
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2017

Student Conduct Administrators' Perceptions of Effective Sanctions That Reduce Recidivism of Alcohol Violations Among College Students

Andel Fils-Aime
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Fils-Aime, Andel, "Student Conduct Administrators' Perceptions of Effective Sanctions That Reduce Recidivism of Alcohol Violations Among College Students" (2017). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 6063.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/6063>



STUDENT CONDUCT ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF EFFECTIVE SANCTIONS THAT REDUCE RECIDIVISM
OF ALCOHOL VIOLATIONS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

ANDEL PIERRE FILS-AIME
B.A. Florida State University, 2005
M.Ed. University of Hawaii, 2007

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Child, Family and Community Sciences
in the College of Education and Human Performance
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2017

Major Professor: Rosa Cintrón

© 2017 Andel Pierre Fils-Aime

ABSTRACT

Recent researchers have found that when alcohol use and/or abuse is a factor in an undergraduate students' college experience, there is a substantial increase in dependence, decreased academic productivity, an increase in safety and security issues, an increase in suicide ideation and attempts, unprotected sexual encounters, and physical assaults that result in injuries (Amaro et al., 2010). One of the most effective ways that institutions in higher education can combat alcohol-related issues on their campuses is for the institutional leaders to play a role in addressing this issue (Busteed, 2008).

In many institutions of higher education, student conduct administrators have been designated as those institutional leaders with the responsibility of addressing alcohol policy violations and establishing a reasonable balance between disciplinary and educational sanctions issued to students (Waryold & Lancaster, 2013). The primary purpose of this research study was to evaluate student conduct administrators' perceptions of the relationship between recidivism and sanctions for alcohol violations at their colleges and universities. More specifically, this study explored the relationship of sanctions that students must complete after having been found responsible for violating the university's alcohol policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Completing this dissertation and receiving my doctoral degree has been a long and arduous journey that I most certainly could not have completed alone. There are several key individuals throughout this process who have continuously inspired me and provided sage advice and guidance. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank those key individuals for their roles in my completion of this task.

First and foremost, my committee chair, Dr. Rosa Cintron, truly made my completion of my dissertation a priority. Without her support and willingness to guide me along this path, I would certainly not be in the position that I am in today. The HEPS motto (*Altiora Peto*) that Dr. Cintron instilled in me and her students will be a motto that I live by as a leader and pass on. I am also very appreciative of the time and effort that my dissertation committee members, Dr. Tom Owens, Dr. Kent Butler, and Dr. Stacey Malaret put into my dissertation. Your feedback, guidance, commitment and expertise truly made this a meaningful learning experience that challenged me to continue to grow as a scholar and practitioner.

I would also like to thank the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) for providing me with the opportunity to advance the research in our field. To Arian Bryant: Thank you for being a sounding board and assisting me in my preparation to complete the Ed. D program. To Kye-Hyoung Lee: Thank you for always being willing to assist me with my statistical analysis. Last but not least, to my wife Janise Nadine Fils-Aime: Thank you for your sacrifices in helping me get to this point. To my son Apollo Antoine Fils-Aime: *Altiora Peto*. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	1
Purpose and Significance of the Study	5
Theoretical Framework.....	6
Research Questions.....	8
Delimitations.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	8
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Legal Implications for the University and Student Relationship.....	11
Parental Involvement and Notification	15
Restorative Justice	16
Impact of Alcohol Abuse on College Students’ Retention and Recidivism.....	18
Impact of Alcohol Abuse on College Students and Legal Issues	21
Impact of Alcohol Abuse on College Students and Victims of Sexual Assault	24
Alcohol Abuse Disciplinary Sanctions	29
Summary	38
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	39
Introduction.....	39
Research Philosophy.....	39
Quantitative Research Design.....	41
Research Questions.....	42
Population and Sample	43
Recruitment of Participants.....	46
Compensation	46
Instrumentation	47
Reliability of the Instrument	47
Web-Based Survey Design	47
Qualtrics	48
Data Collection	48
Data Analysis	48
Ethical Considerations	51
IRB Authorization.....	51
Originality Score.....	51
Summary	52
CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	53

Introduction.....	53
Methodology Review and Response Rate	54
Demographics	55
Research Question 1	74
Research Question 2	80
Research Question 3	85
Summary.....	111
 CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, & CONCLUSIONS	113
Introduction.....	113
Discussion.....	113
Research Question 1	113
Research Question 2	115
Research Question 3	116
Recommendations: Future Research and Practice.....	122
Recommendations: Directors and Vice Presidents	122
Recommendations: Housing and Residence Life Staff	124
Recommendations: Continued Research Based on Gender and Academic Standing	125
Survey Instrument.....	126
Theoretical Framework.....	127
Delimitations.....	128
Recommendations: Future Research Based on High Risk Student Populations	129
Recommendations: Research on Student Athletes	129
Recommendations: Research on Fraternities and Sororities	131
Conclusions.....	133
 APPENDIX A REQUEST TO STUDY ASCA MEMBERSHIP AND INSTRUCTIONS.....	135
 APPENDIX B PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT COMMUNICATIONS.....	138
 APPENDIX C PERMISSION TO USE MODIFIED STUDY INSTRUMENT.....	142
 APPENDIX D STUDENT CONDUCT ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY	145
 APPENDIX E INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL	160
 REFERENCES	162

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Sanction Terminology.....	36
Table 2	Aligning Research Questions with Survey Items	50
Table 3	Demographics of Respondents (N = 264).....	56
Table 4	Descriptive Statistics of Reporting Populations (N = 330).....	57
Table 5	Descriptive Statistics of Incident Locations (N = 327).....	57
Table 6	Descriptive Statistics of Frequency of Violations (N = 329).....	58
Table 7	Level of Agreement on Target Group (N = 333).....	59
Table 8	Entities Addressing Alcohol Related Incidents	60
Table 9	Descriptive Statistics: Parental Notification Policy (N = 331)	60
Table 10	Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 1: Overall Level of Agreement...	62
Table 11	Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 2: Overall Level of Agreement...	62
Table 12	Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 3: Overall Level of Agreement...	63
Table 13	Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 4: Overall Level of Agreement...	63
Table 14	Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 5: Overall Level of Agreement...	64
Table 15	Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 1: Overall Level of Agreement ..	65
Table 16	Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 2: Overall Level of Agreement ..	66
Table 17	Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 3: Overall Level of Agreement ..	66
Table 18	Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 4: Overall Level of Agreement ..	66
Table 19	Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 5: Overall Level of Agreement ..	67
Table 20	Overall Perceptions: Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions	68
Table 21	Overall Perceptions: Effectiveness of Educational Sanctions	68
Table 22	Perceptions of Likelihood of Recidivism Based on Class Standing.....	69
Table 23	Perceptions of Likelihood of Recidivism Based on Gender.....	70

Table 24	Perceptions of Effectiveness of Educational Sanctions Based on Class Standing	70
Table 25	Perceptions of Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions Based on Class Standing	70
Table 26	Perceptions of Effectiveness for Both Disciplinary and Educational Sanctions Based on Class Standing.....	71
Table 27	Perceptions of Effectiveness of Educational Sanctions Based on Gender	71
Table 28	Perceptions of Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions Based on Gender.....	71
Table 29	Perceptions of Effectiveness of Both Disciplinary and Educational Sanctions Based on Gender	72
Table 30	Impact of Sanctions on Caution Toward Policy Violation.....	73
Table 31	Impact of Sanctions on Retention.....	73
Table 32	Impact of Sanctions on Persistence	73
Table 33	Impact of Sanctions on Graduation Rates.....	73
Table 34	Impact of Sanctions on Sexual Assaults	74
Table 35	Mean Difference Test of Educational Sanctions by Educational Levels (Q23)	75
Table 36	Mean Difference Test of Educational Sanctions by Institutional Type (Q23)	77
Table 37	Mean Difference Test of Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size (Q23)..	79
Table 38	Mean Difference Test of Disciplinary Sanctions by Years of Experience (Q22)	81
Table 39	Mean Difference Test of Disciplinary Sanctions by Institutional Size (Q22).	83
Table 40	Mean Difference Test of Disciplinary Sanctions by On-campus Residency...	84
Table 41	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Type, Stage 3 (Q13).....	86
Table 42	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Educational Level, Stage 2 (Q12).....	87

Table 43	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Educational Level, Stage 3 (Q13)	89
Table 44	Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Educational Level, Stage 5 (Q21)	90
Table 45	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 3 (Q13)	92
Table 46	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 4 (Q14)	94
Table 47	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 5 (Q15)	96
Table 48	Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 3, (Q19)	97
Table 49	Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 4, (Q20)	98
Table 50	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 1 (Q11)	100
Table 51	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 3 (Q13)	101
Table 52	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 4 (Q14)	104
Table 53	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 5 (Q15)	106
Table 54	Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 1 (Q17)	107
Table 55	Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 5 (Q21)	108
Table 56	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by On-campus Residency, Stage 3 (Q13)	110
Table 57	Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Residency, Stage 4 (Q14)	111

CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS

Introduction

The issue of alcohol abuse among college students is significant primarily because of the health risks that excessive alcohol consumption can cause, both to students and their academic communities. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention has documented clearly that alcohol is a “significant factor in the three leading causes of death (unintentional injury, homicide, and suicide) among students aged 12 to 20 years old” (Griffin, Umstattd, & Usdan, 2010, p. 523). Griffin et al. (2010) also found that there is a strong correlation between sexual assaults involving college students and the consumption of alcohol. College and university officials must have a comprehensive and holistic understanding of this issue and create policies and an environment that may deter a majority of their students from abusing alcohol (Busteed, 2008). Institutions of higher education must also actively engage their incoming students in order to adequately address pertinent issues surrounding alcohol abuse (English, Shutt, & Oswalt, 2009).

Problem Statement

In order to adequately address issues regarding alcohol abuse on college campuses, institutional administrators and leaders must first identify the areas and populations that are at risk and provide a tangible action plan. Marshall, Roberts, Donnelly, and Rutledge (2011) identified some of the steps that can minimize the risk of alcohol abuse on college campuses: (a) an evaluation of the environment and (b) the development of comprehensive strategies that may

reduce the risk of alcohol consumption by students through the enforcement of institutional policies. Despite the investment of significant time and resources in the management of student behavior, colleges and universities recognize that excessive alcohol consumption and abuse persists among adult college students (Demb & Campbell, 2009). For example, a recent study of college students revealed that 89% of respondents were aware of campus policies related to alcohol use, yet less than half accepted and complied with these campus rules (Marshall et al., 2011).

Although alcohol consumption is a concern for students of both genders, male students present a greater problem than female students. Rubington (1993) has found that, historically, men are more likely to violate their institutions' alcohol policies and are typically heavier drinkers than their female counterparts. According to Labrie, Cail, Pedersen, and Migliuri (2011), male students who are identified through their campus' disciplinary processes as heavy drinkers are less likely than their female counterparts to identify the risks that come with excessive alcohol consumption. These same male students rarely seek professional help for their alcohol-related issues because, to them, it is unimportant. Also, Liguori and Lonbaken (2015) found that first-year male students are more likely to engage in heavy episodic drinking than their female counterparts and are less likely to advance to their second year of study, thus impacting their institutions' retention rates. As a result of the significant impact that this particular type of policy violation may have on an institution, college administrators must be able to identify the appropriate fiscal resources and educational alternatives that can target and alter the behavior of high risk drinking groups (Labrie et al., 2011). Busteed (2008) also proposed that a change in approach to addressing this problem is pertinent for college administrators and

other university personnel primarily because the approaches that have been taken thus far have had little to no effect on the alcohol abuse on college campuses.

Although first-year male college students are adversely affected by excessive alcohol consumption in the area of retention, female college students are impacted in different ways. For example, college women who engage in high-risk drinking games are more likely to encounter negative social and interpersonal consequences (Ray, Stapleton, Turrisi, & Mun, 2014). Female students who engage in pre-gaming events are also at a much higher risk than their male counterparts of experiencing medical emergencies and hospitalizations due to excessive alcohol consumption (Ahmed, Hustad, LaSalle, & Borsari, 2014). This issue may require college administrators to develop and provide campus-based resources that assist students beyond the areas of alcohol abuse or dependence.

There are also unique student populations that are at much higher risks than the general student population on college campuses. One of these unique student populations includes students who join Greek-lettered fraternities and sororities. According to Kingree and Thompson (2013), there is a strong correlation between high-risk alcohol use, fraternity membership, and sexual aggression. This issue is also further when students who are affiliated with fraternities and sororities intentionally eat less food on days when they are expecting to consume more alcohol in order to maximize their level of intoxication (Ward, Galante, Trivedi, & Kahrs, 2015). Overall, college students who identify as being members of their campuses' Greek community engage in much riskier drinking behaviors and experience many more negative consequences that are associated with excessive alcohol consumption (Brown-Rice, Furr, & Jorgensen, 2015).

For college and university administrators, athletes are another important student population when addressing issues of alcohol abuse on their campuses. In one recent study, researchers found that student athletes tend to consume copious amounts of alcohol in order to cope with personal challenges or in response to the positive reinforcement received from their peers (Wahesh, Milroy, Lewis, Orsini, & Wyrick, 2013). Furthermore, intercollegiate athletes consume excessive amounts of alcohol in larger quantities than their non-athlete peers (Marzell, Morrison, Mair, Moynihan & Gruenewald, 2015). In order to combat these concerns within the student-athlete population, college and university administrators should consider educating this population of students through interventions that address high-risk drinking and excessive alcohol consumption (Cimini et al., 2015).

Alcohol abuse and misuse poses a significant health and safety concern to college students, their families, their campus communities, and the community at large. In order to combat this health risk on college campuses, the appropriate theories, philosophies, and practices should be applied to maximize education of these health risks and minimize threats to college students' safety (Prochaska et al., 2004). The transtheoretical model (TTM) is a philosophy that student conduct administrators can integrate into their practice of intentionally sanctioning students for alcohol violations with the intention to produce a change in the student's behavior and minimize the potential of recidivism (Prochaska et al., 2004).

Cameron and Keenan (2010) also indicated that the TTM model's requirement for change includes targeting the practices of those individuals who are assisting in the process of facilitating behavioral change. Student conduct administrators have the responsibility to address alcohol policy violations and apply their institutional rules to students who may have violated

these rules or the law (Waryold & Lancaster, 2013). They also are tasked with the challenge of facilitating the personal development of students who violate rules (e.g., alcohol policies) and providing students with the direction that will lead to a lasting change in behavior (Waryold & Lancaster, 2013).

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the educational and disciplinary sanctions that are most effective in decreasing recidivism among college students who have violated alcohol policies. This study is significant because of its potential to inform student conduct administrators about effective educational sanctions that can contribute to the following desirable outcomes: (a) reduced recidivism of students who violate campus alcohol policies on their campuses and (b) promotion of a healthy and knowledgeable student population that understand the risks of excessive alcohol consumption and abuse. Additionally, this research adds to the body of research available regarding the issue of alcohol abuse on college campuses.

In order to effectively combat the abuse of alcohol on college campuses, Busteed (2008) argued that colleges and universities must begin to focus on the first six weeks of every fall semester when new students are being introduced to their campus communities. Furthermore, in his study Busteed (2008) also found that during the first six weeks of a semester binge drinking increases to nearly 45%. These data give an even greater indication as to why alcohol programming and education efforts should be streamlined to take place in the first six weeks of a student's undergraduate career.

Amaro et al. (2010) found that when alcohol use is a factor in an undergraduate's college experience, there is a substantial increase in dependence, decreased academic productivity, an increase in safety and security issues, an increase in suicide ideation and attempts, unprotected sexual encounters, and physical assaults that result in injuries. The most significant recommendation that Busteed (2008) made was that in order for colleges and universities to effectively address these problems, there must be more involvement from leadership. He argued that there is a void of leadership, financial commitment, and meaningful data that can measure an institution's progress in combating alcohol abuse. There is also a need for trustees and executive leadership to be involved in identifying the appropriate solutions (Busteed, 2008). This type of leadership would ensure a long-term investment in addressing the problems of alcohol abuse.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework utilized in this study was the Transtheoretical Model of Change (TTM); this framework was designed to assist individuals in making gradual, progressive behavioral changes through a series of stages (Prochaska et al., 2004). The five stages associated with this theory include:

1. Pre-contemplation,
2. Contemplation,
3. Preparation,
4. Action, and
5. Maintenance (Prochaska et al., 2004).

The researcher selected this theoretical framework because the stages of change within this framework can be initiated by student conduct administrators when they issue disciplinary sanctions to students for alcohol related policy violations. When the appropriate sanctions are issued to students for alcohol violations, administrators can reduce the number of students actively engaging in high-risk alcohol consumption, debunking myths related to college student drinking, and educating students on healthier alternatives (Prochaska et al., 2004).

When it is appropriately applied, the TTM tracks conceptual changes through a progression of five systematic stages (Velicer, Brick, Fava, & Prochaska, 2013). These five stages include: (1) precontemplation, (2) contemplation, (3) preparation, (4) action, and (5) maintenance (Velicer et al., 2013). The precontemplation stage is one where the individual is unaware of the impact of their behavior on themselves and others or the risks associated with their behavior or problem. Individuals eventually shift into the contemplation stage when they begin to recognize the benefits of changing a specific behavior but do not adequately consider the challenges that may come with making a change. The preparation stage emerges when the individual seeking to make a change has identified goals that will assist in guiding that change. The action stage involves clear and tangible steps that have been taken to initiate the desired change or behavior. The fifth and final stage—maintenance—begins when the individual has been able to sustain the new and changed behaviors identified in the action stage over a meaningful period of time (Prochaska et al., 2004).

Research Questions

The main research questions for this study consisted of the following:

1. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of the most effective educational sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?
2. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of the most effective disciplinary sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?
3. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of disciplinary and educational sanctions for alcohol policy violations that move students through the five stages of the Transtheoretical Model of Change (i.e., Pre-contemplation, Contemplation, Preparation, Action, and Maintenance)?

Delimitations

The delimitations of this study were characterized by the inclusion of only student conduct administrators who were listed as active members in the Association for Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA). As a result of this delimitation, the data from this study may not be reflective of the non-members of ASCA. Therefore, the data that were generated from this study may only be useful to the colleges and universities that have memberships with ASCA.

Definition of Terms

ASCA: The Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) is the professional association composed of members from all institutions of higher education whose membership is

composed of individuals that address institutional policy violations within their respective institutions.

Campus Policies/Code of Conduct: The policies, rules, and expectations that a college/university has in place for all of its students regarding alcohol use.

Freshman: Defined as a period of time when a student is enrolled at a college/university for no more than one year.

Junior: Defined as a period of time when a student is enrolled at a college/university for no more than three years.

Pre-Gaming: Defined as students consuming alcohol prior to attending a major event where alcohol may or may be served. These events can include sporting events, concerts, or a campus activity.

Recidivism: Two or more violations of a college or university's policies or code of conduct that a student has been found responsible for committing

Senior: Defined as a period of time when a student is enrolled at a college/university for four or more years.

Social Fraternity/Sorority – Greek Affiliated: Defined as a Greek-lettered organization where a student is a member.

Sophomore: Defined as a period of time when a student is enrolled at a college/university for no more than two years.

Student Athlete: Defined as a student who represents their college/university in athletic competition.

Student Conduct Administrators: Staff members who are employed by a college or university whose job responsibilities include facilitating their institution's disciplinary or conduct process for students who have violated their institution's policy or code of conduct.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter explores the critical issues surrounding alcohol abuse and/or misuse by college students and focuses on the evolution of the role that colleges and universities play in managing this problem. In addition, this literature review highlights federal laws and policies as well as disciplinary practices that have been used to manage these issues in order minimize the health and academic impacts associated with alcohol misuse in college environments.

Legal Implications for the University and Student Relationship

The 1913 *Gott v. Berea College* case is a landmark case in higher education that defined the parental and authoritative relationship between institutions of higher education (*in loco parentis*) and their students (Olivas, 2006). Not surprisingly, with the institutionalization of *in loco parentis*, colleges and universities began to establish services to promote the education and holistic development of its students (Loss, 2014). According to Olivas (2006), the *Gott v. Berea College* case confirmed that an institution of higher education could place specific limitations on where its students could eat and what local entertainments their students could attend; they could restrict and even forbid students from frequenting places that served alcohol and featured gambling. In the event that students at Berea College failed to comply with their institution's policies, Berea College indicated that disciplinary action against those students could include expulsion.

In 1961, the court case *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* brought an end to the practice of *in loco parentis* (Lee, 2014). This ruling, in favor of Dixon, required institutions

of higher education to afford their students the appropriate rights as they relate to due process as well as protections afforded to them as adults under the Constitution of the United States.

According to Edwards (1994), some of the contributing factors that led to the end of *in loco parentis* on college campuses included an older student body, a shift in liberal thinking, an increased awareness of civil rights, and campus climates that were fraught with rebellion against traditional authorities within the higher education system.

The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) is also a major piece of federal legislation that binds many institutions by its by-laws. Enacted in 1974, FERPA was designed to ensure that the privacy of students educational records would remain confidential between the academic institution and its students (Toglia, 2007). When considering campus judicial policies and incident reports, privacy laws related to a student's disciplinary record can be an impediment and limit a parent or guardian's ability to intervene and address any alcohol related issues with their student. According to FERPA, only the "parents and legal guardians of students under the age of 18 have the right to inspect and review their child's educational records" (Toglia, 2007, p. 32). However, in US colleges and universities, many students are over the age of 18.

Although FERPA restricts the information that institutions can provide legally to the parents and guardians of students who violate alcohol policies, FERPA does recognize that circumstances may arise when the sharing of private information about students is necessary. For example, FERPA allows institutions to contact parents or guardians regarding their student's health and safety in the context of an emergency. According to Cossler (2010), when circumstances arise that involve a student's safety or wellbeing, or when there is a potential risk that a student may pose a threat or danger to other members of the academic community,

colleges and universities may, at their discretion, disclose personal information about a particular student without violating the privacy provisions under FERPA. This exception to FERPA provides the space and opportunity for parents and college/university administrators to create collaborative partnerships that could collectively address the actions of a student who, for example, may have been involved in an incident where there was binge drinking that resulted in that student being hospitalized.

Although FERPA has allowed colleges and universities to share confidential information about a student's disciplinary record with parents or guardians, there are also issues that could have serious legal implications. According to Essex (2004), these legal implications, including and risks, to the university include: (a) failing to notify parents or students of their rights as they relate to FERPA, (b) not allowing parents or students to challenge the accuracy of a report, (c) failing to properly secure and safeguard files, (d) ensuring that only those administrators who have an educational interest in students' information have access to it, and (e) notifying parents or guardians that institutions of higher education are required to release personally identifiable information when the institutions receive a court-ordered subpoena.

Another critical element that colleges and university officials should be aware of when considering their practice of notifying parents or guardians of alcohol related issues is the intersection between FERPA and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act specifically requires that medical professionals and institutions ensure the security of all medical records and maintain the privacy and accountability measures designed to provide these protections (Bergen, 2004). In the event that medical or health providers fail to meet the standards under HIPAA, there could be

significant financial penalties. Rowe (2005) found that there were not significant limitations for college and university officials when it comes to meeting the expectations of FERPA and HIPAA. However, Rowe did recommend that college administrators take the following actions:

- Refrain from asking their institutions' medical/health providers to disclose information without the proper authorization, and
- Cultivate professional relationships with the medical institutions in their respective communities in order to take actions that would remain conducive to the student's privacy and overall well-being.

In order to effectively manage and maintain student privacy as it relates to FERPA and HIPAA, Henning (2007) believes that colleges and universities should embrace the position of *in consortio cum parentibus*, an approach that allows institutions to develop methods and practices that create a partnership dynamic between the two entities.

Because FERPA required higher education administrators to treat their students that were 18 and older as adults, colleges and universities retained the responsibility of ensuring that these same young adults did not directly or indirectly promote underage drinking risks (Bickel & Lake, 1999). For example, in 1981, the case of *Baldwin v. Zoradi* found that a California State University did not effectively enforce its campuses' alcohol policies when several minors engaged in excessive drinking in a campus dormitory. Later that evening, those same students were involved in a car accident that resulted in several injuries (Bickel & Lake, 1999).

Often, there are key indicators in a university's judicial/disciplinary system that contribute to students violating alcohol policies on more than one occasion. For example, when a student goes through their campus disciplinary process for violating university policy, the

disciplinary process is designed to benefit both the student who violated their institution's alcohol policies as well as the members of that campus community. This is primarily due to the belief that once that student who has violated their campus' alcohol policies has learned from the alcohol-related incident, they will be able to use that experience to positively contribute to the larger campus community (O'Reilly & Evans, 2007). Although this is the intended outcome of college and university judicial processes, a high or moderately high recidivism rate for alcohol policy violations may be an indication that the process or the disciplinary sanctions may have been ineffective for the student.

Parental Involvement and Notification

Wheeler and Kennedy, in their 2009 study, determined that there is not a single approach that is most effective in curbing the excessive drinking of college students; the authors elected to determine if integrating parents into the notification and intervention processes of alcohol-related policy violations could be an effective approach for institutions to take. They ultimately found that parents were unaware of their student's violation of their school's alcohol policy, which created limitations on the possible interventions that these parents could have with their students as it relates to alcohol use (Wheeler & Kennedy, 2009). A major contributor to this disconnect was that parents tended to underestimate the amount of alcohol that their student may be consuming and assume that the issue of alcohol abuse tends to affect other people's children (Wheeler & Kennedy, 2009).

Wheeler and Kennedy (2009) also indicated that the drinking habits of most college students mimic the same drinking habits as their parents. This relationship between students'

and parents' drinking habits could indicate whether a student has both the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and support from those key individuals outside of the institution. In the event that parents do not place a high regard on addressing alcohol-related violations with their students, the student who has violated their university's alcohol policy is likely to return to that institution's judicial or conduct office. Wheeler and Kennedy also emphasized the importance of integrating parents into the discussion of cases involving alcohol use/abuse and that sending clear and consistent messages regarding alcohol use can have a lasting impact on a student's decision to drink alcohol (Wheeler & Kennedy, 2009).

Finally, Wheeler and Kennedy (2009) argued that "recruiting parents as partners in an effort to promote healthy decisions about alcohol consumption may perhaps be a vital component of a successful campus-wide alcohol education and prevention initiative" (p. 41). This may also be a monumental step in identifying what could lead to a best practice in institutions as they attempt to address alcohol-related violations and recidivism rates at their institutions. The literature regarding parental involvement in this process was minimal and warranted additional research.

Restorative Justice

On many U.S college campuses, the concept of restorative justice has recently become a method of addressing student conduct violations, including underage alcohol consumption and disruptive behaviors. At the heart of restorative justice is a collaborative process where both the victim, the offender, and other individuals that were indirectly impacted by the conduct of the offender play a role in identifying the appropriate steps the victim should take in repairing the

harm that was caused (Karp, 2013). In order for this process to be successful, the offender must take the following steps:

- Take ownership of their behavior and its impact,
- Actively repair the harm that they caused to all parties directly or indirectly involved, and
- Establish a positive relationship with the members of that community in order to ensure that the harm or offense is not repeated (Karp, 2013).

Restorative justice incorporates a philosophical approach to changing student behaviors that provide students with an opportunity to learn about the university policies that they may have violated as well as to understand the degree to which their behavior may have adversely impacted their campus community. This approach to addressing university-related student violations (e.g. underage alcohol consumption) is vastly different from the judicial processes that many colleges and universities employ which focus more heavily on retribution and punishment (Karp, 2013).

Furthermore, a significant difference between model conduct codes and restorative justice practices resides in their philosophies and anticipated outcomes for addressing or altering student behavior and decision making. For example, Karp (2013) argued that model conduct codes increase the university distance from the student or offender based on the severity of the violation or impact to the institution and its community. However, a central purpose of restorative justice is to get “students to be guided by conscience [so that they are] able to consider the long term consequences of their actions for themselves and others” (Karp, 2013, p. 20). Additionally, restorative justice functions on four core principles that include: (a) inclusive

decision making, (b) active accountability, (c) repairing harm, and (d) rebuilding trust (Karp, 2013). Each of these four concepts are solely designed to seek active engagement from the offending students as well as those individuals who the students may have impacted as a result of their policy violation.

Impact of Alcohol Abuse on College Students' Retention and Recidivism

There are a number of unintended consequences that alcohol use and abuse can have on college students' retention. One impact that alcohol policy violations can have on college students includes alcohol-related incidents that can potentially impact a university's ability to retain its students. Thomspson and Richardson (2008) found that arrests for driving under the influence (DUI) can adversely impact college students and their persistence in their programs of study. For example, the authors found that the financial cost associated with dealing with a legal issue such as a DUI can reduce college affordability and decrease the likelihood that students will re-enroll at their institution during their first, second, or third year at that institution (Thompson & Richardson, 2008). Thompson and Richardson also determined that a DUI arrest can adversely impact college students and create challenges and trauma the student may not have anticipated during the college experience. Similarly, Conway and DiPlacido (2015) found a correlation between students who reported using alcohol daily and skipping class and spending less time on course work; this daily use of alcohol ultimately led to poor academic performance that was reflected in these students' grade point averages (GPAs).

The relationship between alcohol-related incidents and retention is not an issue for four-year colleges and universities only; drinking is also a problem at two-year colleges (Lenk,

Nelson, Erickson, & Toomey, 2015). In Lenk et al.'s 2015 study, only 12% of the 201 surveyed two-year colleges indicated that their institution offered any form of alcohol intervention program targeting students (Lenk et al., 2015); the authors recommended that two-year colleges and universities proactively address alcohol-related issues involving their students in order to increase their overall retention and graduation rates.

Misch (2010) found that students that consume alcohol excessively have a negative impact on the members of their campus and local community. An effective approach to reducing alcohol abuse may include embracing the tactics used in secondhand smoke campaigns; these campaigns relied on peer-to-peer accountability to change human behavior. For example, Misch (2010) noted that when the students who consume and abuse alcohol share with their peers how they have been impacted by their drinking, the concern expressed by their peers is more likely to dissuade that student from abusing alcohol in the future. An approach such as this—that places peer concern and feedback at the center—may be the most feasible for colleges and universities to consider as alcohol abuse and heavy episodic drinking often takes place at times when there are very few administrators on campus to address these risky behaviors. Misch expressed the belief that, moving forward, colleges and universities should encourage students to understand and model responsible alcohol use rather than warning students to abstain from alcohol entirely.

Student conduct or judicial processes are designed to challenge and develop students who have violated their universities' policies by holding them accountable through a fair and impartial review as well as promoting a safe learning environment that is conducive to student success (O'Reilly & Evans, 2007). O'Reilly and Evans (2007) conducted a study that was designed to identify which disciplinary process would be most effective in decreasing the

likelihood of students repeating a violation of their institutions' rules. The most successful disciplinary process was determined based on recidivism rate. The most successful disciplinary process (based on lowest recidivism rate), according to O'Reilly and Evans, involved having other students issue a disciplinary decision through a minority-peer process. However, the student conduct administrators and professionals who participated in this study expressed the belief that students would be less likely to repeat a violation if the administrative disciplinary process was facilitated by a professional (O'Reilly & Evans, 2007). These data indicate that those institutions that have a disciplinary process must be willing to engage their student population in this process by providing them with a significant voice and level of authority.

Cruise (2009) also revealed that students whose parents were notified that they had violated the institution's alcohol policy were far less likely to violate the institutions alcohol policy again. Cruise's study was designed to discover whether parental notification of their student's violation of the Bowling Green University's alcohol policy impacted the likelihood that these same students would violate the university's alcohol policy a second time. Ultimately, Cruise determined that the students who were most likely to violate the university's alcohol policy were male students who lived in an on-campus residence hall. Based on these data alone, one can see that Bowling Green University staff and administrators must pay particularly close attention to the male students who make up their student body. Based on their success in lowering recidivism rates, the institution should consider their practice of parental notifications for alcohol related policy violations. However, for those students who did violate this policy on multiple occasions, the researchers recommended new be alternatives considered.

English et al. (2009) focused primarily on the connections and attitudes that millennial students have related to alcohol, tobacco, and the use of other drugs on their college campuses. English et al. (2009) were able to determine that students of the millennial generation value a structured environment, acknowledge and abide by institutional rules and policies, and exhibit a healthy respect for authority. Based on this understanding of the millennial generation of students, some researchers assumed that the importance of alcohol education and personal responsibility would resonate with them. However, English et al. (2009) found that, despite many institutions' best efforts to address alcohol-related violations by their students, the issue of alcohol abuse increases significantly once first-year millennial students arrive on campus.

When specifically looking at the demographics of college students, English et al. (2009) were able to determine that female college students consume less alcohol and intend to consume less alcohol than their male counterparts. Students of color also were found to consume less alcohol and intended to consume less alcohol than their white counterparts (English et al., 2009). Based on this information, one can assume that it may be in the best interest of institutions to focus on those student populations such as Caucasian males to address the majority of alcohol-related issues on their campuses. However, the best approach might be to research and evaluate those factors that lead to very few students of color committing campus violations related to alcohol use.

Impact of Alcohol Abuse on College Students and Legal Issues

The issue of alcohol use and abuse by college students often is layered with multiple violations of not only institutional policy but also state and federal laws. Fabian, Toomey, Lenk,

and Erickson (2008) found that one of the most common methods that college students often use to obtain alcohol is through the use of a false identity document (ID). College students' use of false IDs are also compounded by alcohol establishments that do not adequately enforce local and federal laws (Fabian et al., 2008). These violations may result in the student facing disciplinary action from their institution as well as legal actions from local law enforcement agencies.

McChargue, Klanecky, and Anderson (2012) found that, when college students consume both alcohol and cannabis, these same students are more likely to encounter legal issues and perform poorly in their courses. McChargue et al. determined that heavy alcohol consumption decreased the negative impact and potential for cannabis consumption to have on a student's GPA and the potential of encountering legal problems. However, excessive alcohol consumption was found to have more serious consequences as it relates to a college student encountering legal issues and low GPA. (McChargue et al., 2012).

Glassman, Braun, Reindl, and Whewell (2011) found that substantial numbers of individuals who attend college football games drink alcohol prior to the start of these athletic events. College football games are popular events that draw current students, local fans, faculty, staff, and alumni. The relationship between college football games and the consumption of alcohol is critical for college administrators to understand primarily because the location and time of potential alcohol abuse can be identified and dictated prior to medical emergencies taking place.

Glassman et al. (2011) also found that the male participants had much higher blood alcohol (BAC) rates and, more importantly, were over the legal limit to operate a motor vehicle.

The results of this study also indicate that, after major football games, students, alumni, and the local population living close to the game location may be at a much greater risk of facing legal issues (e.g., DUI) and possible bodily injury. Perhaps most surprisingly, this study revealed that only 10% of the participants reported that they did not consume any alcohol (Glassman et al., 2011).

In addition, Glassman et al. (2011) discovered that students and other attendees of college football games believed that they received conflicting messages when it came to their use of alcohol at college football games; the primary reason for this perception of mixed messaging arose from a decline in enforcement of institutional and state policies regarding alcohol consumption. Glassman et al. based their statement regarding the decline in enforcement of laws related to alcohol enforcement on the dates of major college football games; local and campus law enforcement typically raise or suspend their open alcoholic beverages container laws on game days, thereby creating an atmosphere that indirectly promotes alcohol consumption. In order for institutions to effectively combat this issue of mixed messaging, there must be a more comprehensive method of addressing these concerns.

Readiness to change is a method that many institutions have utilized to identify many of the cues and factors that contribute to college students altering their high-risk drinking behavior. College and university administrators and staff who must address issues related to alcohol consumption and abuse would do well to embrace the concept of readiness to change; data have shown that nearly three quarters of college students consume alcohol, and a significantly high proportion of men and women consume excessive amounts of alcohol (Harris, Walters, Leahy, 2008). The transtheoretical model (also known as readiness to change) includes the following

stages of change: (a) precontemplation, (b) contemplation, (c) preparation, (d) action and (e) maintenance (Harris et al., 2008). Ultimately, the findings of Harris et al. (2008) indicated that over 50% of participating students reported being in the pre-contemplation stage; nearly 20% reported being in the contemplation stage; and over 20% found themselves in the action stage. Harris et al. also indicated that administrators who were in leadership roles designed to either impact or alter the drinking habits of their students may need to find alternative strategies that will move their students through these stages at a much more efficient rate. Harris et al. also determined that when individuals set a timeline to alter their drinking habits they faced more difficulties in following through with the necessary steps to achieve the desired change. An additional factor that may need to be considered is creating milestones or programs that are designed for students who want to be intentional about altering their drinking behavior and lifestyle.

Impact of Alcohol Abuse on College Students and Victims of Sexual Assault

Undoubtedly, one of the most negative results of alcohol abuse and consumption that adversely impacts college students today (particularly women) is sexual assault or any type of unwanted sexual contact following excessive consumption of alcohol on the part of the perpetrator. According to a study conducted by Ward, Matthews, Weiner, Hogan, and Popson (2012), over 50% of women who reported being sexually assaulted indicated that the individual responsible for the assault was under the influence of alcohol. Ward et al. also reported a strong correlation between drug-related sexual assaults and alcohol use among female college students; most of the drug-related sexual assaults reported by women typically take place after the victim

has consumed alcohol (Lawyer, Resnick, Bakanic, Burkett, & Kilpatrick, 2010). Lawyer et al. (2010) found that a majority of these sexual assault victims indicated that they were familiar with the perpetrator. In their study, Ward et al. (2012) made reference to the five “methods of conveying sexual consent, including direct verbal communication, direct nonverbal communication, indirect verbal communication, indirect non-verbal communication, and nonresponse” (p. 747).

Ward et al. (2012) shed light on the issues related to sexual assault by identifying how gender roles and alcohol abuse may play a role in sexual assaults; they found that men often initiate contact with the victim, asserting themselves and assuming the responsibility of pursuing their potential sexual partners, always acting from a position of dominance. From the perspective of these domineering men, it is the responsibility of women to set the physical boundaries, maintain her sexuality, and serve as the primary authority who can grant consent for sexual intercourse (Ward et al., 2012). Given the fact that these roles place male students in the position of being the aggressor, the addition of alcohol use can only exacerbate these gender-based roles.

Alcohol use is usually a part of the equation when there is a sexual assault; alcohol can play a very critical role in students’ decision making and, ultimately, their choice to engage in risky sexual behavior. A study by Gilchrist, Smith, Magee, and Jones (2012) was specifically designed to evaluate the relationship between alcohol use and risky sexual behavior of female students who were attending an Australian University. One of the more startling results of this study revealed that nearly half of the participants stated that the probability of using a condom after the consumption of alcohol was very low (Gilchrist et al., 2012.). Clearly, for the female

students in this study, alcohol consumption may lead to the possibility of being exposed to a sexually transmitted disease. Moreover, Gilchrist et al. (2012) found a strong correlation between the use of alcohol and the expectation of engaging in a sexual encounter. If this is the case for both male and female university students, a further discussion may need to take place in regards to the level of those different expectancies.

Palmer, McMahon, Rounsaville, and Ball's (2010) study was designed to evaluate the connections between coercive sexual encounters, the use of protective strategies when sex may not be an objective, and the differences or similarities between male and female college students and their alcohol expectancies. Based on their results, Palmer et al. (2010) were able to determine that students who were sexually coercive had a high expectancy of engaging in sexual intercourse after consuming alcohol, but students who were not seeking sexual contact reported consuming more alcohol and also took fewer precautions after consuming alcohol.

McMahon and Farmer (2011) found that it is important for institutions to consider their students' understanding of the impact that alcohol can have on their perceptions and sense of responsibility when issues of sexual assault arise. Palmer et al. (2010) indicated that excessive alcohol consumption may lead to adverse impacts that students may not have intended. It is also an indication that if colleges and universities are to simultaneously address alcohol and sexual misconduct in their written university policies and guidelines for students, they must also strategically address those students who are more likely to engage in heavy episodic drinking or binge drinking. The recommendations from this study appeared to contradict the recommendations of Busteed (2008) who emphasized that colleges and universities should not focus on heavy drinkers but on the 80% of students who use alcohol moderately.

Palmer et al.'s (2010) study ultimately revealed that male college students were more likely to engage in sexually coercive behavior than their female counterparts. The authors also found that victims who did not desire sexual contact had a higher expectancy for sexual contact after the consumption of alcohol. Based on these findings, alcohol use is a form of dependency that some undergraduate students utilize in order to achieve an intended outcome which, in many cases, results in sexual contact. Exner and Cummings (2011) recommended that institutions of higher education should consider implementing prevention programs that are targeted to specific genders; prevention programs that are gender specific will enhance student's awareness of bystander intervention and the signs of potential sexual assaults so that students are able to intervene. Bystander intervention programs that are gender specific may also assist in debunking the traditional myths that only male students are perpetrators of sexual assault when alcohol is used (Exner & Cummings, 2011).

Stappenbeck and Fromme (2009) conducted a study on the relationship between alcohol use, aggression expectancies, and how those factors can contribute to the act of sexual aggression. One of the most critical outcomes of the study was this: when poor conduct was met with positive outcomes it was more likely to persist, and when there is no positive reinforcement and negative behavior is penalized, there is a greater possibility that the negative behavior will decrease. However, Van Brunt, Murphy, and O'Toole (2015) found that the negative outcomes surrounding alcohol use and sexual assault on college campuses were often reinforced by individuals and organizations to penalize the victim as opposed to the perpetrator. For example, Van Brunt et al. (2015) reported that when sororities become aware that one of their members was a victim of sexual assault, sororities may hold that member responsible for the consumption

of alcohol if she was under the influence of alcohol at the time of the assault and may further isolate or penalize that member by revoking her membership. This penalization of the victim of sexual assault is critical as it relates to alcohol and aggression; if a student violates multiple campus policies, including alcohol-related policies as well as causing harm or threatening to cause harm to another individual, those behaviors should be reprimanded accordingly. In the event that students are not reprimanded to the extent of a particular violation, there could be a possibility that they may not perceive that behavior as being problematic.

Students learn by watching their peers—students who behave aggressively after consuming alcohol normalize their behavior for the fellow students, dismissing aggressive behavior as simply a common response to alcohol. In other words, the alcohol is to blame, not the student. For example, according to Stappenbeck and Fromme (2009), there has been a consistent pattern of dismissing the sexually aggressive conduct of perpetrators on college campuses because they were under the influence of alcohol. The dismissal of that behavior as simply an outcome of alcohol consumption will likely decrease the possibility of the perpetrator experiencing a negative outcome that could be a catalyst for change in the future. Van Brunt et al. (2015) posited that this lack of accountability was due to a misogynistic ideology that females are less deserving of the respect and consideration afforded to their male counterparts. This misogynistic ideology is also developed through personal experiences and can be shaped by family, friends, and religious or political beliefs. Based on these data, it is important for colleges and universities to consider educational campaigns that are designed to enforce responsible alcohol consumption as opposed to abstinence, thus making students more aware of the harm that they could cause to one another.

Furthermore, Stappenbeck and Fromme (2009) found that college students who consume alcohol on a consistent basis were more likely to find themselves in environments where sexual aggression is pervasive. Van Brunt et al. (2015) found that fraternities and other male dominant groups typically are the hosts of these alcohol-fueled sexually aggressive environments. Within sexually aggressive environments, alcohol is often used as a tool to potentially reduce the resistance of a possible sexual encounter and is a common grooming behavior (Van Brunt et al., 2015). Provided that they are aware of these risky environments, students may be more inclined to pay closer attention to their environment and protect themselves from potential assaults. Carmody, Ekhomu, and Payne (2009) found that, in order to combat the issues of sexual assault and alcohol abuse on college campuses, higher education administrators should invest in their educational awareness of these areas.

Alcohol Abuse Disciplinary Sanctions

A 2010 study by Hayes, Curry, Freeman and Kuch focused primarily on issues of alcohol abuse and its effective treatment through counseling practices that promote reduction as opposed to abstinence. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism's (NIAAA) Task Force on College Drinking found that "Nearly 1,400 college students die each year because of alcohol-related events, including automobile accidents" (Hayes et al., 2010, p. 87). Hayes et al. (2010) also determined that college students have a higher probability of becoming heavy alcohol drinkers as opposed to their non-collegiate counterparts.

In their study, Hayes et al. (2010) were able to determine that confrontational counseling was less effective than motivational interventions. Motivational interviews or meetings allow

students the opportunity to identify the challenges that excessive alcohol consumption can have on their goals (Hayes et al., 2010). The fundamental areas that constitute motivational interviewing/intervention include “expressing empathy, avoiding arguing, discovering discrepancies, and building efficacy for change” (Hayes et al., 2010, p. 91). The authors determined that this approach may be more palatable to college students with alcohol abuse issues primarily because treatment generally requires those who have far more severe issues with alcohol (Hayes et al., 2010).

College campuses across the country have a responsibility to uphold their institutions’ core values by enforcing their institutions policies and creating developmental opportunities for students to learn from their mistakes (Waryold, 2013). One of the most common violations that student conduct administrators must address relates to the use of alcohol. Alcohol-related policy violations constitute a serious threat to institutions of higher learning because of the grave consequences alcohol use can have on young adults. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), excessive alcohol consumption among young adults contributes to more than 4,300 fatalities every year. For example, in 2015, the CDC found that, among those individuals who are under 21 years of age, 21% engaged and 10% drove a vehicle after consuming alcohol.

The purposes of campus judicial and conduct processes are to promote the moral and ethical development of its students and to maintain an environment that is conducive to learning (Howell, 2005). Howell (2005) completed a study that was designed to review students’ perceptions of their institutions’ judicial processes after they have completed their expectations of that office. After interviewing the 10 students who participated in this study, Howell

discovered that there were four critical areas. These key areas included: (a) feelings about the consequences, (b) empathy, (c) understanding of judicial and disciplinary procedures, and (d) the perception of little to no learning (Howell, 2005). However, this study called into question the effectiveness of their efforts by interviewing several students.

When students were asked how and if they would change their behavior that got them reported to their institution's judicial process, many of them stated that they would change and adjust their behavior in order to prevent being reported to their conduct office. However, when asked about their use of alcohol, the majority of the students did not share a commitment to discontinue their use of alcohol (Howell, 2005). At the conclusion of this study, Howell (2005) recommended that judicial affairs professionals consider more or new sanctions designed to develop their students. Additionally, the author recommended that any future research include the impact of judicial processes of students who were suspended or separated from their institutions after violating their institution's code of conduct.

In regards to effective sanctions that can be issued to students for a conduct related violation there are several alternatives that have been found to be successful. According to Dauenhauer (2014), the recidivism rate for institutional policy violations involving students was only 19% when students were either required to complete some form of community service, a civility workshop, or if they lost a right or privilege in their respective residence hall. Dauenhauer (2014) also found that those students that were required to attend some form of mandated counseling for an alcohol or substance related violation were more likely to have a change in attitude as it related to their alcohol or drug use. However, taking broad and general institutional approaches to campus alcohol policies, alcohol awareness programs, and

intervention or engagement activities are not approaches that can alter alcohol abuse on college campuses.

A study by Carey, Carey, Maisto, and Henson (2009) compared the effectiveness of computer programs or in-person interventions in addressing cases where students violated their campus alcohol policy. The variables for this study included the participants' average number of drinks per week, levels of drinking in terms of risk, and problems related to drinking (Carey et al., 2009). They utilized a readiness-to-change questionnaire to a total of 198 freshman students at a northeastern university. This questionnaire "assessed stage of change with three 4-item subscales: Pre-contemplation, Contemplation, and Action" (Carey et al., 2009). Based on the data that these researchers were able to generate, the violations that occurred with the highest frequency included purchasing, selling, and possession or use of alcohol (Carey et al., 2009).

Carey et al.'s 2009 study indicated a significant difference in the drinking levels of women as opposed to men when it came to brief motivational intervention (BMI). When men had an in-person BMI intervention, there were substantial reductions in men's drinking that included 3.52 fewer drinks (Carey et al., 2009). However, those men who were in the alcohol 101 category did not experience significant changes (Carey et al., 2009). Regarding BMI, women also decreased their drinking levels and drinking behavior outcomes. However, for women in the alcohol 101 category, RAPI scores fell only slightly (Carey et al., 2009). Moreover, the study revealed that women had higher GPAs than men (Carey et al., 2009). Finally, the researchers concluded that because women had higher decreases in the BMI levels they must be more receptive to the brief motivational intervention (Carey et al., 2009). The researchers emphasized that students who were required to complete alcohol interventions were

more likely to engage in high-risk drinking over time and may need interventions that are specific to their challenges (Carey et al., 2009).

Carey et al. (2009) set out to examine whether interviewing would be an effective sanctioning tool to address students who have gone through their institution's conduct process. In their study, they ultimately analyzed the effectiveness of motivational interviewing by examining whether or not the students who had attended single BMI sessions would change their habits related to alcohol consumption or if they went on to repeatedly violate their institution's alcohol policy. The overall concept of motivational interviewing is that it does not impose personal beliefs or sensibilities onto the students, focusing primarily on the expression of empathy. Motivational interviewing identifies areas that lack continuity, accepts that challenging conversations will promote resistance, and provides support for efficacy (LaBrie, Lamb, Pedersen, & Quinlan, 2006).

During their process of collecting their data for this study, La Brie et al. (2006) asked each of the 167 participants to keep a monthly drinking diary after their MI session. Of the participants who completed the intervention, a total of 81% complied with the expectations of the researchers. The data from this study revealed that the small group motivational interviews were quite successful. For example, "despite men drinking at a significantly higher rate than women, the men reduced their number of drinks per month at a higher rate than the women" (LaBrie et al., 2006, p. 272). Assuming that these results can be duplicated at similar large institutions, group motivational interviewing should be used by more institutions and considered a best practice. Additionally, LaBrie et al. (2006) went on to reiterate the fact that motivational enhancement through a group setting effectively reduced recidivism related to students and

alcohol policy violations. It was also recommended that interventions related to campus alcohol policies should be aimed at young white males, as they are more likely to violate these policies.

Dannells and Consolvo (2000) noted that judicial officers assign disciplinary counseling to students because they believe these referrals will alter the problematic behavior and that counselors can gauge the possibility of the student repeating that same behavior; judicial officers, by taking this approach, hope to decrease the possibility of recidivism for that student. However, the counselors who were surveyed in this study revealed that they opposed this method of sanctioning because, philosophically, mandating students to attend counseling sessions “is ethically questionable, clinically inadvisable, and potentially harmful to students” (Dannells & Consolvo, 2000, p. 46).

Singh (2014) determined that as long as colleges and universities attempt to take some type of corrective action in addressing student alcohol abuse, then they are more than likely going to experience some type of success. Researchers have found that the most important aspect of sanctions are when students received brief motivational interviewing interventions and feedback that was specifically designed and personalized for their level of alcohol consumption, there is a decrease in students’ alcohol use (Asher, 2008; Singh, 2014). Counseling has also been identified as a sanctioning method that can provide students with the appropriate personal feedback that can likely decrease the recidivism of alcohol policy violations (Asher, 2008). Although college administrators have collectively identified that alcohol abuse is a problem on their individual campuses, many colleges and universities differ when it comes to the areas of focus on alcohol prevention and the use of campus resources to individual students and the larger campus community (Fisher, Fried, & Anushko, 2008). Fisher et al. (2008) stressed that the

difference in these institutional leaders' approaches were due in large part to the availability of appropriate assessment tools that can adequately evaluate and provide information to support effective campus alcohol policies for documented violations.

In the course of conducting this literature review, the researcher did not find consistent definitions for disciplinary sanctions or educational sanctions. For the purposes of this study disciplinary sanctions, educational sanctions, and each of the specific types of disciplinary and educational sanctions were defined as follows (Table 1):

Table 1

Sanction Terminology

Type of Sanction	Description of Sanction
Disciplinary Sanction	Defined as the status and disciplinary action a student conduct administrator issues to a student after finding them responsible for an alcohol violation. Disciplinary sanctions can include a verbal warning, disciplinary warning, probation, suspension, and/or expulsion.
Verbal Warning	A disciplinary sanction that is an oral reprimand which is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator for violating an institution's alcohol policy.
Written Warning	A disciplinary sanction that is a written reprimand is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator acknowledging that a student has been found responsible for violating an institution's alcohol policy.
Disciplinary Probation	A disciplinary sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that notifies the student that they are not in good standing with their institution for a limited period of time.
Disciplinary Suspension	A disciplinary sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that temporarily separates the student from the institution for a limited period of time.
Expulsion	A disciplinary sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that permanently separates a student from an institution after the student is found responsible for an alcohol policy violation.
Educational Sanctions	A required assignment, exercise, or activity that a student conduct administrator issues to a student after being found responsible for an alcohol violation.
Alcohol Assessment	An educational sanction that is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that is designed to inform students about the negative impacts of alcohol abuse.
Research/Reflection Paper	An educational sanction that is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that requires the student a complete a written assignment where the student acknowledges the negative effects that alcohol has personally had on them.

Type of Sanction	Description of Sanction
Community Service	An educational sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that requires the student to complete a specified amount of service hours with a campus-based or local agency.
Parental Notification	An educational sanction that requires a student conduct administrator to notify the parent(s) of a student that the student has been found responsible for violating a college/university alcohol policy.
Campus-Based Activity or Assignment	An educational sanction that is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator requiring a student to attend or participate in a campus-based activity or event.

Note. This sanction terminology has been adapted/modified from the information provided in the study conducted by Gehring, Lowery, and Palmer (2008)

Summary

This chapter began with a brief introduction that discussed the historical and legal implications regarding the students' disciplinary process at colleges and universities and issues regarding alcohol abuse and recidivism among college students. The chapter also discussed the more serious and severe impacts of excessive alcohol abuse, such as sexual assaults, legal issues that students may encounter, and the adverse impact that violating university alcohol policies can have on a student's academic progress. There has been limited research regarding what professional student conduct administrators may identify as the most effective sanctions to address recidivism which is why this study was needed and will contribute to this canon of literature.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research method selected for this study and provides the background and description for the data collected by the researcher. There is also a description of the limitations associated with this methodology. The focus of this study was to identify the difference between sanctions issued by student conduct administrators for alcohol violations and recidivism. More specifically, this study considered the differences between disciplinary and educational sanctions issued by student conduct administrators for violations of their institutions alcohol policy.

Research Philosophy

A pragmatic worldview or philosophical foundation may emerge from different actions, circumstances, or outcomes as opposed to specific conditions (Creswell, 2009). In the process of designing a study, the researcher may embrace a pragmatic philosophy because pragmatism is a worldview that is problem-centered, practice oriented, and can have multiple solutions (Creswell, 2009). The problem at the core of this study involves identifying the sanctions that student conduct administrators issue to students for violating campus alcohol policies that, at the same time, are most likely to reduce recidivism.

Pragmatism and pragmatic solutions constitute the philosophical foundations that underpinned this research study. Pragmatism generates the expectation that direct attention is given to the work that people do to develop themselves and the individuals close to them who are

aspiring to grow and develop (Henry, 2001). This study was conducted to evaluate the environments in which student conduct administrators must establish and maintain policies as well as the challenges that come from reducing the risk of excessive alcohol consumption. Pragmatism also is a philosophical foundation that recognizes the relationship between institutions and the individuals that make up that institution, without separating the two (Henry, 2001). The difference between a student conduct administrator's sanctions for alcohol violations and the rate of recidivism related to alcohol violations is a fundamental question that the researcher believes can be answered with pragmatic solutions.

The foundational question associated with postpositivist philosophy consists of the following (Creswell, 2009): what are the causes responsible for determining specific effects or outcomes? After viewing problems through a postpositivist lens, the researcher incorporates and considers potential solutions as opposed to giving primary consideration to limited possibilities or variables (Robinson, 1996). Robinson (1996) found that when using a problem-based methodology through a postpositivist lens or framework, it is important to maintain the original context. The researcher in the present study maintained the original context of identifying the difference between alcohol-related sanctions and recidivism. Utilizing the postpositivist worldview assisted the researcher in providing sound recommendations that may enlighten the practice of addressing alcohol violations by student conduct administrators. Robinson's (1996) findings were consistent with this postpositivist approach as it was determined that administrative routines are the direct results of previous efforts to understand, identify, and solve problems.

In this study, the researcher did not attempt to generalize the outcomes and findings. Instead, he identified effective alternatives to sanctions that follow alcohol violations and offer pathways to reducing recidivism that are transferable and remain specific to the context of this study (Borland, 1990). Borland (1990) advocated for the implementation and use of the postpositivist approach when there is an inherent compatibility between the work within a field of study and paradigm. Although the researcher in this study did not completely shift the paradigm on the sanctions that follow alcohol violations and recidivism, the researcher does believe the paradigm was enhanced with meaningful data.

There were several important factors that led the researcher to implement a postpositive philosophy in conducting this research. One important factor is postpositivism's recognition that there is no way to be absolutely positive about knowledge when engaged in the practice and study of the actions and behavior of humans (Creswell, 2009). Another important factor is that postpositivism operates under a worldview where determination, reductionism, observations, and measurement are verified primarily through quantitative research (Creswell, 2009). Finally, the postpositive philosophy and worldview provide the researcher with the most effective framework to address and answer the questions posed in this study.

Quantitative Research Design

In this study, the researcher utilized a quantitative research design; a survey was used to collect and analyze data from participating student conduct administrators. The purpose of utilizing the survey was to gain a greater understanding of the sanctioning perceptions related to alcohol violations issued to students in the nations' colleges and universities. According to

Fowler (2002), surveys are designed to identify the subjective feelings of the public and produce statistical descriptions about different aspects of a population. Based on this information, the researcher determined that a survey was also the most efficient way of maximizing the participation of student conduct administrators as they represent different types of institutions. According to the United States Department of Education (2016), there are a total of 1,700 two-year colleges and 3,026 four-year colleges.

The researcher utilized a survey instrument to collect data, and the survey design was cross-sectional. According to Creswell (2008), cross-sectional surveys can be an effective tool in identifying participants' attitudes, beliefs, opinions, or practices. A cross-sectional survey method qualified as an effective design for this study as it assisted in identifying student conduct administrators' perceptions of effective sanctions that can reduce recidivism for alcohol violations at their respective campuses. The survey used in this study was delivered to participants via the Internet, through Qualtrics; participants received the survey through the Association of Student Conduct Administrators listserv.

Research Questions

The main research questions for this study were:

1. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of the most effective educational sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?
2. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of the most effective disciplinary sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?

3. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of disciplinary and educational sanctions for alcohol policy violations that move students through the five stages of the Transtheoretical Model of Change (i.e., Pre-contemplation, Contemplation, Preparation, Action, and Maintenance)?

Population and Sample

The population for this study included professionals who work in the field of higher education and serve as full-time student conduct administrators. Of this population, student conduct administrators who participated in the study met specific criteria. These criteria included the following:

- Must be members of the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA);
- Must be currently employed, at a college or university in the United States of America; and
- Must have the responsibility of serving as a student conduct administrator.

The following criteria did *not* preclude participation in this study:

- Institution type (public or private),
- Gender,
- Highest educational degree completed, and
- Number of years as a student conduct administrator.

In this study, the population consisted of student conduct administrators. As a professional association, ASCA (2016) aims to assist its members and institutions in identifying “best practices of student conduct administration and conflict resolution in their unique

institutional cultures” (para. 3). The ASCA also has over 2,700 members in the organization (A. Wade, Personal Communication, July 28, 2016). Based on the mission, membership, aims, and purposes of these three professional associations, the researcher identified the ASCA as the professional student affairs association that would provide the best sample of the target population. The members of ASCA (2016) have a collective interest in the area of student conduct that may boost interest in participating in the study (para. 3).

This study utilized a convenience sample through the Association of Student Conduct Administration (ASCA). A convenience sample is used when a researcher has identified participants who represent some characteristics of the target population and are willing and available to participate in the data collection process (Creswell, 2008; Leeuw, Hox, & Dillman, 2008). Utilizing a convenience sample of the ASCA membership will allow the researcher to answer the questions associated with this study. Those individuals that have retained or acquired membership with ASCA were identified as the sample population that are best suited to conduct this study as they have a direct interest in the work and practice of student conduct administrators.

Prior to surveying the members of ASCA, the researcher submitted an application to study the ASCA to the ASCA research committee. The official application to study the ASCA (2016) membership included the following:

- The abstract of the proposed study,
- A description of the desired ASCA membership population the researcher intended to study,
- The researchers’ intended timeline for the study,

- A description of the benefits of the study to the ASCA membership and contribution to the literature associated with student conduct administration,
- A brief description of the protocol and confidentiality the researcher would maintain,
- A copy of the invitation letter the researcher provided to the members of ASCA, and
- A copy of the survey instrument.

The ASCA application to conduct research with members appears in Appendix A. Instructions on how to complete the application are also included.

According to Baruch (1999) most online surveys achieve an average response rate of 33%. More recently, Nulty (2008) reported that a conservative and acceptable return rate for online survey could range from 24.8% to 21%. For the purposes of this study, the researcher chose a minimum response rate of 21%. This required a minimum of 462 student conduct administrators to respond to the study.

In order to boost the selected minimum response rate, Dillman, Smyth, and Melani-Christian (2009) discussed some characteristics to increase participation when implementing web-based surveys. For the purposes of the current study, these features were implemented:

- This researcher established a timeline for implementation of the survey;
- This researcher worked with the appropriate staff in ASCA who electronically sent a notice email to all participants on July 24, 2017 to officially administer the survey;
- In the email from ASCA, the researcher informed the participants about the purpose of the study, the importance of their participation, and how the information obtained from the survey would benefit them as a group and as a profession, thereby demonstrating positive regard for them; and,

- This researcher electronically sent reminder emails through ASCA on July 31, 2017, and a final email on August 9, 2017 informing participants that the survey would remain open until August 11, 2017 (Appendix B)
- In addition, the emails contained expressions of gratitude to the participants.

Recruitment of Participants

Members of the ASCA received a request to participate in this study; participation was voluntary and contingent upon providing consent to participate. Potential participants were also informed that they could withdraw their consent to participate in the study at any time prior to its completion. There were some incomplete responses on specific sections of the survey developed for this study. Those data were used in that section for final analysis of this study.

Compensation

According to Creswell (2008), individuals who elect to participate in a study should not be offered excessive financial incentives in order to encourage their participation. Creswell (2008) also indicated that researchers should identify meaningful ways to compensate research participants for providing their time and effort while completing a study. In order to maintain the integrity of this study, there were no forms of compensation offered to the student conduct administrators who participated in this study. However, the findings of this study were made available to them through the Association of Student Conduct Administrators in order to improve their overall practice related to addressing alcohol related violations on their institutions' campuses.

Instrumentation

The Effective Alcohol Sanctions survey is a web-based survey that was issued in 2012 to over 770 college students across the country (Gehring, Lowery, & Palmer, 2012). This original survey instrument was designed to evaluate students' perceptions of effective alcohol sanctions on college campuses. However, for this study, the researcher modified with permission (Appendix C) this web-based survey to gather data from student conduct administrators about their perceptions of alcohol sanctions that can reduce recidivism. The modified survey is contained in Appendix D

Reliability of the Instrument

This instrument, once modified, was not tested for reliability.

Web-Based Survey Design

The process of collecting data through the use of the web has become one of the most proficient methods of disseminating surveys (Alreck & Settle, 2004). A few of the reasons that web-based surveys have increased in popularity include the fact that access to the Internet has grown rapidly, a large portion of individuals that make up diverse demographic groups utilize the Internet, the costs associated with web surveys are relatively low, and the technology commonly used with web surveys minimizes data handling issues (Alreck & Settle, 2004).

In order to enhance the response rate, the researcher sent multiple invitations to potential participants and allowed the respondents to participate anonymously. When utilizing a web-based survey, it has been found that a plea for help in an email to potential participants is an

effective method that can increase participation and response rates (Petrovic, Petric, & Manfreda, 2016). Petrovic et al., (2016) indicated that when there is a higher frequency of online posts and reminders, there is a positive correlation to web-based survey response.

Qualtrics

For the purpose of this study, the researcher utilized Qualtrics to administer the web-based survey and to collect data. Qualtrics is a web-based survey system provided at no cost to all faculty, staff, and students at the University of Central Florida (UCF, 2016). Utilizing this institutional resource reduced any potential costs associated with this study. The Qualtrics web-based survey resource also provided encryption and privacy protection for all data that were collected from the participants; this level of privacy and security ensured that the data retrieved for this study were not compromised (Qualtrics, 2016).

Data Collection

Participants were emailed information on how to complete the survey through the ASCA email listserv. The contents of the email notification included a brief statement regarding the purpose of the study and a link that electronically connected the participants to the survey instrument. The initial page that the participants were routed to include information regarding the participants' consent and their option to discontinue taking the survey at any time.

Data Analysis

All of the data collected using Qualtrics were downloaded into a file that was analyzed using the most recent version (22.0) of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Statistical data were generated to provide the descriptive and inferential statistics (ANOVA; MANOVA).

The first and second research questions, “What is the difference between student conduct administrators’ perceptions of the most effective educational sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?” and “What is the difference between student conduct administrators’ perceptions of the most effective disciplinary sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?” were analyzed using a one-way ANOVA, and independent sample *t*-tests to evaluate the variables. According to Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, and Barrett (2007), the one-way ANOVA can be used to compare two groups, and the independent sample *t*-tests can be used when investigating two different or unrelated groups. The dependent variable for Research Question 2 was educational sanctions, and the independent variables included alcohol assessment, research/reflection paper, community service, parental notification, and campus based activity or assignment. The dependent variable for Research Question 3 was disciplinary sanctions, and the independent variables included verbal warning, written warning, disciplinary probation, disciplinary suspension, and expulsion.

The third and final research question, “What is the difference between student conduct administrators’ perceptions of disciplinary and educational sanctions for alcohol policy violations that move students through the five stages of the Transtheoretical Model of Change (i.e.: Pre-contemplation, Contemplation, Preparation, Action, and Maintenance)?” was analyzed using a MANOVA. According to Leech, Barrett, and Morgan (2008), the multivariate analysis or (MANOVA) should be used when there are two or more dependent variables that may be related conceptually.

Table 2 shows the alignment among the research questions, the survey items, and the theoretical framework. Chapter 4 contains a tabular display and accompanying narrative discussion of all significant results of the analyses.

Table 2

Aligning Research Questions with Survey Items

Research Questions	Survey Items
1. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of the most effective educational sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?	23, 26, 29
2. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of the most effective disciplinary sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?	22, 27, 30
3. What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of disciplinary and educational sanctions for alcohol policy violations that move students through the five stages of the Transtheoretical Model of Change (i.e., Pre-contemplation, Contemplation, Preparation, Action, and Maintenance)?	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 (Survey Items & Theoretical Framework)

Ethical Considerations

There were very few risks associated with participation in this study. While developing this survey, compliance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act was given very careful consideration (Graham, Hall, & Gilmer, 2008). No participant was expected to provide any personally identifiable information of individual students who have been referred to their office for a violation of their institution's alcohol policy.

Before receiving the survey for this study, each of the participants was presented with a consent form that outlined their rights and pertinent information associated with the study. In addition to being informed of their rights as they relate to this study, participants were informed of the purpose of the study, how the data would be used, and that their personal information would be protected and remain anonymous (Creswell, 2008).

IRB Authorization

Prior to the implementation of this research, approval by the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board (IRB) was sought and received (Appendix E).

Originality Score

This manuscript was submitted to iThenticate and the results were presented to the committee the day of my defense. Results were presented to the dissertation committee by the dissertation chair.

Summary

This chapter provided an outline of the research methodology that the researcher used in this study and the data collection steps that were used to study the sanctions that student conduct administrators issue to students for alcohol policy violations and whether or not those sanctions can impact recidivism. The reasons for utilizing a quantitative design through an online survey have also been addressed. The intended sample for this study was also identified as the members of the Association for Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA). Finally, the researcher provided the research questions that were answered in this study through the online survey, data collection process, and analysis.

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify the educational and disciplinary sanctions that are most effective in decreasing recidivism among college students who have violated alcohol policies. The differences of the student conduct administrators' perceptions were identified quantitatively through the use of a survey instrument that utilized a five point Likert scale which incorporated the transtheoretical model of change. For the purposes of this study the Likert scale scores were identified in the following order: 1 provided an indication that the respondent strongly disagrees, a score of 2 was an indication that the respondent disagrees, a score of 3 is an indication that the respondent neither agrees or disagrees, a score of 4 is an indication that the respondent agrees, and a score of 5 is an indication that the respondent strongly agrees. The levels of effectiveness used the following scores as indicators: a score of 4.0 or higher demonstrated that an educational or disciplinary sanction indicate effectiveness, scores that ranged from 3.0 to 3.9 are neutral to moderate, and a score of 2.9 or lower was an indication of perceived ineffectiveness. In order to identify the strength or weakness for each sanction, each of the scores of the survey items that included a Likert scale response was averaged.

The information provided in this section of the study includes the response rates, the demographic data provided by the respondents, and the statistical results and tests which were conducted in order to answer the three research questions. All of the data that was collected from the Qualtrics survey was exported and analyzed using SPSS version 23.0 for Mac at the

alpha level of .05 level for statistical significance. The outcomes for the data that was produced is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5 of this study.

Methodology Review and Response Rate

The ASCA alcohol sanctions survey was issued to current student conduct administrators that are members of the ASCA. The researcher initially established contact with the chairperson of the ASCA research committee to officially have ASCA distribute the survey participation requests. All recruitment contact letters are contained in Appendix B. The ASCA distributed the first contact letter to participants on July 24, 2017. On the first day of data collection the survey was sent to 2,813 ASCA members. Among this total distribution list 249 (8.9%) returned to sender, 1214 (47.3%) opened the email that was sent, and 279 (23.0%) of the ASCA members actually clicked on the survey link.

The second letter requesting the participation of current student conduct administrators was sent on July 31, 2017. The second survey participation request was sent to 2,805 ASCA members. Among this total distribution list 241 (8.6%) returned to sender, 1041 (40.6%) opened the email that was sent, and 147 (14.1%) of the ASCA members actually clicked on the survey link. Following the distribution of the first two survey participation requests, the researcher was concerned with a low potential response rate. As a result, the researcher contacted the ASCA research chairperson and requested that a third and final survey participation request be sent on behalf of the researcher. The ASCA permits no more than three total contacts for approved studies. A third and final letter requesting student conduct administrators' participation in this study was sent on August 9, 2017. The third and final survey participation request was sent to

2,800 ASCA members. Among this total distribution list 218 (7.8%) returned to sender, 1003 (38.8%) opened the email that was sent, and 107 (10.7%) of the ASCA members actually clicked on the survey link. The researcher received a total of 357 responses for this survey. Of the total response number 264 respondents completed all four sections of the survey. Those 264 responses were used to answer the three main research questions associated with this study. The desired response rate that the researcher established in Chapter 3 was 21%. The overall number of qualified responses that opened the survey was 1,214 of which the researcher received a total response rate of 29%.

Demographics

For this study, the researcher asked several demographic questions in the survey in order to identify the respondents and test for the differences of their perceptions on the most effective sanctions based on demographic categories. The demographic questions that were asked of the survey respondents included gender, highest degree earned, years of experience, institution type, institution size, institutional characteristics, and campus residency. In regard to gender, the female population (50.2%) included slightly more respondents than male (49.1%). The majority of the respondents had also earned master's degrees (74.2%); and in terms of institution type, public institutions also had the highest number of responses (61.4%). The institutions that had the highest response rates included four-year undergraduate and graduate/professional institutions (86.0%). The overall survey response resulted in a total of 351 student conduct administrators that only completed a few sections of the survey. However, a total of 264 student conduct administrators completed the entire survey. These data are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Demographics of Respondents (N = 264)

	Main Variables	N	%
Gender	Male	129	49.1
	Female	132	50.2
	Transgender	2	0.8
Degree Earned	Bachelors	10	3.8
	Masters	196	74.2
	Professional (M.D, D.D, or J.D)	14	5.3
	Doctorate	44	16.7
Institution type	Public	162	61.4
	Private, religious affiliated	41	15.5
	Private, Independent	61	23.1
Institutional characteristics	Four-Year Undergraduate Only	19	7.2
	Four-year undergraduate and graduate/professional	227	86.0
	Other	18	6.8
Institutional size	Fewer than 2,000	33	12.5
	2,000 - 9,999	85	32.1
	10,000 - 19,999	60	22.6
	20,000 - 29,999	40	15.1
	30,000 or more	47	17.7
Years of experience	1 - 4	86	32.5
	5 - 9	74	27.9
	10 - 14	47	17.7
	15 or more	58	21.9
Residency	1 - 999	40	15.3
	1,000 - 4,999	138	52.7
	5,000 - 9,999	66	25.2
	10,000 or more	18	6.9

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

The initial section of the survey asked participants to rank the populations that reported the highest number of alcohol violations, where the majority of alcohol related incidents occurred, and the types of alcohol violations that were most frequently referred to their office. These respondents indicated that housing and residence life staff overwhelmingly reported the highest number of alcohol violations (69.1%), that most alcohol related incidents take place in

on-campus residence halls (72.8%), and that the type of alcohol related violation that was most frequently referred to their office included minors in-consumption/possession of alcohol. These data are summarized in Tables 4, 5, and 6.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Reporting Populations (N = 330)

Characteristics	N	%
Housing and residence life staff	228	69.1
Campus safety/police	52	15.8
Local law enforcement	18	5.5
Faculty/staff	32	9.7

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Incident Locations (N = 327)

Characteristics	N	%
On-campus non-residence halls	24	7.34
Residence halls	238	72.78
Athletic events	12	3.67
Greek affiliated housing	25	7.65
Off campus	28	8.56

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Frequency of Violations (N = 329)

Characteristics	N	%
Minor in consumption/possession of alcohol	256	77.8
Public intoxication	17	5.2
Driving under the influence	17	5.2
Misconduct under the influence of alcohol	22	6.7
Distribution of Alcohol	17	5.2

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

The first section of the survey instrument also asked the respondents if they believed that students who were referred to their office for alcohol violations were aware of the negative health effects of alcohol use, and if these students were primarily under the legal drinking age of 21. These questions were based on a 5-point Likert-scale. The Likert responses included indicators where 1 = respondents who strongly disagreed, 2 = respondents who disagreed, 3 = respondents who neither agreed or disagreed, 4 = respondents who agreed, and 5 = the respondents who strongly agreed. Based on the descriptive statistics, 81.7% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the students they met with for alcohol policy violations were aware of the negative health effects of alcohol use. The responses also indicated that 92.8% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the majority of the students referred to their office for alcohol policy violations were under the legal drinking age of 21. These data can be found in Table 7.

Table 7

Level of Agreement on Target Group (N = 333)

Indicator	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
On average, students who meet with you for alcohol policy violations are aware of the negative effects that alcohol could have on their behaviors, health, and safety.	272	81.7	3.86
On average, the majority of the students referred to your office for alcohol policy violations are under the legal drinking age of 21.	308	92.8	4.47

Note: Strongly Agree=5, Agree=4, Neither =3, Disagree=2, Strongly disagree=1. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

The first sections of the survey instrument asked the respondents who were the individuals able to address alcohol policy violations at their institutions, and whether or not their institutions notify parents of alcohol policy violations. Based on the responses gathered from this survey 31.7% of the respondents indicated that either student conduct administrators, a disciplinary panel, residence hall coordinator/director, and university hearing officers had the ability to address alcohol related incidents. In regard to parental notifications, 61.9% of the respondents indicated that they notified parents of alcohol policy violations. These data can be found in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8

Entities Addressing Alcohol Related Incidents

Entity	N	%
Student Conduct Administrator	154	25.0
Disciplinary Panel	79	12.9
Residence Hall Coordinator/Director	102	16.6
University Hearing Officer	85	13.8
All of the Above	195	31.7

Note. includes multiple responses from participants

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics: Parental Notification Policy (N = 331)

Response	N	%
Yes	205	61.9
No	126	38.1
Total	331	100.0

Section two of the survey instrument asked the respondents about educational sanctions and the differences in effectiveness as they relate to the transtheoretical model of change. The stages of effectiveness that were measured included (a) creating no awareness, (b) recognizing the benefits of changing behavior, (c) making goals that will change behavior, (d) taking tangible steps to change behavior, and (e) sustaining new behavioral changes through tangible steps. Responses were based on a 5-point Likert-scale. The Likert responses included indicators where 1 = the respondents who strongly disagreed, 2 = the respondents who disagreed, 3 = the respondents who neither agreed or disagreed, 4 = the respondents who agreed, and 5 = the respondents who strongly agreed.

For the first stage of the transtheoretical model of change applied to this survey, 78.1% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that community service does not create an awareness that will allow students to understand the overall impact of their behavior as it relates to alcohol use. For the second stage of the transtheoretical model of change 46% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that research/reflection papers are an educational sanction that cause students to recognize the benefits of changing their behavior as it relates to alcohol use. The third stage of the survey responses found that 92.8% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that when students are sanctioned to complete an alcohol assessment that educational sanction, that requirement will cause students to make goals that will assist them and guide a change in behavior. In Stage 4 of the survey response, it was found that 90.9% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that completing an alcohol assessment causes students to take tangible steps towards achieving a desired behavior. In Stage 5 of this section of the survey, it was found that 93.7% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that alcohol assessment causes students to sustain new and changed behaviors through tangible steps over a meaningful period of time. These data can be found in Tables 10-14.

Table 10

Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 1: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Alcohol Assessment	16	10.8	1.8
Research/Reflection Paper	70	41.6	2.6
Community Service	137	78.1	3.3
Parental Notification	73	39.5	2.6
Campus based activity or assignment	57	30.0	2.7

Note. Respondents provided two to three responses for Q11 – Q21.

Table 11

Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 2: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Alcohol Assessment	158	45.5	3.2
Research/Reflection Paper	168	46.0	3.4
Community Service	131	40.9	3.2
Parental Notification	134	36.7	3.2
Campus based activity or assignment	134	30.9	3.3

Note. Respondents provided two to three responses for Q11 – Q21.

Table 12

Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 3: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Alcohol Assessment	233	92.8	4.0
Research/Reflection Paper	167	50.4	3.3
Community Service	23	5.4	2.2
Parental Notification	77	21.2	2.8
Campus based activity or assignment	112	30.1	3.1

Note. Respondents provided two to three responses for Q11 – Q21.

Table 13

Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 4: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Alcohol Assessment	230	90.9	4.0
Research/Reflection Paper	134	37.2	3.2
Community Service	48	12.5	2.5
Parental Notification	93	28.2	3.0
Campus based activity or assignment	118	31.2	3.2

Note. Respondents provided two to three responses for Q11 – Q21.

Table 14

Educational Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 5: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Alcohol Assessment	164	93.7	3.5
Research/Reflection Paper	70	26.0	2.7
Community Service	40	13.3	2.4
Parental Notification	80	36.7	2.8
Campus based activity or assignment	79	30.2	2.9

Note. Respondents provided two to three responses for Q11 – Q21.

Section three of the survey instrument asked the respondents about disciplinary sanctions and the differences in effectiveness as they relate to the transtheoretical model of change. The stages of effectiveness that were measured included (a) creating awareness, (b) recognizing the benefits of changing behavior, (c) making goals that will change behavior, (d) taking tangible steps to change behavior, and (e) sustaining new behavioral changes through tangible steps. These questions were based on a 5-point Likert-scale. The Likert responses included indicators where 1 = the respondents strongly disagreed, 2 = the respondents disagreed, 3 = the respondents neither agreed or disagreed, 4 = the respondents agreed, and 5 = the respondent strongly agreed.

For the first stage of the transtheoretical model of change applied to this section of the survey, 93% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that a verbal warning does not create an awareness that will allow students to understand the overall impact of their behavior as it relates to alcohol use. For the second stage of the transtheoretical model of change, 42% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that a verbal warning is a disciplinary sanction that cause students to recognize the benefits of changing their behavior as it relates to alcohol use. In

the third stage of the survey responses, it was found that 66.9% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that when students are issued a disciplinary suspension as a sanction for an alcohol violation, that sanction will cause students to make goals that will assist them in guiding a change in behavior. In Stage 4 of the survey response, it was found that 68.9% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that a disciplinary suspension causes students to take tangible steps towards achieving a desired behavior. In Stage 5 of this section of the survey, it was determined that 73.1% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that a disciplinary suspension causes students to sustain new and changed behaviors through tangible steps over a meaningful period of time. The results of these analyses can be found in Tables 15-19.

Table 15

Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 1: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Verbal Warning	127	93.0	3.3
Written Warning	88	56.9	2.9
Disciplinary Probation	26	15.8	2.2
Disciplinary Suspension	26	16.2	2.0
Expulsion	29	18.2	2.0

Table 16

Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 2: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Verbal Warning	133	42.0	3.3
Written Warning	151	38.6	3.4
Disciplinary Probation	155	39.9	3.4
Disciplinary Suspension	135	40.6	3.3
Expulsion	123	39.0	3.2

Table 17

Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 3: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Verbal Warning	38	12.8	2.4
Written Warning	61	19.9	2.7
Disciplinary Probation	145	53.3	3.4
Disciplinary Suspension	159	67.0	3.5
Expulsion	103	47.2	3.2

Table 18

Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 4: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Verbal Warning	42	13.2	2.5
Written Warning	65	19.1	2.7
Disciplinary Probation	159	54.8	3.5
Disciplinary Suspension	173	68.9	3.6
Expulsion	113	44.0	3.2

Table 19

Disciplinary Sanction Effectiveness, Stage 5: Overall Level of Agreement

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Verbal Warning	29	10.4	2.4
Written Warning	50	17.4	2.6
Disciplinary Probation	143	57.1	3.4
Disciplinary Suspension	162	73.1	3.6
Expulsion	90	42.0	3.1

The modified survey instrument directly asked participants about their perceptions of the most effective disciplinary and educational sanctions in the third section of the survey. For these two questions, the following were used as indicators of effectiveness: 1 = ineffective, 2 = ineffectiveness, 3 = somewhat effective, 4 = effective, and 5 = very effective. Based on the responses analyzed for this question, the researcher found that 94.7% of the respondents believed disciplinary suspension was a disciplinary sanction that is very effective or effective. A total of 96.2% of the respondents determined that alcohol assessment as an educational sanction was either very effective or somewhat effective. These data can be found in Tables 20, and 21.

Table 20

Overall Perceptions: Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions

Sanctions	Very Effective or Effective		
	N	%	Mean
Verbal Warning	100	38.2	2.3
Written Warning	156	59.5	2.7
Disciplinary Probation	249	94.3	3.7
Disciplinary Suspension	248	94.7	4.0
Expulsion	210	79.8	3.8

Note. 5 = Very effective, 4 = Effective, 3 = Somewhat effective, 2 = Ineffective, 1 = Very ineffective

Table 21

Overall Perceptions: Effectiveness of Educational Sanctions

Sanctions	Very Effective or Effective		
	N	%	Mean
Alcohol Assessment	256	96.2	4.0
Research/Reflection Paper	200	75.6	3.1
Community Service	150	56.6	2.6
Parental Notification	218	82.3	3.4
Campus based activity or assignment	209	78.9	3.2

Note. 5 = Very effective, 4 = Effective, 3 = Somewhat effective, 2 = Ineffective, 1 = Very ineffective

Section three of the survey instrument also asked the respondents about their perceptions of the different student populations that are more likely to be recidivists for violating institutional alcohol policies, and what sanctions may be the most effective based on a student's gender or class standing. Based on the analyzed data, 98% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that freshman are more likely to be recidivists for violating their institutions alcohol policies. Based on gender, 78.1% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that male

students are more likely to be recidivists for violating institutional alcohol policies. Based on class standing, 58.9% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that educational sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for students that are freshman. Based on class standing, 48.8% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that disciplinary sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations. Based on class standing, 47.8% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that a combination of educational and disciplinary sanctions are most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations for freshman. Based on gender, 95.7% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that educational sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for female students, whereas 85.6% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that disciplinary sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations for males. Based on gender, 73.5% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that a combination of disciplinary and educational sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations for female students. The results of the analyses are displayed in Tables 22-29.

Table 22

Perceptions of Likelihood of Recidivism Based on Class Standing

Class Level	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Freshman	237	98.0	4.4
Sophomore	214	68.0	3.9
Junior	69	19.0	2.9
Senior	37	11.1	2.4
Graduate	13	4.0	1.9

Table 23

Perceptions of Likelihood of Recidivism Based on Gender

Gender	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Male	206	78.1	4.2
Female	92	34.9	3.1
Transgender	19	7.5	2.9

Table 24

Perceptions of Effectiveness of Educational Sanctions Based on Class Standing

Class Level	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Freshman	197	58.9	3.9
Sophomore	188	48.6	3.8
Junior	125	33.7	3.4
Senior	112	33.0	3
Graduate	91	25.8	3.1

Table 25

Perceptions of Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions Based on Class Standing

Class Level	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Freshman	170	48.8	3.7
Sophomore	167	44.1	3.7
Junior	146	37.3	3.6
Senior	138	36.6	3.5
Graduate	113	33.2	3.3

Table 26

Perceptions of Effectiveness for Both Disciplinary and Educational Sanctions Based on Class Standing

Class Level	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Freshman	230	47.8	4.3
Sophomore	225	46.1	4.2
Junior	196	39.8	4.0
Senior	175	35.9	3.9
Graduate	147	30.5	3.7

Table 27

Perceptions of Effectiveness of Educational Sanctions Based on Gender

Gender	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Male	107	57.2	3.3
Female	146	95.7	3.7
Transgender	80	47.1	3.4

Table 28

Perceptions of Effectiveness of Disciplinary Sanctions Based on Gender

Sanctions	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Male	127	85.6	3.5
Female	119	76.1	3.5
Transgender	65	38.3	3.2

Table 29

Perceptions of Effectiveness of Both Disciplinary and Educational Sanctions Based on Gender

Gender	Strongly Agree or Agree		
	N	%	Mean
Male	183	72.8	4.0
Female	182	73.5	4.0
Transgender	133	53.7	3.7

The fourth and final section of the survey instrument asked the respondents about disciplinary and educational sanctions and their impact on areas such as students being more cautious, retention, persistence, graduation rates, and sexual assaults. A total of 76.1% respondents indicated that disciplinary and educational sanctions simply make students more cautious so that they are not caught violating alcohol policies. With regard to retention, 82.2% of the respondents indicated that disciplinary and educational sanctions help an institution's retention of first year students. Regarding persistence, 86% of the respondents indicated that disciplinary and educational sanctions help students with persistence. A total of 76.9% of the respondents indicated that disciplinary or educational sanctions help an institution's graduation rate. Responses to the final question of this section indicated that 67.1% of the respondents believed that disciplinary or educational sanctions can help in reducing alcohol related sexual assaults. The results of the analysis of these data are displayed in Tables 30-34.

Table 30

Impact of Sanctions on Caution Toward Policy Violation

Impact	N	%
Yes	201	76.1
No	63	23.7
Total	264	100.0

Table 31

Impact of Sanctions on Retention

Impact	N	%
Yes	217	82.2
No	47	17.8
Total	264	100.0

Table 32

Impact of Sanctions on Persistence

Impact	N	%
Yes	227	86.0
No	37	14.0
Total	264	100.0

Table 33

Impact of Sanctions on Graduation Rates

Impact	N	%
Yes	203	77.0
No	61	23.1
Total	264	100.0

Table 34

Impact of Sanctions on Sexual Assaults

Impact	N	%
Yes	177	67.1
No	87	33.0
Total	264	100.0

Research Question 1

The first research question was, “What is the difference between student conduct administrators’ perceptions of the most effective educational sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?” This question was answered by controlling for six demographic variables that were identified in the survey. These variables included gender, educational level, years of experience, institutional type, institutional size, and on campus residency. The transgender responses for Research Question 1 were suppressed due to a small sample size and the possibility that the identity of these participants may have been revealed based on the responses. The statistical difference tests were conducted by independent sample t-tests for gender, and one-way ANOVA tests for the remaining independent variables. In order to detect significantly different combinations, Tukey and LSD post-hoc tests were conducted.

There was a significant difference between respondents with bachelor’s degrees and respondents with professional degrees ($F= 3.691, p < 0.001$). The student conduct administrators with bachelor’s degrees indicated that their perceptions of the effectiveness of the campus based activity or assignment as an educational sanction were higher than those with professional degrees. These data can be found in Table 35.

Table 35

Mean Difference Test of Educational Sanctions by Educational Levels (Q23)

Sanctions	Educational Level	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q23_1_re edu sanctions - Alcohol assessment	(a) Bachelors	10	3.700	1.337	0.989	N/A
	(b) Masters	196	4.036	0.862		
	(c) Professional	14	3.714	1.069		
	(d) Doctorate	44	4.023	0.792		
	Total	264	4.004	0.883		
Q23_2_re edu sanctions - Research paper	(a) Bachelors	10	2.900	1.663	0.845	N/A
	(b) Masters	196	3.117	0.935		
	(c) Professional	14	2.714	1.139		
	(d) Doctorate	44	3.091	0.984		
	Total	264	3.083	0.987		
Q23_3_re edu sanctions - Community service	(a) Bachelors	10	3.100	1.370	1.712	N/A
	(b) Masters	194	2.624	0.937		
	(c) Professional	14	2.214	0.975		
	(d) Doctorate	44	2.546	0.999		
	Total	262	2.607	0.972		
Q23_4_re edu sanctions - Parental notification	(a) Bachelors	10	3.800	1.317	0.875	N/A
	(b) Masters	195	3.374	0.957		
	(c) Professional	14	3.143	1.231		
	(d) Doctorate	44	3.364	0.967		
	Total	263	3.376	0.988		
Q23_5_re edu sanctions - Campus based activity or assignment	(a) Bachelors	10	3.800	1.135	3.691*	(a)-(c)**
	(b) Masters	195	3.200	0.883		
	(c) Professional	14	2.571	0.852		
	(d) Doctorate	44	3.182	0.971		
	Total	263	3.186	0.920		

Note: $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

There was also a statistical significance when controlling for institutional type. The statistical significance between public institutions and private, independent institutions ($F=4.217, p < .05$) was found in their differences on research/reflection papers as an educational sanction. In this difference, public institutions rated that educational sanction higher. There was also statistical significance between private religious and private independent institutions ($F=4.217, p < .05$) as it relates to the effectiveness of research/reflection papers as an educational sanction. In this difference, private religious institutions also rated that educational sanction higher. These data can be found in Table 36.

Table 36

Mean Difference Test of Educational Sanctions by Institutional Type (Q23)

Sanctions	Institutional Type	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q23_1_re edu sanctions - Alcohol assessment	(a) Public	163	4.068	0.883	1.340	N/A
	(b) Private, religious	41	3.829	0.771		
	(c) Private, Independent	60	3.950	0.946		
	Total	264	4.004	0.883		
Q23_2_re edu sanctions - Research paper	(a) Public	163	3.160	0.975	4.217*	(a) – (c)* (b) – (c)*
	(b) Private, religious	41	3.244	0.943		
	(c) Private, Independent	60	2.767	0.998		
	Total	264	3.083	0.987		
Q23_3_re edu sanctions - Community service	(a) Public	161	2.571	0.986	0.290	N/A
	(b) Private, religious	41	2.683	0.820		
	(c) Private, Independent	60	2.650	1.039		
	Total	262	2.607	0.972		
Q23_4_re edu sanctions - Parental notification	(a) Public	162	3.327	1.014	0.637	N/A
	(b) Private, religious	41	3.512	0.810		
	(c) Private, Independent	60	3.417	1.030		
	Total	263	3.376	0.988		
Q23_5_re edu sanctions - Campus based activity or assignment	(a) Public	163	3.221	0.923	0.758	N/A
	(b) Private, religious	41	3.024	0.908		
	(c) Private, Independent	59	3.203	0.924		
	Total	263	3.186	0.920		

Note: $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

After the researcher controlled for the institutional size variable, there was statistically significant data between the respondents who identified their institutions as having a size between 2,000 – 9,999 and 30,000 or more students ($F = 2.775$, $p < .05$). This statistical significance was identified in the area of alcohol assessment and research/reflection paper, where the institutions of 30,000 or more rated that educational sanction as more effective. For alcohol

assessment as an educational sanction, institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 students and those that had 30,000 or more students demonstrated a significant difference when examining the effectiveness of completing a research/reflection paper ($F=3.067$, $p < .05$) The institutions of 30,000 or more students rated this sanction higher. These data can be found in Table 37.

The final area where a statistical significance was identified was in the area of institutional size and evaluating community service as an effective educational sanction. These differences were between institutions that had fewer than 2,000 students and those with 20,000 – 29,999 students ($F=2.419$, $p < .05$); fewer than 2,000 and 30,000 or more students ($F = 2.419$, $p < .05$); and between 20,000 – 29,999 and 30,000 or more students ($F = 2.419$, $p < .05$). These data can also be found in Table 37.

Table 37

Mean Difference Test of Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size (Q23)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q23_1_re edu sanctions - Alcohol assessment	(a) Fewer than 2,000	32	4.000	0.880	2.775*	(b)-(e)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.788	0.860		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.983	0.892		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	4.225	0.698		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	4.234	0.983		
	Total	264	4.004	0.883		
Q23_2_re edu sanctions - research paper	(a) Fewer than 2,000	32	3.375	1.008	3.067*	(b)-(e)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	2.824	0.928		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.100	1.020		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.075	0.944		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.340	0.984		
	Total	264	3.083	0.987		
Q23_3_re edu sanctions - Community service	(a) Fewer than 2,000	32	2.875	0.976	2.419*	(a)-(d)* (a)-(e)* (c)-(d)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	2.671	0.892		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	59	2.729	0.980		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.308	1.004		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.404	1.014		
	Total	262	2.607	0.972		
Q23_4_re edu sanctions - parental notification	(a) Fewer than 2,000	32	3.344	1.234	0.858	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.447	0.880		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.500	1.033		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	3.180	0.914		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.277	0.994		
	Total	263	3.376	0.988		
Q23_5_re edu sanctions - Campus based activity or assignment	(a) Fewer than 2,000	32	3.281	0.924	0.526	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	3.119	0.884		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.117	0.904		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.200	0.966		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.319	0.980		
	Total	263	3.186	0.920		

Note: $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Research Question 2

The second research question was, “What is the difference between student conduct administrators’ perceptions of the most effective disciplinary sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?” This question was answered by controlling for six demographic variables that were identified in the survey. These variables included gender, educational level, years of experience, institutional type, institutional size, and on campus residency. The transgender responses for Research Question 2 were suppressed due to a small sample size and the possibility that the identity of these participants may be revealed based on the responses. The statistical difference tests were conducted by independent sample t-tests for gender, and one-way ANOVA tests for the rest of independent variables. In order to detect significantly different combinations, Tukey and LSD post-hoc tests were conducted.

The first statistical significance that was identified in the responses included years of experience and the difference between perceptions of probation as a disciplinary sanction. The respondents who identified themselves as having 1-4 years of professional experience and the respondents who were identified as having 10-14 years of experience revealed statistical significance ($F= 3.521, p < 0.01$). There was also a statistically significant difference based on years of experience for expulsion as a disciplinary sanction. Respondents with 1-4 years of professional experience and the respondents with 15 or more years of experience also demonstrated a significant difference ($F = 3.693, p < .05$). These data can be found in Table 38.

Table 38

Mean Difference Test of Disciplinary Sanctions by Years of Experience (Q22)

Sanctions	Years of Experience	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q22_1_re discp sanctions - Verbal Warning	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.279	0.792	0.342	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	71	2.296	0.763		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.149	0.834		
	(d) 15 or more	56	2.304	1.159		
	Total	260	2.265	0.880		
Q22_2_re discp sanctions - written Warning	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.791	0.842	1.053	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	71	2.732	0.774		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.532	0.905		
	(d) 15 or more	56	2.607	1.107		
	Total	260	2.689	0.900		
Q22_3_re discp sanctions - Disciplinary Probation	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.837	0.684	3.521*	(a)-(c)**
	(b) 5 - 9	72	3.722	0.791		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.383	0.795		
	(d) 15 or more	57	3.684	0.869		
	Total	262	3.691	0.788		
Q22_4_re discp sanctions - Disciplinary suspension	(a) 1 - 4	85	3.906	0.826	1.978	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	4.000	0.964		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.872	0.824		
	(d) 15 or more	58	4.224	0.817		
	Total	262	3.996	0.869		
Q22_5_re discp sanctions - Expulsion	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.535	1.369	3.693*	(a)-(d)*
	(b) 5 - 9	70	3.643	1.297		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.915	1.100		
	(d) 15 or more	58	4.190	1.067		
	Total	261	3.778	1.261		

Note. $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

The next variable that produced a statistically significant response was institutional size. The respondents who identified as having fewer than 2,000 students and respondents who selected 2,000 – 9,999 demonstrated a statistically significant difference ($F = 3.129$, $p < .05$).

The final variable that produced statistically significant differences was on-campus residency. When responding to the sanction of disciplinary suspension, respondents who indicated 1,000 – 4,999 and 5,000 – 9,999 on-campus residency students demonstrated a statistically significant difference ($F = 3.394, p < .05$). These data can be found in Tables 39 and 40.

Table 39

Mean Difference Test of Disciplinary Sanctions by Institutional Size (Q22)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q22_1_re discp sanctions - Verbal Warning	(a) Fewer than 2,000	31	2.387	0.844	0.493	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.238	0.816		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	58	2.155	0.970		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.300	0.911		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.340	0.891		
	Total	260	2.265	0.880		
Q22_1_re discp sanctions – Witten Warning	(a) Fewer than 2,000	31	2.839	0.898	0.423	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.631	0.847		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	58	2.655	1.018		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.650	0.975		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.766	0.786		
	Total	260	2.689	0.900		
Q22_3_re discp sanctions - Disciplinary Probation	(a) Fewer than 2,000	31	3.871	0.846	1.754	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.565	0.794		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	59	3.593	0.746		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.800	0.758		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.830	0.789		
	Total	262	3.691	0.788		
Q22_4_re discp sanctions - Disciplinary suspension	(a) Fewer than 2,000	31	4.258	0.930	3.129*	(a)-(b)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.741	0.847		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	59	4.051	0.879		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	4.150	0.770		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	4.085	0.855		
	Total	262	3.996	0.869		
Q22_5_re discp sanctions - Expulsion	(a) Fewer than 2,000	31	4.129	1.310	1.698	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	3.548	1.155		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.717	1.367		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	4.000	1.277		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.851	1.215		
	Total	261	3.778	1.261		

Note. $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

Table 40

Mean Difference Test of Disciplinary Sanctions by On-campus Residency

Sanctions	Residency	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q22_1_re discp sanctions - Verbal Warning	(a) 1 - 999	38	2.395	1.028	0.464	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	136	2.265	0.845		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	65	2.246	0.884		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	2.111	0.832		
	Total	257	2.269	0.881		
Q22_2_re discp sanctions - written Warning	(a) 1 - 999	38	2.947	1.064	1.729	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	136	2.625	0.851		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	65	2.708	0.931		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	2.444	0.705		
	Total	257	2.681	0.901		
Q22_3_re discp sanctions - Disciplinary Probation	(a) 1 - 999	38	3.737	0.921	0.285	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	138	3.652	0.741		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	65	3.739	0.796		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	3.611	0.850		
	Total	259	3.683	0.788		
Q22_4_re discp sanctions - Disciplinary suspension	(a) 1 - 999	38	3.895	1.085	3.394*	(b)-(c)*
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	138	3.891	0.843		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	65	4.262	0.735		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	4.222	0.732		
	Total	259	4.008	0.863		
Q22_5_re discp sanctions - Expulsion	(a) 1 - 999	38	3.737	1.329	2.461	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	136	3.618	1.242		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	4.091	1.224		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	4.056	1.110		
	Total	258	3.787	1.253		

Note. $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

Research Question 3

The third research question was, “What is the difference between student conduct administrators’ perceptions of disciplinary and educational sanctions for alcohol policy violations that move students through the five stages of the Transtheoretical Model of Change (i.e., Pre-contemplation, Contemplation, Preparation, Action, and Maintenance)?” Data to respond to this question were analyzed by controlling for six demographic variables that were identified in the survey. These variables included gender, educational level, years of experience, institutional type, institutional size, and on campus residency. The transgender responses for Research Question 3 were suppressed due to a small sample size and the possibility that the identity of these participants would be revealed based on the responses. The statistical difference tests were conducted by independent sample t-tests for gender, and one-way ANOVA tests for the rest of independent variables. In order to detect significantly different combinations, Tukey and LSD post-hoc tests were conducted.

The first statistically significant difference that was identified by the researcher was in Stage 3 based on institutional type between public institutions, and private independent ($F = 4.217, p < .05$); and between private religious and private independent institutions ($F = 4.217, p < .05$). In both of these instances the respondents who identified as being at a private, independent institution rated the research/reflection paper as an educational sanction lower than the other two respondents in Stage 3. Stage 3 of the educational sanctions by institution type also revealed a significant difference between respondents who identified as being at public institutions and private, religious institutions ($F = 3.634, p < .05$). These data can be found in Table 41.

Table 41

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Type, Stage 3 (Q13)

Sanctions	Type	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q13_1_re_stg3_ach_Assess	(a) Public	161	3.988	0.968	0.301	N/A
	(b) Private, religious	40	3.875	0.992		
	(c) Private, Independent	61	4.016	0.806		
	Total	262	3.977	0.934		
Q13_2_re_stg3_research	(a) Public	161	3.366	1.094	4.217*	(a) – (c)* (b) – (c)*
	(b) Private, religious	40	3.525	0.960		
	(c) Private, Independent	61	3.016	1.133		
	Total	262	3.309	1.093		
Q13_3_re_stg3_community_serv	(a) Public	160	2.213	0.850	1.237	N/A
	(b) Private, religious	40	2.450	0.876		
	(c) Private, Independent	60	2.250	0.856		
	Total	260	2.258	0.856		
Q13_4_re_stg3_parental_notif	(a) Public	161	2.845	1.028	0.459	N/A
	(b) Private, religious	40	3.000	0.906		
	(c) Private, Independent	60	2.817	1.017		
	Total	261	2.862	1.006		
Q13_5_re_stg3_campus_activity	(a) Public	160	3.238	0.901	3.634*	(a) – (b)*
	(b) Private, religious	40	2.825	0.813		
	(c) Private, Independent	60	3.033	1.025		
	Total	260	3.127	0.928		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

The next statistically significant differences were identified in Stage 2 based on educational level between respondents with bachelor's degrees and doctoral degrees ($F= 2.908$, $p <.05$) and respondents with professional degrees and doctoral degrees ($F=2.908$, $p <.05$). In both of these instances, respondents with doctoral degrees rated parental notification as an educational

sanction higher than did the other two categories of respondents. These data can be found in Table 42.

Table 42

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Educational Level, Stage 2 (Q12)

Sanctions	Educational Level	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q12_1_re_stg2_ach_asses	(a) Bachelors	10	3.200	1.229	0.203	N/A
	(b) Masters	197	3.178	1.188		
	(c) Professional	14	3.286	1.267		
	(d) Doctorate	43	3.326	1.149		
	Total	264	3.208	1.182		
Q12_2_stg2_research	(a) Bachelors	10	3.100	0.876	0.478	N/A
	(b) Masters	197	3.437	0.981		
	(c) Professional	14	3.429	0.938		
	(d) Doctorate	43	3.512	1.009		
	Total	264	3.436	0.977		
Q12_3_re_stg2_comm_service	(a) Bachelors	10	3.200	0.919	0.081	N/A
	(b) Masters	195	3.200	1.028		
	(c) Professional	14	3.071	1.385		
	(d) Doctorate	43	3.233	1.151		
	Total	262	3.198	1.061		
Q12_4_re_stg2_parent_notf	(a) Bachelors	10	3.500	0.972	2.908*	(b)-(d)* (c)-(d)*
	(b) Masters	194	3.134	1.024		
	(c) Professional	14	2.786	1.051		
	(d) Doctorate	43	3.535	0.960		
	Total	261	3.195	1.025		
Q12_5_re_stg2_campus_activ	(a) Bachelors	10	3.000	1.054	1.235	N/A
	(b) Masters	194	3.273	0.871		
	(c) Professional	14	3.643	1.008		
	(d) Doctorate	43	3.372	0.874		
	Total	261	3.299	0.887		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Stage 3 of the educational level also demonstrated statistical significance for the research/reflection paper as an educational sanction between bachelor's and master's degree categories ($F = 3.500$, $p, <0.01$); and between bachelor's and doctoral degree categories ($F = 3.500$, $p <.05$). In both of these instances, respondents with bachelor's degrees rated the research/reflection paper lower than did the other two respondent categories. These data can be found in Table 43.

Table 43

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Educational Level, Stage 3 (Q13)

Sanctions	Educational Level	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q13_1_re_stg3_ach_ Assess	(a) Bachelors	10	4.000	0.816	0.217	N/A
	(b) Masters	197	3.990	0.953		
	(c) Professional	14	3.786	0.975		
	(d) Doctorate	44	4.000	0.863		
	Total	265	3.981	0.931		
Q13_2_re_stg3_resea rch	(a) Bachelors	10	2.400	1.075	3.500*	(a)-(b)** (a)-(d)*
	(b) Masters	197	3.411	1.029		
	(c) Professional	14	3.000	1.240		
	(d) Doctorate	44	3.205	1.212		
	Total	265	3.317	1.090		
Q13_3_re_stg3_com munity_serv	(a) Bachelors	10	2.300	0.949	0.632	N/A
	(b) Masters	195	2.226	0.819		
	(c) Professional	14	2.071	0.730		
	(d) Doctorate	44	2.386	1.039		
	Total	263	2.247	0.858		
Q13_4_re_stg3_paren tal_notf	(a) Bachelors	10	3.300	1.252	0.767	N/A
	(b) Masters	196	2.821	0.999		
	(c) Professional	14	2.929	0.917		
	(d) Doctorate	44	2.886	0.993		
	Total	264	2.856	1.003		
Q13_5_re_stg3_camp us_activity	(a) Bachelors	10	3.500	1.269	0.942	N/A
	(b) Masters	195	3.128	0.919		
	(c) Professional	14	2.857	0.864		
	(d) Doctorate	44	3.136	0.878		
	Total	263	3.129	0.924		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Stage 5 of the educational level demonstrated statistical significance for a verbal warning as a disciplinary sanction between respondents with professional degrees and those with doctoral

degrees ($F = 2.939, p < .05$). In this instance, respondents with professional degrees rated verbal warnings lower than did those holding doctoral degrees. These data can be found in Table 44

Table 44

Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Educational Level, Stage 5 (Q21)

Sanctions	Educational Level	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q21_1_re_stg5_verbal	(a) Bachelors	10	2.300	1.160	2.939*	(c)-(d)*
	(b) Masters	195	2.318	0.920		
	(c) Professional	14	1.857	0.770		
	(d) Doctorate	44	2.659	1.033		
	Total	263	2.350	0.953		
Q21_2_re_stg5_written	(a) Bachelors	10	2.800	1.229	2.118	N/A
	(b) Masters	195	2.544	0.985		
	(c) Professional	14	2.071	1.072		
	(d) Doctorate	44	2.795	1.002		
	Total	263	2.570	1.008		
Q21_3_re_stg5_probation	(a) Bachelors	10	4.100	0.316	1.909	N/A
	(b) Masters	197	3.365	1.097		
	(c) Professional	14	3.071	1.269		
	(d) Doctorate	43	3.349	0.997		
	Total	264	3.375	1.078		
Q21_4_re_stg5_suspension	(a) Bachelors	10	4.300	0.483	1.823	N/A
	(b) Masters	197	3.548	1.140		
	(c) Professional	14	3.714	1.069		
	(d) Doctorate	44	3.432	0.974		
	Total	265	3.566	1.099		
Q21_5_re_stg5_expulsion	(a) Bachelors	10	3.100	1.449	0.298	N/A
	(b) Masters	197	3.046	1.131		
	(c) Professional	14	3.286	1.139		
	(d) Doctorate	44	3.159	0.914		
	Total	265	3.079	1.107		

Note. $p^{***} < .001, p^{**} < 0.01, p^* < .05$

Stage 3 of the years of experience demonstrated statistical significance for parental notification as an educational sanction between respondents with 1-4 years of experience and those with 15 or more years of experience ($F = 3.441, p <.05$); and between respondents of 10 – 14 years of experience and those with 15 or more years of experience ($F = 3.441, p <0.01$). In each of these instances, the respondents with 15 or more years of experience rated parental notification higher as an educational sanction than did those in the other categories. These data can be found in Table 45.

Table 45

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 3 (Q13)

Sanctions	Years of Experience	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q13_1_re_stg3_ach_ Assess	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.826	0.935	1.388	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	74	4.108	0.973		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	4.064	0.763		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.983	0.982		
	Total	265	3.981	0.931		
Q13_2_re_stg3_resea rch	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.465	1.002	1.015	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	74	3.324	1.087		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.213	1.160		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.172	1.157		
	Total	265	3.317	1.090		
Q13_3_re_stg3_com munity_serv	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.337	0.862	1.557	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	2.194	0.833		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.043	0.806		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.345	0.909		
	Total	263	2.247	0.858		
Q13_4_re_stg3_paren tal_notf	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.733	0.887	3.441*	(a)-(d)* (c)-(d)**
	(b) 5 - 9	73	2.932	1.018		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.596	1.097		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.155	1.005		
	Total	264	2.856	1.003		
Q13_5_re_stg3_camp us_activity	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.209	0.896	1.723	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	3.000	0.888		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.979	0.944		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.293	0.973		
	Total	263	3.129	0.924		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Stage 4 of the years of experience demonstrated statistical significance for alcohol assessment as an educational sanction between respondents with 1-4 years of experience and 5-9

years of experience ($F = 2.907, p < 0.01$); and between respondents with 1-4 years of experience and 15 or more years of experience ($F = 2.907, p < .05$). In both instances the respondents with 1-4 years of experience rated the alcohol assessment lower than the other respondents. These data can be found in Table 46.

Table 46

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 4 (Q14)

Sanctions	Years of Experience	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q14_1_re_stg4_ach_ assess	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.733	0.913	2.907*	(a)-(b)** (a)-(d)*
	(b) 5 - 9	74	4.122	0.827		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	4.000	0.722		
	(d) 15 or more	58	4.034	1.008		
	Total	265	3.955	0.891		
Q14_2_re_stg4_research	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.244	0.945	0.194	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	73	3.219	1.003		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.106	1.068		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.207	1.104		
	Total	264	3.205	1.015		
Q14_3_re_stg4_community_service	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.581	0.976	0.783	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	2.583	1.004		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.340	0.841		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.483	1.013		
	Total	263	2.517	0.968		
Q14_4_re_stg4_parents_notif	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.860	0.960	2.242	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	74	3.041	0.999		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.787	1.122		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.241	1.113		
	Total	265	2.981	1.042		
Q14_5_re_stg4_campus_Activity	(a) 1 - 4	85	3.259	0.888	0.766	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	3.181	0.909		
	(c) 10 - 14	46	3.022	0.882		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.259	1.036		
	Total	261	3.195	0.926		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Stage 5 of the years of experience demonstrated statistical significance for alcohol assessment as an educational sanction between respondents with 1-4 years of experience and 5-9 years of experience ($F = 3.781, p < 0.01$); and between respondents with 1-4 years of experience and 15 or more years of experience ($F = 3.781, p < .05$). In both instances the respondents with 1-4 years of experience rated the alcohol assessment lower than the other respondents. These data can be found in Table 47.

Stage 3 of the years of experience demonstrated statistical significance for expulsion as a disciplinary sanction between respondents with 1-4 years of experience and 15 or more years of experience ($F = 3.168, p < 0.05$); between respondents with 5-9 years of experience and 15 or more years of experience ($F = 3.168, p < .05$); and between respondents with 10-14 years of experience and 15 or more years of experience ($F = 3.168, p < 0.01$). In all three instances, the respondents with 15 or more years of experience rated expulsion higher than the other respondents. These data can be found in Table 48.

Stage 4 of the years of experience demonstrated statistical significance for expulsion as a disciplinary sanction between respondents with 5-9 years of experience and respondents with 15 or more years of experience ($F = 2.780, p < 0.01$). In this instance, respondents with 15 or more years of experience rated expulsion higher. These data can be found in Table 49.

Table 47

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 5 (Q15)

Sanctions	Years of Experience	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q15_1_re_stg5_ach_ assess	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.291	1.083	3.781*	(a)-(b)** (a)-(d)*
	(b) 5 - 9	74	3.811	0.946		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.553	1.176		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.741	1.052		
	Total	265	3.581	1.074		
Q15_2_re_stg5_research	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.640	0.993	0.341	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	74	2.770	1.014		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.617	0.898		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.741	1.208		
	Total	265	2.694	1.030		
Q15_3_re_stg5_comm_service	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.407	0.987	0.781	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	73	2.507	0.974		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.234	0.914		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.362	0.986		
	Total	264	2.394	0.969		
Q15_4_re_stg5_parental_notif	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.767	1.002	1.796	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	74	2.905	1.062		
	(c) 10 - 14	46	2.609	1.145		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.069	1.153		
	Total	264	2.845	1.083		
Q15_5_re_stg5_campus_Activity	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.895	0.983	0.216	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	73	2.877	0.849		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.894	0.866		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.000	1.060		
	Total	264	2.913	0.941		

Note. $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

Table 48

Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 3, (Q19)

Sanctions	Years of Experience	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q19_1_re_stg3_verbal	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.244	0.894	1.336	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	2.514	0.949		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.362	1.072		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.517	1.080		
	Total	263	2.399	0.987		
Q19_2_re_stg3_written	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.674	1.057	0.537	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	2.736	0.934		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.511	1.101		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.586	1.060		
	Total	263	2.643	1.031		
Q19_3_re_stg3_probation	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.419	1.000	0.285	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	3.444	1.005		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.277	1.155		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.414	0.974		
	Total	263	3.399	1.021		
Q19_4_re_stg3_suspension	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.512	1.026	0.427	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	74	3.541	1.161		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.404	1.077		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.638	0.986		
	Total	265	3.528	1.063		
Q19_5_re_stg3_expulsion	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.105	1.106	3.168*	(a)-(d)* (b)-(d)* (c)-(d)**
	(b) 5 - 9	74	3.122	1.134		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.936	1.150		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.552	1.012		
	Total	265	3.177	1.116		

Note. $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^* < .05$

Table 49

Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Years of Experience, Stage 4, (Q20)

Sanctions	Years of Experience	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q20_1_re_stg4_verbal	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.326	0.987	0.772	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	2.569	0.947		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.468	1.039		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.448	1.095		
	Total	263	2.445	1.009		
Q20_2_re_stg4_written	(a) 1 - 4	86	2.744	1.042	0.909	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	72	2.819	0.939		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	2.532	0.997		
	(d) 15 or more	58	2.621	1.137		
	Total	263	2.700	1.029		
Q20_3_re_stg4_probation	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.535	1.037	0.385	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	73	3.562	1.000		
	(c) 10 - 14	46	3.370	1.082		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.483	0.922		
	Total	263	3.502	1.007		
Q20_4_re_stg4_suspension	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.605	1.077	0.390	N/A
	(b) 5 - 9	74	3.662	1.126		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.553	1.017		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.759	0.961		
	Total	265	3.645	1.053		
Q20_5_re_stg4_expulsion	(a) 1 - 4	86	3.256	1.170	2.780*	(b)-(d)**
	(b) 5 - 9	74	2.986	1.104		
	(c) 10 - 14	47	3.213	1.020		
	(d) 15 or more	58	3.534	0.977		
	Total	265	3.234	1.097		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Stage 1 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for community service as an educational sanction between respondents from institutions with student populations fewer than 2,000 and 30,000 or more ($F = 4.378$, $p < 0.05$); between respondents

from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 30,000 students or more ($F= 4.378, p <.05$); and between respondents from institutions with student populations of 20,000 – 29,999 and 30,000 or more ($F= 4.378, p <.05$). In all three instances, the respondents from institutions that had 30,000 or more students rated community service higher than did respondents from the other groups. These data can be found in Table 50.

Stage 3 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for alcohol assessment as an educational sanction between respondents from institutions that with 2,000 – 9,999 and 20,000 – 29,999 students ($F = 2.475, p <.05$); and between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 20,000 – 29,999 students ($F= 2.780, p <.05$) for community service as an educational sanction. In both instances, the respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 students rated alcohol assessment and community service higher than the other respondents. These data can be found in Table 51.

Table 50

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 1 (Q11)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q11_1_re_stg1_ach_ assessment	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	1.606	0.704	1.413	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	1.964	0.950		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	1.833	0.960		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	1.667	0.662		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	1.766	0.865		
	Total	263	1.810	0.875		
Q11_2_re_stg1_research	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.152	1.093	1.906	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.738	1.131		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.650	1.176		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	38	2.658	1.072		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.468	0.975		
	Total	262	2.584	1.110		
Q11_3_re_stg1_community_service	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.939	1.059	4.378**	(a)-(e)* (b)-(e)* (c)-(e)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.059	1.004		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.100	1.130		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	3.538	1.047		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.660	0.915		
	Total	264	3.231	1.059		
Q11_4_re_stg1_parent_notification	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.606	1.298	0.629	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	2.588	1.038		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.550	1.268		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.846	1.040		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.787	1.197		
	Total	264	2.655	1.153		
Q11_5_re_stg1_campus_activity	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.394	1.029	0.790	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	2.659	0.920		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.733	1.023		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.725	1.037		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.574	0.950		
	Total	265	2.638	0.979		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Table 51

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 3 (Q13)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q13_1_re_stg3_ach_Assess	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	4.030	0.918	2.475*	(b)-(d)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.812	0.824		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	4.017	0.948		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	4.350	0.700		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.894	1.184		
	Total	265	3.981	0.931		
Q13_2_re_stg3_research	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.242	1.119	0.629	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.212	1.025		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.300	1.124		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.425	1.217		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.489	1.040		
	Total	265	3.317	1.090		
Q13_3_re_stg3_community_serv	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.303	0.810	2.780*	(b)-(d)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.440	0.869		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.267	0.821		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	1.949	0.972		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.085	0.747		
	Total	263	2.247	0.858		
Q13_4_re_stg3_parental_notf	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.879	1.139	1.195	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.940	0.936		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.983	0.911		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.600	1.057		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.745	1.073		
	Total	264	2.856	1.003		
Q13_5_re_stg3_campus_activity	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.061	0.966	0.252	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	3.095	0.845		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.200	0.953		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	3.205	0.923		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.085	1.018		
	Total	263	3.129	0.924		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Stage 4 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for several variables: alcohol assessment, research/reflection papers, and community service. The results of the analyses are displayed in Table 52.

Stage 4 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for alcohol assessment as an educational sanction between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 20,000 – 29,999 students ($F = 3.884, p < .01$); between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 10,000 – 19,999 students ($F = 3.884, p < .05$); and between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 30,000 students or more ($F = 3.884, p < .01$). In all three instances, the respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 students rated alcohol assessment lower than did the other respondents.

Stage 4 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for research/reflection papers as an educational sanction between respondents from institutions that had fewer than 2,000 and 2,000 – 9,999 students ($F = 2.623, p < .05$); between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 10,000 – 19,999 students ($F = 2.623, p < .05$); and between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 30,000 or more students ($F = 2.623, p < .05$). The respondents from institutions that had fewer than 2,000 students rated the research/reflection paper higher than the respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 students. In the other two instances, the respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 rated the research/reflection paper lower than did the other respondents.

Stage 4 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for community service as an educational sanction between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999

and 20,000 – 29,999 students ($F = 2.655, p < .05$); between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 30,000 or more students ($F = 2.655, p < .05$); between respondents from institutions that had 10,000 – 19,999 and 20,000 – 29,999 more students ($F = 2.655, p < .05$); and between respondents from institutions that had 10,000 – 19,999 and 30,000 or more students ($F = 2.655, p < .05$). The respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 students rated community service higher than did the other two respondent groups from institutions that had 20,000 – 29,999 students and 30,000 or more students. In the other two instances, the respondents from institutions that had 10,000 – 19,999 also rated community service higher than did the other respondents.

Table 52

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 4 (Q14)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q14_1_re_stg4_ach_ assess	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.970	1.015	3.884**	(b)-(d)**
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.671	0.822		(b)-(c)*
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	4.033	0.920		(b)-(e)**
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	4.250	0.742		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	4.106	0.890		
	Total	265	3.955	0.891		
Q14_2_re_stg4_research	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.455	0.905	2.623*	(a)-(b)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	2.941	1.004		(b)-(c)*
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.333	1.020		(b)-(e)*
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	3.154	1.014		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.383	1.033		
	Total	264	3.205	1.015		
Q14_3_re_stg4_community_service	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.606	1.059	2.655*	(b)-(d)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.667	0.896		(b)-(e)*
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.650	1.005		(c)-(d)*
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.205	0.951		(c)-(e)*
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.277	0.926		
	Total	263	2.517	0.968		
Q14_4_re_stg4_parents_notif	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.970	1.311	1.842	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.118	0.851		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.133	1.033		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.700	1.043		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.787	1.122		
	Total	265	2.981	1.042		
Q14_5_re_stg4_campus_Activity	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.333	0.957	0.723	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	82	3.098	0.840		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.300	0.944		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	3.231	1.012		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.106	0.961		
	Total	261	3.195	0.926		

Note. $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

Stage 5 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for alcohol assessment as an educational sanction between respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 students and respondents from institutions that had 20,000 – 29,999 students ($F = 2.429$, $p < .05$). In this instance, respondents from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 students rated alcohol assessment lower than did respondents from institutions with enrollments of 20,000 – 29,999. These data can be found in Table 53.

Stage 1 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for probation as a disciplinary sanction between respondents from institutions that had fewer than 2,000 and 2,000 – 9,999 ($F = 2.572$, $p < .05$). In this instance respondents from institutions that had fewer than 2,000 students rated probation lower. These data can be found in Table 54.

Stage 5 based on institutional size demonstrated statistical significance for expulsion as a disciplinary sanction between respondents from institutions that had 20,000 – 29,999 students and 30,000 or more students ($F = 2.798$, $p < .05$). In this instance, respondents from institutions that had 30,000 or more rated expulsion higher. These data can be found in Table 55.

Table 53

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 5 (Q15)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q15_1_re_stg5_ach_ assessment	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.545	1.121	2.429*	(b)-(d)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.353	0.935		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.650	1.071		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.975	1.050		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.596	1.228		
	Total	265	3.581	1.074		
Q15_2_re_stg5_research	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.636	1.055	0.384	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	2.706	0.974		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.817	1.033		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.575	1.059		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.660	1.109		
	Total	265	2.694	1.030		
Q15_3_re_stg5_comm_service	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.455	1.034	1.240	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.476	0.938		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.517	1.000		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.200	0.992		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.213	0.907		
	Total	264	2.394	0.969		
Q15_4_re_stg5_parent_notif	(a) Fewer than 2,000	32	2.781	1.313	1.462	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.024	0.886		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.917	1.197		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.600	1.057		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.681	1.086		
	Total	264	2.845	1.083		
Q15_5_re_stg5_campus_activity	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.879	0.992	0.917	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.821	0.809		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.950	0.999		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.150	0.921		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.851	1.063		
	Total	264	2.913	0.941		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Table 54

Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 1 (Q17)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q17_1_re_stg1_verbal	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.303	1.403	0.141	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	3.262	1.163		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.400	1.251		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.250	1.373		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.255	1.293		
	Total	264	3.295	1.262		
Q17_2_re_stg1_written	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.636	1.025	0.928	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	83	2.976	1.147		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.017	1.157		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.846	1.136		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.745	1.132		
	Total	262	2.882	1.130		
Q17_3_re_stg1_probation	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	1.909	0.723	2.572*	(a)-(b)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.405	0.933		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.167	0.806		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.231	1.012		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.043	0.721		
	Total	263	2.198	0.869		
Q17_4_re_stg1_suspension	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	1.788	0.927	1.724	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	82	2.159	1.012		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	1.867	0.947		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	1.949	1.075		
	(e) 30,000 or more	46	1.761	0.848		
	Total	260	1.942	0.975		
Q17_5_re_stg1_expulsion	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	1.818	1.103	1.092	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	83	2.120	1.017		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	1.900	0.986		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.026	1.181		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	1.787	0.883		
	Total	262	1.958	1.026		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Table 55

Perceptions of Effective Disciplinary Sanctions by Institutional Size, Stage 5 (Q21)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q21_1_re_stg5_verbal	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.364	1.113	0.281	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.333	0.883		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.333	0.986		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.487	0.997		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.277	0.902		
	Total	263	2.350	0.953		
Q21_2_re_stg5_written	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	2.576	1.146	0.163	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	84	2.571	0.960		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	2.567	1.015		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	39	2.667	1.084		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	2.489	0.953		
	Total	263	2.570	1.008		
Q21_3_re_stg5_probation	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.515	1.064	0.311	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.400	1.037		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.267	1.056		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.400	1.236		
	(e) 30,000 or more	46	3.348	1.079		
	Total	264	3.375	1.078		
Q21_4_re_stg5_suspension	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.636	1.168	0.949	N/A
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.565	1.063		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.500	1.157		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	3.350	1.145		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.787	0.999		
	Total	265	3.566	1.099		
Q21_5_re_stg5_expulsion	(a) Fewer than 2,000	33	3.061	1.298	2.798*	(d)-(e)*
	(b) 2,000 - 9,999	85	3.165	1.067		
	(c) 10,000 - 19,999	60	3.000	1.074		
	(d) 20,000 - 29,999	40	2.650	0.975		
	(e) 30,000 or more	47	3.404	1.097		
	Total	265	3.079	1.107		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Stage 3 based on campus residency demonstrated statistical significance for alcohol assessment as an educational sanction between respondents that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 and 1,000 – 4,999 students ($F = 6.549, p < 0.01$); between respondents that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 and 5,000 – 9,999 students ($F = 6.549, p < .05$); and between respondents from institutions that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 and 10,000 or more students ($F = 6.549, p < 0.01$). In all three instances, the respondents from institutions that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 students rated alcohol assessment lower than the other respondents. These data can be found in Table 56

Stage 4 based on campus residency demonstrated statistical significance for alcohol assessment as an educational sanction between respondents that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 and 1,000 – 4,999 students ($F = 5.556, p < .05$); between respondents that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 and 5,000 – 9,999 students ($F = 5.556, p < 0.01$); and between respondents from institutions that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 and 10,000 or more students ($F = 5.556, p < .05$). In all three instances, the respondents from institutions that had on-campus residency of 1 - 999 students rated alcohol assessment lower than did the other respondents. These data can be found in Table 57.

Table 56

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by On-campus Residency, Stage 3 (Q13)

Sanctions	Institutional Size	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q13_1_re_stg3_ach_ Assess	(a) 1 - 999	40	3.475	1.062	6.549***	(a)-(b)** (a)-(c)* (a)-(d)**
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	138	4.094	0.782		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	3.970	1.022		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	4.444	0.856		
	Total	262	3.992	0.926		
Q13_2_re_stg3_resea rch	(a) 1 - 999	40	3.625	0.897	1.781	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	138	3.225	1.134		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	3.364	1.076		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	3.056	1.162		
	Total	262	3.309	1.093		
Q13_3_re_stg3_com munity_serv	(a) 1 - 999	40	2.500	0.784	1.742	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	136	2.235	0.863		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	2.152	0.789		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	2.056	1.162		
	Total	260	2.242	0.860		
Q13_4_re_stg3_paren tal_notf	(a) 1 - 999	40	2.725	0.987	0.627	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	137	2.920	0.978		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	2.879	1.045		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	2.667	1.138		
	Total	261	2.862	1.006		
Q13_5_re_stg3_camp us_activity	(a) 1 - 999	40	3.175	0.844	0.458	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	136	3.169	0.931		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	3.015	0.903		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	3.167	1.150		
	Total	260	3.131	0.925		

Note. $p^{***} < .001$, $p^{**} < 0.01$, $p^{*} < .05$

Table 57

Perceptions of Effective Educational Sanctions by Residency, Stage 4 (Q14)

Sanctions	Residency	N	Mean	S.D.	F	Post-hoc
Q14_1_re_stg4_ach_ assess	(a) 1 - 999	40	3.500	1.013	5.556**	(a)-(b)*
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	138	3.949	0.874		(a)-(c)**
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	4.152	0.769		(a)-(d)*
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	4.278	0.895		
	Total	262	3.954	0.896		
Q14_2_re_stg4_research	(a) 1 - 999	40	3.500	0.987	1.690	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	137	3.109	1.034		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	3.242	0.929		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	3.056	1.211		
	Total	261	3.199	1.018		
Q14_3_re_stg4_community_service	(a) 1 - 999	40	2.600	0.928	1.048	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	136	2.559	0.995		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	2.455	0.880		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	2.167	1.200		
	Total	260	2.512	0.973		
Q14_4_re_stg4_parents_notif	(a) 1 - 999	40	2.825	1.010	0.696	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	138	3.036	1.014		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	3.030	1.022		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	2.778	1.437		
	Total	262	2.985	1.047		
Q14_5_re_stg4_campus_Activity	(a) 1 - 999	39	3.179	0.854	0.796	N/A
	(b) 1,000 - 4,999	135	3.274	0.901		
	(c) 5,000 - 9,999	66	3.061	0.975		
	(d) 10,000 or more	18	3.167	1.098		
	Total	258	3.198	0.927		

Note. $p^{***}<.001$, $p^{**}<0.01$, $p^{*}<.05$

Summary

This chapter provided a brief review of the methodology used to conduct this data, demographic data gathered from the respondents which included response rates, the statistical

tests that were used to evaluate the responses, and the differences in the respondents' perceptions of effective disciplinary and educational sanctions. The perceptions of the most effective disciplinary and educational sanctions as they related to the transtheoretical model of change were also carefully analyzed with the intent to identify the effectiveness of each sanction and the perceptions of how those sanctions would assist students in their transition through the five stages of the transtheoretical model. Further discussion, recommendations for best practice, future research worth consideration and conclusions based on these analyses are provided in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, & CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to continue to add to the cannon of literature on effective sanctions that can reduce recidivism of alcohol violations among college students. This was approached by surveying student conduct administrators' who were members of ASCA about their perceptions of the sanctions that they have seen to be the most effective. The data that has been gathered for this study may provide essential information that can inform and establish best practices for those student conduct administrators who are members of ASCA. The contents of this chapter will continue the discussion related to the results of the data presented in the previous chapter and the outcomes connected to the research questions that were presented at the beginning of this study. The discussion reveals pertinent perspectives that will recommend best practices as they relate to the pairing of sanctions and provide implications for future research. The chapter concludes with the researcher's closing remarks.

Discussion

Research Question 1

The first research question was, "What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of the most effective educational sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?" Overall, regardless of the demographic variables that separated the respondents (i.e gender, educational level, years of experience, institutional type, institutional size, and on-campus residency), there appeared to be strong indicators that suggest alcohol

assessment is the educational sanction that was viewed as being the most effective. For example, the only variables that demonstrated a statistically significant difference in the area of alcohol assessment were from respondents who identified as being from institutions that had 2,000 – 9,999 and 30,000 students or more ($F= 2.775, p <.05$). In both of these cases, the alcohol assessment as an educational sanction had strong indicators of effectiveness where the mean of 2,000 – 9,999 was 3.788, and the mean of 30,000 or more was 4.23. Dauenhauer (2014) also determined that students who were required to complete some form of counseling or assessment for an alcohol or controlled substance related violation were more likely to alter their behavior in the area of alcohol or substance use.

The researcher found that when analyzing the effectiveness of community service as an educational sanction based on institutional size, there were statistically significant differences between several of the respondents. These differences included students fewer than 2,000 (2.875 mean) and 20,000 – 29,999 (2.308 mean); fewer than 2,000 (2.875 mean) and 30,000 or more (2.404 mean); and between 10,000 – 19,999 (2.729 mean) and 20,000 – 29,999 (2.308 mean). Although there were statistically significant differences among these areas, they all demonstrated that community service as an educational sanction was not viewed as being effective by the student conduct administrators. This finding also supported Dauenhauer (2014). In her study, she found that recidivism for alcohol related policy violations resulted in a 19% recidivism rate for students who completed some form of community service, workshop, or lost a right or privilege.

Due to the fact that this study has revealed that community service as an educational sanction may be viewed as a sanction that may not have as much of an impact on recidivism for

alcohol violations, student conduct administrators may need to consider other sanctions that are more likely to be effective. One educational sanction concept that may be effective is restorative justice. For example, Karp (2013) indicated that restorative justice is designed to allow students to critically think about their conduct and the long-term implications of how their decisions and behavior may impact members of their community. Based on this unique and holistic approach, restorative justice should be an educational sanction that is studied in order to determine if this approach will be effective in reducing recidivism for alcohol related policy violations on college campuses.

Research Question 2

The second research question was, “What is the difference between student conduct administrators’ perception of the most effective disciplinary sanctions and recidivism for alcohol policy violations?” Based on the overall responses from the survey issued to the student conduct administrators, verbal and written warnings have been identified as the least effective disciplinary sanction. There were no statistically significant differences among the respondents as related to a verbal or written warning as disciplinary sanctions. For example, when analyzing for the mean differences based on educational levels for those respondents with bachelor’s degrees (2.300 mean), master’s degrees (2.280 mean), professional degrees (2.143 mean), and doctorates (2.233 mean), there were no mean scores at or close to 4.0 for verbal warnings. The means for written warnings for respondents with bachelor’s degrees (2.700 mean), master’s degrees (2.700 mean), professional degrees (2.643 mean), and doctorates (2.651 mean) were slightly higher than the verbal warnings but maintained mean scores that demonstrated

ineffectiveness. Given these data, the researcher was able to determine that student conduct administrators overall saw verbal warnings as an ineffective disciplinary sanction for alcohol violations. Conversely, Gehring et al. (2008), found that students perceived a warning (47%) as the most effective sanction that can deter other students from violating their institutions alcohol policies.

Although the student conduct administrators' perceptions of the effectiveness of warnings differed from the perceptions of the students who participated in the Gehring et al. study, there were similarities in their perceptions of the effectiveness of probation as an effective disciplinary sanction. For example, Gehring et al. found that 42% of the students identified disciplinary probation as the second most effective sanction that could deter students from violating their institution's alcohol policies. The data gathered from the student conduct administrators who participated in this study also demonstrated that probation was a moderately effective disciplinary sanction. For example, when identifying the student conduct administrators by their educational levels, those respondents with bachelor's degrees (3.9 mean), master's degrees (3.717 mean), professional degrees (3.500 mean), and doctorates (3.591 mean) viewed disciplinary probation as more effective than verbal or written warnings.

Research Question 3

The third research question was, "What is the difference between student conduct administrators' perceptions of disciplinary and educational sanctions for alcohol policy violations that move students through the five stages of the Transtheoretical Model of Change (i.e., Pre-contemplation, Contemplation, Preparation, Action, and Maintenance)?" The stages of

effectiveness that were measured included (a) creating no awareness, (b) recognizing the benefits of changing behavior, (c) making goals that will change behavior, (e) taking tangible steps to change behavior, and (e) sustaining new behavioral changes through tangible steps. These choices were based on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The Likert-type responses included indicators where 1 = the respondents strongly disagreed, 2 = the respondents disagreed, 3 = the respondents neither agreed or disagreed, 4 = the respondent agreed, and 5 = the respondent strongly agreed.

Research Question 3: Responses Based on Gender

Based on gender, there were no statistically significant differences between the male and female respondents in the five stages of the transtheoretical model of change. For Stage 1 of the transtheoretical model, males (3.209 mean), and females (3.242 mean) rated community service as the highest educational sanction that would create no awareness. For Stage 2 of the transtheoretical model, both male (3.392 mean) and female (3.473 mean) respondents indicated that research/reflection paper would be the most effective educational sanction to get students to this stage. This may be the case, because a research/reflection paper is a tangible educational sanction that directly requires students to identify (a) the behaviors that resulted in their being documented for an alcohol violation, and (b) how they intend to change their behavior in the future. Stages 3, 4, and 5 of the transtheoretical model indicated that male and female respondents perceived that alcohol assessment would be the most effective for students sanctioned for alcohol policy violations.

For Stage 1 of the disciplinary sanctions, both male (3.225 mean) and female (3.386 mean) respondents indicated that the verbal warning was a disciplinary sanction that was likely to create no awareness. Stage 2 found that male (3.438) and female (3.447) respondents

perceived that probation was the most effective disciplinary sanction that would assist students in recognizing the benefits of changing their behavior. However, in Stages 3, 4, and 5, it was found that suspension was the highest rated disciplinary sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

Research Question 3: Responses Based on Institutional Type

Based on an analysis of Stage 1 for educational sanctions by institutional type, all three categories of institutions (3.226 average mean) indicated that community service was the educational sanction that would create no awareness in this stage. For Stage 2, all three institution categories had the highest average mean (3.433) for research/reflection papers as the sanction that would cause students to identify the benefits of changing their behavior. Stages 3 (3.977 mean average), 4 (3.954 mean average), and 5 (3.580 mean average) also went on to identify alcohol assessment as the educational sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

For disciplinary sanctions based on institutional type in Stage 1, verbal warning was identified as the disciplinary sanction that would create no awareness and had the highest average mean of 3.307. Stage 2 indicated that probation had the highest average mean among the institutional types which was 3.442. Stages 3 (3.519 average mean), 4 (3.637 average mean), 5 (3.557 average mean) also went on to identify suspension as the disciplinary sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

Research Question 3: Responses Based on Educational Level

Based on an analysis of Stage 1 for educational sanctions by educational level, all four categories of the highest degrees earned by the respondents (3.231 average mean) indicated that community service was the educational sanction that would create no awareness in this stage. For Stage 2, all four categories of the highest degrees earned by the respondents had the highest average mean (3.436) for research/reflection papers as the sanction that would cause students to identify the benefits of changing their behavior. Stages 3 (3.981 mean average), 4 (3.955 mean average), and 5 (3.581 mean average) also went on to identify alcohol assessment as the educational sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

For disciplinary sanctions based on educational level in Stage 1, verbal warning was identified as the disciplinary sanction that would create no awareness and had the highest average mean of 3.295. Stage 2 indicated that probation had the highest average mean (3.437) among the respondents based on educational level. Stages 3 (3.528 average mean), 4 (3.645 average mean), and 5 (3.566 average mean) also went on to identify suspension as the disciplinary sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

Research Question 3: Responses Based on Years of Experience

Based on an analysis of Stage 1 for educational sanctions by years of experience, all four categories of years of experience (3.231 average mean) indicated that community service was the

educational sanction that would create no awareness in this stage. For Stage 2, all four categories of years of experience had the highest average mean (3.436) for research/reflection papers as the sanction that would cause students to identify the benefits of changing their behavior. Stages 3 (3.981 mean average), 4 (3.955 mean average), and 5 (3.581 mean average) also went on to identify alcohol assessment as the educational sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

For disciplinary sanctions based on years of experience in Stage 1, verbal warning was identified as the disciplinary sanction that would create no awareness and had the highest average mean of 3.295. Stage 2 indicated that probation had the highest average mean among the respondents based on educational level which was 3.437. Stages 3 (3.528 average mean), 4 (3.645 average mean), and 5 (3.566 average mean) also went on to identify suspension as the disciplinary sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

Research Question 3: Responses Based on Institutional Size

Based on an analysis of Stage 1 for educational sanctions by institutional size, all five categories of institutional size (3.231 average mean) indicated that community service was the educational sanction that would create no awareness in this stage. For Stage 2, all four categories of institutional size had the highest average mean (3.436) for research/reflection papers as the sanction that would cause students to identify the benefits of changing their behavior. Stages 3 (3.981 mean average), 4 (3.955 mean average), and 5 (3.581 mean average)

also went on to identify alcohol assessment as the educational sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

For disciplinary sanctions based on institutional size in Stage 1, verbal warning was identified as the disciplinary sanction that would create no awareness and had the highest average mean of 3.295. Stage 2 indicated that probation had the highest average mean among the respondents based on educational level which was 3.437. Stages 3 (3.528 average mean), 4 (3.645 average mean), 5 (3.566 average mean) also went on to identify suspension as the disciplinary sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

Research Question 3: Responses Based on On-campus Residency

Based on an analysis of Stage 1 for educational sanctions by campus residency, all four categories of campus residency (3.241 average mean) indicated that community service was the educational sanction that would create no awareness in this stage. For Stage 2, all four categories of campus residency had the highest average mean (3.429) for research/reflection papers as the sanction that would cause students to identify the benefits of changing their behavior. Stages 3 (3.992 mean average), 4 (3.954 mean average), and 5 (3.584 mean average) also went on to identify alcohol assessment as the educational sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

For disciplinary sanctions based on campus residency in Stage 1, verbal warning was identified as the disciplinary sanction that would create no awareness and had the highest average mean of 3.295. Stage 2 indicated that probation had the highest average mean (3.438) among the respondents based on campus residency. Stages 3 (3.527 average mean), 4 (3.649 average mean), 5 (3.573 average mean) also went on to identify suspension as the disciplinary sanction that would cause students sanctioned for alcohol violations to make goals, take tangible steps, and sustain those new and changed behaviors over an extended period of time.

Recommendations: Future Research and Practice

Recommendations: Directors and Vice Presidents

Busteed (2008) indicated that one of the most effective ways that higher education institutions can effectively address alcohol related issues on their college campuses is to play a direct role in addressing the issue. In this study, the researcher found that those student conduct administrators who had 15 or more years of experience rated alcohol assessment as a very effective educational sanction (4.138 mean), and suspension (4.224 mean) as a very effective disciplinary sanction. However, when compared to Gehring et al.'s (2008) survey of students and their perceptions of effective sanctions for alcohol violations, only 18% of the students surveyed identified suspension as an effective sanction, and 36% believed that participating in an alcohol education program would be effective.

The difference in perceived effectiveness of educational and disciplinary sanctions between experienced student conduct administrators and students appears to present a unique

challenge and opportunity. Based on this difference in perceptions, it may be prudent for senior student conduct administrators to continuously evaluate the perceived effectiveness of these sanctions along with their students on annual basis. By evaluating the effectiveness of common alcohol violations with their students, these professionals may be able to create an environment that allows them to not only understand those sanctions that are likely to be the most impactful but to also gain an understanding of any emerging trends surrounding alcohol use in their respective communities.

In addition to becoming more aware of the students' perceptions of the effectiveness of alcohol related sanctions, it is likely just as important for student conduct administrators, directors, vice presidents, and other higher education professionals to focus on the impact that alcohol use may have on students in areas such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates. The respondents of this study indicated that disciplinary or educational sanctions help students in their retention (82.20%), persistence (85.98%), and graduation rates (76.89%). These responses of perceptions of the effectiveness of these sanctions highlight the importance of the findings of Conway and DiPlacido (2015). They found a connection between students who use alcohol consistently and decreased levels of academic performance and engagement.

The overall responses regarding the perceptions of the impact of disciplinary and educational sanctions on retention and graduation rates warrants further exploration. Rather than relying only on perceptions, student conduct administrators should directly evaluate whether or not their disciplinary and educational sanctions played a role in their students' decisions to persist with their academic interests after being assessed a sanction or to re-enroll at their institutions after being temporarily dismissed for an alcohol related violation. Identifying these

actual data can provide vice presidents and directors the information they need to inform their student conduct sanctioning process and align their practice with their institutions' overall mission and goal in the area of retention and graduation rates.

Furthermore, the respondents of this study also indicated that disciplinary or educational sanctions for alcohol violations may help in reducing alcohol related sexual assaults (67.05% mean). These data are important to consider in the issues of alcohol use and sexual assault among college students. Ward et al. (2012), indicated that over 50% of women who were sexually assaulted stated that the perpetrator responsible for the assault had previously consumed alcohol. College administrators in the 21st century have even more of a responsibility to not only educate their students about alcohol related issues and to maintain a safe environment, providing their students with the resources and opportunities to grow and develop into responsible members of society. Student conduct administrators, directors, and vice presidents within student affairs divisions must continue to identify those measures in an effort to decrease the likelihood of any of their students being sexually assaulted.

Recommendations: Housing and Residence Life Staff

The results of this study provided results that have significant implications for professionals who work in the area of residence life. Study participants indicated that 69.09% of the individuals who reported alcohol related violations were on housing and residence life staffs, and 72.78% of alcohol related incidents took place in residence halls. In addition to student conduct administrators having the authority to address alcohol related violations, 16.59% of the

respondents in this study indicated that the residence hall coordinators/directors had the ability and responsibility to address these issues.

Based on their frequency of contact with students who may violate institutional alcohol policies, it may be more prudent to closely evaluate the results of this study as it relates to the effectiveness of disciplinary and educational sanctions based on campus residency. For example, when analyzing Stage 1 of the educational sanctions for campus residency, the respondents from institutions that had 10,000 or more students residing on their campus indicated that community service (3.722 mean) was an educational sanction that does not create an awareness

Recommendations: Continued Research Based on Gender and Academic Standing

The results of this study also provided pertinent information about student conduct administrators' perceptions or the effectiveness of disciplinary and educational sanctions based on a student's gender and academic standing. When asked about the likelihood of being a recidivist for alcohol policy violations based on class standing, 97.96% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that freshman students were perceived to be the student population that would encounter alcohol policy violations more frequently. The researcher also found that 78.11% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that male students were perceived to have a higher likelihood of being a recidivist for alcohol policy violations. These findings are consistent with those of Liguori and Lonbaken (2015) who indicated that first-year male students engage in high risk drinking more frequently than their female counterparts.

Although 34.85% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that female students had an increased likelihood of recidivism and that only 7.45% of the respondents strongly agreed or

agreed that transgender students had a likelihood of recidivism, more research should be conducted to specifically identify the risky behavior of these students. Additional research may also need to be considered in order to discuss the types of intervention that are more likely to impact and change high risk drinking among these groups.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument that was modified for this study did not meet all of the guidelines outlined by Dillman et al. (2009). Dillman et al. (2009) indicated that it was pertinent to ask respondents one question at a time when administering a survey. However, Sections 2 and 3 of the modified survey instrument asked the respondents a total of 15 questions that required multiple responses for each question. The researcher designed the questions in this manner in order to minimize the length of survey instrument.

Dillman et al. (2009) recommended developing a list of possible response categories that are likely to include all potential responses. For this study, the researcher only included common disciplinary sanctions and did not include educational sanctioning options such as restorative justice, and motivational interviewing. There were several questions asked in Sections 1 and 4 of the survey that did not account for all of the possible responses from the respondents. For example, it may have been more beneficial to include N/A or other as a response option for survey questions 3, 4, and 41 if neither of the options reflected the dynamics of that campus community or if the respondents did not have resident who lived on-campus. The survey also did not account for respondents who may have been employed by a college or university that exclusively provides online academic programs. These issues may have created confusion for

some respondents and may have resulted in the respondents not completing the survey in its entirety.

Theoretical Framework

Overall, the researcher believes that the transtheoretical model of change was the appropriate theoretical framework to use for this study. Based on the responses from participants, the researcher was able to indicate that although there were small variations as to the perceptions of the effectiveness of disciplinary and educational sanctions, each of the stages outlined specific disciplinary and educational sanctions that would be effective based on a five-point Likert-type scale. Although the researcher evaluated the five stages of the transtheoretical model of change quantitatively, future researchers should consider using a mixed-methods or qualitative approach when trying to determine the effectiveness of disciplinary or educational sanctions for alcohol related policy violations.

Additionally, it may also be important for student conduct administrators to proceed with caution prior to implementing the transtheoretical model of change for disciplinary and educational sanctions based on this study alone. In this study, the alcohol assessment along with a temporary or permanent separation from an institution was found to be effective. However, there may be other disciplinary and educational sanctions that were not rated in this study that could have a positive effect on decreasing recidivism for alcohol related violations. It may be beneficial for student conduct administrators to closely evaluate and study restorative justice and how the key steps within that process can be applied to the transtheoretical model of change,

thereby encouraging students to change their behavior through restorative justice as an educational sanction.

Furthermore, the use of any theoretical framework within a student conduct process should also be evaluated based on how closely it aligns with an institution's or office's mission. Consistently executing the mission of an office or institution of higher education is important because those entities have a responsibility to demonstrate how their practice of holding students accountable for institutional violations advances the mission of the institution. In the event that there is a disconnect between a mission and student conduct sanctioning practice, colleges and universities may be at risk of harsh criticism or litigation. These are all reasons why theoretical framework and practice should be studied and considered for institutional and student population fit.

Delimitations

The delimitations of this study were characterized by the inclusion of only student conduct administrators who were listed as active members in the Association for Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA). As a result of this delimitation, the data from this study may not be reflective of the non-members of ASCA. Therefore, the data that were generated from this study may only be useful to the colleges and universities that have memberships with ASCA.

Recommendations: Future Research Based on High Risk Student Populations

Recommendations: Research on Student Athletes

Student athletes comprise a unique student population on college campuses, and they are generally at a higher risk of experiencing alcohol related issues and problems than their non-student athlete counterparts (Ford, 2007). According to Druckman et al. (2015), the issues regarding student athlete's alcohol and/or drug use may be more problematic than that of non-athlete students. They found that student athletes have a tendency to significantly underreport their alcohol use. The issue of underreporting is in large part due to concerns that student athletes have about their athletic performance. More specifically, Druckman et al (2015) found that a total of 46% of participants in their study consumed more than five alcoholic drinks during one week. However, only 3% of these participants openly admitted to consuming this amount of alcohol.

Although student athletes are more likely to engage in high-risk alcohol consumption, college and university officials are in a position to implement meaningful prevention and education programs regarding alcohol use. According to Wyrick et al. (2016), student athletes who are no longer in their competition season are more likely to experience alcohol-related problems. Some of these alcohol related problems include student athletes engaging in maladaptive behaviors such as fighting or choosing to ride in a vehicle where the driver is also intoxicated (Howell et al., 2015). This information provides a clear indication that those university officials who are directly involved in collegiate athletics can target their student athletes pre-season and post-season to closely monitor alcohol related problems that may rise

around these times. Close attention may also need to be directed towards first-year student athletes, as they have also been found to have a higher probability of experiencing alcohol-related problems while in season (Wyrick et al., 2016).

Additionally, collegiate student athletes' behavior and disposition regarding alcohol consumption can also be influenced by their peers and teammates. Seitz et al. (2014) found that student athletes have a perception that their teammates are more likely to approve of alcohol use as opposed to their coaches. In addition to their teammates, first-year student athletes' use and approval perceptions regarding alcohol are also influenced by their friends, and upperclassmen (Massengale et al., 2017). There is also the perception that coaches indirectly approve of alcohol use, as they promote team dynamics through activities such as recruitment and building relationships (Seitz et al., 2014).

Beyond student athletes' coaches and coaching staff, athletic trainers are also in positions to influence and guide student athletes' perceptions and decision making regarding alcohol use. Howell et al. (2015) determined from their study that athletic trainers should receive sufficient education and training to assist their student athletes with alcohol related brief intervention assistance. This is primarily because of the frequency of contact that athletic trainers have with student-athletes. Because of this high frequency of contact, they are more likely to detect alcohol related unintentional injuries. However, athletic trainers indicated that they do not feel professionally prepared to assist student athletes with alcohol related issues (Howell et al., 2015).

Based on the significant risk factors surrounding student athletes and alcohol use, additional studies should be conducted around the areas of teammates' abilities to alter student-athletes' behavior when engaging in high-risk alcohol consumption. A study such as the present

study may allow staff within college and university athletic departments to establish peer support and peer to peer accountability programs regarding alcohol consumption. Future research should also include evaluating coaches' and athletic trainers' comfort level and competency in addressing signs of alcohol abuse among student athletes. Seitz et al. (2014), and Howell et al. (2015) indicated, in their studies, that coaches and athletic trainers are in positions that allow them to influence and alter student-athletes' perceptions surrounding their alcohol use. These university administrators are also in positions to alter high-risk drinking behavior because they are the most familiar with student athletes' competition schedules and when they may be more susceptible to engaging in high-risk alcohol use.

Recommendations: Research on Fraternities and Sororities

On many college campuses fraternities and sororities have been viewed as student organizations that are more likely to engage in high risk alcohol consumption, hazing, and other risky behaviors that can impact the health and safety of the members of a campus community (Biddix, 2016). Because of these risk factors, conversations and actions regarding their permanent separation from college campuses have strengthened (Biddix, 2016). Mangan (2017) highlighted several alcohol related incidents that caused the leadership of colleges and national fraternal organizations to take serious action against fraternities, sororities, and non-affiliated student organizations that pose a significant risk to college students. A few of these alcohol and safety related incidents involving fraternities and sororities include the following:

- American University revoking the charter of Alpha Tau Omega for significant hazing and alcohol violations.

- In 2009, Penn State permanently closed the chapter of Delta Tau Delta for hazing and other violations.
- In 2013, Lafayette College prohibited participation in activities with unrecognized groups after the alcohol-related death of a first-year student who participated in underground fraternity recruitment.
- In 2014, the Board of Trustees at Amherst College issued a campus-wide ban on fraternities and sororities. Students who were found to participate in any fraternity or sorority activities could face suspension or expulsion.
- After a 2014 alcohol related death of a West Virginia University freshman who was pledging the Kappa Sigma fraternity, the national organization revoked the chapter's charter for previous violations.

Most recently, following the alcohol and hazing related death of a 19-year-old Beta Theta Pi pledge at Penn State, the university terminated its Greek student leaders' ability to investigate and issue sanctions for student organization policy violations (Brown, 2017). However, despite these serious alcohol related deaths and incidents, fraternities and sororities maintain a unique connection, relationship, and impact on college campuses. The relationships between universities and fraternities and sororities are unique because they are also assets that have an elevated level of student engagement, retention, and generous alumni contributions (Biddix, 2016).

In addition to alcohol playing a significant role in hazing-related incidents involving fraternities and sororities, sexual assault within these student organizations have also been more likely to impact this particular student community. According to Gentry (2017), binge drinking

is a primary indicator of sexual assault minimization and victim-blaming in sorority communities. Gentry (2017) indicated that it is important for fraternity men to become more aware of issues that surface from excessive alcohol consumption such as drunk sex and being able to identify a situation where a potential sexual partner is incapacitated.

Future research surrounding the relationship between alcohol use and fraternity and sororities is an important area of study that will allow student conduct administrators to gain a better understanding of how students' attitudes towards alcohol have either changed or remained static. There should also be a sustained effort in researching any connections between alcohol use and prevention/educational efforts that are designed to minimize and/or eradicate underage alcohol consumption and alcohol abuse. A study of this caliber would allow student conduct administrators and student affairs professionals to identify what prevention/educational efforts are more likely to be effective in these groups and have a sustained and prolonged impact on the organizations. Based on the statements from Gentry (2017), future research should also include evaluating the impact that alcohol minimization has on women who are members of sororities.

Conclusions

Research has shown that alcohol use and abuse on college campuses has been identified as one of the leading causes of death involving students between the ages of 12 and 20 years old (Griffin et al., 2010). Despite the fact that many students are aware of campus policies that restrict underage use and misuse of alcohol, students continue to engage in high risk drinking behavior (Marshall et al., 2011). Due to the disregard that many students have for institutional alcohol policies, student conduct administrators and other university officials who are tasked

with the responsibility of maintaining a campus environment that is conducive to students' academic and personal development must continue to be engaged in the process of identifying solutions that will likely have a long-term impact and effect on those students who engage in high-risk alcohol consumption.

The results of this study demonstrated that student conduct administrators perceived alcohol assessment and suspension as the educational and disciplinary sanctions that would be the most effective in decreasing recidivism and assisting students in maintaining a long-term change in behavior. Although there is variance in regard to the perceptions of the effectiveness of these sanctions based on student conduct administrators' years of experience, educational level, institution type, size, and campus residency these sanctions may have positive effects on students' overall success at their colleges or universities. Future research should be initiated in order to identify the differences or relationships of disciplinary and educational sanctions with students' retention, persistence, and graduation rates. Identifying or answering these questions will continue to assist student conduct administrators in making decisions that continue to enhance and meet their institutions' missions, visions, and goals.

APPENDIX A
REQUEST TO STUDY ASCA MEMBERSHIP AND INSTRUCTIONS

Request to Study ASCA Membership Application
Dated: April, 2015



Study Title:
Lead Researcher:
Institutional Affiliation of Lead Researcher:
E-Mail Address of Lead Researcher:
Phone Number of Lead Researcher:
Mailing Address of Lead Researcher:
Additional Researchers & Institutional Affiliation:

Instructions

This application and all requested supporting documents should be combined into a single PDF document. The completed application packet in PDF form should be e-mailed to the chair of the ASCA Central Office at asca@tamu.edu. While information about the application process is contained on the ASCA Website, www.theasca.org all questions should be directed to the ASCA Research Committee Chair, Andrea Seiss Temple University at caporale@temple.edu.

Application Questions (please check the appropriate box below)

1. Nature of Study:

Quantitative Qualitative Mixed-Methods

2. Basis for study:

Doctoral Dissertation Master's Thesis Independent Research

3. How do you plan to initiate the study:

By e-mail invitation By postal mail invitation

4. What portion of ASCA membership do you plan to study (specific information requested later):

All ASCA membership
 Random sample of ASCA membership
 Selected sample of ASCA membership (i.e., just four year or two year institutions)
 Random sample of selected ASCA membership (i.e., one member from two year schools)
 Other

5. Are all researchers members of ASCA?

No Yes - membership number(s):

6. Do you plan to submit your study requests in manuscript form the ASCA Journal?

No Yes

7. Do you plan to present a program at the ASCA Annual Conference about this study?

No Yes

Information to be Included in the Application (responses may be typed into a separate document)

1. Study abstract [350 word limit]
2. Describe the specific portion(s) of the ASCA membership database that you wish to study (i.e., all membership, random sample, just four year institutions, etc.) [150 word limit]
3. Describe the plan and timeline for your study invitations. This narrative should include the nature of contacts with ASCA members as well as the number of contacts and the specific dates that you wish these contacts to occur. Please note that the ASCA Research Committee may need to work with you to set the specific dates for contact if your request is granted. [350 word limit]
4. Describe your study's benefit to the ASCA membership and contribution to literature in the field of conduct administration. [200 word limit]
5. Describe your protocol to insure the confidentiality of ASCA membership during your study as well as to insure that the ethics of ASCA members are not compromised during your study. Please note that all quantitative studies are required to insure that participation is both voluntary and anonymous. [250 word limit]
6. Please attach a copy of the invitation letter(s) you wish distributed to ASCA membership. It is recommended that different language be used in each contact letter, so please include a copy of each individual invitation letter you wish to use. Please note that the ASCA Research Committee may recommend alterations to your invitation letters if deemed appropriate.
7. Please attach a copy of your proposed study instrument (at this stage, the instrument may still be in draft form).
8. Please attach a completed copy of your institution's IRB protocol that you plan to submit for this study. It is noted that you will not have previously submitted this document to the IRB (as permission to study ASCA membership has yet to be granted), but this information is vital to the ASCA Research Committee's decision-making. If you will not be seeking IRB approval, please describe why in detail.
9. Describe any additional information that you wish to share with the ASCA Research Committee.

APPENDIX B
PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT COMMUNICATIONS

Dear [Name of research participant],

This is Andel Fils-Aime, I am a Doctoral student enrolled in the Higher Education and Policy Studies program at the University of Central Florida. I am writing you in order to request that you assist me in the completion of my dissertation on the effective educational and disciplinary sanctions that can reduce the recidivism of alcohol violations among college students. This study will gather data from student conduct administrators at colleges and universities in the United States that are members of the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA).

The Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) has identified you as a current student conduct administrator that addresses incidents of institutional policy violations by your students. The only request for this study is that you participate in a brief 15 minute [survey](#) responding with your perception of effective educational and disciplinary sanctions that can reduce recidivism of alcohol policy violations. At the beginning of this survey/questionnaire, the researcher for this study Andel Fils-Aime will provide you with an electronic consent agreement in order to officially confirm your willingness to participate in this study.

Your participation in this study is both anonymous and voluntary, and is not a requirement as a member of ASCA. However, your contribution to this study will assist in the advancement of knowledge and best practices in the area of addressing alcohol policy violations that effect students on college campuses in the United States.

In the event that you have any questions about the nature and purpose of this study please feel free to contact Andel Fils-Aime, the principal researcher/investigator for this study at Andel.Fils-Aime@knights.ucf.edu or via phone at (909)773-2865. Thank you in advance for your time, contribution, and consideration for this study. You may also contact Dr. Rosa Cintron, Major professor at Rosa.CintronDelgado@ucf.edu.

Sincerely,

Andel Pierre Fils-Aime
Ed. D Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Click on this link to take the survey:

http://ucf.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9mDq69rH772HVqZ

REMINDER EMAIL TO RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Dear [Name of research Participant],

This is Andel Fils-Aime, I am a Doctoral student enrolled in the Higher Education and Policy Studies program at the University of Central Florida. I am writing you in order to request that you assist me in the completion of my dissertation on the effective educational and disciplinary sanctions that can reduce the recidivism of alcohol violations among college students. This study will gather data from student conduct administrators at colleges and universities in the United States that are members of the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA).

The Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) has identified you as a current student conduct administrator that addresses incidents of institutional policy violations by your students. The only request for this study is that you participate in a brief 15 minute [survey](#) responding with your perception of effective educational and disciplinary sanctions that can reduce recidivism of alcohol policy violations. At the beginning of this survey/questionnaire, the researcher for this study Andel Fils-Aime will provide you with an electronic consent agreement in order to officially confirm your willingness to participate in this study.

Your participation in this study is both anonymous and voluntary, and is not a requirement as a member of ASCA. However, your contribution to this study will assist in the advancement of knowledge and best practices in the area of addressing alcohol policy violations that effect students on college campuses in the United States.

In the event that you have any questions about the nature and purpose of this study please feel free to contact Andel Fils-Aime, the principal researcher/investigator for this study at Andel.Fils-Aime@knights.ucf.edu or via phone at (909)773-2865. Thank you in advance for your time, contribution, and consideration for this study. You may also contact Dr. Rosa Cintron, Major professor at Rosa.CintronDelgado@ucf.edu.

Sincerely,

Andel Pierre Fils-Aime
Ed. D Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Click on this link to take the survey:

http://ucf.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9mDq69rH772HVqZ

REMINDER EMAIL TO RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Dear [Name of research Participant],

This is Andel Fils-Aime, I am a Doctoral student enrolled in the Higher Education and Policy Studies program at the University of Central Florida. I am writing you in order to request that you assist me in the completion of my dissertation on the effective educational and disciplinary sanctions that can reduce the recidivism of alcohol violations among college students. This study will gather data from student conduct administrators' at colleges and universities in the United States that are members of the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA).

The Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA) has identified you as a current student conduct administrator that addresses incidents of institutional policy violations by your students. The only request for this study is that you participate in a brief 15 minute survey responding with your perception of effective educational and disciplinary sanctions that can reduce recidivism of alcohol policy violations. At the beginning of this survey/questionnaire, the researcher for this study Andel Fils-Aime will provide you with an electronic consent agreement in order to officially confirm your willingness to participate in this study. Please note that if you intend to participate in this study the survey will officially close on Friday August 11, 2017.

Your participation in this study is both anonymous and voluntary, and is not a requirement as a member of ASCA. However, your contribution to this study will assist in the advancement of knowledge and best practices in the area of addressing alcohol policy violations that effect students on college campuses in the United States.

In the event that you have any questions about the nature and purpose of this study please feel free to contact Andel Fils-Aime, the principal researcher/investigator for this study at Andel.Fils-Aime@knights.ucf.edu or via phone at (909)773-2865. Thank you in advance for your time, contribution, and consideration for this study. You may also contact Dr. Rosa Cintron, Major professor at Rosa.CintronDelgado@ucf.edu.

Sincerely,

Andel Pierre Fils-Aime
Ed. D Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

Click on this link to take the survey:

http://ucf.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9mDq69rH772HVqZ

APPENDIX C
PERMISSION TO USE MODIFIED STUDY INSTRUMENT

To Dr. Lowery, Dr. Ghering, and Dr. Palmer,

My name is Andel P. Fils-Aime and I am currently a full-time Student Conduct Administrator serving as the Director for Student Conduct and Academic Integrity at the University of Texas at Austin. I am also a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education and Policy Studies program at the University of Central Florida. In order to complete my doctoral program, I am officially requesting permission to use a modified version of the web-based survey instrument that you used in your 2012 study on “Student’s Views of Alcohol Sanctions on College Campuses.” This modified version of your 2012 instrument will be directed towards Student Conduct Administrators in that are members of ASCA. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns please feel free to contact me either via email or over the phone. My email address is Andel.Fils-Aime@knights.ucf.edu, and my personal cellular phone number is (909)773-2865. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Andel Pierre Fils-Aime
Ed. D Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida



Donald D. Gehring <dgehrin1@earthlink.net>

  Reply all | 

Tue 11/22/2016 5:37 PM

To:  Andel Fils-Aime

Cc:  John Lowery <john.lowery@okstate.edu>;  Carolyn J Palmer <cpalmer@bgsu.edu> 

Andel, thanks for making the changes I suggested. There are still a couple of widows, but it may just be how it is coming into my computer. You have my permission to use our survey as modified. John and Carolyn have you had an opportunity to review his latest version. He and I have worked on it through two iterations. Happy Thanksgiving to Y'all.
Don

-----Original Message-----

From: Andel Fils-Aime

Sent: Nov 22, 2016 4:35 PM

To: Don Gehring , John Lowery , Carolyn Palmer

Subject: Re: Survey

Hello Dr. Gehring,

Thanks again for setting aside some time to speak with me this afternoon. Attached to this email is the updated version of the survey with the corrections that we discussed. I really appreciate your help and assistance. I'll be looking forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience. Thanks and have a great day.

APPENDIX D
STUDENT CONDUCT ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

ASCA alcohol sanctions survey

Q1 I consent to participating in this study.

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q2 PART I

Q3 Please rank, from 1-4 (with one being the highest), the population who reports the highest number of alcohol policy violations at your institution?

- _____ Housing and Residence Life staff (1)
- _____ Campus Safety/Police (2)
- _____ Local law enforcement (3)
- _____ Faculty/Staff (4)

Q4 Please rank, from 1-5 (with one being the highest), where a majority of the reported alcohol related incidents occur?

- _____ On-campus Non-Residence Halls (1)
- _____ Residence Halls (2)
- _____ Athletic Events (3)
- _____ Greek affiliated housing (4)
- _____ Off Campus (5)

Q5 Please rank, from 1-5 (with one being the highest), the types of alcohol violations that are most frequently referred to your office.

- _____ Minor in consumption/possession of alcohol (1)
- _____ Public Intoxication (2)
- _____ Driving Under the Influence (3)
- _____ Misconduct under the influence of alcohol (4)
- _____ Distribution of Alcohol (5)

Q6 On average, students who meet with you for alcohol policy violations are aware of the negative effects that alcohol could have on their behaviors, health, and safety.

- Strongly Agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly disagree (5)

Q7 Who are the individuals at your institution who can find a student responsible for violating your institutions alcohol policies?

- Student Conduct Administrator (1)
- Disciplinary Panel (2)
- Residence Hall Coordinator/Director (3)
- University Hearing Officer (4)
- All of the Above (5)

Q8 Does your institution notify parents about alcohol policy violations for which their student has been found responsible?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q9 On average, the majority of the students referred to your office for alcohol policy violations are under the legal drinking age of 21.

- Strongly agree (1)
- Agree (2)
- Neither agree nor disagree (3)
- Disagree (4)
- Strongly disagree (5)

Q10 PART II

The following questions should be answered based on the definition of terms listed below.

Alcohol Assessment - An educational sanction that is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that is designed to inform students about the negative impacts of alcohol abuse.
Research/Reflection Paper - An educational sanction that is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that requires the student to complete a written assignment where the student acknowledges the negative effects that alcohol has personally had on them.
Community Service - An educational sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that requires the student to complete a specified amount of service hours with a campus-based or local agency. Community service is designed to provide students with an opportunity to positively contribute to their campus or local community.
Parental Notification - An educational sanction that requires a student conduct administrator to notify the parent(s) of a student that the student has been found responsible for violating a college/university alcohol policy. The parental notification is designed to positively impact students through parental engagement and assistance.
Campus based activity or assignment - An educational sanction that is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator requiring a student to attend or participate in a campus-based activity or event that deals with some form of alcohol education or awareness.

Q11 The following educational sanctions do not create an awareness that allows a student to understand the overall impact of their behavior.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Alcohol Assessment (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research/Reflection Paper (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Service (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parental Notification (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus based activity or assignment (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q12 The following educational sanctions cause students who have violated alcohol policy to recognize the benefits of changing their behavior, but may not prepare students to consider the challenges that may come with making this change.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Alcohol Assessment (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research/Reflection Paper (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Service (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parental Notification (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus based activity or assignment (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13 The following educational sanctions cause students who have violated an alcohol policy to make goals that will assist them student in guiding a change in behavior.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Alcohol Assessment (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research/Reflection Paper (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Service (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parental Notification (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus based activity or assignment (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q14 The following educational sanctions cause students who have violated an alcohol policy to take tangible steps towards achieving a desired behavior.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Alcohol Assessment (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research/Reflection Paper (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Service (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parental Notification (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus based activity or assignment (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q15 The following educational sanctions cause students who have violated an alcohol policy to sustain the new and changed behaviors through tangible steps over a meaningful period of time.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Alcohol Assessment (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research/Reflection Paper (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Service (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parental Notification (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus based activity or assignment (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q16 PART III

The following questions should be answered based on the definition of terms listed below.

Verbal Warning - A disciplinary sanction that is an oral reprimand which is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator for violating an institution's alcohol policy.
Written Warning - A disciplinary sanction that is a written reprimand is issued to a student by a student conduct administrator acknowledging that a student has been found responsible for violating an institution's alcohol policy. A copy of the written warning is kept in the students file.
Disciplinary Probation - A disciplinary sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that notifies the student that they are not in good standing with their institution for a limited period of time. Any future violations may result in suspension.
Disciplinary Suspension - A disciplinary sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that temporarily separates the student from the institution for a limited period of time. Any future violations may result in an extended period of suspension or expulsion,
Expulsion - A disciplinary sanction issued to a student by a student conduct administrator that permanently separates a student from an institution after the student is found responsible for an alcohol policy violation.

Q17 The following disciplinary sanctions do not create an awareness that allows a student to understand the overall impact of their behavior.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Verbal Warning (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written Warning (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Probation (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Suspension (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expulsion (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q18 The following disciplinary sanctions cause students who have violated alcohol policy to recognize the benefits of changing their behavior, but may not prepare students to consider the challenges that may come with making this change.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Verbal Warning (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written Warning (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Probation (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Suspension (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expulsion (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19 The following disciplinary sanctions cause students who have violated an alcohol policy to make goals that will assist in guiding a change in behavior.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Verbal Warning (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written Warning (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Probation (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Suspension (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expulsion (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20 The following disciplinary sanctions cause students who have violated an alcohol policy to take tangible steps towards achieving a desired behavior.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Verbal Warning (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written Warning (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Probation (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Suspension (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expulsion (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q21 The following disciplinary sanctions cause students who have violated an alcohol policy to sustain the new and changed behaviors through tangible steps over a meaningful period of time.

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Verbal Warning (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written Warning (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Probation (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Suspension (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expulsion (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q22 The following disciplinary sanctions would be the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations. You may have more than one in each column.

	Very Effective (1)	Effective (2)	Somewhat Effective (3)	Somewhat Ineffective (4)	Ineffective (5)	Very Ineffective (6)
Verbal Warning (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written Warning (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Probation (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Disciplinary Suspension (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expulsion (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q23 The following educational sanctions would be the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations. You may have more than one in each column.

	Very Effective (1)	Effective (2)	Somewhat Effective (3)	Somewhat Ineffective (4)	Very Ineffective (5)
Alcohol assessment (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Research/reflection paper (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community service (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parental notification (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus based activity or assignment (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q24 Based on a students' class standing, the following students are more likely to be recidivists for violating your institutions alcohol policies.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Freshman (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sophomore (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Junior (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Graduate (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q25 Based on a students' gender, the following students are more likely to be recidivists for violating your institutions alcohol policies.

	Strongly agree (1)	agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Male (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Female (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transgender (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q26 Based on a students' class standing, educational sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations. You may have more than one in each column.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Freshman (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sophomore (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Junior (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Graduate (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q27 Based on a students' class standing, disciplinary sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations. You may have more than one in each column.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Freshman (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sophomore (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Junior (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Graduate (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q28 Based on class standing, a combination of both disciplinary and educational sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations. You may have more than one in each column.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Freshman (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sophomore (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Junior (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Senior (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Graduate (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q29 Based on gender, educational sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations. You may have more than one in each column.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Male (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Female (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transgender (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q30 Based on gender, disciplinary sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Male (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Female (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transgender (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q31 Based on gender, a combination of disciplinary and educational sanctions are the most effective in decreasing recidivism for alcohol policy violations.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
Male (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Female (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transgender (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q32 PART IV

Q33 Do you believe either disciplinary or educational sanctions simply make most students more cautious so they do not get caught violating alcohol policy in the future?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q34 Do you believe either disciplinary or educational sanctions for alcohol violations help an institutions retention of first year students?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q35 Do you believe either disciplinary or educational sanctions for alcohol violations help students in their persistence?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q36 Do you believe either disciplinary or educational sanctions for alcohol violations help an institution's graduation rates?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q37 Do you believe either disciplinary or educational sanctions for alcohol violations help in reducing alcohol related sexual assaults?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q38 Which of the following characteristics best describes your institution?

- Public (1)
- Private, religious affiliated (2)
- Private, Independent (3)

Q39 Which of the following characteristics best describe your institution?

- Four-Year Undergraduate Only (1)
- Four-year undergraduate and graduate/professional (2)
- Graduate/Professional only (3)
- Two-Year/Community College (4)

Q40 How many students are enrolled on your campus?

- Fewer than 2,000 (1)
- 2,000 - 9,999 (2)
- 10,000 - 19,999 (3)
- 20,000 - 29,999 (4)
- 30,000 or more (5)

Q41 How many students live on your campus?

- 1 - 999 (1)
- 1,000 - 4,999 (2)
- 5,000 - 9,999 (3)
- 10,000 or more (4)

Q42 Please identify how many years you have worked as a student conduct administrator.

- 1 - 4 (1)
- 5 - 9 (2)
- 10 - 14 (3)
- 15 or more (4)

Q43 Please identify the highest degree you have earned.

- Bachelors (1)
- Masters (2)
- Professional (M.D, D.D, or J.D) (3)
- Doctorate (4)

Q44 Please select one of the options that is consistent with your identity.

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Transgender (3)

Q45 Is there anything you would like to add?

APPENDIX E
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Andel Pierre Fils-Aime**

Date: **June 30, 2017**

Dear Researcher:

On 06/30/2017, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: Student Conduct Administrators' Perceptions of Effective Sanctions that Reduce Recidivism of Alcohol Violations Among College Student's
Investigator: Andel Pierre Fils-Aime
IRB Number: SBE-17-13194
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gillian Amy Mary Morien".

Signature applied by Gillian Amy Mary Morien on 06/30/2017 03:29:21 PM EDT

IRB Coordinator

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, R., Hustad, J., Lasalle, L., & Bosari, B. (2014). Hospitalizations for students with an alcohol-related sanction: Gender and pregameing as risk factors. *Journal of American College Health, 62*(5), 293-300. doi:10.1080/07448481.2014.897952
- Amaro, H., Reed, E., Rowe, E., Picci, J., Mantella, P., & Prado, G. (2010). Brief screening and intervention for alcohol and drug use in a college student health clinic: Feasibility implementation, and outcomes. *Journal of American College Health, 58*, 357-364. doi:10.1080/07448480903501764
- Alreck, P., & Settle, R. (2004). *The survey research handbook* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- American College Personnel Association. (2016). *Who we are ACPA*. Retrieved from <http://www.myacpa.org/who-we-are>
- Association for Student Conduct Administration. (2016). *Promoting best practices ASCA*. Retrieved from <http://www.theasca.org/>
- Bergen, M. (2004). HIPAA-FERPA revisited. *Journal of School Nursing, 20*(2), 107-112. doi:10.1177/10598405040200020901
- Bickel, R., & Lake, P. (1999). *The rights and responsibilities of the modern university. Who assumes the risks of college life?* Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Biddix, J. (2016). Moving beyond alcohol: A review of other issues associated fraternity membership with implications for practice and research. *Journal of College Student Development, 57*(7), 793-809.

- Borland, J. (1990). Postpositivism inquiry: Implications of the “New Philosophy of Science” for the field of the education of the gifted. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 34(4), 161-167.
doi:10.1177/001698629003400406
- Brown-Rice, K., Furr, S., & Jorgensen, M. (2015). Analyzing Greek members’ alcohol consumption by gender and the impact of alcohol education interventions. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 59(1), 19-38. Retrieved from ERIC database.
(EJ1066337)
- Brown, S. (2017). Penn State says it will take control of Greek life after students death. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Penn-State-Says-It-Will/240261?cid=rclink>
- Busteed, B. (2008). The mistake colleges make about student drinking. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(34), A34. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ794180)
- Cameron, M., & Keenan, E. (2010). The Common Factors Model: Implications for transtheoretical clinical social work practice. *Social Work*, 55(1), 63 – 73. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/sw>
- Carey, K., Carey, M., Maisto, S., & Henson, J. (2009). Computer versus in-person intervention for students violating campus alcohol policy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77, 74-87. doi:10.1037/a0014281.
- Carmody, D., Ekhomu, J., & Payne, B. (2009). Needs of sexual assault advocates in campus-based sexual assault centers. *College Student Journal*, 43(2). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ872265)

- Castillo, J., Curtis, M., Brundage, A., March, A., Stockslager, K. (2014). Comparisons of response rates, respondent demographics, and item responses for web-based and mail survey modes in a national study of school psychologists. *Trainers Forum*, 32(2), 32-50. Retrieved from http://trainersofschoolpsychologists.org/TSP/Trainers_Forum.html
- Center for Disease Control. (2015). *Alcohol and Public Health*. Retrieved from the Center for Disease Control website: <http://www.cdc.gov/alcohol/fact-sheets/underage-drinking.htm>
- Cimini, D., Monserrat, J., Sokowloski, K., Dewitt-Parker, J., Rivero, E., & McElroy, L. (2015). Reducing high-risk drinking among student athletes: The effects of a targeted athlete-specific brief intervention. *Journal of American College Health*, 63(6), 343-352. doi:10.1080/07448481.2015.1031236
- Cosler, C. (2010). Privacy concerns: The effects of the latest FERPA changes. *School Business Affairs*, 76(3), 22-24. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ904659)
- Conway, J., & DiPlacido, J. (2015). The indirect effect of alcohol use on GPA in first-semester college Students: The mediating role of academic effort. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, & Practice*, 17(3), 303-318. doi:10.1177/1521025115575705
- Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Cruise, C., (2009). *The relationship between parental notification and recidivism and retention of students who violated the university alcohol policy*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/he_diss/28/
- Dannells, M., & Consolvo, C. (2000). Disciplinary counseling: Implications for policy and practice. *NASPA Journal*, 38(1). doi:10.2202/1949-6605.1128
- Dattalo, P. (2010). *Strategies to approximate random sampling and assignment*. New York, NY. Oxford University Press.
- Druckman, J., Gilli, M., Klar, S., & Robison, J. (2015). Measuring drugs and alcohol use among college student-athletes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 96(2), 369-380.
- Edwards, A. F. (1994). *In loco parentis: Alive and kicking, dead and buried, or rising phoenix?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Student of Higher Education, Tucson, AZ. Retrieved from: <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED375720>
- Engel, U., Jann, B., Lynn, P., Scherpenzeel, A., & Sturgis, P. (2015). *Improving survey methods: Lessons learned from recent research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- English, E., Shutt, M., & Oswalt, S. (2009). Decreasing use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs on a college campus: Exploring potential factors related to change. *NASPA Journal*, 46(2). Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2202/1949-6605.6037?journalCode=uarp19>
- Essex, N. (2004). Confidentiality and student records: Ten ways to invite legal challenges. *Clearing House*, 77(3), 111- 113. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ702156)
- Evans, N., Forney, D., & Guido-DiBrito. (1998). *Student development in college. theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Exner, D., & Cummings, N. (2011). Implications for sexual assault prevention: College students as prosocial bystanders. *Journal of American College Health, 59*(7), 655-657. doi:10.1080/07448481.2010.515633
- Fabian, L., Toomey, T., Lenk, K., & Erickson, D. (2008). How do underage college students get alcohol. *Journal of Drug Education, 38*(1), 15-26. doi:10.2190/DE.38.1.b
- Fink, A. (2003). *How to manage, analyze, and interpret survey data* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.
- Ford, J. (2007). Substance use among college athletes: A comparison based on sport/team affiliation. *Journal of American College Health 55*(6), 367-373.
- Fowler, F. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.
- Fowler, F. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.
- Gentry, M. (2017). The drunk sex problem, revisited. *Doctor Gentry's Blog*. Retrieved from <http://doctorgentry.blogspot.com/>
- Gilchrist, H., Smith, K., Magee, C., & Jones, S. (2012). A hangover and a one-night stand: Alcohol and risky sexual behavior among female students at an Australian university. *Youth Studies Australia, 31*(2), 35-43. Retrieved from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3378&context=hbspapers>
- Glassman, T., Braun, R., Reindl, D., & Whewell, A. (2011). Blood (breath) alcohol concentration rates of college football fans on game day. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 55*(2), 55-73. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ954687)
- Graham, R., Hall, R., & Gilmer, W. (2008). Connecting the dots...: Information sharing by post-secondary educational institutions under the family education rights and privacy act

- (FERPA). *Education and the Law*, 20(4) 301-316. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ929566)
- Griffin, J., Umstattd, R., & Usdan, S. (2010). Alcohol use and high risk sexual behavior among collegiate women: A review of research on alcohol myopia theory. *Journal of American College Health*, 58(6), 523-532.
- Groves, R., Fowler, F., Couper, M., Lepkowski, J., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Harris, T., Walters, S., & Leahy, M. (2008). Readiness to change among a group of heavy drinking college students: Correlates of readiness and a comparison of measures. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(3), 325-330. doi:10.3200/JACH.57.3.325-330
- Hayes, B., Curry, J., Freeman, M., & Kuch, T. (2010). An alternative counseling model for alcohol abuse in college: A case study. *Journal of College Counseling*, 13(1), 87-96. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ886956)
- Henry, S. (2001). What happens when we use Kohlberg? His troubling functionalism and the potential of pragmatism in moral education. *Educational Theory*, 51(3), 259-276. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00259.x
- Howell, M. (2005). Students' perceived learning and anticipated future behaviors as a result of participation in the student judicial affairs process. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(4), 374-392. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ743891)
- Howell, S., Barry, A., & Pitney, W. (2015). Exploring the athletic trainer's role in student athletes presenting with alcohol-related unintentional injuries. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 50(9), 977-980.

- Karp, D. (2013). *The little book of restorative justice for colleges and universities*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Kingree, J., & Thompson, M. (2013). Fraternity membership and sexual aggression: An examination of mediators of the association. *Journal of American College Health, 61*(4), 213-221. doi:10.1080/07448481.2013.781026
- Labrie, J., Cail, J., Pedersen, E., & Migliuri. (2011). Reducing alcohol risk in adjudicated male college students: Further validation of a group motivational enhancement intervention. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse, 20*(1), 82-98. doi:10.1080/1067828X.2011.534369
- LaBrie, J., Lamb, T., Pedersen, R., & Quinlan, T. (2006). A group motivational interviewing intervention reduces drinking and alcohol-related consequences in adjudicated college students. *Journal of Student Development, 47*(3), 267-280. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2007.05.014
- Lawyer, S., Resnick, H., Bakanic, H., Burkett, T., & Kilpatrick, D. (2010). Forcible, drug-facilitated, and incapacitated rape and sexual assault among undergraduate women. *Journal of American College Health, 58*(5), 453-460. doi:10.1080/07448480903540515
- Lee, P. (2014). The case of Dixon v. Alabama: From civil rights to student's rights and back again. *Teachers College Record, 116*(12). 1-18. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org>
- Leeuw, E., Hox, J., Dillman, D. (2008). *International handbook of survey methodology*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Lenk, K., Nelson, T., Erickson, D., & Toomey, T. (2015). How are 2-year US colleges addressing student alcohol use and related problems? *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(4), 380-385. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/journal/238>
- Liguori, G., & Lonbaken, B. (2015). Alcohol consumption and academic retention in first-year college students. *College Student Journal, 49*(1), 69-77. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1095506)
- Loss, C. (2014). Institutionalizing in loco parentis after Gott v. Berea College (1913). *Teachers College Record, 116*(12).
- Mangan, K. (2017). When fraternities go underground, problems surface. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.chronicle.com/article/When-Fraternities-Go/240289>
- Marshall, B., Roberts, K., Donnelly, J., & Rutledge, I. (2011). College student perceptions on campus alcohol policies and consumption patterns. *Journal of Drug Education, 41*(4), 345-358. doi:10.2190/DE.41.4.a
- Marzell, M., Morrison, C., Mair, C., Mornihan, S., & Gruenewald, P (2015). Examining drinking patterns and high-risk drinking Environments among college athletes at different competition levels. *Journal of Drug Education, 45*(1), 5-16. doi:10.1177/0047237915575281
- Massengale, K., Ma, A., Rulison, K., Milroy, J., & Wyrick, D. (2017). Perceived norms and alcohol use among first-year college student-athletes' different types of friends. *Journal of American College Health, 65*(1), 32-40.

- McChargue, D., Klanecky, A., & Anderson, J. (2012). Alcohol use problems mediate the relation between cannabis use frequency and college functioning among students mandated to an alcohol diversion program. *Journal of College Student Development, 53*(4), 611-615. doi:10.1353/csd.2012.0053
- McMahon, S., & Farmer, L. (2011). An updated measure for assessing subtle rape myths. *Social Work Research, 35*(2), 71-81. doi:10.1093/swr/35.2.71
- Misch, D. (2010). Changing the culture of alcohol abuse on campus: Lessons learned from secondhand smoke. *Journal of American College Health, 59*(13). doi:10.1080/07448481.2010.497524
- National Association for Student Personnel Administrators. (2016). *About NASPA*. Retrieved from <https://www.naspa.org/about>.
- Nardi, P. (2003). *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. Boston, Ma: Pearson.
- O'Reilly, F., & Evans, R. (2007a). 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 ERIC database. (EJ816828)
- O'Reilly, F., & Evans, R. (2007b). Community: Calling students to be accountable. *Christian Higher Education, 6*(2), 119-130. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ815508)
- Palmer, R., McMahon, T., Rounsaville, B., & Ball, S. (2009). Coercive sexual experiences, protective behavioral strategies, alcohol expectancies and consumption among male and female college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(9), 1563-1578. doi:10.1177/0886260509354581

- Petrovcic, A., Petric, G., Lozar Manfreda, K. (2016). The effect of email invitation elements on response rate in a web survey within an online community. *Computers in Human Behavior, 56*, 320-329. Retrieved from <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/computers-in-human-behavior/>
- Prochaska, J., Prochaska, J., Cohen, F., Gomes, S., Laforge, R., & Eastwood, A. (2004). The transtheoretical model of change for multi-level interventions for alcohol abuse on campus. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 47*(3), 34-50. Retrieved from <http://www.jadejournal.com>
- Qualtrics. (2016). *Security statement*. Retrieved from <https://www.qualtrics.com/security-statement/>
- Ramsey, S., Thompson, K., McKenzie, M., & Rosenbaum, A. (2016). Psychological research in the Internet age: The quality of web-based data. *Computers in Human Behavior, 58*, 354-360. Retrieved from Science Direct database.
- Ray, A., Stapleton, J., Turrisi, R., & Mun, E. (2014). Drinking game play among first-year college student drinkers: An event specific analysis of the risk for alcohol use problems. *American Journal of Drug & Alcohol Abuse, 40*(5), 353-358.
doi:10.3109/00952990.2014.930151
- Rea, L., Parker, R. (1992). *Designing and conducting survey research*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.
- Robinson, V. (1996). Problem-based methodology and administrative practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*(3), 427-451. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED385944)

- Rubington, E. (1993). College drinking and social control. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 39*(1), 56-65. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ473930)
- Seitz, C., Wyrick, D., Rulison, K., Strack, R., & Fearnow-Kenney, M. (2014). The association between coach teammate injunctive norm reference groups and college student-athlete substance use. *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education, 58*(2), 7-26.
- Sendelbah, A., Vehovar, V., Slavec, A., Petrovcic, A. (2016). Investigating respondent multitasking in web surveys using paradata. *Computers in Human Behavior, 55*, 777-787. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.10.028
- Singh, M. (2014). *College students can learn to drink less, if schools help*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2014/01/28/267612384/college-students-can-learn-to-drink-less-if-schools-help>
- Stappenbeck, C., & Fromme, K. (2009). Alcohol use and perceived social and emotional consequences among perpetrators of general and sexual aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(4), 699-715. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/jiv>
- Stoutenborough, J. W. (2008). Demographic measures. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 185–186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, K., & Richardson, K (2008). DUI Arrests and academic attrition. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(5), 497-508. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ812147)
- Toglia, T. (2007). How does FERPA affect you? *Tech Directions, 67*(2), 32-35. Retrieved from <https://www.techdirections.com>

- United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). *Fast facts*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=84>
- University of Central Florida, Information Technology. (2016). *SDES office directory*. Retrieved from <https://directory.sdes.ucf.edu/file/44/news-attachment-introducing-qualtrics.pdf>
- Van Brunt, B., Murphy, A., & O'Toole, M. (2015). The dirty dozen: Risk factors for sexual violence on college campuses (DD-12). *Violence and Gender, 2*(3), 145-160. doi:10.1089/vio.2015.0014
- Velicer, W., Brick, L., Fava, J., & Prochaska, J. (2013). Testing 40 predictions from the transtheoretical model again with confidence. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 28*, 220-240. doi:10.1080/00273171.2012.760439
- Waal, T., Pannekoek, J., & Scholtus, S. (2011). *Handbook of statistical data editing and imputation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Wahesh, E., Millroy, J., Lewis, T., Orsini, M., & Wyrick, D. (2013). Hazardous drinking by first-year college-athletes: The differential roles of drinking motives, alcohol consequences, and season status. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 57*(2), 66-84. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1014116)
- Ward, R., Galante, M., Trivedi, R., & Kahrs. (2015). An examination of drunkorexia, Greek affiliation, and alcohol consumption. *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education, 59*(3), 48-66. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1092830)

- Ward, R., Matthews, M., Weiner, J., Hogan, K., & Popson, H. (2012) Alcohol and sexual consent scale: Development and validation. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 36(6), 746-756. doi:10.5993/AJHB.36.6.3
- Waryold, D., & Lancaster, J. (2013). *The state of student conduct. Current forces and future challenges: Revisited*. College station, TX: Association for Student Conduct Administration.
- Wheeler, W., & Kennedy, J. (2009) Using parents in a defined role in alcohol education: Parents as prevention specialists. *NASPA Journal*, 46(1), 30-49. Retrieved from <https://www.naspa.org/publications/journals>
- Wyrick, D., Milroy, J., Reifsteck, E., Rulison, K., Dudley, W., & Fearnow-Kenney, M. (2016). Investigating risk factors predictive of problem outcomes experienced by first year drinking and non-drinking collegiate student athletes. *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education*, 60(3), 22-41.