Involvement of Coaches in the Campus Judicial Process: Perceptions of Judicial Affairs Administrators and Athletic Coaches

Tracy McFarland
St. John Fisher College

Follow this and additional works at: https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_etd

Part of the Education Commons

How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?

Recommended Citation

Please note that the Recommended Citation provides general citation information and may not be appropriate for your discipline. To receive help in creating a citation based on your discipline, please visit http://libguides.sjfc.edu/citations.

This document is posted at https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_etd/110 and is brought to you for free and open access by Fisher Digital Publications at St. John Fisher College. For more information, please contact fisherpub@sjfc.edu.
Involvement of Coaches in the Campus Judicial Process: Perceptions of Judicial Affairs Administrators and Athletic Coaches

Abstract
High rates of binge drinking among college athletes are particularly troubling to campus administrators because drinking results in greater harms and increased disciplinary outcomes for athletes and because others in the campus community often experience secondhand effects as a result of athletes' binge drinking. The level of trust in the coach-athlete relationship makes athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process a viable approach to reduce the binge drinking rates of athletes and the associated harms and disciplinary outcomes that they experience. This study explored the perceptions of athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators regarding coach involvement in the campus judicial process through a mixed-methods approach utilizing a focus group, telephone interviews, and the administration of a Web survey instrument. Results of the study suggested that both groups believe athletic coach involvement in the campus discipline process is a viable solution to reducing the future involvement of athletes in alcohol-related incidents. Both groups also demonstrate a willingness to collaborate with each other when student-athletes are involved in campus alcohol policy violations. Notification of athletic coaches should occur when student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations and collaboration between coaches and judicial administrators should be implemented to help prevent athletes' involvement in future alcohol-related incidents.

Document Type
Dissertation

Degree Name
Doctor of Education (EdD)

Department
Executive Leadership

First Supervisor
Michael Wischnowski

Second Supervisor
Diane Barrett

Subject Categories
Education

This dissertation is available at Fisher Digital Publications: https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_etd/110
Involvement of Coaches in the Campus Judicial Process: Perceptions of Judicial Affairs
Administrators and Athletic Coaches

By

Tracy McFarland

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Ed.D. in Executive Leadership

Supervised by
Dr. Michael Wischnowski

Committee Member
Dr. Diane Barrett

Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education
St. John Fisher College

August 2009
Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education  
St. John Fisher College  
Ed.D. Program in Executive Leadership

We recommend that the dissertation by

Tracy B. McFarland

Entitled Involvement of Coaches in the Campus Judicial Process: Perceptions of Judicial Affairs Administrators and Athletic Coaches

Be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Education Doctorate degree.

Michael Wischnowski, Ph.D., Chair

Diane Barrett, Ph.D., Committee Member

July 21, 2009
Dedication

This research study has been an intensive project and would not have been possible without the support, time, and expertise given by many individuals. It is impossible to recognize everyone who has played a role, but I would like to acknowledge a select few. First, to my children, Natalie and Owen, thank you for your patience and unconditional love for the past two and a half years. I know you didn’t always understand what I was doing, or why, but thank you for letting me realize my dream. Good things will come from this – I promise! To Jeff, the one person who bore the brunt of my emotional roller coaster ride, and who, even from 1000 miles away, was always able to provide an incredible amount of encouragement and belief in me. I love you with all my heart. Thank you seems completely inadequate to describe what your love and support has meant. To my mom and dad, for instilling in me the value of hard work and the belief that I could accomplish anything I set out to do. Those values and beliefs have always helped me to succeed. To Jim Blackburn, my boss, mentor, and friend, your patience and expertise guided me throughout this entire journey. Thank you for the countless hours spent reading and editing my dissertation, for talking through my problems, and for being a great executive mentor. The unexpected gifts of chocolate weren’t too bad either! To Dr. Michael Wischnowski – I could not ask for a better Dissertation Chair. Your support, guidance, and encouragement along the way have made all the difference. Thank you for helping me make this happen. To Dr. Diane Barrett, committee member extraordinaire, your input on many, many iterations of my dissertation has been extremely valuable, and
your knowledge of APA was a godsend. To Jennifer Furner, without your constant support, ear to listen, and shoulder to cry on, I would not have made it. Even when you had your own issues to deal with, I could always count on you to be there for me. From the bottom of my heart, I thank you. Last, to my DR6 and Cohort 2 teammates – it was a wild ride!
Biographical Sketch

Tracy McFarland is currently the Associate Dean of Students at Keuka College in Keuka Park, New York. Ms. McFarland attended The State University of New York, College at Geneseo from 1985 to 1989 and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Communications in 1989. She attended The State University of New York, College at Buffalo from 1989 to 1991 and graduated with a Master of Science degree in Student Personnel Administration in 1991. She came to St. John Fisher College in the summer of 2007 and began doctoral studies in the Ed.D. Program in Executive Leadership. Ms. McFarland pursued her research in the involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process under the direction of Dr. Michael Wischnowski and received the Ed.D. degree in 2010.
Abstract

High rates of binge drinking among college athletes are particularly troubling to campus administrators because binge drinking results in greater harms and increased disciplinary outcomes for athletes and because others in the campus community often experience secondhand effects as a result of athletes’ binge drinking. The level of trust in the coach-athlete relationship makes athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process a viable approach to reduce the binge drinking rates of athletes and the associated harms and disciplinary outcomes that they experience. This study explored the perceptions of athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators regarding coach involvement in the campus judicial process through a mixed-methods approach utilizing a focus group, telephone interviews, and the administration of a Web survey instrument. Results of the study suggested that both groups believe athletic coach involvement in the campus discipline process is a viable solution to reducing the future involvement of athletes in alcohol-related incidents. Both groups also demonstrate a willingness to collaborate with each other when student-athletes are involved in campus alcohol policy violations. Notification of athletic coaches should occur when student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations and collaboration between coaches and judicial administrators should be implemented to help prevent athletes’ involvement in future alcohol-related incidents.
## Table of Contents

Dedication .................................................................................................................. ii
Biographical Sketch ................................................................................................... iv
Abstract ....................................................................................................................... v
Table of Contents ......................................................................................................... vi
List of Tables ............................................................................................................... viii

### Chapter 1: Introduction ........................................................................................ 1

- Binge Drinking ....................................................................................................... 2
- Binge Drinking and College Students ................................................................... 4
- Binge Drinking and College Athletes ................................................................. 6
- Historical Perspective of Student Discipline and Development ..................... 12
- Campus Judicial Procedures ............................................................................... 16
- Judicial Response of Athletic Coaches ............................................................. 21

### Chapter 2: Review of the Literature .................................................................. 25

- Theoretical Perspectives Regarding Binge Drinking ....................................... 26
- Analysis of Research Literature ......................................................................... 29
- Interpretation of Research Literature ............................................................... 35
- Conclusion ............................................................................................................. 41

### Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology ......................................................... 43

- Research Context and Participants ................................................................... 44
- Instruments and Procedures Used ...................................................................... 46
List of Tables

Table 1.1  Lawrence Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development ..........................15
Table 4.1  Sport and Gender Representation of Athletic Coaches in Focus Group ......61
Table 4.2  Gender, Years Experience, Type of Institution, and Division Standing Represented by Judicial Affairs Administrators .........................................................66
Table 4.3  Frequency and Percentages of Demographic Information for Judicial Affairs Administrators and Athletic Coaches ..........................................................78
Table 4.4  Question 6: Alcohol Consumption, Abuse, and Related Misconduct on Campus ....................................................................................................................80
Table 4.5  Question 7: Standards for Student-athletes ...........................................81
Table 4.6  Question 8: Judicial Administrators’ Standards of Fairness ......................82
Table 4.7  Question 9: The Effectiveness of Judicial Sanctions to Deter the Future Alcohol-related Misconduct of Student-athletes .....................................................83
Table 4.8  Question 10: Athletic Coach Power to Effect Change ............................84
Table 4.9  Question 11: Coach Response to First-time, Alcohol-related Policy Violation ......................................................................................................................85
Table 4.10 Question 12: Coach Response to Multiple Alcohol-related Policy Violations ..................................................................................................................86
Table 4.11 Question 13: Athletic Coach Authority to Discipline Student-athletes ....87
Table 4.12 Question 14: When Student-athletes are Written up ............................89
Table 4.13 Question 15: When Student-athletes are Found Responsible ...............90
Table 4.14 Question 16: Athletic Coach Participation in the Campus Judicial Process

Table 4.15 Question 17: When a Student-athlete is Written up, I believe

Table 4.16 Question 18: When a Student-athlete is Found Responsible, I believe

Table 4.17 Question 19: Benefits and Value of Collaboration

Table 4.18 Questions 20 & 21: Willingness to Collaborate
Chapter 1: Introduction

Binge drinking is a critical issue on college campuses today. The destructive behaviors that typically result from excessive alcohol consumption are extremely troubling to campus administrators, yet efforts to decrease binge drinking and related harms to self and others have proved ineffective. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism recently defined binge drinking as “a pattern of drinking alcohol that brings blood alcohol concentration (BAC) to 0.08 gram-percent or above. For a typical adult, this pattern corresponds to consuming 5 or more drinks (male), or 4 or more drinks (female) in about 2 hours” (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism [NIAAA], 2002, p. 2). The male-female ratio of binge drinking is often referred to as the 5/4 measure. College student-athletes are a subgroup of special concern, as their rates of binge drinking are even higher than the binge drinking rates of the general college student population (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001). This behavior by athletes results in greater involvement in harmful acts and disciplinary outcomes.

To counteract athlete perceptions and reduce the harms that result from binge drinking, individual colleges and universities, as well as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), have implemented a variety of education and prevention efforts. Unfortunately, these efforts have failed to reduce binge drinking rates (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001; Thoms & Hamilton, 2002). In addition, many campuses do not enforce alcohol policies as strictly or consistently as they should. If institutions want to decrease binge drinking and the related negative harms associated with athletes, it may be
necessary to look beyond education and prevention efforts. Emphasis on stronger and more consistent enforcement of alcohol policies and collaboration among various campus departments might be two potential alternatives.

**Binge Drinking**

For several years, controversy has existed among researchers regarding the term binge drinking. In the clinical setting, the term binge refers to heavy drinking over the course of several days and is usually associated with self-destructive tendencies (Schuckit, 1998). This definition of binge does not adequately portray the type of excessive drinking that occurs on college campuses and in society today. In addition, the 5/4 measure of binge drinking does not address the rate or time period of drinking and fails to take into account the size or weight of the person consuming the alcohol. As a result, some researchers wish to eliminate the term binge drinking and find a suitable replacement that encompasses all relevant factors (Lang & Voas, 2001; Perkins, DeJong, & Linkenbach, 2001). Regardless of the terminology used, binge drinking is a serious health issue in the United States that results in significant physical and mental consequences for those who engage in the behavior.

Binge drinking can result in a host of negative effects ranging from physical consequences to mental impairments. Effects can be both short-term and long-term in nature. Short-term physical consequences of binge drinking include symptoms such as: hangover, loss of consciousness, falling, running into things, unintentional injuries, sexual dysfunction, alcohol poisoning, respiratory arrest, choking on vomit, sexual assault, domestic violence, and physical assault (Anonymous, 2004/2005; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2006; Hingson, Heeren, Winter, & Wechsler, 2005;
Syndistar, Inc., 2001). Long-term physical consequences include sexually transmitted diseases, unplanned pregnancy, high blood pressure, stroke, cardiovascular disease, birth defects, liver damage, pancreatic cancer, decreased bone density, brain damage, and even death (Anonymous, 2004/2005; Foster & Marriott, 2006; Syndistar, Inc., 2001). It is important to note that the long-term physical effects occur with prolonged heavy drinking. These effects may also be dependent on other factors including age and gender as well as the duration and severity of alcohol abuse (Syndistar, Inc., 2001). On the whole, women experience more alcohol-related diseases than men, and the onset of these diseases progresses more quickly in women than men (Syndistar, Inc., 2001). In young adults, binge drinking may impede muscle and bone growth (Syndistar, Inc., 2001).

In addition to the physical consequences that result from binge drinking, imbibers also experience both mental and social consequences. Mental consequences include lowered cognitive abilities, neurological and brain cell damage, and problems with memory. Reasoning ability, motor control, and reaction time are also impaired as a result of binge drinking (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2006; Foster & Marriott, 2006; Syndistar, Inc., 2001). Social consequences tend to manifest themselves as anti-social behavior, increased aggression, diminished awareness to social situations, depression, and anxiety. Despite the multitude of health ailments and social problems that result from binge drinking, individuals continue to engage in this excessive style of alcohol consumption.

According to the 2002 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, approximately 23% of Americans participated in binge drinking and approximately 16% were considered heavy drinkers (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration,
2003). In 1993, the annual number of adult binge drinking episodes was 1.2 billion. By the year 2001, the rate grew to 1.5 billion binge drinking episodes (Naimi, Brewer, Mokdad, Denny, Serdula, & Marks, 2003). While this statistic may not be alarming in and of itself, what is alarming is that the frequent bingers, who represent only 7% of the drinking population, consume approximately 45% of the alcohol consumed by adults in the United States (U.S. Department of Justice [USDOJ], 2002). Drinking statistics for youth (21 and younger) show even greater cause for concern. “The proportion of young drinkers who report drinking heavily (5 or more drinks at a sitting) is higher than for adults” (USDOJ, 2002). Adults typically consume two or three drinks per occasion about nine times a month, but youth consume on average four to five drinks per occasion about five times a month (Anonymous, 2004/2005). Youth also include college students, and this population is of special concern because of their high rates of binge drinking.

**Binge Drinking and College Students**

Much research has been conducted with regard to college students and binge drinking. It is hard to miss the headlines that report alcohol-related injuries and deaths at colleges and universities across the country. Research consistently reports that college students are more likely than their non-college peers to participate in binge drinking (Dawson, Grant, Stinson, & Chou, 2004; Johnston, O’Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2007). The binge drinking rates of college students remained virtually unchanged from 1993-2001 (NIAAA, 2002; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, Sebring, Nelson, & Lee, 2002) with approximately two in five college students meeting the definition of a binge drinker (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001).
College students are influenced to drink by a variety of biological, psychological, and social factors (Baer, 2002). On the biological front, genetics and parental attitudes toward alcohol have been shown to influence drinking. In the realm of psychology, certain personality traits including sensation seeking, disinhibition, non-conformity (Brennan, Walfish, & AuBuchon, 1986) and extraversion (Martsh & Miller, 1997) have shown relationships to drinking. Social factors related to drinking include drinking motives (that is, drinking to cope) (Brennan et al., 1986; Carey & Correia, 1997; Cronin, 1997), alcohol expectancies (Sher, Wood, Wood, & Raskin, 1996, Werner, Walker, & Greene, 1995; Wood, Sher, & Strathman, 1996), and perceived norms (Baer & Carney, 1993; Baer, Stacy, & Larimer, 1991; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986; Perkins, Meilman, Leichliter, Cashin, & Presley, 1999; Prentice & Miller, 1996). Other social factors, including the social context of where drinking takes place (Thombs, Wolcott, & Farkash, 1997), the types of drinking groups (Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986), and the gender of students (male) (Schenk, Leonard, & Greene, 1998) have also been explored.

Involvement in activities such as athletics (Leichliter, Meilman, Presley, & Cashin, 1998; Nelson & Wechsler, 2001) and Greek affiliation (Cashin, Presley, & Meilman, 1998; Engs, Diebold, & Hanson, 1996) plays a part in encouraging students to drink. Drinking games common among the college student population also contribute to the binge consumption of alcohol (Borsari, 2004; Borsari, Bergen-Cico, & Carey, 2003; Johnson & Sheets, 2004). The characteristics of being white, male, having college-educated parents, being a resident of a fraternity, being involved in athletics, participating in binge drinking as a high school senior, and viewing parties as important have all been associated with binge drinking in the college setting (Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport, & Castillo, 1995).
While roughly 80% of college students drink alcohol, approximately 40% of college students engage in binge drinking. These binge drinkers tend to experience more negative consequences as a result of their binge drinking behavior than non-binge drinkers. Negative consequences also ensue in the form of secondhand effects for others within the campus community. Hingsom et al. (2005) conducted a study of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among college students and found that between 1998 and 2001, there was an increase in unintentional injury deaths, and an increase in the proportion of college students who drank and then drove under the influence of alcohol. “During both years, more than 500,000 students were unintentionally injured because of drinking and more than 600,000 were hit/assaulted by another drinking student” (p. 259). Additional alcohol-related problems resulting from binge drinking include unplanned and unprotected sex, sexual assault, damaging property, and getting into trouble with campus police (Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens, & Castillo, 1994). Secondhand effects of binge drinking refer to the experiences of non-bingeing students who encounter problems as a result of other students' binge drinking. Common secondhand effects include being insulted or humiliated, having property damaged, babysitting a drunken student, and experiencing interrupted sleep or study (Wechsler, 1996). With the multitude of negative effects associated with binge drinking, it is easy to see why binge drinking among college students, particularly by athletes, is the focus of numerous research studies.

_Binge Drinking and College Athletes_

The vast amount of research conducted on college student drinking attitudes and behaviors has afforded researchers the opportunity to study specific subgroups of the
college student population. Longitudinal studies conducted with large samples, like the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Studies (CAS) and the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (CADS), have identified high-risk populations within the college setting. College athletes are one group that emerged as a high-risk group for binge drinking. A strong relationship between athletics and alcohol was forged in 1953 when the President of Anheuser-Busch brewery, August A. Busch, Jr., purchased the St. Louis Cardinals baseball team. Over the years, breweries have spent vast sums of money on sport-related advertising and on sponsorship of both amateur and professional athletic teams. The outcome is a mutually beneficial relationship between the alcohol industry and sport (Stainback, 1997). As a result of this relationship, it is only natural that athletes' drinking behavior became a source of study and inquiry.

Data from the 1997 and 2001 NCAA studies revealed that almost 80% of college athletes reported using alcohol in the 12 months prior to the studies. This percentage rate is consistent with other research showing alcohol consumption rates of athletes to be 83.1% and 86.7% (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001; Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Grossman et al., 1997). Although these drinking rates may appear high, they are only slightly higher than the drinking rates of nonathlete students in those studies (80.6% and 84% respectively). While drinking rates for all students hover in the 80% range, the real concern is binge drinking or heavy episodic drinking (five or more drinks in one sitting for males, four or more drinks in one sitting for females) and the associated negative consequences that arise (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, & Lee; 2000).

Research has identified athletes as a high-risk group for binge drinking (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001; Wechsler et al., 1997). Athletes exhibit certain social factors that tend to
increase the risk for binge drinking including having five or more close friends, considering parties important, spending two or more hours per week socializing, and having 70% or more of friends who binge drink. Not only do college men and women involved in athletics report higher rates of binge drinking than students not involved in athletics, they also engage in a more excessive style of drinking (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001), including drinking more per week, more frequent binge drinking (Leichliter, Meilman, Presley, & Cashin, 1998), and drinking to get drunk (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001). Studies conducted by Wechsler et al. (1997) and Nelson and Wechsler (2001) found that a greater percentage of athletes than nonathletes reported participation in both heavy episodic drinking and frequent heavy episodic drinking (three or more heavy drinking episodes). Other researchers have also reported similar findings. Leichliter et al. (1998) found that intercollegiate athletes consumed more drinks per week than nonathletes (7.57 drinks per weeks for athletes, 4.12 drinks per week for nonathletes), and that a larger percentage of athletes reported binge drinking (five or more drinks per sitting by males and females) in the past two weeks (53.3% of athletes compared to 36.3% of nonathletes).

Level of Involvement in Athletics

A limited number of studies have explored the level of involvement in athletics and its relationship to alcohol consumption. While one might expect that athletes and team leaders would drink less, the opposite was found to be true. Leichliter et al. (1998) determined that team leaders actually exhibited higher rates of binge drinking than team members and students not involved in athletics. Hildebrand, Johnson, and Bogle (2001) found that as athlete involvement increased (never, high school, college) so did the
percentage of students classified as heavy drinkers (13.8%, 22.2%, and 28.5% respectively). As a result of their elevated drinking, team leaders may experience more negative consequences and disciplinary outcomes than team members. Because of the drinking habits of athletes, coach involvement in the judicial process could be useful for targeting interventions with both athletes and team leaders.

Alcohol Consumption Across NCAA Divisions and Among Sport Types

While the alcohol consumption rates and binge drinking rates of athletes are compelling, breaking down the usage patterns across division type and among sports is also important for further identifying high-risk groups and tailoring specific intervention strategies to the unique characteristics of those groups. Very little research has been conducted with regard to alcohol usage rates across different NCAA divisions (Division I, II, III) or among sport types. The most recent data comes from the 2001 NCAA study, which looked at 12-month prevalence rates of alcohol use as well as comparisons among sports. Division III athletes had the highest 12-month prevalence rate for the use of alcohol at 82.1%, followed by Division I (78.3%), and then Division II (77.7%). Differences in 12-month prevalence rates among sports were also studied. Sports with the highest prevalence rates included women’s swimming/diving (88.1%), women’s soccer (86.9%), softball (85.3%), men’s swimming/diving (84.7%), men’s soccer (83.9%), and baseball (83.4%). Sports with lower prevalence rates included men’s track and field, women’s basketball, and men’s basketball (71.3%, 71.5%, and 74.1% respectively). This data provides a simplistic and broad overview of drinking across NCAA divisions and among sports. Yet, it may be useful in identifying specific divisions and sports where
coach involvement in the judicial process could help athletes reduce their drinking and the associated negative outcomes.

**Athlete Drinking and Seasonal Status**

Another facet of the athlete realm that could shed some light on the alcohol consumption patterns of athletes is athlete drinking and its possible relation to seasonal status. Some evidence indicates that athletes’ alcohol consumption is lower during their competitive season and higher out of season (Bower & Martin, 1999; National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA], 2001; Thombs, 2000). A recent, more methodologically sound study conducted by Martens, Darns-O’Connor, and Duffy-Paement (2006) found reductions in athlete drinking and related negative consequences during the competitive season, thus corroborating previous studies. In addition, athletes’ perceptions of athletes’ drinking also decreased during the season, although athletes’ perceptions of nonathletes’ drinking did not decrease. This also provides further rationale for coach involvement in the judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct. As drinking rates would be predicted to be higher out-of-season, off-season coaches could provide support and influence to team members involved in alcohol-related misconduct.

**Athlete Harms and Consequences**

With athletes’ higher rates of drinking and binge drinking, it is no surprise that they also experience more negative alcohol-related consequences than nonathletes. While all students (athletes and nonathletes) experience negative consequences as a result of binge drinking, Nelson and Wechsler (2001) found that athletes were more likely to experience a wider range of alcohol-related harms as well as five or more different alcohol-related problems. Alcohol-related harms in the study included experiences such
as suffering from a hangover, missing class, doing something later regretted, arguing with friends, having unprotected sex, and getting hurt or injured. Leichliter et al. (1998) found that intercollegiate athletes were more likely than nonathletes to experience 18 of 19 possible negative consequences in the past year as a result of substance use. Alcohol was identified as the most frequently used substance in the study.

The NCAA recognizes the negative consequences of athletes’ use of alcohol. In a 1996 article in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Frank D. Uryasz, Director of Sports Sciences at the NCAA, indicated that when violent and serious incidents occur with collegiate athletes, alcohol is usually involved (Naughton, 1996). The consequences of these serious alcohol-related incidents often have numerous and far-reaching effects for the athletes involved.

A college student-athlete hospitalized for alcohol poisoning is one example of how the alcohol-related behavior of athletes can result in numerous disciplinary and personal repercussions. On a personal level, the athlete must contend with any residual health issues related to the alcohol poisoning and incur the costs associated with medical transport and emergency care. The athlete will also need to inform parents and family members as well as deal with any consequences imposed from home. When the student-athlete is discharged from the hospital and arrives back at school, the individual may feel a certain amount of embarrassment and shame, especially among peers. In the athletic arena, the athlete may face admonition as well as punishment from the coach or athletic program. Punishment could include additional practice or training, sitting out a designated number of games, or even suspension from the team. A host of other possibilities exists as well. From a college perspective, the athlete may be required to
participate in campus judicial proceeding as a result of violating a campus policy (for example, underage drinking, drinking games, public drunkenness). Penalties would be beyond what the coach or athletic program imposed and could range from community service and fines to disciplinary probation and alcohol education classes. In the case of a severe incident, or if the athlete repeatedly violated the alcohol policy, it could even result in suspension or dismissal from the institution. At a community level, if the alcohol poisoning resulted in involvement by local authorities, the student may have received a ticket and be required to appear in court.

While athletes’ drinking often results in violations of campus alcohol policy, the related behaviors associated with drinking also result in violations of other established rules and regulations (for example, harassment, vandalism/property damage, assault). These violations range from nuisance behaviors (residence hall quiet hours violations, disruption of other students’ sleep) to more severe violations and disruptions such as physical assault and sexual assault. College administrators must respond to these incidents in order to confront the negative, disruptive behavior, maintain a living environment conducive to learning, and enforce community standards.

**Historical Perspective of Student Discipline and Development**

Over the years, parents and administrators alike have viewed student discipline as a responsibility of the institution (D annells, 1997). This point of view dates back to Colonial times when the early English common law doctrine, *in loco parentis*, governed the college and university setting. *In loco parentis* literally means *in place of the parent*. In colonial times, students often traveled great distances to attend universities. In response, colleges tended to usurp the parental role and *administrators were given wide
latitude to discipline students” (Martin & Janosik, 2004). In a historical context, the concept of in loco parentis made sense, but due to changing social conditions, the concept was phased out by the late 1960s and a new era of campus discipline, based on the theory of student development, was incorporated. Dannells (1997) cited three major social conditions that led to this shift. With the lowering of the age of majority from 21 to 18, institutions were no longer required to take care of minors. The typical 18-year-old student was seen as an adult and a contractual relationship between the student and institution ensued. A shift also occurred in the demographics of students attending college after World War II. Older students in their twenties and thirties were replacing traditional 18-21 year olds and were choosing to attend college part-time rather than full-time. At the same time, there was a dramatic increase in students from different cultures and different races. With the changing demographics, colleges realized that they needed to address the value systems these new populations and cultures were bringing to their institutions. The focus shifted to student development, and student discipline began to be viewed as part of the educational process of the student. While in loco parentis waned, student affairs professionals, faculty, and even athletic coaches maintained their guidance of college students.

“The term student development is used extensively in student affairs practice” (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 4) and is designed to encompass the learning and growth that occurs in college students as a result of their experiences at the institution that they attend. Student development theory is an eclectic blend of theory founded on the general theories of human development and provides the basis for the practice of student affairs professionals. The philosophy of student development is built on the concept of
“Concern for the development of the whole person” (Rodgers, 1990, p. 27). Student Affairs professionals aim to foster the positive growth and development of students by proactively addressing student needs, designing programs, developing policies, and creating healthy college environments (Evans et al., 1998). In the context of student conduct, judicial affairs administrators find the cognitive-development model of Kohlberg’s theory of moral development useful. Kohlberg’s theory is used to structure student affairs work with individuals and groups in disciplinary settings as well as for policy development and enforcement.

Kohlberg’s theory of moral development is based on Piaget’s research regarding the moral development of children (Evans et al., 1998). Kohlberg supplemented Piaget’s theory by defining additional stages that could be applied to moral development later in life. This expanded model works well for use in college settings as it addresses the stages of moral development through which college students progress.

Kohlberg postulated a theory of moral development with three levels and six stages (two stages within in each level). The theory focused on the concept of “justice” and “each level represented a different relationship between the self and society’s rules and expectations” (Evans et al., 1998, p. 174). Individuals progress sequentially through the six stages with growth occurring at varying rates for each individual. When the student encounters an ethical or moral dilemma, an opportunity for growth in the area of moral development arises. “Movement through this developmental process represents a shift in thinking; the person is actually changing the way in which he or she frames moral questions and understands the world” (Gismondi, A., 2006, p. 1). See Table 1.1 for details on Kohlberg’s model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I Pre-Conventional | **1 Heteronomous Morality**  
What is right is defined as obeying rules so as not to be punished and refraining from physical harm to persons and property.  
**2 Individualistic, Instrumental Morality**  
Individuals at this stage follow rules if it is in their best interest. |
| II Conventional  | **3 Interpersonally Normative Morality**  
Right is defined as living up to the expectations of those to whom one is close and carrying out one’s social roles. Gaining the approval of others is common.  
**4 Social System Morality**  
Individuals at this stage view the social system as made up of a consistent set of rules and procedures that apply equally to all people. |
| III Post Conventional | **5 Human Rights and Social Welfare or Principled Morality**  
The rightness of laws and social systems are evaluated on the basis of the extent to which they promote the fundamental human rights and values.  
**6 Morality of Universalizable, Reversible, and Prescriptive General Ethical Principles**  
Involves equal consideration of all points of view of all individuals involved in a moral situation. |

Kohlberg’s theory provides the basis on which student affairs practitioners view the moral development of college students and has implications for how judicial affairs administrators handle disciplinary hearings. According to Gismondi (2006):

Most college students are at a formative level, and many have had little experience away from their home community previous to these years. Therefore, it is vital that professionals on campus are aware of these factors when helping to guide development (p. 4).

Athletic coaches traditionally assist in the development of college student-athletes, with moral development being one part of the overarching holistic development process. Involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process would provide opportunities to challenge student-athletes in ways that encourage and enhance their moral development.

**Campus Judicial Procedures**

In the colleges and universities of today, enforcement of campus policy typically falls under the jurisdiction of Judicial Affairs and Campus Conduct Officers. Institutions of higher education each have their own distinctive process in place to handle student conduct issues (Wilson, 1996). The terminology used among institutions might be different and offices that handle student conduct matters may go by many names, but the goal of most campus judicial systems is the same. Institutions hope to educate their students and construct learning opportunities for those who fall short of the behavioral expectations of the community.

Private and public institutions differ in the amount of latitude and flexibility they have when it comes to “hearing standards, consequences for misconduct, and what types of conduct they can regulate” (Association for Student Judicial Affairs [ASJA], 2006,
General Overview of Conduct Procedures, §7. Guidelines for public institutions tend to be more rigid and structured while private institutions have more leeway.

Addressing misconduct on college campuses is not a recent phenomenon. As far back as 1822, there are accounts of student rioting at the University of Virginia, and “references to drunk and disorderly conduct…are often found in the detailed histories of American institutions of higher education” (Dannells, 1997, p. 27). The Association for Student Judicial Affairs indicated that:

Modern disciplinary practices trace their routes to the 1961 case of Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education. In Dixon, the students argued that their meeting with the Administrator did not meet the standards for due process. As a result of this meeting, the students were expelled from the institution. The Court ruled that students should be given at least notice of the charges and an opportunity to be heard. The court also said that a full criminal hearing is not required (2006, General Overview of Conduct Procedures, §3).

Although campus conduct hearings do bear some resemblance to criminal proceedings, there are vast differences as well. Jurisdiction, standard of proof, and consequences are all very different in a college setting compared to a court of law.

College rules and regulations are not criminal statutes. They are policies put in place to govern the behavior of an academic community. While some regulations, such as alcohol, drug, and sexual assault policies, may echo criminal statutes, adhere to state law, or use similar terminology, overall the campus conduct system is less legalistic than the court system (ASJA, 2006).
College hearing bodies also do not use the *beyond a reasonable doubt* standard of proof used in criminal cases. Instead, colleges and universities tend to rely on the *preponderance of evidence philosophy* before finding a student responsible for a policy violation. Based on the facts provided, it must be more likely than not that the student violated a campus policy. Whereas criminal prosecution is a matter of public record, campus judicial proceedings are typically bound by confidentiality. In addition, the courts have a much wider jurisdiction than colleges and universities, which are limited to the campus itself or to situations that demonstrate a connection to the campus. Court hearings also tend to be adversarial in nature, while campus judicial systems take an educational approach to discipline. Finally, the sanctions imposed by campus judicial administrators often focus on repairing harm to victims and members of the college community, with the student understanding and learning how misconduct and poor choices can affect others (ASJA, 2006). These issues are usually not addressed in the criminal process.

In general, students who violate college and university alcohol policies are subject to a campus disciplinary hearing implemented through the college judicial system. Upon initial violation of a policy, a member of the campus community files a written complaint to the judicial affairs office or campus administrator responsible for overseeing student conduct (AJSA, 2006). Typically, the individual who files the complaint is a member of the residence life staff, a campus police officer, or a student, although at most institutions, any member of the campus community may file a report. The judicial affairs administrator reviews the documentation and assigns the case to a hearing officer or hearing body (Wilson, 1996). Depending on the nature of the violation and the institution, the hearing can be either an informal or a formal process.
Informal processes, often called administrative reviews, permit students “to accept responsibility and reach agreement regarding sanctions without a trial-type adversarial hearing” (Wilson, 1996, A Few Sample Procedures, ¶4). They involve discussion between the judicial affairs staff member, admittance of a violation by the student, and acceptance of sanctions. Administrators at several levels of the college, including resident directors, the director of housing and residence life, and the assistant or associate dean of students, can all oversee informal processes. On the other hand, there are instances when violations are severe, when students do not accept responsibility for their actions, or when students repeatedly violate policies. These situations often require a more formal, adversarial process. Formal processes traditionally involve a hearing with an administrator, or a board comprised of faculty, staff, and students. The accused student has the right to present information regarding the situation as well as any witnesses, and board members are able to ask questions of the accused student. When all questions are exhausted, the group reviews the case and makes a decision regarding the outcome and any intended sanctions. The outcome of the hearing is then communicated to the student in writing (ASJA).

A multitude of sanctions is available at all levels of the judicial process. It is useful to view sanctioning practices on a continuum, with written reprimands and warnings at one end, and suspension or dismissal from the institution at the other end. At one end of the continuum, warnings, reprimands, and probation tend to act as admonitions and deterrents to future policy violations. Midway through the continuum, sanctions such as restrictions and loss of privileges serve as consequences for misbehavior. At the other end of the continuum, sanctions that bear lasting effects are
typical, including suspension, dismissal, and expulsion. Sanctions can also fall under the categories of either rehabilitative or educational. Rehabilitative sanctions include apology letters, community service, and educational programs. Educational sanctions consist of counseling, alcohol education classes, and researching and writing papers (Wilson, 1996).

A sanctioning process should consider the purposes of the sanctions, the developmental level of the student, and aggravating and mitigating factors inherent in the offense, as well as those concerns related to the student’s response to the situation and disciplinary process itself (Wilson, 1996, Sanctions and Other Remedies, ¶9).

Sanctions for alcohol-policy violations can fall into all categories depending on the nature of the specific incident and the frequency of occurrence. Sanctioning at one small, liberal arts institution in the Northeast categorizes violations according to level. For a first alcohol violation, a student receives a $35 fine, two hours of community service, a Web-based alcohol education requirement, and a group alcohol workshop. For a second alcohol offense, a student receives a $45 fine; five hours of community service; a Web-based alcohol education requirement; two, one-hour sessions of motivational interviewing; weekend suspension; and parental notification. If a student is found responsible for a third offense, there is a $75 fine, referral to a local alcohol counseling and referral agency for assessment and/or treatment, removal from campus housing, and parental notification. Involvement in a fourth offense results in suspension from the institution (Keuka College, 2007, p. 85).

Not all college alcohol-sanctioning practices are the same. However, many institutions use a tiered approach similar to the one outlined, with repeat offenses
resulting in more severe sanctions. Colleges also use a mixture of several types of sanctions for alcohol violations, including rehabilitative, punitive, deterrent, and educational. The most serious alcohol-related offenses require sanctions with long-term effects.

**Judicial Response of Athletic Coaches**

Parallel to the campus judicial process, athletic coaches also have their own processes for handling disciplinary infractions with members of their teams. These include alcohol-policy violations as well as other campus rule infractions. “When disciplinary concerns arise, they must take precedence in the coach’s routine” (Connor, 2002, p. 27).

Little to no research or theory exists on the participation of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process of student-athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct. However, some literature looks at involving athletic coaches in the prevention efforts of alcohol abuse by student-athletes, with coach discipline of student-athletes serving as one piece of the larger picture. The Athletic Prevention Programming and Leadership Education (APPLE) model (Grossman, Gieck, Freedman, & Fang, 1993) consists of seven pieces that help athletic departments assess their alcohol and other drug prevention efforts (Grossman et al., 1993). It also assists them with moving toward proactive prevention (Grossman & Smiley, 1999). One of the seven pieces included in the model is discipline. This piece centers on disciplinary actions put in place for student-athletes due to their involvement in violations of campus alcohol and other drug policies. Inclusion of this piece in the model signifies involvement on the part of athletic coaches in the campus disciplinary process of student-athletes.
The NCAA, the governing body for college athletics, allows individual colleges discretion in handling conduct issues involving student athletes (Lipka, 2006). Coaches are often involved in the process and that involvement requires coaches to assume several roles, including investigator, prosecutor, defense attorney/counselor, and judge (Connor, 2002). At times, it may even be necessary for the coach to remove a student from the team.

Evidence of coach involvement in the athlete disciplinary process can be found in examples from institutions across the country. In 1996, Tom Osborne, Football Coach at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, suspended a starting linebacker who was arrested for driving while under the influence of alcohol (Naughton, 1996). Also, in 1996, John D. Swofford, Director of Athletics at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, placed the entire men’s soccer team on probation, and forfeited tournament play, after a freshman team member was hospitalized for alcohol poisoning. The alcohol poisoning occurred after a party at the home of the soccer team’s co-captain (Naughton, 1996). On January 7, 2006, Virginia Tech dismissed junior Marcus Vick from the team for stomping on an opposing player’s leg in the Gator Bowl and because of his frequent run-ins with the law (Bechtel, 2006). In July 2006, Harvard Football Captain, Matt Thomas, was arrested for assault and battery when he tried to force his way into his girlfriend’s bedroom. In response to this behavior, Coach Tim Murphy dismissed Thomas from the team (Bartholomew, 2006). The actions outlined in these cases provide strong evidence that the disciplinary decisions of coaches can have strong effects on individual athletes and the team. They also demonstrate that coaches can be strong proponents of a student development philosophy that emphasizes the complete maturation of the student-athlete.
Today, however, most coaches are not formally involved in the campus disciplinary process. Their involvement in the discipline of athletes is relegated to the periphery of the established campus system. Yet, the consequences coaches impose can have strong and lasting effects. Because of this, administrators may want to consider involving athletic coaches in the formal campus discipline process.

A coach’s judicial process is often more informal than campus disciplinary proceedings, and coaches may be able to resolve a situation more quickly than the school. At other times, the campus judicial system may decide first. If that happens, coaches may impose further penalties. It is important to remember that although the coach is concerned about the athlete as a student and an individual, the coach also has an obligation to take into account how the violation affects the team, as well as the entire athletic program.

Scrutiny regarding athletic eligibility issues, and the 2006 Duke lacrosse incident, spurred the implementation of athletic codes of conduct by many schools. These codes outline athlete expectations plus punishments for violations. It is a good concept in theory, but many of these codes take the decision-making piece away from coaches and put it into the hands of the athletic director. This provides a measure of objectivity and removes the coach from making decisions that sometimes can be difficult emotionally and personally. Yet, research has shown that coaches exert a great amount of influence in regulating athlete behavior (Bower & Martin, 1999; Dacin, Parks, & Allison, 2003). Athletes respond to coaches due to the inherent nature of the relationship, providing a sound reason for coaches to be involved in the disciplinary process. Anshel (1991) advocated for utilizing coaches to help regulate and prevent drug use in sports. This
concept could also prove useful for prevention of alcohol use and related negative behaviors.

In summary, research has shown that a coach’s perceptions and rules regarding alcohol use can have a limiting effect on the alcohol consumption by athletes. Researchers also encourage coach involvement in the prevention of alcohol abuse among athletes, as well as collaboration among campus departments. The influential nature of the athlete-coach relationship could be a viable option to curb future alcohol-related misconduct and disciplinary outcomes of athletes. The purpose of this study is to determine from the point of view of coaches and judicial affairs administrators whether athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process is a feasible alternative to reduce the binge drinking of athletes and associated harms and disciplinary outcomes.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

High rates of binge drinking on college campuses, particularly with college athletes, are a source of concern for administrators. Binge drinking typically results in greater harms and disciplinary outcomes among college athletes than for nonathletes. Others in the campus community also experience a host of other secondhand effects because of athletes’ binge drinking. Therefore, it is imperative that colleges critically review their current approaches to alcohol abuse and consider new approaches to address binge drinking, especially with the high-risk population of college athletes. Coaches have a tremendous amount of influence where their athletes are concerned, and “it is likely that coaches are the most important and significant other to whom athletes respond” (Anshel, 1991, p. 156). The level of trust in the coach-athlete relationship could become a springboard for athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process and, ultimately, a means to reduce the binge drinking rates of athletes and the associated harms and disciplinary outcomes that they experience.

Scant research exists regarding the role of athletic coaches in the campus disciplinary process of athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct. Therefore, this literature review contains an overview about what is known about the following related topics: theoretical perspectives regarding binge drinking, binge drinking on college campuses, athlete binge drinking and associated harms and disciplinary outcomes, secondhand effects of binge drinking, judicial and policy approaches to binge drinking,
prevention efforts, and rationale for athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process.

*Theoretical Perspectives Regarding Binge Drinking*

Although several theories exist to explain the binge drinking patterns of college students, the models that seem to make the most sense with regard to college athletes are the ones that emphasize the social and environmental influences related to drinking. Two theories of particular interest include the perceived norms theory and social ecology theory.

*Perceived Norms Theory*

Why do college students drink? Perceived norms theorists suggest that “perceptions of peer norms, regardless of the actual norm, may contribute significantly to student alcohol abuse as students act in accordance with what they believe to be the expectations of their peers” (Perkins et al., 1999, p. 254). Perkins et al. conducted a secondary analysis of data obtained through the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey database. They utilized information from institutions completing the long form of the Core Survey between fall 1994 and spring 1996. The study specifically examined the extent of existing misperceptions about the use of alcohol and other drugs. Overall, students tended to overestimate substance abuse levels at their schools. These overestimations were considerably exaggerated regarding the use of alcohol. The study included a very large number of respondents, as well as a demographically diverse representation of institutions, making the findings very significant (Perkins et al., 1999). The perceived norms model (PNM) also provides a plausible explanation for the binge drinking behavior of college athletes given the college social environment and the team context.
Thombs (2000) tested the perceived norms model with regard to the drinking patterns of college athletes. He used an anonymous questionnaire to survey 297 NCAA athletes at a public university in the Midwest. He hypothesized that athletes’ perceptions of teammates’ drinking would correlate more strongly with athletes’ drinking than with the perceived drinking norm of the typical student, perceived expectations of the head coach (regarding drinking), and with certain sociodemographic variables. His assumption was not substantiated and showed that onset of regular drinking was the most powerful discriminator. However, results still supported the perceived norms approach as athletes in the study tended to perceive their teammates’ drinking to be higher than their own, and they perceived the drinking habits of the average student to be higher than that of their typical teammate (Thombs).

Social Ecology Theory

Social ecology theory is also a useful lens for understanding why college athletes drink and offers a broader range of influencing factors than the social norms approach. “The key concept in this perspective is that behavior is multifaceted, with social and environmental issues being important contributing factors” (Williams et al., 2006, p. 230). Social ecology theory maintains that substance abuse issues are caused primarily by the social environment and, to a lesser degree, by the individual. Hansen (1997) claimed that “the more profoundly a social unit affects interaction among students, the more likely it will be to promote or discourage alcohol and drug use” (p. 168). In athletics, both team members and athletic coaches are social units that influence athlete behavior. The social ecology model introduced by McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, and Glanz (1988) for use in health promotion and prevention initiatives provides a useful framework for
understanding why college athletes drink. It outlines five factors or influences on behavior including intrapersonal factors, interpersonal processes, institutional or organizational factors, community factors, and public policy.

Williams et al. (2006) followed Hansen’s (1997) lead and adopted social ecology theory for use in alcohol and drug prevention among college athletes. For athletes in a college setting, multiple social and environmental factors influence individual behavior. Intrapersonal factors incorporate the personal knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs an athlete has about alcohol use and its effects on health and sport performance. Interpersonal factors consist of a student’s sphere of influence such as an athletic team or close friends and the ability those groups and individuals have to shape the athlete’s personal alcohol use. Organizational and institutional factors include team captains or leaders and the athlete’s perception of the coach’s attitude and rules regarding alcohol use. Community factors take into account the perceptions that athletes may have regarding the alcohol usage of the general student population, as well as their view of alcohol use by other athletes. Policy factors include alcohol policy enforcement by the institution and the athletic department, along with the severity of potential consequences.

The social ecology perspective views behavior as complex and affected by various social and environmental influences. Athletes have additional environmental influences that nonathletes do not, such as coaches, the athletic department, and their athletic team, which could provide further opportunities for substance abuse intervention and reduction of alcohol policy violations. In addition, Bower and Martin’s (1999) research with female African-American basketball players suggests that coaches’ rules have a deterrent effect on the alcohol consumption of athletes, providing further support
for the coach as an environmental influence. In the social ecology realm, modifying substance abuse should not focus on changing the person, but rather on changing the person’s environment. Perhaps the involvement of athletic coaches in alcohol-related disciplinary matters of athletes could prove to be a means to reducing involvement in binge drinking and disruptive behaviors.

**Analysis of Research Literature**

In order to pursue the study of involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process as a means to reduce athletes’ future involvement in alcohol-related incidents, it is important to explore the research and literature associated with athletes’ perceptions, attitudes, and usage patterns with regard to alcohol use. It is also imperative to understand the workings of the campus judicial process and institutional responses to binge drinking and alcohol-related incidents.

**Binge Drinking and College Students**

The Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Studies (CAS) conducted between 1993 and 2001 comprise a key component of alcohol-related research. Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, Sebring, Nelson, and Lee (2002) compared responses from the four survey years (1993, 1997, 1999, and 2001). The population of the study included a random selection of students from 119 four-year colleges who participated in the previous three studies. Results indicated no change in the binge-drinking rate of college students over the eight years of the studies (1993-2001). This was true despite the multitude of education and prevention efforts implemented by colleges and universities, which suggest that new strategies are needed to reduce the binge consumption of alcohol by college
students, particularly student athletes. These new strategies could involve athletic coaches in the process.

*Binge Drinking and College Athletes*

Leichliter et al. (1998) used data acquired from more than 58,000 students who participated in the Core Alcohol and Drug Surveys (CADS) between October 1994 and May 1996 to determine whether “students who participate in intercollegiate athletics drink more... than students not involved in athletics” (Introduction section, 59). Findings confirmed their hypothesis. Nelson and Wechsler (2001) studied binge drinking using information from Harvard’s 1997 CAS. “Athletes were found to be more likely than their nonathlete peers to exhibit several social factors which have been found to increase risk for binge drinking” (p.45). Some of the social factors included having five or more close friends, spending two or more hours per week socializing, considering parties important, and having 70% or more of friends who are binge drinkers. In addition to binge drinking at higher rates than their nonathlete peers, studies confirmed that athletes also experienced more alcohol-related harms and negative consequences from their drinking than nonathletes (Leichliter, et al.; Nelson & Wechsler). Due to the strong nature of the athlete-coach relationship, involvement of coaches in the disciplinary process could result in a more favorable, reflective, and developmental response on the part of athletes.

A study conducted by Hildebrand et al. (2001) compared patterns of alcohol abuse and engagement in alcohol-related risk behaviors by college students to see if participation in athletics (currently or previously) was associated with those behaviors. Results indicated that students involved in athletics “consumed more alcohol, began drinking earlier, and engaged in alcohol-related risk behaviors more frequently than
college students who had never been athletes” (Results section, ¶1). “Results of this study showed that current and former student athletes contribute disproportionately to problems of alcohol abuse and other related risk behaviors on college campuses” (Discussion section, ¶4). Collaboration between coaches and judicial affairs administrators could likely result in identification of additional strategies to reduce the alcohol-related behavior of athletes.

Secondhand Effects of Binge Drinking

While it is easy to assume the negative consequences of alcohol-related behavior are only detrimental to the student athlete engaging in the behavior, research has demonstrated that binge drinking produces secondhand effects harmful to other students as well (Wechsler, 1996; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, et al. 2002). Wechsler’s (1996) summary of findings from the 1993 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study indicated that “on campuses where more than half the students are binge drinkers, the vast majority of students (87 percent) who live on campus have experienced one or more problems as a result of others’ binge drinking” (p. 23). Secondhand effects of binge drinking include being insulted or humiliated; experiencing unwanted sexual advances (females only); being pushed, hit, or assaulted; experiencing interrupted sleep or study; babysitting a drunken student; experiencing damage to personal property; and experiencing sexual assault (Wechsler, 1996; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo et al., 2002).

Wechsler encouraged colleges to reflect on their mission and determine whether they could accomplish their goals if they “tolerate behavior that compromises the quality of students’ educational and social lives” (1996, p. 24). Wechsler also urged colleges to implement stronger alcohol policies and suggested the necessity for collaboration among
campus constituents to address the behavioral issues that result from binge drinking. The alliance of athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators in dealing with alcohol-related disciplinary issues meets this challenge.

Research has shown that, in addition to differences between athletes and nonathletes, there are also gender differences in consequences of drinking. The drinking behavior of males results in more disciplinary outcomes and increased recidivism than the drinking behavior of females (Perkins, 2002). Using the College Student Experiences Questionnaire, Polomsky and Blackhurst (2000) examined differences between the college experiences of male students with and without repeated policy violations at a mid-sized public university. Their research suggested that students who repeatedly violate policies might be more social and have difficulty balancing competing obligations, which are also two characteristics associated with the lifestyle of athletes. Polomsky and Blackhurst recommended a developmental approach to judicial sanctioning in the future (2000).

Research conducted by Kompalla and McCarthy (2001) looked at recidivism rates in relation to the type of disciplinary sanction imposed. “Overall recidivism rates were equivalent for students assigned to active and passive sanctions, although the rates varied among individuals assigned to active sanctions” (Kompalla & McCarthy, 2001, p. 223). This suggests that some combinations of sanctions have a greater effect on preventing participation in future violations. Athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators could work together to identify the types of sanctions that would effectively reduce the binge drinking rates of athletes and the associated negative behaviors.
Campus Judicial Process

Fitch and Murry (2001) assessed and classified the effectiveness of student judicial systems at doctoral-granting universities to determine if particular types of judicial systems were more effective in adjudicating student misconduct. They classified three types of judicial systems: formal, informal, and mixed. Formal systems were defined as more legalistic and based on the court system; informal systems were defined as less legalistic, less ceremonial, and more removed from the court system; and mixed systems contained both formal and informal elements (Fitch & Murry). Results indicated that formal systems heard the lowest number of cases and had the fewest appeals. They also had the least recidivism. Informal systems heard the highest number of cases and had the highest rate of recidivism. Mixed systems had the least number of lawsuits filed, the highest number of appeals, and the highest number of judicial decisions overturned on appeal. No one approach fared best in every category, and all three systems appeared to handle certain aspects of the judicial process better than others did. However, it seems a formal approach may work better in reducing recidivism. Currently, athletic coaches are not typically part of the formalized campus judicial process. It is time to look at involving coaches and using them as an additional avenue to address the high binge drinking rates of athletes and related disciplinary outcomes.

Support for Campus Alcohol Policies

Policy is another part of the campus disciplinary process. Policy consists of the type of rules that are in place at an institution as well as the enforcement of those rules. Wechsler, Lee, Nelson, and Kuo (2002) studied undergraduate college students' drinking behavior, access to alcohol, and the influence of deterrence policies utilizing data from
the 2001 CAS as well as the three previous Harvard CAS surveys. They compared data from the previous studies, but limited their samples to students 23 years of age and younger. They compared students younger than 21 years of age with traditional-age college students between the ages of 21 and 23. Their research found that although student exposure to educational materials and programs increased over the course of the four studies, no changes in the level of binge drinking resulted. While binge drinking rates remained flat, “underage students reported significant changes in their experience of alcohol-related sanctions including less warnings, but more fines, mandatory attendance at alcohol education courses, community service and other disciplinary actions” (p. 229). This is a positive finding overall, yet, it is tempered because the number of students receiving those sanctions was very small. Perhaps coaches could utilize their influence with athletes to assign sanctions more relevant for the binge-drinking violations of athletes.

DeLong, Towvim, and Schneider (2007) conducted a study to examine college student support for policies and enforcement strategies to reduce alcohol problems on campus. The study utilized a random sample of students from 32 four-year colleges and universities that participated in the Social Norms Marketing Research Project (SNMRP). DeLong et al. (2007) used the Survey of College Alcohol Norms and Behaviors (SCANB) to look at enforcement strategies, campus management, and availability of alcohol. Study results indicated that a majority of students showed support for 5 of the 12 proposed policies to reduce campus alcohol problems. Student support was greatest for using strict disciplinary sanctions for students who engage in alcohol-related violence and for repeat offenders of campus alcohol policies. In addition, there was strong support for restriction
of advertising promoting alcohol use at campus events and banning kegs on campus (DeJong et al.). There was also a fair amount of support for several other policy options. In general, results indicate that students are looking for stronger and unwavering enforcement of alcohol and substance abuse policies. The involvement of coaches in the disciplinary process would add another level of administrative commitment to the messages being sent to students, particularly athletes, about alcohol use and the enforcement of campus alcohol policies.

It is clear that education and prevention programs targeted at athletes have not decreased their rate of binge drinking (Thombs & Hamilton 2002; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, et al., 2002), which indicates that a new approach to reduce binge drinking by college athletes is necessary. Recent research has shown stronger support from students for stricter and more consistent enforcement of alcohol policies (DeJong et al. 2007) as well as an increase in implementation of disciplinary actions (Wechsler, Lee, Nelson, et al., 2002). These indicators suggest stronger policies and consistent enforcement of sanctions could have an effect on the recidivism rates of athletes. Athletic coaches have direct access to, and influence over, student-athletes. Their involvement in the campus disciplinary process would send a strong and clear message to athletes about campus and athletic program policies regarding alcohol use. In addition, coach involvement in alcohol-related discipline could have a restricting effect on athletes' binge drinking, particularly during the playing season.

Interpretation of Research Literature

A lack of research studies exist that document athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process and judicial affairs administrators' perceptions regarding athletic
coach involvement in the discipline domain. However, much research has been conducted regarding the associated issues of binge drinking and campus discipline. The following themes emerged from this related research: (a) identification of student-athletes as a high-risk group for binge drinking, (b) usefulness of social and ecological theories to explain binge drinking by athletes, (c) relationship between binge drinking and negative behaviors leading to disciplinary outcomes, (d) secondhand effects of binge drinking, (e) ineffectiveness of education and prevention efforts, (f) weakness of alcohol policies and inconsistent use of sanctions as a deterrent for alcohol-related misconduct, and (g) recommendation for collaboration among institutional departments to address binge drinking and negative outcomes.

**Athletes: A High-Risk Group for Binge Drinking**

The 2002 study conducted by Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, et al. is pivotal research that compared findings of eight years of data pertaining to the alcohol consumption behaviors and attitudes of college students. The large samples studied provide comprehensive information on the issue plus opportunities to study subgroups such as athletes. The most salient points of this research emphasized that binge drinking rates have not changed over time, the rate of binge drinking among athletes continues to be higher than nonathletes, and education and prevention efforts have failed to make an impact on the binge drinking rates of athletes (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, et al.).

**Perceived Norms and Social Ecology Perspectives**

The Perceived Norms Model (PNM) is a useful approach for beginning to understand why college students drink. It has also been used as a model to explain the drinking habits of college student-athletes (Thombs, 2000). The PNM maintains that
college students tend to overestimate or inflate the drinking occurring on their campus. As a result, students feel pressure to increase their alcohol consumption to fit in with the perceived standard (Perkins, et al. 1999; Thombs). More research needs to be conducted, but the PNM has proven useful for understanding the psychology of why student-athletes binge drink. The PNM is simple to understand since peer pressure is a common motivator for other deviant behavior (Perkins, et al.). It works well to explain drinking behavior in a college setting where rumors, gossip, and campus folklore can easily escalate and “inflate a student’s sense of what is normal or typical behavior among peers” (Perkins, et al., 1999, p. 253). Athletes utilize perceived norms with regard to both their teammates and the student population in general. They not only perceive their typical teammates’ drinking to be higher than their own but also perceive that the typical student drinks more than their average teammate (Thombs). When looking through the perceived norms lens, it is easy to comprehend why athletes continue to be a high-risk group for binge drinking and why athletic coaches with their influence over athletes could have a profound effect on the binge drinking rates of athletes and related negative outcomes.

The PNM also integrates well with the social factors that are associated with binge drinking among athletes. The social proclivity of athletes places them in the mainstream of campus. Athletes are often in a prime position to hear the alcohol-related stories and gossip of their peers. This may lead to a warped or misguided perception of reality regarding drinking behavior. In addition, athletes on some campuses may have higher levels of alcohol use and at the same time may be more visible due to their status; thus, their behavior could distort the perceptions of other students (Perkins et al., 1999).
Binge Drinking, Negative Behavior, and Disciplinary Outcomes

Some researchers initially assumed the rate of binge drinking among college athletes would be lower than the rate of binge drinking in the overall college student population because of the rigorous training demands and expectations for athletes to be in top physical condition (Straus & Bacon, 1953). On the contrary, research indicated that athletes not only consume more alcohol than nonathletes, but they participate in binge drinking at higher rates, engage in more alcohol-related harms and risk behaviors, and experience more negative consequences from alcohol use than nonathletes (Hildebrand et al., 2001; Leichliter, et al., 1998, Nelson & Wechsler, 2001). The alcohol-related harms and risk behaviors associated with an athlete’s binge drinking include getting into trouble with police; arguing with friends; damaging property; and getting hurt or injured. Many of these harms and behaviors lead to various disciplinary outcomes (Wechsler, Lee, Kao, et. al., 2002). Although not implicitly stated in many studies, the disciplinary outcomes associated with binge drinking result from student behaviors that lead to campus policy violations. Since the rate of binge drinking and negative outcomes among athletes is higher, these students might also face more disciplinary outcomes. To determine the effects of disciplinary sanctions on athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct, it may be necessary to gather the opinions of both judicial affairs administrators and coaches regarding these issues.

Because athletes binge drink more than nonathletes (Leichliter, et al., 1998; Nelson & Wechsler, 2001), it stands to reason that they experience the negative effects of binge drinking firsthand. In addition, they may also be more frequently involved in creating the secondhand effects that other students experience. A new approach to
discipline is warranted, particularly when education and prevention efforts have not reduced the binge drinking rate of college athletes and because athletes’ behavior is inconveniencing and harming other students. Implementing stronger policies and consistently enforcing sanctions may help reduce recidivism rates of athletes. In recent years, students have shown support for stronger alcohol policies (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, et al., 2002) especially with regard to alcohol-related violence and repeat offenders of college alcohol policies (DeJong et al., 2007). There also seemed to be some merit in adopting a more formalized campus judicial system in order to reduce recidivism (Fitch & Murray, 2001). In light of athletes’ rates of binge drinking and related harms, additional research exploring the relationship between disciplinary sanctions and recidivism rates of athletes may prove informative. The perceptions of athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators regarding this issue could prove to be especially informative.

Much of the literature tended to focus on peer norms regarding usage of alcohol by students, but Thombs (2000) and Wechsler (1996) asserted that institutions must also be consistent and strong in adopting and enforcing alcohol policies. The messages about alcohol use on campus are not only reinforced by students, but also by administrators and other authorities setting and implementing campus policies. This suggests a top-down approach may be necessary to address alcohol-related misbehavior. Wechsler recommended including campus personnel at all levels and encouraging strict enforcement of school policies. Because of their unique relationship with student-athletes, coaches may very well be key players in developing a new approach to dealing with athlete binge drinking.
Call for Collaboration

A number of research articles called for collaboration between offices and departments on campus as a response to binge drinking and related harms (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001; Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Grossman, & Zanakos, 1997; Williams et al., 2006). Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Grossman et al. indicated “few college alcohol education and prevention programs make use of coaches and athletic directors” (p. 200). This signifies there might be some merit to involving coaches in the disciplinary process of athletes adjudicated for alcohol-related misconduct. Within the framework of the social ecology model, there are numerous ways for athletic department staff to shape the alcohol consumption habits and related negative behaviors of athletes. Coaches’ rules often act as a deterrent to negative behavior (Bower & Martin, 1999), so it is only natural that researchers advocate their use in “creating and enforcing year-long team and departmental policies regarding alcohol use and misuse” (Williams, et al., 2006, p. 234). They also advise that health educators serve as a resource to athletic staff, implying that coaches may be involved in helping athletes with alcohol-related issues or concerns on a more personal level. As a result of publicity surrounding the 2006 Duke lacrosse case, “coaches across the country are implementing preventive law programming for athletes” (Association of Student Judicial Affairs Law and Policy Report, 2006, Policy Implications, ¶1). This provides a prime opportunity for collaboration between coaches and judicial affairs administrators. Collaborative programming interventions could potentially have positive effects on athletes’ behavior, thus reducing future incidents of alcohol-related misconduct. Research needs to be conducted to gauge athletic coaches’
and judicial administrators’ perceptions of coach involvement in the judicial process as well as readiness for change.

Very little, if any, empirical data exists regarding athletic coaches’ response to policy violations of athletes that occur off the field. Many real-life examples can be found in the media, but research studies regarding the responsibility and response of the coach are severely lacking. Some information can be found in coaching magazines and literature, but the information tends to be based on assumption and opinion, rather than research or fact. Data gleaned from a mixed-methods study of athletic coach and judicial affairs administrator perceptions regarding the involvement of athletic coaches in the judicial process could help fill the void in research and perhaps provide both empirical and practical evidence for future interventions regarding athletes’ involvement in alcohol-related misconduct.

Conclusion

History clearly shows a relationship between alcohol and negative student behavior (Dannells, 1997; Fitch & Murry, 2001). Binge drinking has reached an all-time high on college campuses today with athletes consistently identified as a high-risk group for binge drinking (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001). Social factors, perceived norms, and social ecology theory all help explain why student-athletes participate in binge drinking. However, education and prevention efforts have failed to make an impact on reducing binge drinking among athletes, even with targeted efforts. The negative harms and disciplinary outcomes associated with binge drinking by athletes continue to be concerns not only for athletes, but also for those students who do not engage in binge drinking yet experience the unwanted secondhand effects. Alcohol policies on many campuses are
weak at best, and enforcement has been lacking or inconsistent. Students are showing increasing support for stricter alcohol policies and enforcement of those policies (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, et. al. 2002; DeJong et al. 2007), and the time is ripe for change. With athletes under continuous scrutiny for their high rates of binge drinking, which lead to misconduct and policy violations, administrators should be looking at alternative disciplinary approaches to decrease this behavior. Stricter policy enforcement and collaboration between judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches are two approaches that warrant further investigation.

Research Question

The purpose of this study is to explore the feasibility of athletic coach participation in the campus judicial process as a potential means to reduce athlete involvement in alcohol-related misconduct. The study attempts to answer the following overarching research question:

*What do athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators identify as the current and desirable role, if any, of coaches in the judicial process as a means to help reduce athletes' future involvement in alcohol-related incidents?*
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

High rates of binge drinking among college athletes are particularly troubling to campus administrators because binge drinking results in greater harms and increased disciplinary outcomes for athletes and because others in the campus community often experience secondhand effects as a result of athletes’ binge drinking. Since previous approaches to curb binge drinking among athletes have not produced the desired effects, new approaches to address this issue should be introduced. Coaches earn a great deal of respect and loyalty from their athletes, which results in their ability to have an impact on the behaviors and actions of their players (Anshel, 1991). The level of trust in the coach-athlete relationship makes athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process a viable approach to reduce the binge drinking rates of athletes and the associated harms and disciplinary outcomes that they experience. The research question this study attempted to answer was: What do athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators identify as the current and desirable role, if any, of coaches in the judicial process as a means to help reduce athletes’ future involvement in alcohol-related incidents? This question guided the study at all levels from survey construction, to data collection and analysis, and finally to verification of the results of the study.

This chapter focuses on the methods the researcher used to ascertain the perceptions and attitudes of athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators regarding coach involvement in the campus judicial process. A mixed-methods approach utilizing a focus group, telephone interviews, and an electronic survey instrument was employed. A
focus group comprised of five athletic coaches and telephone interviews with four judicial affairs administrators was used to help identify and narrow questions to be included on the survey instrument. A Web survey was conducted with participants due to their scattered locations across the State of New York as well as for ease and timeliness of data collection.

Research Context and Participants

The study identified athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators' perceptions of coach involvement in the campus judicial process. Participants included members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), specifically Division III athletic coaches of men's and women's basketball, softball, and baseball, in the State of New York, and chief judicial affairs officers at Division III institutions in the State of New York.

The NCAA is "a voluntary governing organization through which the nation's colleges and universities govern their athletic programs" (National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA], n.d., ¶1). The NCAA includes institutions, conferences, organizations, and individuals and strives to develop the education and athletic participation of student-athletes (NCAA, n.d.). The NCAA is comprised of several divisions: Division I, Division II, and Division III. In addition, Division I schools with football programs are further categorized into the Football Bowl Subdivision (formerly Division I-A) and the NCAA Football Championship Division (formerly Division I-AA). While many Division III institutions can be classified as small schools, membership in a certain Division is not based on a set of specific institutional criteria. Rather, each Division has its own philosophy and guiding principles. Division III focuses on the
holistic development of students and the integration of academics and athletics. Division III athletes do not receive any financial aid based on their level of athletic ability, and athletic departments at Division III institutions are staffed and financially supported like other departments in the college or university (NCAA, 2007).

Judicial affairs administrators are dedicated to the development of the student conduct process in the collegiate environment. They oversee the student judicial process on college campuses and are responsible for the oversight and administration of campus policy violations, which include violations of college alcohol policies.

There are 63 NCAA Division III institutions in New York State, represented by approximately 214 athletic coaches of men's and women's basketball, softball, and baseball teams. Each institution has only one chief judicial officer; therefore, there are approximately 63 chief judicial officers at Division III institutions in the State of New York. The researcher surveyed all members of the population. The researcher was unable to identify a small number of the email addresses for coaches and judicial administrators, and some of the emails were not deliverable or bounced back for various reasons. A total of 260 participants were sent invitations to participate in the study, which included 204 athletic coaches and 56 judicial affairs administrators. Participation in the study was voluntary and no monetary reimbursement was provided. However, an incentive to participate was included in order to encourage participation. Each individual who returned a completed survey was given the opportunity to enter a drawing for a chance to win a $100.00 gift card.
Instruments and Procedures Used

No standard survey instrument existed for measuring the perceptions of athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators regarding athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process. Therefore, the researcher had to create a survey instrument. The main source of data collection was a Likert scale Web survey instrument. However, before the survey was created, the overlying constructs that would serve as the basis for the survey needed to be identified. Those elements were then used to design the individual survey items. To aid in this process, the researcher conducted a focus group with athletic coaches and telephone interviews with judicial affairs administrators to elicit specific information.

Focus Group

Due to the exploratory nature of the research topic, a focus group was a suitable method for gathering information (Dean, 1994). Conducting a focus group helped the researcher identify appropriate and necessary items for the survey instrument and assisted with establishing the validity of the instrument. Participant responses helped the researcher determine if the survey items were actually asking what the researcher wanted them to and would result in the required information.

The researcher solicited participants for the focus group from the Athletic Department at Keuka College. Keuka College is a Division III institution in the Finger Lakes Region of New York State and the athletic coaches closely aligned with the population under study. Participants included male and female coaches with varying levels of experience, representing a range of sports. This varied representation provided a
wide scope of responses and input to the focus group data. The researcher recruited five athletic coaches to participate in the focus group.

Athletic coaches at Keuka College were sent an email from the researcher asking them to consider participating in the focus group. Coaches who agreed to participate in the focus group received a thank-you email from the researcher approximately two days later. The researcher then scheduled the actual focus group and arranged a date, time, and location for the meeting. This process took approximately one week to finalize. Once the schedule was confirmed, the researcher sent an email to the focus group participants thanking them for their participation; explaining the focus group process; and outlining the date, location, and time of the focus group. The focus group was completed on December 9, 2008.

The focus group was held in a classroom in the Keuka College Athletic Department. This location was accessible to participants and allowed coaches the freedom to speak candidly. The researcher served as the moderator of the focus group. The researcher developed a set of focus group protocols for use with the focus group (see Appendix A). The focus group protocols centered on: (a) coaches’ current experience with involvement in the campus judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct, (b) coaches’ vision of how they would like to be involved in the campus judicial process, (c) the practicality of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process, including benefits and limitations of involvement, (d) personal opinions of coaches regarding their involvement in the campus judicial process, and (e) other pertinent comments. Each of the focus group participants was asked to sign an informed consent document prior to the start of the focus group. The researcher also
provided light refreshments for participants throughout the focus group process. Once the focus group was completed, the researcher evaluated the data collected through the process of content analysis outlined by Maykut and Morehouse (1994).

Data analysis consisted of pulling out comments made in the focus group and then collapsing those comments into relevant themes. Results of the content analysis assisted the researcher with creating appropriate questions for the survey instrument. The researcher also engaged in member checking by having the focus-group participants review their comments after the focus group was completed and the data had been transcribed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Member checking is a technique used to increase the rigor of qualitative research. It allows participants the opportunity to reflect on the “accuracy and credibility of the account” (Creswell, 2007, p. 208). The focus-group participants were not part of the final group of New York coaches who were surveyed for the study.

Telephone Interviews

In addition to a focus group with athletic coaches, it was important to include the perspective of judicial affairs administrators in creating the questions to be included in the survey instrument. To accomplish this goal, the researcher conducted four, one-to-one, semi-structured, telephone interviews with judicial affairs administrators. The judicial affairs administrators’ responses to the interview questions helped the researcher identify pertinent and relevant questions to include on the Web survey instrument.

The researcher conducted individual telephone interviews rather than a focus group with judicial affairs administrators due to the limited availability of judicial affairs administrators in New York State. Conducting a focus group with judicial affairs
administrators from New York would have restricted the population the researcher could potentially survey. Therefore, the researcher conducted telephone interviews with judicial affairs administrators outside the State of New York.

The researcher solicited participants for the telephone interviews through her professional contacts in the field of judicial affairs in the states of Georgia, Florida, and Virginia. The representation of judicial affairs administrators from several states and types of institutions provided a variety of responses and input, which were useful for creating individual survey items. The researcher followed up with emails and telephone calls to the identified individuals to solicit their participation in the interview process.

The interview process consisted of four phases: (a) identifying potential interviewees, (b) contacting potential interviewees, (c) following up with interested individuals, and (d) conducting telephone interviews. During the first phase, the researcher identified potential interviewees through conversations with colleagues and contacts and began collecting email and telephone information for the individuals identified. The colleagues and contacts notified the potential interview participants that the researcher would be soliciting their participation in the study.

Phase two consisted of contacting the potential interview participants to seek their participation. The researcher contacted the identified individuals by email and provided a brief introduction of her background and experience. The email identified the research topic and its relevance to the field of judicial affairs, how the judicial affairs administrators could be of assistance to the researcher, and the amount of time required for participation. The email also contained a request to respond back to the administrator within a specified period if the individual was willing to participate in the interview.
Phase three of the interview process consisted of follow-up telephone calls and emails to those individuals who indicated an interest in participating in the interview process. The researcher contacted those individuals to thank them for their participation, coordinated a date and time to conduct the telephone interview, and explained the interview process. Once the interviews were scheduled, the researcher followed up with each participant via email to confirm the date and time of their interview and to have each participant complete an informed consent form. Participants were instructed to fax the signed informed consent form to the researcher prior to the scheduled interview.

The last phase of the interview process consisted of the actual telephone interviews, which took place between December 17, 2008 and February 4, 2009. The protocol for the telephone interviews consisted of written directions for conducting the interview and a set of pre-determined questions that the researcher asked each participant (Patten, 2007). The interview questions centered on: (a) judicial affairs administrators’ experiences with involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, (b) the benefits of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, (c) the limitations of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, (d) the practicality of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, and (e) judicial affairs administrators’ opinions regarding the future involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process. The telephone interview protocols are outlined in Appendix B.

The researcher conducted four telephone interviews with judicial affairs administrators. After the interviews were completed, the researcher personally transcribed and organized the information from each of the interviews. The researcher then evaluated all data through the process of content analysis as outlined by Maykut and
Morehouse (1994). The researcher followed the same process for content analysis that was used with the focus group data. The researcher also had telephone-interview participants verify the comments made in their interviews after the data had been transcribed as a way to add credibility to the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These findings helped inform the creation of individual items and sets of items for the Web survey instrument.

**Survey Instrument**

The researcher began creating individual survey items prior to administering the focus group and telephone interviews. However, survey construction was not finalized until after the focus group and telephone interviews had been completed, the data had been analyzed, and the information from the focus group and telephone interviews was incorporated into the instrument. One survey instrument was constructed for use by both athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators. Survey items were based on a Likert scale with a few open-ended questions included. The researcher used the following information to inform the creation of the survey items: (a) results of the content analysis from the focus group and telephone interviews, (b) judicial procedure sections of student handbooks from several Division III institutions, and (c) relevant literature pertaining to alcohol-related interventions with athletes and the collegiate judicial process regarding alcohol-related incidents.

The researcher structured the individual survey questions around the themes identified from the focus group and telephone interviews (see Appendix C). Some open-ended questions were included to provide additional information and clarification. Participants also provided demographic data regarding both personal and institutional
characteristics so that comparisons could be made among those traits. The researcher included five demographic items on the survey.

*Pilot testing.* Once the individual survey items were identified and placed into a logical order, the researcher conducted a pilot test of the instrument as a way to confirm content validity, to help identify additional potential questions, and to refine and adjust the instrument (Creswell, 2003). Sixteen individuals were involved in the pilot study. Pilot-study participants were athletic coaches of various sports at a Division III institution in the Southeast and judicial affairs administrators from a variety of institutions in Georgia, Florida, and New York. Pilot-study respondents were invited to participate in the pilot study via an initial email message or a follow-up telephone call from the researcher. Each individual was asked to complete and return the survey instrument and an instrument evaluation form to the researcher within a specified period. The researcher used the feedback from the evaluation forms to make final revisions to the survey directions, items, and overall construction (Creswell, 2003).

*Expert panel review.* Concurrently with the pilot test, the researcher solicited an expert panel of outside reviewers to evaluate the survey instrument for face validity. Two chief judicial affairs administrators, each with over 15 years of experience in student affairs and several years experience in judicial affairs, were identified based on their education and professional expertise. Two athletic directors, each with over 15 years of experience, were identified based on their education and professional expertise in the field of collegiate athletic coaching. The researcher contacted the experts via email and asked them to participate in the review. All individuals who were asked to assist agreed to serve as expert reviewers. The survey was sent to each participant through a personal
email, which included a link to the Web survey and a list of items to review. Comments were returned to the researcher via email within a specified period. The researcher then adjusted the survey based on the feedback provided by the expert reviewers.

Survey Administration

The researcher used a Web survey as the method of distribution. A Web survey instrument was ideal for survey distribution since participants were located throughout New York State. This method provided a reliable, economical, and timely way to reach participants and served to ensure participant anonymity. The researcher created a database of NCAA Division III head athletic coaches of baseball, softball, and men’s and women’s basketball in New York State from contact information obtained through the NCAA website and Web links to Division III institutions in New York State. The researcher created a separate database of chief judicial affairs administrators at Division III institutions in New York State through an Internet search of Division III institutions in New York State. When information was not clear or could not be found on a Web site, contact information for judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches was verified by a telephone call to the specific Division III institution.

To increase the response rate of participants, the researcher followed the multiple contact protocol outlined by Dillman (2007) regarding Internet and Web surveys. Dillman’s guidelines suggested: (a) sending a brief pre-notice email to the sample, (b) sending the actual instrument through an individual email message that contains an active link to the survey (c) sending an email reminder with a link to the survey, and (d) sending a final contact with an additional email reminder to nonrespondents.
The researcher launched the survey on April 22, 2009. Two days prior to the survey launch, the researcher sent a pre-notice email to participants informing them of the upcoming survey and encouraging their participation. The pre-notice email to judicial affairs administrators was sent directly from the researcher, while the NCAA Division III coaches received a pre-notice email from an established athletic director in New York State. On the day of the survey launch, participants received an email from the researcher via surveymonkey.com. The main text of the email contained the cover letter information, including saliency of the study and encouragement to respond, and invited participants to click on an active link that took them to the survey. The email also included an incentive for individuals to participate. Participants who completed the survey were given the opportunity to enter a drawing for a $100 gift card provided by the researcher.

Prior to clicking the active link, participants were informed that entering the survey meant they agreed to participate in the study, thus addressing informed consent. The participants were also told that if they did not wish to participate in the survey, they could opt out by clicking out of the page. A copy of the final, on-line survey is included in Appendix D. The survey remained open for 15 days: from April 22 through May 6, 2009. This maximized the time for participants to respond and allowed those individuals who might have been out of the office when the survey launched to complete the survey when they returned. Reminder emails were sent out four times to participants who had not yet responded. Reminders were spaced approximately four days apart and were used as a mechanism to encourage participation and increase the response rate. The final survey reminder was sent out on the day the survey closed. The survey closed at
5:00 p.m. (Eastern Standard Time) on May 6, 2009. At the close of the survey, all links listed in the emails sent to judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches were deactivated, so no late responses could be accepted. After the survey closed, the survey responses were downloaded from surveymonkey.com and entered into SPSS version 16.0 for data analysis.

The researcher checked responses to the survey on a daily basis and kept track of response rates by pulling reports from surveymonkey.com. This allowed the researcher to determine the need for additional reminders or follow-up. The researcher elected to include one more reminder than initially planned, which yielded ten more responses.

**Data Analysis**

The researcher used a four-stage approach to data analysis by evaluating data according to its chronological order in the data collection process. The four stages included: (a) content analysis of information obtained from the focus group and telephone interviews, (b) descriptive analysis of Likert survey items, (c) use of inferential statistics to analyze the survey data and make comparisons between variables, and (d) content analysis of responses from open-ended questions.

**Analysis of Focus Group and Telephone Interviews**

The initial phase of data analysis concentrated on the analysis of information obtained from the focus group held with Keuka College athletic coaches and the telephone interviews with judicial affairs administrators. The researcher began to organize the data by transcribing the data from the tapes of the focus group and the telephone interviews. The researcher reviewed the transcripts several times and used techniques such as writing notes in the margins (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and
highlighting important concepts and specific parts of the text (Wolcott, 1994) in order to arrange and manage the information.

Once the information was organized, the researcher began the formal analysis process. Analysis involved reducing the data through identification of themes, patterns, concerns, and repeated responses of focus group participants. This was done through the process of coding, which assigned names to the reduced segments of data (Creswell, 2007). Once the data were reduced and coded, the researcher created broader categories by combining several themes or codes into one category. The researcher used the model suggested by Maykut and Morehouse (1994) to separate the coded information into overarching themes. This information was useful to help suggest potential items for the survey instrument. Finally, the researcher created a visual display of the data from the focus group and telephone interviews. The display was in the form of a table, which identified the main themes and their connection to specific items or groups of items on the survey (see Appendix C).

Analysis of Survey Data

The first part of the analysis of survey data focused on the population response. The researcher reported information in relation to the members of the population who completed the survey and those who did not. The researcher also provided a comparison of the total response rate to that of different categories of respondents as identified in the demographic segments of the survey (for example, gender and profession). A table including frequency and percentages for the demographic items was included.

Secondly, the researcher discussed the process for sending reminders to participants and determining response bias for the survey. Response bias is the effect of
non-responses on survey estimates (Creswell, 2003). If non-response to a survey is high, the researcher cannot be certain how the non-respondents would have answered, which, in turn, leads to an unknown level of bias (Light, Singer, & Willett, 1990). The researcher checked for non-response bias by conducting a wave analysis, which evaluated responses to select items at different points to determine if average responses changed. There was no indication of a change in responses at any point, so the potential for response bias was eliminated.

The researcher used descriptive statistics to analyze the data and report the findings. "Descriptive statistics is a method of summarizing data so they can be easily comprehended" (Patten, 2007, p. 103). The researcher computed cross tabs to provide frequency and percentage data regarding the responses of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches to each individual item on the survey. Tables were included to provide a visual representation of the data.

Inferential statistics were used to determine the significance of judicial affairs administrators’ and athletic coaches’ responses to individual survey items. An independent samples t test was conducted on each survey item in order to compare the responses of both groups. Because many hypothesis tests were conducted in the survey data, the researcher elected to adjust the alpha level to .01 to control for Type I error.

Analysis of Open-Ended Questions

The researcher used the process of content analysis to analyze the data contained in the responses to the open-ended items on the questionnaire. The researcher followed the same content analysis procedure used to analyze the data from the focus group. The process consisted of: (a) collecting and organizing responses, (b) reducing data to identify
themes and categories, (c) coding data by naming meaningful segments, and (d) combining codes into broader categories and themes. In addition, responses to the open-ended questions provided rich, detailed information that allowed the researcher to add emphasis and clarification throughout the results and discussion sections of the study.

Summary

This chapter outlined the research design and methodology for the study. It summarized the details of the participants who were involved, the methods used to develop the instrument, the type of instruments used, the procedures that were applied, and the statistical analyses used.

The researcher used a mixed-methods approach to research that involved a focus group, telephone interviews, a Web survey comprised mostly of Likert scale items, and some open-ended questions. The focus group and telephone interviews were used to identify potential items for the survey instrument. Focus-group participants included male and female athletic coaches from Keuka College who represented varying levels of experience and a variety of sports. Interview participants included four judicial affairs administrators from various institutions outside New York State. In addition, the entire population of chief judicial affairs officers at Division III institutions in New York State, and the entire population of athletic coaches of men’s and women’s basketball, softball, and baseball at NCAA Division III institutions in New York State were surveyed through use of a Web survey instrument. The instrument was designed to identify the perceptions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches regarding coach involvement in the judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct. The survey was pilot tested with Division III athletic coaches at an institution in the Southeast and judicial
affairs administrators from institutions in Georgia, Florida, and New York. An expert panel of seasoned judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches also reviewed the survey.

Data from the focus group and telephone interviews were analyzed through the process of content analysis. Information obtained from the survey instrument was evaluated using descriptive and inferential statistics. The open-ended items from the questionnaire were analyzed using a process similar to the content analysis procedure used for the focus group and telephone interviews. The goal of the study was to gather information from judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches regarding their perceptions and attitudes toward the involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process.
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the results of data collected from athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators regarding their perceptions of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process as a means to reduce future alcohol-related policy violations of student-athletes. The topics covered in this chapter include: (a) descriptive statistics and qualitative results of the focus group and telephone interview data and (b) descriptive and inferential statistics and qualitative results based on the responses of the Web-survey participants. The research question that guided the study was:

What do athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators identify as the current and desirable role, if any, of coaches in the judicial process as a means to help reduce athletes’ future involvement in alcohol-related incidents?

Description of Focus Group Participants

To begin to answer this question, the researcher conducted a focus group with five coaches from a Division III athletic program at a small college in the Northeast. The focus group was held on December 9, 2008. The coaches who participated represented a variety of sports, with all but one coach overseeing responsibility for two intercollegiate athletic teams each. The focus group lasted just short of two hours. Both male and female coaches were represented in the focus group. The gender and sport representation of coaches is listed in Table 4.1. The focus group was used to help inform the creation of individual items and groups of items on the Web-survey instrument. The focus group protocols used to guide the discussion are outlined in Appendix A.
Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Synchronized Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Men’s Lacrosse/Men’s &amp; Women’s Cross Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Women’s Soccer/Women’s Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Men’s Soccer/Men’s &amp; Women’s Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Women’s Volleyball/Women’s Lacrosse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus Group Themes

Key themes that emerged from the focus group discussion among these athletic coaches included expectations of athletes, role of coaches in the judicial process, and coach response to alcohol violations. The theme expectations of athletes centered on the expectations coaches have of their players with regard to college alcohol policies and compliance with team and athletic department rules about the use of alcohol. This theme also focused on the responsibility of athletes to serve as positive role models for other students. The theme role of coaches in the judicial process encompassed the opinions of athletic coaches about their perceived function and responsibility in the campus judicial process. The theme coach response to alcohol violations included the ways that coaches respond when they find out one of their student-athletes has been involved in an alcohol-policy violation. This theme also centered on coaches’ decisions to remove student-athletes from the team due to alcohol-related policy violations.
Expectations of Athletes

Coaches varied in the expectations they placed on their athletes with regard to behavior and alcohol consumption, with the largest discrepancies occurring between coaches of opposite genders. Female athletic coaches cited rules set as a team, with specific consequences for alcohol violations, while male athletic coaches appeared to favor flexibility in their expectations and approach to alcohol violations. One female athletic coach indicated:

We set it up on the first day before we even step on the court to play. We set it up as an expectation, because we believe that we’re being judged, we’re set at a higher standard, and there’s a lot more to lose.

At the other end of the spectrum, one of the male athletic coaches specified, “I don’t think we can have one solid rule. That takes kind of the decision-making away from us. Kind of the flexibility away from us.”

Coaches also felt that student-athletes had a commitment to uphold the policies and rules of the college, including alcohol and drug policies, and felt it was important to impose team rules and expectations surrounding those issues. One coach indicated “the contract they sign at the beginning of the year…says that this…is an academic-year commitment that you’re making, and one of those has to do with alcohol and drugs.” Another coach said, “I think in terms of team rules…we should still have our own team policies…team expectations.” These comments reinforced the need to explore athletic coach expectations of athletes in the Web-survey instrument. Questions 7A and 7B on the survey were specifically designed to address that issue (see Appendices C and D).
Athletic Coach Role in Judicial Process

The theme role of coaches in the judicial process captured coaches’ perceptions of their function in the formal campus discipline process. Coaches in this focus group indicated they were not involved in the campus discipline process; however, they still perceived they had a role in disciplining athletes involved in campus alcohol policy violations. Two things that stood out from the conversation were: (a) athletic coaches viewed their role as that of an educator and (b) coaches felt they had a responsibility to help athletes learn the concept of responsibility. There was much agreement and a variety of comments on the topic. One coach commented, “I think one of the roles we play as coaches is educating them….Having conversations and talking with them about….legitimate expectations, and….what’s going to happen to you when you get into the adult world.” There was a sense among the coaches that part of their job is teaching student-athletes how to make good choices and preparing them for life after college. Another coach spoke about the concept of responsibility, saying, “I think that the relationship we have with our players, and helping them…understand the importance of being responsible…is the most important thing.” The focus of athletic coaches on their role in teaching responsibility prompted the researcher to include several groups of questions on the survey about coaches’ ability to effect athlete behavior, and the current and preferred role of athletic coaches in the discipline of athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct. Questions 10A-D and 16A-E examined the coaches’ ability to effect behavior, while questions 14A-D, 15A-E, 17A-E, and 18A-G looked at the current and preferred role of athletic coaches in the discipline process.
Coach Response to Alcohol Violations

The third theme that came up regularly throughout the focus group was the response of coaches when they found out student-athletes were involved in alcohol-related policy violations. Coaches’ responses in this area were similar to how they set expectations with the team regarding alcohol use. The female coaches tended to respond with a one-size-fits-all, blanket policy, implemented for the entire team such as, “I’m very strict with it. I have a two-strike policy in a semester, or a year...and a matter of fact I even had so many, they were all partying together, I even had to forfeit a game.” The male athletic coaches, on the other hand, preferred to handle situations on a case-by-case basis as situations arose. One male athletic coach said it this way:

It’s one of those things where, you know, in frustration I say to myself, alright. I could walk in here ...and say, ‘The next guy that gets an alcohol ticket or write-up is done.’ The problem that I run into with that is that there’s a lot of scenarios that can happen with that...but if I say that, I have to do it.

Male coaches stated that they took the history of the athlete and circumstances of the situation into consideration, while female coaches outlined how they took a more strict and unyielding approach.

Some of the coaches also discussed the decisions they had to make about keeping or removing players from teams due to their involvement in alcohol-related policy violations. To illustrate the point, one coach stated:

I had 18 different opportunities to kick...off the team, and to be quite honest...I didn’t do it ‘cuz I thought it would be better to have him around and talk to him a
bit...it was better for him and the program in the long run to keep him. Now he's a prosecutor and lives in Syracuse.

An additional response imposed by some coaches when athletes were involved in alcohol-related misconduct included implementing additional exercise regimens for the individual involved and sometimes for the entire team. Other coaches went as far as contacting parents, particularly in extreme cases where the behavior of the athlete was not improving or was increasing in intensity.

Overall, coaches seemed to have an honest sense of concern for their student-athletes. They worried that if an athlete became disconnected from his or her coach and the team because of the outcome of an alcohol-related policy violation, the athlete might struggle or end up leaving the institution. Based on the focus group discussion on athletic coach response to alcohol violations, the researcher included question 16B on the survey, which addresses the responsibility of coaches when they find out student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related policy violations. The researcher also included two sets of questions about the actual measures taken by the coach when an athlete is found responsible for alcohol-related misconduct. Questions 11A-F and 12A-F were designed to focus on the ways athletic coaches respond to the alcohol-related policy violations of their athletes (see Appendices C and D).

As a result of the focus group discussion, several important themes were identified including: (a) expectations of athletes, (b) role of coaches in the judicial process, and (c) coach response to alcohol violations. Each of the themes was used to create either an individual survey item or a group of questions relative to the specific constructs identified (see Appendix C).
Description of Telephone Interview Participants

The researcher also conducted individual telephone interviews with four judicial affairs administrators at institutions outside New York State. The interviews took place between December 17, 2008 and February 4, 2009. Telephone-interview participants had varied levels of experience as conduct officers and represented a variety of institutions. Both male and female judicial affairs administrators were included in the telephone interview sample. Demographic information, including years of experience, gender, type of institution, and division standing of judicial administrators, is presented in Table 4.2. Each telephone interview lasted approximately one-half hour. The protocols used to guide the telephone interviews are outlined in Appendix B.

Table 4.2

Gender, Years Experience, Type of Institution, and Division Standing Represented by Judicial Affairs Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Division standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>NCAA Division I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>NAIA Division III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>NCAA Division II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>NAIA Division III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NCAA = National Collegiate Athletic Association; NAIA = National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics.

Telephone Interview Themes

Important themes that developed from the telephone interviews with judicial affairs administrators included the role of coaches in the judicial process, limitations of
coach participation, benefits of coach participation, expectations of athletes, coach involvement in the judicial process, and athlete vs. nonathlete discipline. Information obtained from the telephone interviews was used to inform the creation of individual items and groups of questions on the Web survey instrument.

The theme role of coaches in the judicial process revolved around how and when it was appropriate for athletic coaches to be involved in the judicial process, how coaches could support the decisions of judicial affairs administrators, and how coaches could help prevent athlete involvement in alcohol-related incidents. The theme limitations of coach participation centered on judicial administrators' perceptions of how involving coaches in the judicial process might be construed as negative or limiting to the process. On the other hand, the theme benefits of coach participation focused on the positive outcomes of involving coaches in the campus judicial process such as reinforcing a positive image of the athletic program and supporting campus discipline messages.

The theme expectations of athletes in the telephone interviews focused on the role of student-athletes as leaders and role models and the responsibility of athletes to be held accountable for their actions. The theme coach involvement in the judicial process focused on the current level of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process, specifically, support of judicial decisions and actual examples of their involvement in the process. The final theme, athlete vs. nonathlete discipline, emphasized judicial affairs administrators' perceptions of treatment of athletes in the judicial process, specifically, fairness and equity in relation to nonathletes.
Role of Coaches in the Judicial Process

The most frequently cited theme in the telephone interviews was role of coaches in the judicial process. Most of the judicial affairs administrators felt athletic coaches should not be involved in the actual disciplinary process itself. They believed this might provide an opportunity for the coach to influence the process unduly. However, once a student-athlete had been found responsible, and a sanction had been imposed, judicial affairs administrators felt it was the duty of the coach to be supportive of that decision. One judicial affairs administrator said:

I think their involvement is fine, and I think...when it’s done correctly... it’s an ultimate benefit to the student to have their involvement, as long as that involvement is not intended to, or there isn’t an attempt to...circumvent the process.

Judicial affairs administrators also felt coaches could be helpful with the prevention of alcohol-related incidents and with encouraging athletes to follow through with sanctions if they were found responsible for an alcohol-related policy violation. One judicial affairs administrator indicated, “I think where they can be helpful... is both in prevention and follow through if an incident does occur.” Another administrator said:

I think that one of the best things athletic coaches and the athletic department could do, is to have a very, very close partnership with the student affairs side of the fence that works on these issues as well as the judicial issues.

Judicial affairs administrators also viewed coach involvement as a way to help the institution with the overarching goal of student success and as an opportunity to assist student-athletes with learning from their mistakes. One particular administrator viewed
athletic coach involvement in the judicial process as a campus responsibility and felt that
“coaches would fall into that, helping make it an educational and successful environment,
but an environment that you could possibly mess up and still be ok and learn from that.”

The role of coaches in the judicial process was a theme common to both the
telephone interviews and the focus group. As a result, the researcher included a series of
questions on the survey regarding this theme. Questions 10A-D covered coach power to
change athlete behavior, athletic coach sanctioning authority, how athletic coaches are
informed of student-athlete violations, and the concept of coaches and judicial affairs
administrators working closely together. Four sets of questions concerning the current
and desirable role of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process were also included as
a result of telephone interview comments. Questions 14A-D, 15A-E, 17A-E, and 18A-F
were constructed to examine the current and desirable role of coaches in the judicial
process (see Appendices C and D).

Benefits and Limitations

Themes regarding the benefits and limitations of athletic coach participation in
the campus judicial process also surfaced repeatedly in the telephone interviews. On the
benefit side, judicial affairs administrators felt athletic coach participation was an
advantage in terms of the image of athletes and the athletic department as a whole. One
judicial affairs administrator put it this way, “I think their involvement is a plus for the
image that we try to create for our athletic program. Not only are these people, again,
performing well academically…they’re also being good citizens and modeling
appropriate behavior.”
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Judicial affairs administrators also suggested that the benefits of coach participation included reinforcing the messages sent by student affairs with regard to campus discipline, as well as supporting athlete sanctions and treatment. An insightful administrator said, “If they’re hearing it not just from us, but from their coaches, from their faculty members, from the athletic administration, and from all parties involved, hopefully somewhere in there the message gets through.” Judicial affairs administrators also viewed coach participation as an opportunity to teach student-athletes the concept of responsibility. One judicial affairs administrator summarized it this way:

I think, in general, having coaches involved would be fantastic, because the whole point of the student judicial process is educational and to get students to take responsibility, to learn about…mistakes that they’ve made, and to take positive steps to not have it happen again, and to learn from it. And the coach is such a key person in their life, that if you can get the coach on board and involved in the process, it’s just going to help that transition and that learning experience significantly.

Lastly, judicial administrators also felt coaches could be a “crucial link in dealing with alcohol and other drug problems.”

Data obtained from the telephone interviews regarding benefits of coach involvement helped the researcher identify a series of questions focusing on potential benefits of coach involvement in the campus judicial process. Questions 16A-E focused on the perceptions of the coach’s ability to (a) deter future behavior, (b) reinforce campus alcohol policies, and (c) be a benefit to the overall process. Two questions, 19A and 19B,
were also created to look at the potential for collaboration between athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators (see Appendices C and D).

Judicial affairs administrators indicated a wide range of issues that could be perceived as limitations to coach participation in the campus judicial process. These included protection of student-athletes, not needing the opinions of coaches to make judicial decisions, persecution or special treatment of athletes, hindrance of untrained coaches, coaches with their own alcohol and drug issues, and coaches who do not buy into the process.

With regard to coaches’ protection of student-athletes, one judicial administrator indicated:

They view ‘em as theirs... a territorial thing, so I could see them trying to get over-involved and... provide a sense of protection. Well, I’m gonna protect you from going through the process and try to... get you special benefits or whatever.

Another judicial affairs administrator thought coaches should not be involved in the judicial process at all. That administrator said:

I think that... if a coach were to intervene, or try to intervene, and give his or her opinion on what should happen, I think that would be inappropriate. I think we need to be kept... as separate as possible.

Other limitations cited were that, if coaches were involved, athletes might be seen either as persecuted or receiving preferential treatment, that coaches who were untrained or uninformed about the campus judicial process might do more harm than good, and that coaches who had personal alcohol and drug problems of their own might not take their role seriously. One administrator indicated, “From an alcohol and other drug perspective,
if they have their own personal issues with it, they may not be able to be an appropriate advocate.” Coach involvement could also be limited by a lack of interest in the process. One telephone interviewee stated, “If you have a coach that doesn’t get it, doesn’t buy into the process, for whatever reasons has biased opinions, that can get in the way significantly.”

While the limitations of coach involvement suggested by judicial affairs administrators varied widely, they all served as relevant examples of potential pitfalls should a system ultimately be put in place to formalize coach involvement in the campus judicial process. The information obtained from the telephone interviews provided rich information to help form questions surrounding the limitations of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process. As a result, the researcher included questions about athletic coach ability to deter the future alcohol-related violations of athletes and the appearance of favoritism on the part of coaches with regard to judicial outcomes. Survey questions 16C, 17D, and 18E explore these topics (see Appendices C and D).

**Expectations of Athletes**

A theme that came up with regularity in the telephone interview process, just as it did in the focus group with coaches, was *expectations of athletes*. Judicial affairs administrators stated that they viewed athletes as leaders and role models on campus. One judicial administrator put it this way:

> I think that... they need to be held to... I don’t know if a higher standard would be the right word, but perhaps a different standard... when it comes to conduct issues... they’re examples and they’re leaders on campus, and we need to make sure that they are setting that good example.
Judicial affairs administrators felt that not only should individual athletes have specific expectations imposed by the coach, but that those expectations should also apply to the team as a whole. One example expressed by a judicial administrator was, “I mean, they have to hold their team accountable, too… I look at it you’re only as strong as your weakest link, so if somebody’s lettin’ the team down…then that whole team is being affected by that.” However, some judicial administrators felt that there was too much ambiguity on the part of coaches, with their expectations of players, and that consistent protocol regarding the usage of alcohol and violation of policies needed to be set. One judicial affairs administrator expressed her concern this way:

Each team is typically allowed to have their own set of standards in how they tell their student or their athletes what they expect of them, what their expectations are, and that standard could be different from what the athletic department policy is, which could be different from…the university policy…so it’s all really amorphous and not consistent and confusing and I think that creates a major problem for student-athletes.

While there was agreement among judicial affairs administrators that student-athletes serve as leaders and role models and that they represent their team, not all judicial administrators indicated the same level of discontent that one administrator expressed regarding the ambiguity of standards and expectations set by athletic departments and coaches. Questions 7A and 7B, concerning the expectations of athletes as role models and holding athletes to higher standards, were developed for the Web survey instrument as a result of feedback from the telephone interviews (see Appendices C and D).
Other Important Themes

Two other themes identified from the telephone interviews with judicial affairs administrators included coach involvement in the judicial process, and athlete vs. nonathlete discipline. Judicial administrators felt coaches were typically not involved enough in the process or were only involved after the athlete had been sanctioned. As far as the differences between athlete and nonathlete discipline, judicial affairs administrators did not perceive that a difference existed. All the administrators mentioned that every student, regardless of their affiliation with an athletic team or special club, is seen as just that, a student. Judicial administrators felt coaches might hold student-athletes to a higher standard, but that it was their duty, as judicial affairs administrators, to treat all students the same by engaging them in the process and holding them accountable. Judicial administrators also recognized that students, faculty, and staff often perceive student-athletes as role models and might believe that athletes need to be held to a higher standard.

The discussion in the telephone interviews about the theme coach involvement in the judicial process directed the researcher to include sets of questions centered on coach response to first-time, alcohol-related violations of athletes (11A-F), multiple alcohol-related policy violations of athletes (12A-F), the authority of the coach to discipline athletes for campus alcohol violations (13A-C), and the overall perceptions of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process. Two questions, 8A and 8B, which centered on the discipline process of athletes vs. nonathletes, were also included in the survey as a result of comments made in the telephone interviews.
Summary of Focus Group and Telephone Interviews

Thirty-nine themes were identified through the focus group and telephone interview data. There were many commonalities between what judicial affairs administrators regarded as important issues and what athletic coaches thought were significant issues with respect to the involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process. Eleven of the 39 themes identified were used to construct individual survey items and groups of items for the Web survey instrument. Some questions were created due to the obvious saliency of the theme to the research question, while other items were included because of the emphasis of that particular theme in the focus group and telephone interviews. The 11 themes used to construct survey items were: How do coaches find out, expectations of athletes, athletes as leaders, role of coaches in judicial process, benefits of coach participation, limitations of coach participation, holding athletes to standards, coach response to alcohol violations, coach involvement in the judicial process, how collaboration might look, and athlete vs. nonathlete discipline. A list of themes and their relation to the final survey items is supplied in Appendix C. A copy of the Web survey instrument is located in Appendix D.

Web Survey

A Web survey instrument was used to solicit information from athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators regarding their perceptions about athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process as a means to reduce future alcohol-related violations of student-athletes. The survey consisted of twenty questions, with sub-sets of questions under each main question. The instrument included: (a) 52, four-point Likert Scale items; (b) nine, three-point Likert Scale items; (c) three, five-point Likert Scale
items; and (d) six open-ended response items. The open-ended items were included to provide participants with the opportunity to share further information.

Description of Sample and Response Rate

Survey participants consisted of head athletic coaches of baseball, softball, men’s basketball, and women’s basketball at Division III institutions in New York State, and chief judicial affairs administrators responsible for the oversight and administration of the student conduct process at Division III institutions in New York State. The survey was sent to 260 individuals (56 judicial affairs administrators and 204 athletic coaches) and was completed by 119 participants for an overall response rate of 45.8%. The response rate of athletic coaches was 41.2%, while the response rate of judicial affairs administrators was 62.5%. Of the 119 surveys, three were discarded for significantly incomplete information (where only demographic information had been completed). This left the researcher with 116 valid surveys available for analysis.

The survey was open for 15 days. The researcher sent out four reminders, with reminders being sent only to those participants who had not yet responded. A wave analysis was conducted to determine non-response bias. Responses from late respondents were compared with responses from early respondents to determine if responses varied greatly (Creswell, 2003). The wave analysis was conducted at four points in the survey administration process, at approximately four-day intervals. Responses did not vary greatly at any point; therefore, the opportunity for response bias in the survey was limited, and the survey data were representative of the entire population.
Demographic Information

Five demographic questions were included on the survey. These questions represented information about participant’s position, years of experience, gender, type of institution, and to whom the athletic department on their campus reported. A total of 72 men and 44 women completed the survey, 62.1% and 37.9% respectively. Athletic coaches comprised 69% of the total respondents, and judicial affairs administrators comprised 29.3% of the total respondents. Of the respondents, 62.1% were employed at private institutions and 37.9% were employed at public institutions. A majority of respondents, 68.1%, indicated that the athletic department at their institution reported to the Vice President for Student Affairs/Dean of Students, 14.7% indicated athletics reported to the President of the college or university, 2.6% indicated athletics reported to the Chief Financial Officer, and 13.8% of respondents indicated athletics reported to other positions within the institution. A complete breakdown of the frequency and percentages of the demographic information is located in Table 4.3.

Descriptive Statistics

Because the main focus of the research is on a topic that has not previously been explored, the researcher elected to include only one overarching research question: What do athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators identify as the current and desirable role, if any, of coaches in the campus judicial process as a means to help reduce athletes’ future involvement in alcohol-related incidents? The specific analysis of the responses to each survey item and its relationship to the research question follows. In each analysis, references are made to data presented in tables. Although some
Table 4.3

Frequency and Percentages of Demographic Information for Judicial Affairs Administrators and Athletic Coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrator</th>
<th>Athletic coach</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(29.3)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(47.1)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(52.9)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Public</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(35.3)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Private</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(64.7)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Whom Athletics Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o VP Student Affairs/Dean of Students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.1)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o VP Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

interpretation of data is presented in this section, the bulk of the conclusions and implications are presented in Chapter 5.

This study is concerned with the perceptions of two different groups, judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches. Therefore, the researcher elected to use the cross tabs function in SPSS to determine the frequency and percentile ranks of multiple variables between both groups. “The cross tabs command is useful for describing samples where the mean is not useful” (Cronk, 2006, p. 20). Since the data in this study consisted of nominal and ordinal scales, the cross tabs function provided a valuable way for the
researcher to begin to understand the data. For all tables included in this section, the term disagree refers to the combination of responses from the strongly disagree and disagree categories, and the term agree, refers to the combination of responses from the strongly agree and agree categories.

*Alcohol consumption, abuse, and related misconduct.* To determine the perceptions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches regarding alcohol consumption and abuse by student-athletes, as well as student-athlete engagement in policy violations and judicial proceedings, participants were asked to respond to six survey items. Table 4.4 shows the data for participant responses to question 6.

Overall, judicial affairs administrators agreed at a high rate that alcohol abuse by students is a significant problem. Judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches both believed that student-athletes have a problem with alcohol consumption. However, judicial administrators also felt alcohol abuse by student-athletes was a significant problem, while coaches did not. Both groups also believed that the consumption of alcohol by student-athletes often leads to their involvement in campus judicial proceedings.

*Student-athlete standards.* Question 7 asked participants if they thought student-athletes serve as role models and if athletes should be held to a different standard than nonathletes. Table 4.5 shows the data for participant responses to question 7.
Table 4.4

*Question 6: Alcohol Consumption, Abuse, and Related Misconduct on Campus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Alcohol abuse by students is a significant problem</td>
<td>20.6 79.4</td>
<td>40.0 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Alcohol abuse by student-athletes is a significant problem</td>
<td>36.4 63.7</td>
<td>51.9 48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Student-athletes do NOT have a problem with alcohol consumption</td>
<td>87.9 12.1</td>
<td>70.9 29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Student-athletes engage in alcohol consumption more frequently than nonathletes</td>
<td>75.0 25.0</td>
<td>88.3 11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>The administration of the college spends too much time dealing with alcohol-related misconduct</td>
<td>48.5 49.6</td>
<td>76.2 23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>The consumption of alcohol by student-athletes often leads to their involvement in campus judicial proceedings</td>
<td>28.6 67.8</td>
<td>35.4 64.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches strongly agree that student-athletes serve as role models on campus. On the other hand, both groups also do not feel that student-athletes should be held to a higher standard than nonathletes when they violate campus alcohol policies.
Table 4.5

*Question 7: Standards for Student-athletes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Serve as role models for other students on campus</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Should be held to a higher standard than nonathletes when they violate campus alcohol policies</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Judicial administrators’ standards of fairness.* Question 8 asked participants how they felt judicial affairs administrators treat athletes as opposed to nonathletes with regard to their involvement in alcohol-related campus policy violations. Participants were also asked to indicate if they felt judicial administrators imposed similar sanctions for athletes and nonathletes. Table 4.6 shows the data for participant responses to question 8.

Judicial administrators and athletic coaches appear to have a high degree of faith that judicial affairs administrators treat athletes and nonathletes in the same manner, as well as impose similar sanctions, when they are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations.

*Judicial sanctions as deterrents.* Question 9 asked participants for their perceptions of typical sanctions for alcohol-policy violations and the ability of those sanctions to deter the future alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes. Table 4.7 shows the data for participant responses to question 9.
Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Treat student-athletes the same as nonathletes with regard to their involvement in alcohol-related misconduct</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Impose similar sanctions for student-athletes involved in alcohol-related policy violations as for nonathletes</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judicial administrators and athletic coaches agreed that most sanctions were effective in deterring student-athletes’ future involvement in alcohol-related misconduct. However, for a few areas, such as fines and Web-based alcohol education programs, the two groups did not concur.

*Athletic coach power to effect change.* Question 10 asked participants their perceptions of the power of athletic coaches to effect change in the drinking behavior of their athletes; athletic coach ability to sanction athletes in addition to sanctions received from the campus judicial system; athletic coaches being kept informed of the off-field behavior of student-athletes, particularly with regard to alcohol; and thoughts on athletic
Table 4.7

*Question 9: The Effectiveness of Judicial Sanctions to Deter the Future Alcohol-related Misconduct of Student-athletes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Written Reprimand</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Campus Alcohol Workshop</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Web-Based Alcohol Education Program</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Mandated Alcohol and Other Drug Assessment</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9G</td>
<td>Mandated Counseling</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

coaches and judicial affairs administrators working closely together. Table 4.8 shows the data from participant responses to question 10.

Both judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches had high levels of agreement with all four sub-questions within question 10. Responses for these items imply a solid reason for athletic coaches to be kept informed and involved in the campus judicial process.
**Table 4.8**

**Question 10: Athletic Coach Power to Effect Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>Have the power to effect change in the drinking behavior of their athletes</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>Should be free to sanction student-athletes involved in alcohol-related misconduct, in addition to sanctions imposed by judicial affairs administrators/campus conduct officers</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>Should be kept informed by campus administrators of their players off-field behavior, particularly when it relates to a campus alcohol-policy violation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10D</td>
<td>Should work closely with judicial affairs administrators/campus conduct officers</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response to first-time, alcohol-related policy violation.* Question 11 asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with how athletic coaches on their campus respond when an athlete is found responsible for a first-time alcohol policy violation. Table 4.9 shows the data for participants’ responses to question 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>69.0 31.0</td>
<td>83.8 16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>Additional exercise regimen such as running laps or sprints</td>
<td>61.6 38.4</td>
<td>40.5 59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11C</td>
<td>Sitting out of practice(s)</td>
<td>33.3 66.7</td>
<td>42.4 57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11D</td>
<td>Suspension from game(s)</td>
<td>40.7 59.3</td>
<td>43.2 56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11E</td>
<td>Removal from the team</td>
<td>95.7 4.3</td>
<td>90.4 9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response to multiple alcohol-related policy violations. Question 12 asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with how athletic coaches on their campus respond when an athlete is found responsible for multiple alcohol-related policy violations. Table 4.10 shows their responses to question 12.

On the whole, responses regarding athletic coach response to first-time and multiple alcohol-related policy violations of student-athletes were similar between the two groups. Both groups agreed with most of the ways coaches would address policy violations, with the exception that judicial administrators did not think coaches would impose additional exercise regimens for first-time violations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12B</td>
<td>Additional exercise regimen like running laps or sprints</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12C</td>
<td>Sitting out of practice(s)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12D</td>
<td>Suspension from game(s)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12E</td>
<td>Removal from team</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Athletic coach authority to discipline student-athletes.* Question 13 asked participants their view of athletic coach authority to discipline student-athletes for off-field misconduct, including involvement in campus alcohol-policy violations. Table 4.11 shows the data for participant responses to question 13.

Overall, athletic coaches and judicial administrators felt that whether it was stated in the job description or not, athletic coaches had authority to discipline their athletes for off-field misconduct, including alcohol-related misconduct.
Table 4.11

*Question 13: Athletic Coach Authority to Discipline Student-athletes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Not Sure</td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13A</td>
<td>Athletic coaches at my institution are granted specific authority through their job description to discipline their student-athletes involved in <em>off-field</em> misconduct, including involvement in campus alcohol-policy violations</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B</td>
<td>Athletic coaches at my institution have implied authority to discipline their student-athletes involved in <em>off-field</em> misconduct, including involvement in campus alcohol policy violations</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13C</td>
<td>Athletic coaches at my institution have no authority to discipline their student-athletes for involvement in <em>off-field</em> misconduct</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When student-athletes are written up. Question 14 asked participants what currently happens on their campuses when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related policy violation. The question was based on a never, sometimes, always scale. Table 4.12 shows the data for participant responses to question 14.

Overall, there were some discrepancies in the level of involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process when a student-athlete is written up for a first-time alcohol policy violation. Conflicting views on many of the questions may indicate that judicial administrators and athletic coaches are not necessarily informed about, or may have misperceptions about, what the other group actually does when an athlete is documented for a first-time, alcohol-related policy violation.

When student-athletes are found responsible. Question 15 asked participants what currently happens on their campus when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related policy violation. The question was based on a never, sometimes, always scale. Table 4.13 shows the data for participant responses to question 15.

Question 15 had slightly more similar responses between the two groups than responses to question 14. However, there were still some discrepancies in the perceptions of what is actually occurring.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Never</td>
<td>% Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>The athletic director is notified by a judicial affairs administrator, and the athletic director notifies the appropriate athletic coach</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14B</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach is notified by a judicial affairs administrator</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14C</td>
<td>A conversation occurs between a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete’s athletic coach</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14D</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach is encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of the student-athlete</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Judicial affairs administrators</td>
<td>Athletic coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Never</td>
<td>% Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A</td>
<td>The athletic director is notified by a judicial affairs administrator and the athletic director notifies the appropriate athletic coach</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15B</td>
<td>His/her coach is verbally notified by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15C</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach is notified in writing (via email or letter) by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15D</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach is requested to attend a meeting with a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15E</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach is encouraged to help the student-athlete navigate through the appeal process</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Athletic coach participation in the campus judicial process. Question 16 asked participants to indicate their level of agreement about statements related to athletic coach participation in the campus judicial process. Table 4.14 shows the data for participant responses to question 16.

It is obvious that judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches both felt the athlete-coach relationship could help deter athletes from making poor choices regarding future alcohol-related behavior and that athletic coaches could serve to reinforce campus alcohol policies, which would ultimately benefit student-athletes.

Athletes written up. Question 17 asked participants how they believed athletic coaches should be involved when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation. Table 4.15 shows the data for participants’ responses to question 17.

While both groups had similar responses to most questions, there appeared to be a tendency on the part of judicial affairs administrators to agree at lower rates than athletic coaches. This could indicate a lack of trust or some other concern that might be holding them back from stronger agreement.

Athletes found responsible. Question 18 asked participants how they believed athletic coaches should be involved when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation. Table 4.16 shows the data for participant responses to question 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree          % Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree          % Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A</td>
<td>The relationship that evolves between a student-athlete and his/her athletic coach can help deter the future involvement of that athlete in alcohol-related campus policy violations</td>
<td>0                      100</td>
<td>1.4                  98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B</td>
<td>When an athletic coach becomes aware that a player has engaged in alcohol-related misconduct, it is the coach’s responsibility to have a conversation with the athlete about his/her behavior</td>
<td>9.4                   90.6</td>
<td>1.4                  98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16C</td>
<td>Involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process would NOT help deter the future alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes</td>
<td>100                     0</td>
<td>93.0                7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16D</td>
<td>An athletic coach can serve as an additional resource to reinforce campus rules, regulations, and policies pertaining to the consumption of alcohol</td>
<td>0                      100</td>
<td>2.8                  97.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16E</td>
<td>Student-athletes would benefit from the participation of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, particularly with incidents of alcohol-related misconduct</td>
<td>21.9                 78.2</td>
<td>14.5                85.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15

Question 17: When a student-athlete is written up, I believe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17A</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should be notified by a judicial affairs administrator</td>
<td>34.3 65.6</td>
<td>5.6 94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17B</td>
<td>A conversation with a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete’s athletic coach should occur</td>
<td>34.3 65.6</td>
<td>11.4 88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17C</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should be encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of the student-athlete</td>
<td>63.3 36.7</td>
<td>30.4 69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17D</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should NOT be involved in the campus judicial process in order to avoid the appearance of favoritism</td>
<td>61.3 38.7</td>
<td>60.3 39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the data indicated that athletic coaches would like to receive notification of sanctions for athletes and assist them through the appeal process as necessary. It should be noted that while judicial administrators agreed with how athletic coaches should be involved in the judicial process, their responses did not indicate as strong a level of support as did athletic coaches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18A</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should be verbally notified by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete</td>
<td>21.9 78.0</td>
<td>15.7 84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18B</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should be notified in writing (via email or letter) of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete</td>
<td>31.2 68.8</td>
<td>9.7 90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18C</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should be requested to attend a meeting with the judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete</td>
<td>77.4 22.6</td>
<td>32.8 67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18D</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should be encouraged to help the student-athlete navigate through the appeal process</td>
<td>43.7 56.2</td>
<td>22.9 77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18E</td>
<td>His/her athletic coach should NOT be involved in the campus judicial process in order to avoid the appearance of favoritism</td>
<td>62.5 37.5</td>
<td>61.7 38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18F</td>
<td>The role of the athletic coach should be limited ONLY to supporting the decision of the judicial affairs administrator</td>
<td>71.0 29.0</td>
<td>76.8 23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaboration. Question 19 centered on the concept of collaboration and the benefits and value of such an approach to discipline. An additional sub-question asked if athletic coaches should have the opportunity to serve on a campus judicial board. Table 4.17 shows the data for participant responses to question 19.

Table 4.17

**Question 19: Benefits and Value of Collaboration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Judicial affairs administrators</th>
<th>Athletic coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
<td>% Disagree % Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19A</td>
<td>Collaboration between judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches would benefit student-athletes by helping them to reduce their future involvement in alcohol-related campus policy violations</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>4.2 95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19B</td>
<td>There is great value in allowing athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators to collaborate with regard to the alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes</td>
<td>3.1 96.9</td>
<td>4.2 95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19C</td>
<td>Athletic coaches should have the opportunity to serve as a member of a campus judicial board</td>
<td>25.0 75.0</td>
<td>18.3 81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19D</td>
<td>Athletic coaches should NOT be involved in judicial processes regarding student-athletes</td>
<td>81.2 18.7</td>
<td>81.4 18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overwhelmingly, judicial administrators and athletic coaches agreed that collaboration between judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches was valuable and would benefit student-athletes by helping them to reduce their future involvement in alcohol-related campus policy violations. Both groups also endorsed providing opportunities for athletic coaches to serve as members of a campus judicial board.

**Collaboration among groups.** Question 20 asked judicial affairs administrators if they would be willing to collaborate with athletic coaches when student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations. Question 21 asked athletic coaches if they would be willing to collaborate with judicial affairs administrators when their athletes are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations. Table 4.18 shows the data for participant responses to questions 20 and 21.

Table 4.18

**Questions 20 & 21: Willingness to Collaborate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>As a judicial affairs administrator, I would be willing to collaborate with</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>athletic coaches when student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>campus policy violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>As an athletic coach, I would be willing to collaborate with judicial</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affairs administrators when my student-athletes are involved in alcohol-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>related campus policy violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the descriptive data seem to show strong support for collaboration between judicial administrators and athletic coaches and for involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process.
Inferential Statistics

While the cross tabs function in SPSS is useful for identifying how groups within populations respond to individual survey items in terms of frequency and percentages, cross tabulations cannot provide information regarding the significance of responses between groups. "The independent-samples t test compares the means of two samples" (Cronk, 2006, p. 58) and helps to identify the significance of the difference between two groups. Therefore, the researcher computed independent-samples t tests for each of the questions on the Web-survey instrument to compare the responses of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches.

The researcher adjusted alpha from .05 to .01 for most questions and from .05 to .012 and .013 for a few questions. This was done in consultation with a statistician, in order to control for the family-wise Type I error problem (for example, t-tests that are significant by chance) that arises when conducting multiple hypothesis tests in the same data (B. Blaine, personal communication, June 22, 2009). Only comparison results that were deemed significant by computation of independent-samples t tests are included in the following analysis.

Question 6E, on my campus, the administration of the college spends too much time dealing with alcohol-related misconduct, was included on the survey to identify the perceptions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches with regard to the amount of time college judicial officers spend on alcohol-related disciplinary issues. An independent-samples t test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups.
\( t(111) = 3.78, p < .01 \). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly higher \((m = 2.67, sd = 0.74)\) than the mean of athletic coaches \((m = 2.19, sd = 0.55)\).

Question 9B, *fines are effective in deterring the future alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes*, was included on the survey to gauge the perceptions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches on the use of specific sanctions to deter future alcohol-related misconduct by student-athletes. An independent-samples *t* test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups \((t(107) = 2.55, p < .012)\). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower \((m = 2.24, sd = 0.90)\) than the mean of athletic coaches \((m = 2.65, sd = 0.69)\).

Question 9E, *Web-based alcohol education programs are effective in deterring the future alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes*, was included on the survey to gauge the perceptions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches on the use of specific sanctions to deter future alcohol-related misconduct by student-athletes. An independent-samples *t* test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups \((t(107) = 2.52, p < .013)\). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly higher \((m = 2.73, sd = 0.84)\) than the mean of athletic coaches \((m = 2.34, sd = 0.68)\).

Question 10A, *athletic coaches have the power to effect change in the drinking behavior of their athletes*, was included on the survey to identify how survey participants perceived the power of athletic coaches change the drinking behavior of their athletes. An independent-samples *t* test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups.
(n(108) = 2.96, p < .01). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly higher (m = 3.40, sd = 0.56) than the mean of athletic coaches (m = 3.09, sd = 0.46).

Question 17A, when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe his/her athletic coach should be notified by a judicial affairs administrator, was included on the survey as part of a series of questions to help identify the personal opinions of participants regarding what they feel should happen when a student-athlete is written up for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. An independent-samples t test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups (t(102) = 4.57, p < .01). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower (m = 2.72, sd = 0.77) than the mean of athletic coaches (m = 3.35, sd = 0.59).

Question 17B, when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe a conversation with a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete’s athletic coach should occur, was included on the survey as part of a series of questions to help identify the personal opinions of participants regarding what they feel should happen when a student-athlete is written up for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. An independent-samples t test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups (t(100) = 4.19, p < .01). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower (m = 2.66, sd = 0.60) than the mean of athletic coaches (m = 3.21, sd = 0.63).
Question 17C, when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe his/her athletic coach should be encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of the student-athlete, was included on the survey as part of a series of questions to help identify the personal opinions of participants regarding what they feel should happen when a student-athlete is written up for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. An independent-samples $t$ test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ($t(97) = 3.89, p < .01$). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower ($m = 2.27, sd = 0.64$) than the mean of athletic coaches ($m = 2.86, sd = 0.71$).

Question 18A, when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe his/her athletic coach should be verbally notified by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete, was included on the survey as part of a series of questions to help determine the personal opinions of participants regarding what they feel should happen when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. An independent-samples $t$ test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ($t(100) = 2.56, p < .012$). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower ($m = 2.88, sd = 0.66$) than the mean of athletic coaches ($m = 3.26, sd = 0.72$).

Question 18B, when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe his/her athletic coach should be
notified in writing (via email or letter) by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete, was included on the survey as part of a series of questions to help determine the personal opinions of participants regarding what they feel should happen when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. An independent-samples t test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ($t(102) = 3.06, p < .01$). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower ($m = 2.84, sd = 0.77$) than the mean of athletic coaches ($m = 3.31, sd = 0.68$).

Question 18C, when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe his/her athletic coach should be requested to attend a meeting with the judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete, was included on the survey as part of a series of questions to help determine the personal opinions of participants regarding what they feel should happen when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. An independent-samples t test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ($t(99) = 4.94, p < .01$). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower ($m = 2.13, sd = 0.56$) than the mean of athletic coaches ($m = 2.90, sd = 0.78$).

Question 18D, when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe his/her athletic coach should be encouraged to help the student-athlete navigate through the appeal process, was included on the survey as part of a series of questions to help determine the personal opinions of
participants regarding what they feel should happen when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. An independent-samples $t$ test comparing the mean scores of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ($t(100) = 3.58, \ p < .01$). The mean of judicial affairs administrators was significantly lower ($m = 2.53, sd = 0.57$) than the mean of athletic coaches ($m = 3.04, sd = 0.71$).

Summary

This chapter covered the data analysis of the focus group and telephone interviews. Data was analyzed in order to identify the pertinent themes needed to create individual items and groups of items for the Web survey instrument. Participant responses from the Web survey were analyzed, and findings were presented through use of both descriptive and inferential statistics. Chapter 5 will summarize the main findings and highlight key similarities and differences in the opinions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches. A discussion of the findings in relation to the current literature, implications for practice, and implications for future research will also be included.
in future alcohol-related policy violations. The remainder of this chapter will elaborate on the results of the study and clarify what those results mean to the future involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial processes.

Discussion of Research Results

Results of the current research suggest that including athletic coaches in the campus judicial process can benefit student-athletes by helping them to reduce their future involvement in alcohol-related incidents. Judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches had similar responses to many of the survey items. Their levels of agreement and disagreement are discussed throughout the remainder of the chapter, as are results that were deemed significant through computation of t tests.

Agreement on Survey Items

The highest levels of agreement for both groups occurred on questions 10A-D, 16A-E, 19A-B, 20, and 21. Questions 17A-B and 18A, 18B, and 18D are also included in this discussion as the rates of agreement between judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches revealed statistically significant differences.

Question 10A dealt with the power of athletic coaches to effect change in the drinking behavior of their athletes. Question 10B questioned participants about athletic coach ability to sanction student-athletes for their involvement in alcohol-related misconduct in addition to the sanctions of judicial administrators. Question 10C asked participants their opinions on keeping athletic coaches informed of the off-field behavior of their athletes. Question D focused on the concept of athletic coaches and judicial administrators working closely together. Agreement was in the 90th percentile range for all questions. The high level of agreement on all questions indicates that athletic coaches
and judicial affairs administrators view athletic coaches as potential allies to judicial administrators in the campus judicial process. It reinforces the value that athletic coaches can bring to the judicial system, especially in helping to prevent athletes' future involvement in alcohol-related misconduct. Question 10A revealed statistically significant differences between the two groups. The means of judicial affairs administrators were significantly higher than the means of athletic coaches. This indicates while both groups feel strongly that athletic coaches have the power to affect the drinking behavior of their athletes, judicial administrators actually believe this more strongly than athletic coaches.

High levels of agreement also occurred on questions 16A-E, which asked about athletic coach participation in the campus judicial process. Questions 16A and 16C asked participants their level of agreement about the ability of the athlete-coach relationship to aid in deterring athletes from involvement in future alcohol-related campus policy violations. Question 16B focused on the responsibility of athletic coaches to have discussions with student-athletes when they engage in alcohol-related misconduct. Question 16D asked participants about their perceptions of the athletic coach’s ability to serve as an additional resource regarding campus alcohol rules and policies. Question 16E asked participants whether student-athletes would benefit from athletic coach participation in the campus judicial process of alcohol-related incidents as evidence by a reduction of their involvement in future alcohol-related campus policy violations. Agreement levels were above 90% for all questions except one, 16E.

Question 16E asked participants if student-athletes would benefit from the participation of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, particularly with
incidents of alcohol-related misconduct. Both groups agreed that student-athletes would benefit; however, the level of agreement was lower for this question than for the other questions in the group (judicial administrators-78.2%, athletic coaches-85.5%). Even though the agreement rate was not as strong as it was for the other questions in the group, responses still indicate considerable agreement about the benefit of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process.

None of the responses in this group of questions was statistically significant; yet, the responses as a whole reinforce the value athletic coaches can bring to the campus judicial process. Responses also emphasize the importance of athletic coaches as an untapped resource to reinforce campus alcohol policies, bolster the success of student-athletes, and reinforce positive behavior.

Questions 17A and 17B asked participants what they believed should occur when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation. Question 17A asked participants if they believed the student-athlete’s athletic coach should be notified by a judicial affairs administrator, and question 17B asked if a conversation with a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete’s athletic coach should occur. Even though both groups agreed on these questions, judicial administrators agreed at much lower rates than athletic coaches did and the differences were found to be statistically significant. This indicates that while there is agreement that coaches should be notified and conversations between judicial administrators and athletic coaches should occur when student-athletes are written up, judicial affairs administrators do not feel as strongly that these things should happen as athletic coaches do. They may feel somewhat cautious to change the existing judicial process to include athletic coaches.
Questions 18A, 18B, and 18D asked participants what they believed should occur when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation. Question 18A asked participants if they believed the student athlete’s athletic coach should be verbally notified by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place, question 18B asked if written notification of sanctions should occur, and 18D asked if the athlete’s coach should be encouraged to help the student navigate through the appeal process. Just as with question 17, all three questions indicated agreement by both groups; however, judicial administrators did not agree as strongly as athletic coaches. In addition, t tests revealed statistically significant differences between the groups. This reinforces that while judicial affairs administrators are in favor of the proposed involvement of athletic coaches when student-athletes are found responsible for alcohol-related policy violations, some hesitancy exists, which may need to be more fully explored.

Questions 19A and 19B were concerned with collaboration between judicial administrators and athletic coaches. Agreement levels for these questions were above 95% and indicate that both groups view collaboration as beneficial and valuable to reducing the future alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes. Responses did not show significant differences between the responses of athletic coaches and judicial administrators; however, it is obvious that both groups value each other’s opinions and that collaboration between the two groups should be cultivated.

Questions 20 and 21 showed willingness on the part of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches to collaborate with each other when student-athletes are involved in campus alcohol-related policy violations. Response to these questions was
over 93% in the agree category, which indicates there is no hesitancy on the part of coaches or judicial administrators to work with each other. There is a readiness for both groups to cooperate to implement change in the campus judicial process.

Disagreement on Survey Items

Disagreement between athletic coaches and judicial administrators tended to occur more for specific items rather than overall groupings of questions. One area of concern was question 6B, which asked participants if alcohol abuse by student-athletes is a significant problem on their campus. While no statistically significant differences were revealed between the two groups, judicial affairs administrators felt alcohol abuse by student-athletes was a significant problem, while athletic coaches did not. The alcohol consumption patterns of athletes have shown that athletes binge-drink at higher rates than nonathletes do and that they consume alcohol in a more dangerous fashion. (Hildebrand et al., 2001; Leichliter et al., 1998; Nelson & Wechsler, 2001) Therefore, it is interesting that one-half of the athletic coaches who participated in the survey did not view alcohol abuse by student-athletes as a significant problem on their campuses.

The underlying reasons for coaches’ responses to this question are not clear and could stem from a number of factors. Ignorance about the issue of alcohol abuse and the high binge drinking rate of student-athletes could be one reason for the split among athletic coaches. The type of institution at which an athletic coach works could be reason. For example, student-athletes who attend a religiously affiliated campus or a dry campus might experience fewer alcohol-related incidents or opportunities to drink in comparison to student-athletes who attend other types of institutions. The system that an athletic department has in place to deal with alcohol-related infractions of athletes and the
consequences for those violations could also have an effect on deterring student-athlete drinking behavior on some campuses. If rules and regulations about alcohol consumption are consistently upheld and enforced by athletic personnel, it could limit the alcohol abuse of student-athletes.

Question 6 asked participants if the administration of the college spends too much time dealing with alcohol-related misconduct on their campus. Athletic coaches disagreed at a high rate, indicating they did not think that too much time was spent on discipline by campus administration. However, judicial administrators were split almost equally between the disagree and agree responses. Responses to this question revealed statistically significant differences in the means of judicial administrators and athletic coaches. Because judicial affairs administrators deal with the alcohol-related misconduct of students on a daily basis, they may have a clearer view of how much time is actually spent on alcohol-related disciplinary issues. Responses may also indicate that on some campuses, perhaps those with higher alcohol consumption and binge-drinking rates, the administration spends more time dealing with alcohol-related disciplinary issues.

Question 9 asked participants which judicial sanctions they thought were effective in deterring the future alcohol-related behavior of student-athletes. Two areas of disagreement were highlighted and both were statistically significant. Judicial administrators did not believe that fines were effective deterrents while athletic coaches did, and coaches did not believe that Web-based alcohol education programs were effective deterrents, although judicial administrators believed they were.

While this study can neither prove nor disprove the efficacy of specific sanctions to deter future behavior, it is possible that judicial administrators view fines as punitive
sanctions rather than educational measures and thus their disagreement. The goal of most campus judicial systems is to educate and develop students (Wilson, 1996). Therefore, educational sanctions such as community service and counseling are often implemented rather than punitive sanctions such as fines.

Web-based alcohol programs are a recent phenomenon in alcohol-sanctioning practices, and findings regarding their efficacy have been varied. Some studies have indicated they are successful (Doumas & Anderson, 2009; Neighbors & Larimer, 2002), while others indicated the opposite (Croom et al., 2009). Therefore, it is easy to understand the mixed response of participants regarding the ability of these programs to deter future alcohol-related misconduct.

Question 11B asked respondents what the typical response of an athletic coach on their campus was for a student-athlete found responsible for a first-time, alcohol-related policy violation. There was disagreement between the two groups on the issue of athletic coaches implementing additional exercise regimens when student-athletes were found responsible for a first-time alcohol policy violation. Athletic coaches agreed it was a typical response on their part, while judicial affairs administrators did not. This is not surprising as judicial administrators may not be aware of the sanctions athletic coaches put into effect for their players.

Question 14 queried participants about the notification process for athletic personnel by judicial administrators when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related policy violation. None of the responses in this group of questions was statistically significant; however, there was much disparity between groups in their responses. Question14A specifically dealt with notification of the athletic director who
would then disseminate the information to the appropriate coach. Judicial administrators felt that notification to the athletic director was not consistent and happened only sometimes, while coaches felt strongly that the athletic director was always notified, who then passed the information on to the coach. While the reason for the difference in opinions of the two groups is not apparent, there is a split in the way both groups view the notification process to the athletic director, with coaches being more confident that it occurs and judicial administrators feeling less confident that it occurs.

Question 14C asked participants when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related policy violation on my campus, a conversation occurs between a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete’s athletic coach. Judicial affairs administrators indicated at a high rate that sometimes a conversation occurs, while athletic coaches indicated it never happens. Again, there appears to be ambiguity in the way both groups view what is happening on their campuses.

The same also holds true for question 14D, when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related policy violation on my campus, his/her athletic coach is encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of the student-athlete. Judicial affairs administrators indicated that sometimes it happens, while athletic coaches indicated it never happens. While ambiguity does seem to exist surrounding what is currently happening on Division III campuses in New York State, perhaps restructuring the question to reflect a different type of response that might elicit clearer and better responses should be considered. Instead of a never, sometimes, always scale, perhaps a yes, no response choice would provide a clearer picture of what is actually occurring.
Question 15 was similar to question 14 in that it asked respondents to indicate what happens with regard to notification of athletic personnel on their campus when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related policy violation. Responses to these questions did not show statistically significant differences between the two groups; however, differences were reflected in the descriptive statistics.

Just as with question 14A, the discrepancy with notification to the athletic director held true for question 15A. Athletic coaches indicated the athletic director is always notified and informs the appropriate coach, while judicial administrators felt that the athletic director is only notified sometimes. Again, there is a distinction in the way both groups view notification of the athletic director. Athletic coaches are more confident that it happens and judicial administrators are less confident that it occurs. Perhaps there is also a certain level of trust on the part of athletic coaches that the athletic director will keep them informed about their players’ involvement in alcohol-related incidents, which is reflected in their strong level of always responses.

Question 15B asked participants to respond to whether the athletic coach is verbally notified by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for an athlete found responsible for an alcohol-related policy violation on their campus. Responses to this question indicated that judicial affairs administrators felt confident that sometimes this happened on their campus, while athletic coaches felt that it never happened. Again, there is ambiguity between both groups to what is actually occurring. In this instance, judicial administrators who would be responsible for the notification have a high level of confidence that it happens sometimes, but athletic coaches believe it
never happens. The level of trust associated with who directs the notification to the athletic coach may play a part in participant responses.

Question 15E asked participants whether the student-athlete’s athletic coach is encouraged to help the athlete navigate through the appeal process when he/she is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. Just as in question 15B, judicial administrators indicated that athletic coaches are encouraged sometimes, while athletic coaches indicated they are never encouraged. Once again, the two groups do not share the same view. This could be because of lack of communication between judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches, which may result in limited trust and inadequate understanding of the appeal process and where coaches fit into the system.

Question 17C was concerned with what participants in the study believed about the statement when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, I believe his/her athletic coach should be encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of the student-athlete. While judicial affairs administrators disagreed with the statement, athletic coaches tended to agree with it. Responses also indicated statistically significant differences between the two groups on this question, with the mean of judicial administrators being significantly lower than the mean of athletic coaches. Judicial affairs administrators’ response to this question is somewhat perplexing as they had similar responses to athletic coaches on the other questions in this group. However, their responses do correspond to the views asserted by judicial affairs administrators in the telephone interviews. In the telephone interviews, judicial administrators felt coaches should not be involved in the actual disciplinary
process but should be involved after the process was complete, or by way of prevention
of incidents and follow through with sanctions.

There might also be some natural resistance on the part of judicial administrators
to including athletic coaches as advocates in the judicial process. Judicial affairs
administrators may perceive a loss or shift of power in their ability to make critical
decisions regarding student conduct if athletic coaches are involved in the judicial
process. They may be concerned that athletic coaches will encroach on what has
traditionally been the responsibility of judicial affairs administrators, thus diminishing the
authority judicial administrators possess.

The final area of disagreement occurred on question 18C. This question asked
participants if an athletic coach should be requested to attend a meeting with the judicial
affairs administrator and the student-athlete when that athlete is found responsible for
involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation. Judicial administrators do not
feel that this should happen while athletic coaches feel it is something that should occur.
The differences between the responses of the two groups were statistically significant.

Judicial administrators may be wary of involving athletic coaches in the judicial
process in this way for fear that the athletic coach may unduly influence the judicial
process. This was also a concern indicated by judicial administrators who participated in
the telephone interviews. Athletic coaches, on the other hand, want to assist the athlete in
taking responsibility for his/her actions and help the athlete remain on the path to success
as suggested by similar comments during the focus-group.

Research indicates that student-athletes engage in alcohol consumption more
frequently than nonathletes (Leichliter et al., 1998) and that student-athletes exhibit more
of the social factors found to increase the risk of binge-drinking (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001). A study by Hildebrand et al. (2001) implies that college athletes begin drinking earlier, consume more alcohol, and engage in alcohol-related risk behaviors more frequently than nonathletes. While judicial affairs administrators’ responses in this study supported what has been proven through research, the views of athletic coaches were not as clear. About one-half of the coaches did not believe alcohol-abuse by student-athletes was a significant problem on their campus, despite what the literature indicates.

This presents some issues with regard to the collaboration of athletic coaches and judicial affairs personnel on student-athlete involvement in campus alcohol-policy violations. Efforts to enter into a collaborative relationship with judicial affairs administrators aimed at reducing the future alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes may be thwarted by the misperceptions some athletic coaches have about student-athlete drinking behavior. Some coaches communicate enabling messages about alcohol use without consciously being aware that they do so (Grossman, Gieck, Freedman, & Fang, 1993). These messages can minimize the risks of alcohol-consumption by asserting that alcohol use is an inevitable rite of passage in college. In order to collaborate effectively with judicial administrators, athletic coaches may first need to be properly educated about the realities of student-athlete drinking - including alcohol consumption, binge drinking, and the associated negative harm as cited in the research literature (Hildebrand et al., 2001; Leichliter et al., 1998; Nelson & Wechsler, 2001).

In addition, research conducted on the use of social ecology theory in alcohol and drug prevention (Williams et al., 2006) suggests that coaches serve as an organizational and institutional factor influencing individual athlete behavior concerning the
consumption of alcohol. Thombs’ (2000) research also provides some support for coaches and athletic directors being able to influence both athletes and nonathletes in efforts to curb abusive drinking behavior. If coaches do not perceive that student-athletes on their campus have a significant problem with alcohol abuse, it could ultimately have a negative effect on the prevention and intervention efforts of the college and could also assist in creating a permissive alcohol culture on the campus.

Research shows that athletic coaches are a strong influence in the lives of college athletes and can be an important contributing factor for regulating and preventing drug use in sports (Anshel, 1991). While the focus of the Anshel study was on the use of drugs by college athletes, its implications can also apply to alcohol abuse by college athletes. Research has also shown that coaches’ rules can influence student-athletes’ decisions to refrain from participating in alcohol consumption (Bower & Martin, 1999). The responses of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches in the current study indicate that they feel very strongly that athletic coaches have the power to effect change in the drinking behavior of their athletes. While this study deals with perceptions and not the actual implementation of a program to create behavioral change, the fact that judicial administrators’ and coaches’ perceptions correspond with previous research lends credibility to the concept of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, particularly as a means to reduce the future alcohol-related policy violations of student-athletes. Anshel (1991) advocated for involving coaches in the prevention efforts of drug use by student-athletes by having coaches show their concern for athletes including disapproval, explanation of policies, consistent enforcement of rules, and implementation of consequences for policy violations. Anshel also proposed involving coaches in
educational programming, serving as a personal counselor for athletes, and implementing behavioral contracts for student-athletes with drug-related issues. These are all strategies that could be implemented by coaches to curb the drinking behavior of student-athletes that often result in campus alcohol-policy violations.

The current study reveals that judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches feel strongly that athletic coaches can serve as additional resources to reinforce campus rules and regulations pertaining to the consumption of alcohol. This finding corresponds to research that suggests students are showing support for stronger alcohol policies and enforcement of sanctions (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, et al., 2002), particularly with repeat alcohol policy offenders (DeJong et al., 2007). Research also indicates that institutions must consistently and strongly enforce alcohol policies (Thombs, 2000; Wechsler, 1996). Athletic coaches can assist judicial affairs administrators in ensuring student-athlete compliance with sanctions imposed for alcohol policy violations. Coaches can also be a part of efforts to educate student-athletes during new student orientation about campus policies and regulations pertaining to alcohol use and the associated consequences for violating those policies.

Much of the research about binge drinking and related harms calls for collaboration between campus offices and departments (Nelson & Wechsler, 2001; Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Grossman, et al., 1997; Williams et al., 2006) as a way to respond to and reduce binge drinking and its negative outcomes. One study even indicates that not many alcohol prevention and education programs on college campuses actually involve coaches or athletic directors in these efforts (Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Grossman, et al., 1997). Results of the current research suggest that judicial
affairs administrators and athletic coaches strongly agree that collaboration between athletic coaches and judicial administrators would benefit student-athletes by helping athletes deter their future involvement in alcohol-related campus policy violations. They also agreed at high rates that there is great value in allowing coaches and judicial administrators to collaborate with regard to the alcohol-related misconduct of athletes. Collaboration between these two groups could ultimately result in the implementation of new alcohol abuse prevention initiatives on college campuses and a reduction in multiple alcohol-related policy violations by student-athletes.

Since there is little to no research that has looked at the involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, this study provides broad baseline knowledge about the perceptions of judicial administrators and athletic coaches on this topic. Overall, the study indicates that both groups believe that the consumption of alcohol by student-athletes leads to their involvement in campus judicial proceedings. Both groups also see the value in collaborating with regard to the alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes, particularly in helping them to reduce their involvement in future alcohol-related campus policy violations.

With a few exceptions, judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches agree on a vision of what they feel ought to happen regarding athletic coach notification of the alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes as well as coach involvement in the campus judicial process. Disagreement in the study stems from specific sanctioning strategies used by each group to curb the future drinking behavior of athletes as well as the ways in which judicial affairs administrators currently notify athletic coaches of off-field, alcohol-related misbehavior. While there was much agreement between the two
groups, it is important to note that even on some of the items where both groups agreed, there were statistically significant differences in their responses. Judicial affairs administrators were not as strongly in favor of some of the suggested types of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process as athletic coaches were. This signifies that campuses should not rush into this type of partnership without much discussion and communication between both groups prior to implementation.

Implications for Practice

Based on the results of this study, it is clear that judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches find much value in the concept of collaboration between both groups as a means to help reduce the future alcohol-related policy violations of student-athletes. While there are differing views between the two groups about what is currently happening on their campuses with regard to the sanctioning of student-athletes by judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches, their vision for the future is aligned.

In this study, athletic coaches do not feel they are: (a) notified consistently by judicial affairs administrators when student-athletes are written up, (b) involved in conversations with judicial administrators when student-athletes are written up, or (c) encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of student-athletes. Judicial affairs administrators indicate these things do not always happen, but that they occur sometimes. It is apparent that some ambiguity exists about whether or not to involve athletic coaches in the judicial process of athletes written up for alcohol-related campus policy violations. The same also holds true when student-athletes are found responsible for alcohol-related policy violations. Athletic coaches indicate they are: (a) never notified verbally or in writing of any sanctions imposed, (b) never requested to
attend a meeting with the judicial administrator and student-athlete, and (c) never encouraged to help the student-athlete navigate through the appeal process.

However, when asked how they believed athletic coaches should be involved in the campus judicial process when a student-athlete is written up, judicial administrators and athletic coaches felt: (a) coaches should be involved in the process, (b) coaches should receive notification of the violation by a judicial affairs administrator, and (c) coaches should have a conversation with the judicial administrator. The only area of disagreement is that athletic coaches feel they should be encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial process, while judicial administrators do not. The same holds true for how both groups believe athletic coaches should be involved when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. Both groups believe athletic coaches: (a) should be notified verbally and in writing, (b) should help student-athletes navigate through the appeal process, and (c) should be involved in the judicial process and not limited to only supporting the decisions of judicial administrators. The only area of disagreement between the groups is that judicial affairs administrators do not think athletic coaches should be requested to attend a meeting with the judicial administrator and the student-athlete, while coaches feel this is something that should happen.

These results suggest that athletic coaches should participate in the campus judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations. Judicial administrators and athletic personnel should work together to set policy that outlines how judicial affairs administrators will communicate with athletic coaches when a student-athlete has been documented for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. The more
specific this policy is, the clearer expectations will be on both ends. When a student-athlete is written up, communication should include, at the very least, a telephone call to the athletic coach from the judicial affairs administrator who will be handling the case. Specific details do not need to be discussed. A basic overview of the violation can give athletic coaches enough information to have an initial conversation with the student-athlete prior to the actual judicial-hearing. Institutions may also elect for the judicial administrator and athletic coach to have a face-to-face conversation at this point; however, the amount of time necessary to coordinate such a meeting could serve as a limitation and place additional responsibilities and time constraints on judicial administrators that are not necessary.

When a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation, his or her athletic coach should be verbally notified of any sanctions put in place for that athlete as a result of the judicial hearing. Verbal notification would consist of a telephone call from a judicial affairs administrator to an athletic coach that outlines the specific sanctions and due dates. Ideally, a telephone call should be followed by written notification as suggested by the survey. However, some schools may opt to utilize only a verbal notification procedure. Institutions that elect to use written notification must decide the most appropriate form of communication. There are pros and cons to emails, memos, and letters, and depending on the campus climate, one method may be preferred over another. Regardless of which method an institution selects, the communication should address: (a) the policy or policies violated, (b) any sanctions put in place for the athlete, (c) deadlines for completion of sanctions, and (d) any additional suggestions for how the coach can assist with the process. In addition, coaches may want to keep the
judicial administrator informed of any conversations they have with the athlete or any sanctions they decide to put in place.

It is also important to reiterate that while athletic coaches favored the implementation of a meeting with the judicial administrator and student-athlete when a student-athlete is found responsible for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, judicial administrators were not supportive of this idea. The intent of athletic coaches is most likely the success of the student-athlete; however, the successful involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process does not depend on including this type of meeting in the process. Some institutions may favor this kind of communication, and they should not be dissuaded from incorporating it into their judicial process. However, it is not imperative for successful collaboration.

A notification and communication process must also be established if a student-athlete found responsible for an alcohol-related policy violation decides to appeal the process or sanctions of that decision. At minimum, this should include notification (verbal or written) from a judicial administrator to the student’s athletic coach indicating that the athlete has decided to appeal and how the appeal process will work (for example, hearing board or administrative hearing). Notification should also include how the athletic coach can be of assistance to the student-athlete throughout the appeal process.

Once systems have been created to involve athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, the next step is to train athletic coaches about how the campus judicial system works. Campuses may want to include other key athletic personnel such as the Athletic Director, Assistant Athletic Directors, and Athletic Trainers in the training process as well. Since institutions each have their own specific student conduct policies and
processes, it is not a one-size-fits-all approach. The bulk of education efforts will likely fall to judicial affairs administrators and other campus community members responsible for overseeing student conduct. This process is a large undertaking, but the result of athletic coaches understanding the campus judicial process would be well-informed coaches who could answer student-athlete questions about procedure and who would be qualified to help guide athletes through the judicial process. In turn, this may also increase student satisfaction with the campus judicial process.

Educating athletic coaches and athletic personnel about the campus judicial process should begin by providing them with current, written information about the judicial system on their campus. This might include the student handbook, code of conduct, and any other publications that outline portions of the campus conduct system. A hands-on training program conducted by judicial affairs administrators for athletic coaches would comprise an additional segment of training. The entire training program should include: (a) an overview of the campus judicial process, (b) the specific role(s) of the athletic coach in the judicial and appeal processes, and (c) involvement of athletic coaches in case studies and role-plays.

A verbal review of the student conduct process by the chief judicial administrator should provide an overview of the campus judicial system as well as an opportunity for coaches to discuss the process and ask questions. It is extremely important that the role of the athletic coach in the campus judicial and appeal processes be highlighted. For example, although an athletic coach may: (a) be notified by a judicial administrator when a student-athlete is documented for involvement in an alcohol-related policy violation, (b) have a meeting with the judicial administrator and student-athlete, or (c) sit in on the
appeal hearing with the athlete, it does not necessarily mean the coach will have any
input into the actual outcome of the case. This message needs to be made explicitly clear
to coaches when they are being trained as well as throughout the year. In turn, athletic
coaches will need to learn to accept and understand their role and be able to draw the line
with their involvement.

Judicial affairs administrators who participated in the survey disagreed with
involving athletic coaches as advocates in the campus judicial process of a student-athlete
written up for an alcohol-related policy violation. Through comments made in their
telephone interviews, some judicial administrators indicated coaches should not be
involved until after the judicial process was complete and sanctions had been imposed.
Therefore, it is extremely important that athletic coaches understand that their role is not
to direct or determine the outcome of any judicial case involving a student-athlete, but
rather to be kept informed of the process and resulting outcome. If at any point a judicial
administrator feels uncomfortable with how an athletic coach is interpreting his or her
role in the judicial process, the athletic director and chief conduct administrator should be
notified.

The last piece of the training process should involve athletic coaches in hands-on
opportunities to explore what their actual involvement in the campus judicial process will
look like. This can be accomplished by incorporating a series of case studies and role-
plays into the training process. Case studies and role-plays should not include names of
current or former athletes but can incorporate variations of actual events so that coaches
have practice opportunities based on realistic experiences. The case studies and role-plays
should focus on athletic coaches’ knowledge of the campus judicial system (for example,
how they would explain the process to a student-athlete who has questions) and how they would serve as a resource (referrals to particular campus offices and individuals) to student-athletes involved in an alcohol policy violation.

Preferably, this training would occur every year prior to the beginning of the school so that coaches can be prepared as soon as student-athletes return to campus. As new personnel are added to the coaching staff, additional training for these individuals will need to be incorporated. Training does not need to be as comprehensive as the summer training program and can be as simple as a conversation between a judicial administrator and an athletic coach. The goal is to educate new hires about the campus judicial system and help them understand their role in the judicial process.

Just as athletic coaches need to be trained on their role in the campus judicial process, student-athletes also need to be educated about how athletic coaches can serve as a resource if a student-athlete becomes involved in a campus alcohol policy violation. Athletic coaches should coordinate this education piece with assistance from judicial administrators. It should occur at the beginning of the school year as either part of pre-season athletic training, during orientation, or at some point during the first few weeks of school. This should be an information session that outlines how athletic coaches are available as resources to student-athletes who violate campus alcohol policies. Athletes need to understand that coaches will not have input into the actual decision making process but will be available to serve as a guide throughout the process and as an individual they can go to with questions.

An additional implication for practice is determining how collaboration between coaches and judicial administrators can be implemented. According to Hord (1986),
collaboration involves shared authority and responsibility for planning, implementation, and evaluation of a joint effort. It also comprises a “mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into...to achieve common goals” (Matterich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001, p. 39). Involving athletic coaches in the notification process and training them to serve as resources for student-athletes involved in alcohol policy violations is a great first step. However, research literature suggests athletic coaches should be involved in campus alcohol prevention efforts (Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Grossman et al., 1997) and collaboration across departments of the college (Nelson & Wechsler, Wechsler, Davenport et al, 1997; Williams, 2006).

Adding athletic coaches as an additional piece of current campus alcohol and other drug prevention efforts not only sends the right message to student-athletes and other students, it also adds an additional resource to typically overworked student affairs departments and alcohol and other drug offices on campus. It can also serve to strengthen relationships between campus constituents. Involving athletic coaches in the judicial process may also cause student-athletes to think twice before engaging in alcohol consumption that could lead to involvement in alcohol-related policy violations.

Involving athletic coaches in campus prevention efforts may also situate athletic coaches in a more positive light on campus. Athletic coaches can work with the NCAA to implement some of the alcohol and drug programs endorsed by the association and incorporate requirements for student-athlete attendance at particular programs. Coaches can collaborate with student affairs or alcohol and other drug professionals to conduct alcohol programming for student-athletes both during pre-season and throughout the school year. Athletic coaches can also work with orientation staff to set expectations for
new, first-year student-athletes about alcohol consumption as they enter the institution. Athletic coaches should be integrally involved in these efforts, not just in the coordination of them. They need to find ways to be actively involved, rather than passively involved, in these programs.

Athletic coaches can also assist in the collaboration process by serving as role models for the decisions student-athletes make and for their behavior. The actions of the coach and his or her attitudes about alcohol consumption have a trickle down effect to the players. Therefore, athletic coaches must be intentional in their own choices and in the conversations they initiate with their players regarding the use of alcohol. Coaches have the ability to set a positive tone for individual and team attitudes with regard to the use of alcohol and should take every opportunity to do so.

The final implication for practice involves assessing the efforts to include athletic coaches in the campus judicial process. Any new program must be assessed to determine if it is meeting the intended outcomes, which in this case, is the deterrence of future student-athlete involvement in alcohol-related campus policy violations. Measurement of the intended outcomes is important to determine if the program is working and if it is not, to determine what needs to be changed in order to make the initiative more effective.

Overall, the implications from the current research suggest an interinstitutional model for collaboration focused on involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process. Gray's (1989) seminal work on collaboration outlines three stages of the collaboration process. These stages include: (a) coming together to form relationships, (b) interacting and making decisions, and (c) assessing the effectiveness of change efforts. Based on implications for practice identified as a result of the current research, the first
stage of collaboration would consist of judicial affairs administrators or athletic coaches approaching the other group to initiate the collaboration effort and begin discussion about involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process. Stage two would center on the decisions that need to be made on each campus about how athletic coaches will be involved in the judicial process as well as the implementation of those ideas. The third stage would focus on assessing the efficacy of the initiative to deter the future alcohol-related policy violations of student-athletes.

While this represents a somewhat simplified model of collaboration, viewing collaboration as a series of steps, rather than an overall concept, allows institutions to break down the process into smaller, more manageable pieces. Those pieces can then be coordinated with a timeline for implementation and assessment. Because the pieces do not all have to occur at once, it allows the opportunity for judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches to ease into the process. This is particularly important, as there may be some hesitancy on the part of judicial administrators to change the existing campus judicial process.

Limitations

As with any study, there are limitations of this research. The sample size was limited to the population of Division III head baseball, softball, men’s basketball and women’s basketball coaches and chief judicial affairs administrators in New York State. Therefore, these findings may not accurately reflect regional differences and may lack generalizability to a larger population. The possibility of dishonesty in data collection also exists as the study utilized a self-reporting survey instrument. However, self-
reporting measures are generally considered valid when the anonymity and privacy of respondents can be assured (Manfredo & Bo, 1988; Williams, Aiken, & Malin, 1985).

In addition, the researcher chose to include only head athletic coaches of baseball, softball, men’s basketball, and women’s basketball in the study. Their responses may not be indicative of head coaches of other collegiate sports. The researcher also chose to include only chief judicial affairs administrators at Division III institutions in the study. They may not have similar opinions to judicial affairs administrators who do not serve as the chief judicial officer on campus.

The concepts of in-season and out-of-season policy violations for student-athletes were not addressed in this study. Athletic coaches in particular may have had different responses to how they would deal with student-athletes involved in campus alcohol-policy violations if the delineation between in-season and out-of-season had been included.

Finally, the wording used in questions 6B and 6E may not have been specific enough to indicate clearly what each question was asking. The phrase significant problem in question 6B and the phrase too much time in question 6E allowed participants to interpret the statements rather than defining the meaning for them. In future administrations of the survey, the wording on questions 6B and 6E should be well-defined so that all participants have the same understanding of the question.

**Implications for Research**

Several implications for future research emerge as a result of this study. First, although there is much agreement between judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches on the degree to which athletic coaches should be involved in the campus
judicial process, the rates of agreement by judicial administrators tend to be somewhat lower than the rates of athletic coaches. Results indicate that although judicial administrators believe athletic coaches should be involved in the campus judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related policy violations, there is some hesitation on their part. Further research to determine the reasons for their lower rates of agreement should be conducted. It is difficult to determine if results indicate a lack of trust on the part of judicial affairs administrators regarding involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, a lack of time to implement collaboration, or if they are hesitant to change the existing judicial process. These factors should be explored through additional research.

The current study only addresses the on-campus, alcohol-related policy violations of student-athletes and does not look at their involvement in alcohol violations that might occur outside the campus community. The media clearly show that collegiate athletes engage in non-campus, alcohol-related violations of the law including DUI, DWI, public drunkeness, underage drinking, and other violations of the law associated with the consumption of alcohol (for example, sexual assault or vandalism). Future studies looking at the involvement of athletic coaches in efforts to reduce student-athlete involvement in off-campus, alcohol-related violations would be beneficial, especially since off-campus violations by student-athletes often shed a negative light not only on the individual, but also on the athletic program and institution.

This study addresses the involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process at Division III institutions in New York State. In order to be able to generalize findings to other populations, replication of this study (conducted at Division III institutions in other states and parts of the country as well with NCAA Division I and
Division II institutions) is necessary. Such research will inform the academic community whether or not judicial administrators and athletic coaches in other parts of the country, or at different types of institutions, hold similar views as their Division III counterparts in New York State. Furthermore, replication of this study under similar conditions while incorporating matched responses of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches from like institutions would provide a better overall picture of what is currently happening on college campuses with regard to the involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process.

While this study asked participants demographic information such as gender, type of sport, years of experience, and athletic department reporting structure, comparisons based on these demographic variables were beyond the scope of this research. Now that baseline data regarding judicial affairs administrators’ and athletic coaches’ perceptions of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process as a means to reduce the future alcohol-related violations of student athletes is available from this study, it might be interesting to compare groups based on demographic information to identify where differences and similarities exist.

Finally, although there is a fair amount of literature concerning binge drinking by college athletes and the associated negative outcomes, the research appears to be lacking a qualitative perspective. Many of the major alcohol studies conducted (for example, CAS, CADS) used quantitative methods, including surveys with large samples, to determine the alcohol usage patterns, attitudes, and behaviors of students and student-athletes. Very little research has been done using focus groups, interviews, or case studies. Many of the comments made by the focus group and telephone interview
participants in this study reinforced the actual results of the study, which indicates that these qualitative methods can be valuable in strengthening current approaches and supplementing empirical data that already exists. Qualitative research would give student-athletes the opportunity to share their personal opinions about alcohol consumption and abuse and may help to identify other factors contributing to the excessive alcohol consumption of athletes and the related negative behaviors in which they engage.

Conclusion

The opinions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches make a compelling argument for involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process as a means to help deter student-athletes from becoming involved in future alcohol-related incidents. Both groups firmly believe that: (a) athletic coaches have the ability to effect change in the drinking behavior of their athletes, (b) the relationship that exists between a coach and his/her athlete can be instrumental in discouraging that athlete’s future involvement in alcohol-related misconduct, and (c) athletic coaches serve as additional resources to reinforce campus alcohol regulations. Furthermore, there is a strong willingness on the part of both groups to collaborate with each other when student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations, with the ultimate goal being to reduce potential alcohol-related policy infractions.

Ambiguity exists about the current role of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process. Athletic coaches appear to be involved at some level, but it is not clear how they are involved, as the perceptions of judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches do not concur. This ambiguity exists both when a student-athlete is written up initially for
involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation and when an athlete is ultimately found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. The only areas of agreement between both groups regarding the current role of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process include: (a) the athletic coach is sometimes notified by a judicial affairs administrator when a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, (b) the athletic coach is never notified by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for a student-athlete found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation, and (c) the athletic coach is never requested to attend a meeting with the judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation.

The desired role of the athletic coach in the campus judicial process is more apparent. When a student-athlete is written up for involvement in an alcohol-related campus policy violation, both judicial administrators and coaches believe the athletic coach should be notified and have a conversation with the judicial affairs administrator. Both groups also feel the appearance of favoritism should not keep athletic coaches from participating in the judicial process. However, ambiguity does exist with athletic coaches serving as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of a student-athlete who is written up for an alcohol-related campus policy violation.

Both groups indicate that athletic coaches should be involved in the campus judicial process when a student-athlete is found responsible for an alcohol-related campus policy violation. The desired role of athletic coaches includes: (a) receiving verbal and written notification by the judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for
References


the student-athlete, (b) helping the student-athlete to navigate through the appeal process, and (c) serving as more than just a support for the decision of the judicial administrator.

Both groups also feel the appearance of favoritism should not keep athletic coaches from participating in the judicial process. The only area where both groups diverge is requesting the athletic coach to have a meeting with the judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete. Athletic coaches are supportive of this idea, but judicial administrators do not believe it should be part of the process.

Responses to the survey show a high level of support for athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process as a means to help reduce the future alcohol-related policy-violations of student-athletes. While uncertainty exists between athletic coaches and judicial administrators about how athletic coaches are currently involved in the process, both groups have similar views as to what they believe should be occurring. Athletic coaches should be involved in the campus judicial process by serving as an additional resource about campus alcohol rules and regulations, by receiving verbal and written notification about sanctions from judicial administrators, and by assisting athletes through the appeal process when necessary. Athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators believe that involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process adds value to the conduct system and can ultimately help deter athletes from becoming involved in future alcohol-related campus policy violations.
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Appendix A
Focus Group Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tell me how you are currently involved in the campus disciplinary process of athletes involved in alcohol-related incidents. | - Tell me about the level of frequency of your involvement.  
- Tell me what you think happens when coaches are involved in the judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related incidents.  
- Tell me about your level of enjoyment with your involvement in the campus disciplinary process of athletes involved in alcohol-related incidents.  
- What are the benefits of athletic coach involvement?  
- What are the limitations of athletic coach involvement?  
- What recommendations do you have regarding athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process? |
| Tell me how you would like to be involved, if at all, in the campus judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related incidents. | - What are the reasons you wish/do not wish to be involved?  
- Ideally, how do you envision your involvement in the campus judicial process?  
- What suggestions do you have for ways that coaches can be involved in the campus judicial process? |
| How practical do you think it is for coaches to be involved in the campus judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related incidents? | - What are some of the benefits of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process?  
- What are some of the limitations of athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process?  
- Tell me how involvement in the campus judicial process would fit in with your other responsibilities as a coach.  
- What is your estimate of the time commitment needed for coaches to be involved in the campus judicial process? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>What are your opinions regarding athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related incidents?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Probes  | -Why do you think athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process is a good/bad idea?  
-Tell me why you are enthusiastic about athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process.  
-Tell me why you are reluctant about athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Is there anything else you would like to say about athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Probes  | -Is there anything we didn’t cover regarding athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process that you would like to talk about?  
-Do you have any last thoughts about athletic coach involvement in the campus judicial process that you would like to share? |
Appendix B
Telephone Interview Protocols

Date: 

Time: 

Interviewer: 
Interviewee: 
Institution Where Interviewee Works: 
Position of Interviewee: 
Years of Experience as Judicial Affairs Administrator: 
Contact Information for Interviewee: Telephone:  

Email: 

(Briefly describe research study and purpose of interview) 

Interview Questions: 

1. In your experience, how have athletic coaches been involved in the campus judicial process of athletes involved in alcohol-related incidents? 

2. What do you view as the benefits of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process? 

3. What do you view as the limitations of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process? 

4. What are your thoughts on the practicality of involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process? 

5. What are your opinions regarding the involvement of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process? 

(Thank individual for participating and assure confidentiality of responses.)
Appendix C

Focus Group and Telephone Interview Themes and Their Relation to Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Relation to Survey Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of athletes</td>
<td>Questions 7A, 7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes as leaders</td>
<td>Question 7A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of coach participation</td>
<td>Questions 16A, 16D, 16E, 19A, 19B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of coach participation</td>
<td>Questions 16C, 17D, 18E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding athletes to standards</td>
<td>Questions 7B, 8A, 8B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Relation to Survey Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach involvement in the judicial</td>
<td>Questions 11A, 11B, 11C, 11D, 11E, 11F,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td>12A, 12B, 12C, 12D, 12E, 12F, 13A, 13B,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13C, 16B, 19D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How collaboration might look</td>
<td>Questions 17A, 17B, 17C, 17E, 18A, 18B,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18C, 18D, 18G, 20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete vs. nonathlete discipline</td>
<td>Questions 8A, 8B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Final Web Survey Instrument

Perceptions of Athletic Coach Involvement in the Campus Judicial System

Thank you for choosing to participate in this survey.

**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

1. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR CURRENT PROFESSIONAL POSITION. (Note: If you happen to be both a judicial officer and an athletic coach, please answer the survey as representative of your "primary role" on campus)
   - Judicial Affairs Administrator/Corrections Officer
   - NCAA Division II Head Baseball Coach
   - NCAA Division II Head Softball Coach
   - NCAA Division II Head Men's Basketball Coach
   - NCAA Division II Head Women's Basketball Coach

2. PLEASE INDICATE THE TOTAL YEARS OF EXPERIENCE THAT YOU HAVE SERVED IN THIS CAPACITY.
   - 0 - 5 years
   - 6 - 7 years
   - 8 - 11 years
   - 12 - 15 years
   - More than 15 years

3. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR GENDER.
   - Male
   - Female

4. AT WHAT TYPE OF INSTITUTION ARE YOU EMPLOYED?
   - Public
   - Private
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5. AT YOUR INSTITUTION, TO WHOM DOES THE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT REPORT?
- [ ] Vice President for Student Affairs/Dean of Students
- [ ] President of College/University
- [ ] Vice President for Finance
- [ ] Other - please specify below

PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

6. ON MY CAMPUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Alcohol abuse by students is a significant problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Alcohol abuse by student-athletes is a significant problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Student-athletes do NOT have a problem with alcohol consumption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Student-athletes engage in alcohol consumption more frequently than non-athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The administration of the College spends too much time dealing with alcohol-related misconduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The consumption of alcohol by student-athletes often leads to their involvement in campus judicial proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. STUDENT-ATHLETES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. They set a good example for other students on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. They should be held to a higher standard than non-athletes when they violate campus alcohol policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. JUDICIAL AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATORS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Treat student-athletes the same as non-athletes with regard to their involvement in alcohol-related misconduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Impose similar sanctions for student-athletes involved in alcohol-related policy violations as for non-athletes involved in alcohol-related policy violations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. THE FOLLOWING JUDICIAL SANCTIONS ARE EFFECTIVE IN DETERRING THE FUTURE ALCOHOL-RELATED MISCONDUCT OF STUDENT-ATHLETES:

A. Written Reprimand
B. Fine
C. Probation
D. Campus Alcohol Workshop
E. Web-Based Alcohol Education Program
F. Mandated Alcohol and Other Drug Assessment
G. Handled Counseling

10. ATHLETIC COACHES:

A. Have the power to effect change in the drinking behavior of their athletes.
B. Should be free to sanction student athletes involved or alcohol-related misconduct, in addition to sanctions imposed by judicial affairs
C. Should be kept informed by campus administrators of their players’ “off-field” behavior, particularly when it relates to a campus alcohol policy violation.
D. Should work closely with judicial affairs administrators/conduct officers.

[QUESTIONS 11 & 12]

WHEN A STUDENT-ATHLETE IS FOUND RESPONSIBLE FOR AN ALCOHOL-RELATED POLICY VIOLATION, A TYPICAL RESPONSE OF AN ATHLETIC COACH ON MY CAMPUS IS TO IMPOSE THE FOLLOWING:

11. FOR A FIRST-TIME ALCOHOL-RELATED POLICY VIOLATION:

A. Nothing
B. Additional exercise regimen such as running laps or sprints
C. Siting out of practice(s)
D. Suspension from team(s)
E. Removal from house
F. Other - please specify below
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12. FOR MULTIPLE ALCOHOL-RELATED POLICY VIOLATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Additional exercise regimen such as running laps or sprinting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sitting out of practice(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Suspension from game(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Removal from team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other - please specify below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. ATHLETIC COACHES AT MY INSTITUTION:

A. Are granted specific authority through their job description to discipline their student-athletes involved in "off-field" misconduct, including involvement in campus alcohol-policy violations.
B. Have implied authority to discipline their student-athletes involved in "off-field" misconduct, including involvement in campus alcohol-policy violations.
C. Have no authority to discipline their student-athletes for involvement in "off-field" misconduct.

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 14 & 15 AS THEY RELATE TO WHAT IS CURRENTLY HAPPENING ON YOUR CAMPUS.

14. WHEN A STUDENT-ATHLETE IS "WRITTEN UP" FOR INVOLVEMENT IN AN ALCOHOL-RELATED POLICY VIOLATION ON MY CAMPUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most of the Time</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The Athletic Director is notified by a judicial affairs administrator and the Athletic Director notifies the appropriate athletic coach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The athletic coach is notified by a judicial affairs administrator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A conversation occurs between a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete's athletic coach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The athletic coach is encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of the student-athlete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. WHEN A STUDENT-ATHLETE IS "FOUND RESPONSIBLE" FOR AN ALCOHOL-RELATED POLICY VIOLATION ON MY CAMPUS:

- The Athletic Director is notified by a judicial affairs administrator and the athletic [Response] (Select): [ ] Never, [ ] Sometimes, [ ] Always
- The athletic coach is verbally notified by a judicial affairs administrator or any [Response] (Select): [ ] Never, [ ] Sometimes, [ ] Always
- The athletic coach is notified in writing (via e-mail or letter) by a judicial [Response] (Select): [ ] Never, [ ] Sometimes, [ ] Always
- The athletic coach is requested to attend a meeting with a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete [Response] (Select): [ ] Never, [ ] Sometimes, [ ] Always
- The athletic coach is encouraged to help the student-athlete navigate through the appeal process [Response] (Select): [ ] Never, [ ] Sometimes, [ ] Always

16. PLEASE INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS ABOUT ATHLETIC COACH PARTICIPATION IN THE CAMPUS JUDICIAL PROCESS:

- The relationship that exists between a student-athlete and his/her coach can help deter the future involvement of that athlete in alcohol-related campus policy violations [Response] (Select): [ ] Strongly Disagree, [ ] Disagree, [ ] Agree, [ ] Strongly Agree
- When an athletic coach becomes aware that a player has engaged in alcohol-related misconduct, it is the coach's responsibility to have a conversation with the athlete about his/her behavior [Response] (Select): [ ] Strongly Disagree, [ ] Disagree, [ ] Agree, [ ] Strongly Agree
- Involving athletic coaches in the campus judicial process would NOT help deter the future alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes [Response] (Select): [ ] Strongly Disagree, [ ] Disagree, [ ] Agree, [ ] Strongly Agree
- An athletic coach can serve as an additional resource to reinforce campus rules, regulations and policies pertaining to the consumption of alcohol [Response] (Select): [ ] Strongly Disagree, [ ] Disagree, [ ] Agree, [ ] Strongly Agree
- Student-athletes would benefit from the participation of athletic coaches in the campus judicial process, particularly with respect to alcohol-related misconduct [Response] (Select): [ ] Strongly Disagree, [ ] Disagree, [ ] Agree, [ ] Strongly Agree

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 17 & 18 BASED ON YOUR PERSONAL OPINION OF HOW THE SITUATIONS OUTLINED SHOULD BE HANDLED.
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17. WHEN A STUDENT-ATHLETE IS "WRITTEN UP" FOR INVOLVEMENT IN AN ALCOHOL-RELATED CAMPUS POLICY VIOLATION, I BELIEVE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Mount athletic coach should be notified by a judicial affairs administrator.
B. A conversation with a judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete's athletic coach should occur.
C. Mount athletic coach should be encouraged to serve as an advocate in the judicial hearing process of the student-athlete.
D. Mount athletic coach should NOT be involved in the campus judicial process in order to avoid the appearance of favoritism.
E. If there are any other ways in which you feel athletic coaches should be involved in the campus judicial process when one of their student-athletes is "written up" for involvement in an alcohol-related policy violation, please indicate below:

18. WHEN A STUDENT ATHLETE IS "FOUND RESPONSIBLE" FOR AN ALCOHOL-RELATED CAMPUS POLICY VIOLATION, I BELIEVE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Mount athletic coach should be verbally notified by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete.
B. Mount athletic coach should be notified in writing (via e-mail or letter) by a judicial affairs administrator of any sanctions put in place for the student-athlete.
C. Mount athletic coach should be requested to attend a meeting with the judicial affairs administrator and the student-athlete.
D. Mount athletic coach should be encouraged to help the student-athlete navigate through the appeal process.
E. Mount athletic coach should NOT be involved in the campus judicial process in order to avoid the appearance of favoritism.
F. The role of the athletic coach should be limited ONLY to supporting the decision of the judicial affairs administrator.
G. If there are any other ways in which you feel athletic coaches should be involved in the campus judicial process of a student-athlete who is "found responsible" for an alcohol-related policy violation, please indicate below:
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19. I BELIEVE:

A. Collaboration between judicial affairs administrators and athletic coaches would benefit student-athletes by helping them to reduce their future involvement in alcohol-related campus policy violations.  
B. There is great value in allowing athletic coaches and judicial affairs administrators to collaborate with regard to the alcohol-related misconduct of student-athletes.  
C. Athletic coaches should have the opportunity to serve as a member of a campus judicial board.  
D. Athletic coaches should NOT be involved in judicial processes regarding student-athletes.

20. PLEASE ANSWER ONLY IF YOU ARE A JUDICIAL AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATOR.

As a judicial affairs administrator, I would be willing to collaborate with athletic coaches when student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations.  

Please include any additional comments you would like to make about collaboration with athletic coaches.

21. PLEASE ANSWER ONLY IF YOU ARE AN ATHLETIC COACH.

As an athletic coach, I would be willing to collaborate with judicial affairs administrators when my student-athletes are involved in alcohol-related campus policy violations.  

Please indicate any additional comments you would like to make about collaboration with judicial affairs administrators.

Thank you for your participation in this survey. If you would like a copy of the results, please e-mail the researcher at the following address and indicate "research results" in the subject line: tracyfordin@hsmail.com

Participants interested in being included for the drawing for a $100 gift card of your choice should e-mail the researcher at the following address and indicate "research drawing" in the subject line. Please include your name and telephone number in the e-mail: tracyfordin@hsmail.com