. (2008). Demystifying governance: The influential practitioner. In J. M. Lancaster & D. M. Waryold (Eds.), *Student conduct practice: The complete guide for student affairs professionals* (pp. 31-45). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Duhn, K. (2008, February 14). 6 shot dead, including gunman, at Northern Illinois University. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2008/US/02/14/university.shooting/>
- Ellis, R. & Sidner, S. (2014, May 27) Deadly California rampage: Chilling video, but no match for reality. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2014/05/24/justice/california-shooting-deaths/>
- Erdely, S. R. (2014, November 19). A rape on campus: A brutal assault and struggle for justice at UVA. *Rolling Stone*. Retrieved from <http://www.rollingstone.com/culture/features/a-rape-on-campus-20141119>
- Emmanuel, N. R. & Miser, K. M. (1987), Evaluating judicial program effectiveness. *New Directions for Student Services*, 1987: 85–94.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice (2nd Ed.)*. pp. 1-193 San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Footer, N. S. (1996). Achieving fundamental fairness: The code of conduct. In W. L. Mercer (Ed.), *Critical issues in judicial affairs: Current trends in practice* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 73 pp. 19-33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Ganim, S. (2014, October 24). Academic fraud or not, UNC students likely will keep degrees. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2014/10/25/us/unc-report-academic-fraud/index.html?iref=allsearch>
- Ganim, S. & Sayers, D. (2014, October 25). UNC report finds 18 years of academic fraud to keep athletes playing. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2014/10/22/us/unc-report-academic-fraud/>
- Gregory, D. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2003). The effect of the Clery Act on campus judicial practices. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 763-778. Retrieved from: http://mwbdvjh.muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_college_student_development/v044/44.6gregory.pdf
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldstein, A. & Stimpson, M. (2013). The student conduct administrator: Competency nine – Assessment. In D. M. Waryold & J. M. Lancaster (Eds.), *The state of student conduct. Current forces and future challenges: Revisited* (pp. 42-52). Association for Student Conduct Administrators.
- Hancock, B. (2002) Trent *Focus for Research and Development in Primary Health Care An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Retrieved from: http://faculty.cbu.ca/pmacintyre/course_pages/MBA603/MBA603_files/IntroQualitativeResearch.pdf
- Harper, S. R., Harris, F., III, & Mmeje, K. (2005). A theoretical model to explain the overrepresentation of college men among campus judicial offenders: Implications for campus administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 42, 565-588.
- Hauser, C. (2007 April 16). Virginia Tech shooting leaves 33 dead. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/16/us/16cnd-shooting.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Hefling, K. (2014, April 29). Campus rape addressed by White House task force. *Diverse*. Retrieved from <http://diverseeducation.com/article/63633/>
- Hoekema, D. A. (1994). *Campus rules and moral community: In place of in loco parentis*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield
- Howell, M. T. (2005). Students' perceived learning and anticipated future behaviors as a

- result of participation in the student judicial process. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(4), 374-392. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/195181244?accountid=14270>
- Hirsch, G. (2013). *Helping college students succeed: A model for effective intervention*. Chicago. Routledge
- Hirsch, J. K., and Ellis, J. B. (1996). Differences in life stress and reasons for living among college suicide ideators and non-ideators. *College Student Journal*, 30 (3): pp. 377-386.
- Hudd, S. S., Dumlao, J., Erdmann-Sager, D., Murray, D., Phan, E., Soukas, N., & Yokozuka, N. (2000). Stress at college: Effects on health habits, health status and self-esteem. *College Student Journal*, 34(2), 217.
- Ignelzi, M. (2000) Meaning-making in the learning and teaching process. In M. B. Baxter Magolda (Ed). *Teaching to promote intellectual and personal maturity: Incorporating students' worldviews and identities into the learning process*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 82. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Ishler, J. L. (2005). Today's first-year students. *Upcraft, Gardner, & Barefoot (Eds.). Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student*, 15-26.
- Ishler, J. L., & Upcraft, M. L. (2005). The keys to first-year student persistence. *Upcraft, Gardner, & Barefoot (Eds.). Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student*, 27-46.
- Janosik, S. M. (2004). Parents' views on the Clery Act and campus safety. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 43-56.
- Janosik, S. M., Davis, M. B., & Spencer, E. F. D. (1985). Characteristics of repeat student offenders: A 6-year study. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 411-414.
- Janosik, S. M., Dunn, P. M., & Spencer, E. F. D. (1986) Student misconduct: Differences between first and repeat offenders. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 7(1), 46-51.
- K12 Academics. (2014, October 21). *School shootings: History of school shootings in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12academics.com/school-shootings/history-school-shootings-united-states#.VHX0OpPF-sA>
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self*. Pp. 79 – 164. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: the mental demands of modern life*. Pp. 40 – 278. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R., Broderick, M., Drago-Severson, E., Helsing, Popp, D., & Portnow, K. (2001)

Toward a new pluralism in ABE/ESOL classrooms: Teaching to multiple "cultures of min." Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Education, National Center for Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.

- Love, P.G., & Guthrie, V.I. (Eds.). (1999). Understanding and applying cognitive development theory. *New Directions for Student Services*, No. 88. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kang, J.C. (2013, March 28). That other school shooting. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/magazine/should-it-matter-that-the-shooter-at-oikos-university-was-korean.html?pagewanted=all>
- Kibler, W. (2013). Preamble to the constitution of the association for student judicial affairs: Reflections upon the crafting of the preamble and the relevance it has today. In D. M. Waryold & J. M. Lancaster (Eds.), *The state of student conduct. Current forces and future challenges: Revisited* (pp. 7-9). Association for Student Conduct Administrators.
- King, R. H. (2012). Student Conduct Administration: How Students Perceive the Educational Value and Procedural Fairness of Their Disciplinary Experiences. *Journal of College Student Development* 53(4), 563-580. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Retrieved June 22, 2014, from Project MUSE database. http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.temple.edu/journals/journal_of_college_student_development/v053/53.4.king.html
- Kingkade, T. (2014a, September 12). Columbia students bring out mattresses to support senior Emma Sulkowicz's rape survivor project. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/09/12/columbia-mattress-emma-sulkowicz_n_5811030.html
- Kingkade, T. (2014b, October 15). 85 colleges are now under federal investigation for sexual assault cases. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/10/15/colleges-federal-investigation-sexual-assault_n_5990286.html?utm_hp_ref=breakingthesilence
- Kohlberg, L. (1975). The cognitive-developmental approach to more education. *Phi Delta Kappa* 56, 670-677.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976) Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.) *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues* (pp. 31-53). New York: Holt.
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R. H. (1977). Moral development: A review of the theory. *Theory into Practice*, 16 (2), 53-59.
- Kompalla, S. L., & McCarthy, M. C. (2001). The effect of judicial sanctions on recidivism and retention. *College Student Journal*, 35, 223-231.

- Kreps, D. (2014, November 26). UVA officials hold emergency meeting to discuss sexual assaults. *Rolling Stone*. Retrieved from <http://www.rollingstone.com/culture/news/uva-officials-hold-emergency-meeting-to-discuss-sexual-assaults-20141126>
- Kuh, G. D. (Ed.). *Evaluation in Student Affairs*. Cincinnati, Ohio: American College Personnel Association, 1979.
- Leonard, E. A. (1956). *Origins of personnel services in American higher education*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lichtman, M. (2010). *Qualitative research in education*. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Lowery, J. W. (2008). Laws, policies, and mandates. In J. M. Lancaster & D. M. Waryold (Eds.), *Student conduct practice: The complete guide for student affairs professionals* (pp. 71-92). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Lumley, M. A., & Provenzano, K. M. (2003). Stress management through written emotional disclosure improves academic performance among college students with physical symptoms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(3), 641–649.
- Martinez, M. & Hanna, J. (2014, June 10). 'I just want people to die,' Seattle college shooting suspect wrote, prosecutor says. *CNN*. <http://www.cnn.com/2014/06/10/justice/seattle-campus-shooting-charges/>
- Magolda, M., & Magolda, P. (1988). Student activism: A historical overview. In K. M. Miser (Ed.). *Student affairs and campus dissent: reflections of the past and challenges for the future* (pp. 7-22). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Mazza, E. (2014, November 24). UVA students who've admitted to sexual assault haven't been expelled, says school official. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/11/23/uva-sexual-assault_n_6209302.html
- McCormack, A. S. (1996). Drinking in stressful situations: college men under pressure. *College Student Journal*, 30 (1): 65-77.
- Miller, T. K. (Ed.). (2003). *The book of professional standards for higher education*. Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.
- Morgan, S. (1997). Cheap drinks, heavy costs: students and alcohol. *Youth and Policy*, 56: 42-54.
- Mullane, S. P. (199). Fairness, educational value, and moral development in the student disciplinary process. *NASPA Journal*, 36, 86-95.

- Murphy, B. (2013, February 01). Harvard cheating scandal ends in dozens of forced withdrawals. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/02/01/harvard-cheating-scandal-n_2600366.html
- Naquin, M.R. and Glibert, G.G. (1996). College students' smoking behavior, perceived stress and coping styles. *Journal of Drug Education, 26 (4):* 367-76.
- O'Reilly, F. L., & Evans, R. D. (2007). The effectiveness of discipline/judicial processes on catholic campuses as measured by the rate of recidivism. *College Student Journal, 41(4)*, 1055-1063. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/61961361?accountid=14270>
- Paterson, B.G. & Kibler, W.L. (2008). Incivility on campus. In D. Waryold & J. Lancaster (Eds.) *Contemporary administration of student conduct and ethical development on college campuses* (pp. 175-201). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Paul E.L. & Kelleher, M. (1995) Precollege concerns about losing and making friends in college. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*, 513–521.
- Pavela, G. (1997). Model code of academic integrity. *Journal of College and University Law, 24*, 97-118.
- Pavela, G. (2006). Model code of student conduct. In J. M. Lancaster & Associates (Eds.), *Exercising power with wisdom: Bridging legal and ethical practice with intention* (pp. 171-192). A. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications.
- Paterson, B. G. & Gregory, D. (2013). The evolution of student discipline. In D. M. Waryold & J. M. Lancaster (Eds.). *The state of student conduct: Current forces and future challenges: Revisited* (pp. 45-51). Association for Student Conduct Administrators.
- Paterson, B. G. & Kibler, W. L. (2008). Incivility on college campuses. In J. M. Lancaster & D. M. Waryold (Eds.), *Student conduct practice: The complete guide for student affairs professionals* (pp. 175 - 201). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Polomsky Jr, J., & Blackhurst, A. (2000). The relationship between disciplinary status and the college experiences of male students. *College Student Affairs Journal, 19(2)*, 41.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university: A history*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Rest, J. R. (1979). *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S. J., & Bebeau, M.J. (1999b). DIT2: Devising and

- testing a revised instrument of moral judgment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 644-659.
- Smith, D. B. (1994). Student discipline in American colleges and universities: A historical overview. *Educational Horizons, 72*, 78-85.
- Stimpson, M. T., & Janosik, S. M. (2011). Variability in reported student learning as a result of participating in the student conduct system. *College Student Affairs Journal, 30*(1), 19-30,96. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1503763683?accountid=14270>
- Stimpson, M. T., & Stimpson, R. L. (2008). Twenty-seven years of student conduct literature: Implications for practice, scholarship, and ASJA. *Journal of Student Conduct Administration, 1*(1), 14-31.
- Stoner, E. N. II, (2008). Revising your student conduct code. In J. M. Lancaster & D. M. Waryold (Eds.), *Student conduct practice: The complete guide for student affairs professionals* (pp. 71-92). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Stoner, E. N. II, (2000). *Reviewing your student discipline policy: A project worth the investment*. Chevy Chase, MD: United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, Inc.
- Stoner, E. N., II, & Cerminara, K. (1990). Harnessing the "spirit of insubordination:" A model student disciplinary code. *Journal of College and University Law, 17*, 89-121.
- Stoner, E. N., II, & Lowery, J.W. (2004). *Navigating past the "spirit of insubordination": A twenty-first-century model student conduct code with a model hearing script*. Retrieved from http://www.edstoner.com/uploads/stoner__lowery_JCUL_2004_cropped.pdf
- Struthers, C. W., Perry, R. P., & Menec, V. H. (2000). An examination of the relationship among academic stress, coping, motivation and performance in college. *Research in Higher Education, 41*(5), 581-592.
- Taylor, M. (2014a, April 28). White House releases proposals on campus sexual assaults. *Al Jazeera America* Retrieved from <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/4/28/campus-sexual-assaultwhitehousetaskforcerecommendations.html>
- Taylor, M. (2014b, September 19). Obama launches national drive to combat campus sexual assault. *Al Jazeera America* Retrieved from <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/9/19/campus-sexual-assaultitsonus.html>
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the cause and cures of student attrition*.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Theelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thomason, A. (2014, October 20). Report on academic fraud at Chapel Hill to be released on Wednesday. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogs/ticker/jp/report-on-academic-fraud-at-chapel-hill-to-be-released-on-wednesday>

The White House. (2012, January 27). Fact sheet: President Obama's blueprint for keeping college affordable and within reach for all Americans. *Office of the Press Secretary*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/01/27/fact-sheet-president-obama-s-blueprint-keeping-college-affordable-and-wi>

The White House. (2013, August 22). Fact sheet on the President's plan to make college more affordable: A better bargain for the middle class. *Office of the Press Secretary*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/08/22/fact-sheet-president-s-plan-make-college-more-affordable-better-bargain->

The White House. (2014a, January 01). Support for higher education. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/higher-education>

The White House. (2014b, January 22). Memorandum – establishing a White House task force to protect students from sexual assaults. *Office of the Press Secretary*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/01/22/memorandum-establishing-white-house-task-force-protect-students-sexual-a>

Upcraft, M. L., & Schuh, J. H. (2000). Assessment in student affairs. In M. J. Barr & M. K. Desler (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration (2nd Ed.)* pp. 249-264). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vendituoli, M. (2014, July 29). Few hazing victims see it that way, researcher explains. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Few-Hazing-Victims-See-It-That/147953/>

Walker, L. J. (1983). Source of cognitive conflict for stage transition in moral development. *Developmental Psychology*, 19, 103-110.

Walker, L. J. (1988). The development of moral reasoning. *Annals of Child Development*, 5, 33-78.

Willis, J.W. (2007). *Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Winnicott, D. W. (1965). *The maturational process and the facilitating environment* (p. 116). New York: international University Press.

Zacker, J. (1996). Evaluation in judicial affairs. *New directions for student services*, (73), 99-106.

APPENDIX A: EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER FOR ADMINISTRATORS

January 2015

Dear Student Conduct Administrator:

My name is Kevin Williams and I am a doctoral candidate at Temple University in the School of Education. My advisor, James Earl Davis, professor in the College of Education, and I are conducting research exploring the experiences of students that have participated in the student conduct process at Temple University. The title of this project is College student behavior: A qualitative investigation of students' experience and future behavior related to the student conduct process. The purpose of this study will examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and its influence on their learning and future behaviors by comparing their experiences to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. You have been identified as a potential research participant due to your role as an administrator working with students participating in the student conduct process.

We invite you to participate in this study, as your feedback would be greatly valued as we explore ways to improve the student conduct process. **Your participation includes a 60 – 90 minute individual audio-recorded, face-to-face interview to discuss your role in administering the student conduct process.** The actual interviews will take place in a university-centralized facility and will only last 60 – 90 minutes. You will be asked to read over the interview transcription once completed to check for accuracy of responses. **This entire process should take no more than two hours of your time.**

Your participation in this study is voluntary and the information obtained will only be used for this study. This study will have no impact on employment, and the researchers will only know your identity. All information will be maintained confidentially in accordance with the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Participants will pick a pseudonym to protect their identity. If you decide to participate in this study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participating at any time without consequence.

I have attached the consent form for this project that will provide further details pertaining to this study. Please contact Kevin Williams at kevinw@temple.edu if you would like to participate in this study. You may also contact Dr. James Earl Davis, Principal Investigator, at jdavis21@temple.edu. Please contact the Institutional Review Board at or irb@temple.edu if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study.

APPENDIX B: ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Administrator Participant Interview Questions

1. Demographics

- a. Age, race, gender, years in field, years in role, and highest degree obtained

2. Student Conduct Purpose and Cause of Behavioral Issues

- a. What is the purpose of the student conduct process?
- b. What is your role in the student conduct process?
- c. What are the overarching experiential outcomes associated with the conduct process?
 - i. How are these overarching outcomes shared with students?
 - ii. How are these outcomes measured for understanding?
- d. What are the overarching learning outcomes associated with the conduct process?
 - i. How are these outcomes shared with students?
 - ii. How are these outcomes measured for understanding?
- e. What is the range of behavioral issues seen in the conduct process?
- f. What influences student behavioral issues?

3. Student Conduct Process Discussion

- a. What is the process review meeting?
 - i. What are the outcomes associated with the process review meeting?
How is rapport developed during the process review meeting?
 - ii. How does your relationship with students during this process influence or hinder the experience and learning outcomes?
 - iii. How are the overarching outcomes reinforced during process review meetings?
 - iv. How do you support the students' experiences and learning during the process review meeting?
 1. What tools are used to maintain constancy between students?
 - v. In what ways do the process review hearings influence or hinder students' experience and learning during the conduct process?
 - vi. How is student development theory used during this part of the process?
- b. What is an administrative hearing?
 - i. What are the outcomes associated with the administrative hearing?
 - ii. When is an administrative hearing an option?
 - iii. How is rapport developed during the administrative hearing?
 - iv. How does your relationship with students during this process influence or hinder the experience and learning outcomes?
 - v. How are overarching outcomes reinforced during administrative hearings?
 - vi. How do you support the students' experiences and learning during an administrative hearing?

- 1. What tools are used to maintain constancy between students?
 - vii. In what ways does the administrative hearing influence or hinder students' experience and learning during the conduct process?
 - viii. How is student development theory used during this part of the process?
- c. What is a hearing board?
 - i. What are the outcomes associated with the hearing board?
 - ii. When is a hearing board an option?
 - iii. How is rapport developed during the hearing board?
 - iv. How are overarching outcomes reinforced during the hearings board?
 - v. How do you support the students' experiences and learning during the hearing board?
 - 1. What tools are used to maintain constancy between students?
 - vi. In what ways do hearing boards influence or hinder students' experience and learning during the conduct process?
 - vii. How is student development theory used during this part of the process?
- d. What is a sanction?
 - i. What are the outcomes associated with sanctions?
 - ii. What is the extent of sanctions offered?
 - iii. How is rapport developed during the sanction phase of the process?
 - iv. How does your relationship with students during this process influence or hinder the experience and learning outcomes?
 - v. How are overarching outcomes reinforced during the sanction process?
 - vi. How do you support the students' experiences and learning during sanction process?
 - 1. What tools are used to maintain constancy between students?
 - vii. In what ways do sanctions influence or hinder students' experience and learning during the conduct process?
 - viii. In what ways do sanctions influence future decision-making?
 - ix. What is the follow up process to measure sanction effectiveness?
 - x. What do you think students want to experience and learn from the student conduct process?
 - xi. How is student development theory used during this part of the process?
- e. What are students' perceptions before and after the conduct process?
- f. What advice are students sharing with others pertaining to the conduct process?

4. Decision-Making and Future Behaviors:

- a. What new skills have students' reported gaining from participating in the conduct process?
- b. What aspects of the student conduct process do you think most influences future behavior for students? Why?

- c. What behavioral changes have students' reported occurred since participating in the student conduct process?
- d. What ways do you use campus resources to support students participating in the conduct process?
 - i. What were the resources and how did they help?
- e. What additional information would you like to share?

APPENDIX C: STUDENT CONDUCT REPORT REQUEST EMAIL

January 2015

Dear

My name is Kevin Williams and I am a doctoral candidate at Temple University in the College of Education. My advisor, Dr. James Earl Davis, professor in the College of Education, and I are conducting research exploring the experiences of students that have participated in the student conduct process at your university. The title of this project is College student behavior: A qualitative investigation of students' experience and future behavior related to the student conduct process. The purpose of this study will examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and its influence on their learning and future behaviors by comparing their experiences to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. I am reaching out to gain access to a report of students that participated in the student conduct process between August 2012 and September 2014 retrieved from the student conduct management system.

Information obtained by your office will be used to invite 15 – 20 mixed-gender, 18 – 24-year-old undergraduate students to participate in this study through email sent by your office. Selected students will participate in a 60-minute semi-structured and face-to-face interview exploring their experience with the student conduct process at your institution. Information gained from this study will provide insight into ways that colleges and universities may improve student behavioral interventions in order to more fully support students struggling with behavioral issues and the communities impacted by such behavior. Additionally, the outcome of this study will aid administrators in developing future conduct processes to amplify outcomes and overall accountability to students, stakeholders, and the field of higher education.

I am requesting an excel report(s) that includes the following columns for main-campus undergraduate student participating in the student conduct process between August 2012 and September 2014 from the ages of 18 – 24: **Last Name, First Name, Email, Age/Birthdate, Gender (M/F/O), Racial/Ethnic Identifier, Academic Standing, Date of Incident, Type of Hearing, Date of Hearing, Violation Type, Plea (Responsible/Not Responsible) Finding of Responsibility (Y/N), Sanction Type, Sanction Completed (Y/N), Sanction Completed Date, On-Campus (Y/N), Off-Campus (Y/N), and Address.** All information will be maintained confidentially in accordance with the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

I have attached a copy of the IRB protocol and approval that will provide further details pertaining to this study.

APPENDIX D: EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER ONE FOR STUDENTS

January 2015

Dear Student:

The Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards invites you to participate in a research project exploring the experiences of students that have participated in the student conduct process at Temple University. The title of this project is College student behavior: A qualitative investigation of students' experience and future behavior related to the student conduct process. The purpose of this study will examine the experiences of students who participate in the conduct process and its influence on their learning and future behaviors by comparing their experiences to the expressed outcomes of the professionals who administer the process. You have been identified as a potential research participant due to your previous involvement with the student conduct process.

We invite you to participate in this study, as your feedback would be greatly valued as we explore ways to improve the student conduct process. **Your participation includes a 60-minute individual audio-recorded, face-to-face interview to discuss your experience with the student conduct process.** The actual interviews will take place in a university-centralized facility and will only last 60 minutes. You will be asked to read over the interview transcription once completed to check for accuracy of responses. **This entire process should take no more than two hours of your time.**

Your participation in this study is voluntary and the information obtained will only be used for this study. This study will have no impact on any previous or future behavioral issues, and the researchers will only know your identity. All information will be maintained confidentially in accordance with the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Participants will pick a pseudonym to protect their identity. If you decide to participate in this study, you may withdraw your consent and stop participating at any time without consequence.

I have attached the consent form for this project that will provide further details pertaining to this study. The research is being conducted by Kevin Williams, a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Temple University and Dr. James Earl Davis, professor in the College of Education Temple University. Please contact Kevin Williams at kevinw@temple.edu if you would like to participate in this study. You may also contact Dr. James Earl Davis, Principal Investigator, at jdavis21@temple.edu. Please contact the Institutional Review Board at irb@temple.edu if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study.

APPENDIX E: EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER TWO FOR STUDENTS

February 2015

Dear Student,

I am writing again to request your assistance with a research study. You will be compensated with a **\$25 Visa gift card** if you agree to participate in the study. You have been selected because you participated in the Temple University Student Conduct Process. The research study is an analysis of how participation in the process impacts future behaviors.

Participation in the study includes the following:

- A 60-minute, one-on-one, audio-recorded interview that will take place on Temple's main campus
- You will select a pseudonym to protect your identity before your interview begins
- You will be asked to review a transcript of your interview to ensure accuracy
- You will receive a \$25 Visa gift card to compensate you for your time

Additional Info: All information will be confidential in accordance with the Temple Institutional Review Board (IRB). The consent form containing full details for participation is attached to this e-mail.

To participate in the study, please contact Kevin Williams, doctoral candidate in the College of Education, at kevinw@temple.edu.

APPENDIX F: EMAIL FOLLOW UP LETTER FOR STUDENTS

February 2015

Dear Student,

Thank you for your interest in participating in my study. To move forward I need your permission to view the following information stored by Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards:

- Your year in college and demographics
- Description of your alleged violation and hearing
- Description of your plea and if you were found responsible

All information will be confidential and only used to ensure that I am interviewing a range of students with different types of experiences in the Conduct Process.

Please respond to this email stating that you give me permission to view the above information. We can schedule the 60-minute interview once I have your permission.

APPENDIX G: STUDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Student Participant Interview Questions

1. Demographics

- a. Name/pseudonym, age, race, gender, sexual orientation, current class standing, class standing during incident, credits completed, major, Greek affiliation, cumulative GPA, current living situation, living situation during incident, socio-economic class, and first-generation status.

2. Types of Violations and Possible Causes to Explore:

- a. Why did you have a conduct hearing?
- b. Did you plea responsible or not responsible? Why or why not?
 - i. Where did the violation(s) occur?
 - ii. What influenced your behaviors that got you in trouble?
 - iii. How did your living situation or the environment influence your behavior?

3. Experiences and Learning from the Students in the Conduct Process:

- a. What did the Student Conduct Administrator (SCA) share was the purpose of the student conduct (SC) process?
- b. How would you describe your experience with the process review meeting?
- c. What specific things did the SCA do or say that made the experience positive or negative during PR meeting?
- d. What did you actual learn/gain by participating in the PR meeting?
- e. What did the SCA do to help you learn in the PR meeting?
- f. What type of hearing process did you attend and why was this chosen?
- g. How would you describe your experience during the hearing?
- h. What specific things did the SCA do or say that made the experience positive or negative during the hearing?
- i. What did you actual learn/gain by participating in the hearing?
- j. What did the SCA/Chair do to help you learn from the hearing?
- k. What type of sanction(s) did you receive (passive and/or active)?
 - i. What was the rationale described for your assigned sanctions?
 - ii. What did the SCA state that you should learn from your sanctions?
 - iii. Did you complete your assigned sanction(s)? Why or why not?
 - iv. What did you learn/gain from the sanction(s)?
 - v. In what ways did the sanction(s) influence/impact future decision-making?
 - vi. In what ways did the sanction(s) influence/impact future behaviors?
- l. What specific things did the SCA do or say that made the experience positive or negative during the following up meeting?
- m. What did you actual learn/gain by participating in follow up meeting?
- n. What did the SCA/Chair do to help you learn from the follow up meeting?
- o. Describe any aspect of the student conduct process that was more helpful than others (i.e. the people, PR meeting, hearing, and/or sanctions). If so, why?

- p. What did you experience overall by participating in the SC process?
- q. What did you hope to experience by participating in the SC process?
- r. What did you learn/gain overall by participating in the SC process?
- s. What did you hope to learn/gain by participating in the SC process?
- t. What did going through the SC process mean to you?
- u. What advice would you give other students about the SC process?
- v. How did you view the SC process before and after?

4. Decision-Making and Future Behaviors

- a. How did the SC process make you reflect on where you want to see your life in the future?
- b. What new skills/insight have you gained and used after participating in the SC process? How have you applied these skills?
- c. What aspects of the SC process influenced your future behavior?
- d. Describe if you are more likely or less likely to violate university policy? Why or why not? What type of policies?
- e. What behavioral changes have occurred since participating in the SC process? If so, why or why not?
- f. Describe if you have continued any type of behavior that may be a violation of the conduct code. If so, what are they?
- g. Describe ways the disciplinary process helped identify campus resources.
- h. What do you see as the purpose of the student conduct process?
- i. What additional information would you like to share?

APPENDIX H: IRB APPROVAL



Office for Human Subjects Protections Student Faculty Conference Center
 Institutional Review Board 3340 N Broad Street - Suite 304
 Medical Intervention Committees A1 & A2 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19140
 Social and Behavioral Committee B Phone: (215) 707-3390
 Unanticipated Problems Committee Fax: (215) 707-9100
 e-mail: irb@temple.edu

Certification of Approval for a Project Involving Human Subjects

Protocol Number: 22690
 PI: DAVIS, JAMES
 Review Type: EXPEDITED
 Approved On: 14-Jan-2015
 Approved From: 14-Jan-2015
 Approved To: 13-Jan-2016
 Committee: A1 - MEDICAL INTERVENTION
 School/College: EDUCATION (1900)
 Department: COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (190)
 Sponsor: Temple University
 Project Title: College student behavior: A qualitative investigation of students' experience and future behavior related to the student conduct process.

The IRB approved the protocol 22690.

If the study was approved under expedited or full board review, the approval period can be found above. Otherwise, the study was deemed exempt and does not have an IRB approval period.

If applicable to your study, you can access your IRB-approved, stamped consent document or consent script through eRA. Enter the relevant approved submission (for example, Modifications Required to Secure Approval) and open the stamped documents by clicking the View icon next to each document. The stamped documents are labeled as such.

Before an approval period ends, you must submit the Continuing Review form via the eRA module. Please note that though an item is submitted in eRA, it is not received in the IRB office until the principal investigator approves it. Consequently, please submit the Continuing Review form via the eRA module at least 60 days, and preferably 90 days, before the study's expiration date.

Note that all applicable Institutional approvals must also be secured before study implementation. These approvals include, but are not limited to, Medical Radiation Committee ("MRC"); Radiation Safety Committee ("RSC"); Institutional Biosafety Committee ("IBC"); and Temple University Survey Coordinating Committee ("TUSCC"). Please visit these Committees' websites for further information.

Finally, in conducting this research, you are obligated to submit modification requests for all changes to any study; reportable new information using the Reportable New Information form; and renewal and closure forms. For the complete list of investigator responsibilities, please see the Policies and Procedures, the Investigator Manual, and other requirements found on the Temple University IRB website: <http://www.temple.edu/research/regaffairs/irb/index.html>

Please contact the IRB at (215) 707-3390 if you have any questions

APPENDIX I: IRB MODIFICATION APPROVAL



Research Integrity & Compliance
Student Faculty Center
3340 N. Broad Street, Suite 304
Philadelphia PA 19140

Institutional Review Board
Phone: (215) 707-3390
Fax: (215) 707-9100
e-mail: irb@temple.edu

Modifications are Approved

Date: 10-Feb-2015

Protocol Number: 22690
 PI: DAVIS, JAMES
 Review Date: 2/6/2015
 Committee: A1 - MEDICAL INTERVENTION
 School/College: EDUCATION (1900)
 Department: COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (190)
 Sponsor: TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
 Project Title: College student behavior: A qualitative investigation of students' experience and future behavior related to the student conduct process.

On 2/6/2015, the IRB approved the following modifications:

A \$25.00 gift card will be given to participants completing the study.

Please contact the IRB at (215) 707-3390 if you have any questions.