Spring 2017

An Analysis of Campus Civility: Best Practices from Student Affairs Professionals

Amy Zieziula

Recommended Citation

AN ANALYSIS OF CAMPUS CIVILITY: BEST PRACTICES FROM STUDENT

AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS

by

AMY WILLEMS ZIEZIULA

(Under the Direction of Teri Denlea Melton)

ABSTRACT

Incivility on college campuses is an issue that can disrupt the learning environment and

the retention of students, as well as harm the reputation of a college campus. This is a

pertinent issue for leaders in higher education to address and to promote a more civil

campus both inside and outside of the classroom. There is no research that addresses

how Student Affairs Professionals best promote civility on college campuses, and this

study fills that research gap. This qualitative study was conducted using Student Affairs

Professionals at eight SUNY institutions. The Generational Theory and Work Place

Incivility Theory were utilized to frame this research. The researcher collected data

relating to civility initiatives from websites, civility statements, workshops, and

interviews with three Student Affairs Professionals. The researcher then analyzed this

data and found that Student Affairs Professionals are promoting civility through Offices

of Diversity and Inclusion, Student Handbooks, dialogues and conversations with

students, and creating programs utilizing current issues that may spark debate. The

researcher also found that there are no centralized efforts on college campuses within this

study to create civility initiatives.

INDEX WORDS: Civility, Student Affairs, Incivility, Civility Campaigns

AN ANALYSIS OF CAMPUS CIVILITY: BEST PRACTICES FROM STUDENT

AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS

by

AMY WILLEMS ZIEZIULA

Bachelor of Science, State University of New York at Brockport, 2005

Master of Education, University at Buffalo, 2008

Educational Specialist, Georgia Southern University, 2013

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

AN ANALYSIS OF CAMPUS CIVILITY: BEST PRACTICES FROM STUDENT

AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS

by

AMY WILLEMS ZIEZIULA

Major Professor: Teri Denlea Melton
Committee: Meca Williams-Johnson
                      Kerry Greenstein

Electronic Version Approved:
Spring 2017

DEDICATION

      This work is dedicated to my husband, Nicholas, and our daughter, Anika. Nick, without your support and constant guidance this would not have been possible. This accomplishment is not just mine, but truly both of ours. Anika, you are the best and the reason I wanted to hurry up and finish this! Mommy cannot wait to spend more time with you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have guided me throughout my doctoral process, and who I will forever be grateful to. I would like to thank my Dean of Students' coworkers at Georgia Southern University who encouraged me to start this journey, without their inspiration I would not be where I am today. To my cohort, who kept me sane throughout this process and made our Saturday classes much more enjoyable. Thank you to the participants who so willingly responded to my study, and provided me with such valuable insight.

I would also like to thank my committee for your flexibility with me as I relocated back to New York. And for making me smile as I conducted my second defense eight months pregnant online via Skype. And of course, thank you Dr. Melton, my advisor. You have pushed me when I needed to be pushed, and supported me when I needed the support. I truly am grateful for all of your guidance.

I am forever appreciative for the example in which my parents have set for me. Both of my immigrant parents taught me how to be determined and to have a desire to always want to achieve more. I can hear my mother's voice as I type this, reminding me, "I always want you to have it better than we did." I would also like to thank my parents for instilling in me at a young age the importance of education. I will never forget seeing my mother graduate from college, and how proud my sisters and I were of her. And I will never forget the way in which my father supported my mother through her journey back to college. These are important lessons that impacted me and made me want to complete my doctorate more than anything. And thank you to my sisters, for checking in on me and asking when I would be finished. Rachel and Juliana, I am finally finished, so

now you can count me back in on the Christmas cookie baking, summer BBQs, shopping trips, and everything else I passed on to have more time to write.

And lastly, but most importantly, to my family. Nick, there is no way I would have made it through this journey without you supporting me every step of the way. You have always been exactly what I needed, before I even knew what I needed. Whether it was encouraging words, a quick break, challenging conversations or endless support; you have always given me what I needed. There really are not enough words to express how forever thankful I am for you. And to our sweet little Anika, thank you for going to bed a little earlier some nights, so that I could write. And now, mommy cannot wait to cuddle you much more and write a little less. Lastly, Anika, I hope that I can be an example to you, that anything is possible with determination and a strong support system. And I am so very blessed to have the support system that I do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"What the [explicit word]?" were the first words Vice President for Enrollment

Management and Student Development at Hudson Valley Community College,

Alexander Popovics, described hearing on his voicemail from a disgruntled student

(2014, p. 130). Similarly, a professor at Towson University had asked students to stop

joking around and to settle down, but moments later the professor witnessed one student

hit another student (Dechter, 2007). Schroeder and Robertson (2008) wrote of a student

who continuously texted while seated in the front row of the classroom, holding the

phone at a high enough level to distract all other students in the classroom, and when

approached by another student regarding this distraction, the student abruptly responded

saying it was her "right" to do what she wanted in class. More recently, a University of

Connecticut student was intoxicated in the dining hall and pushed and cursed at a dining

services employee for not giving him any macaroni and cheese (Dicker, 2015). Uncivil

acts such as these are far too familiar on college campuses today.

Faculty have reported witnessing disorderly behaviors in the classroom, such as

students talking loudly, students making loud comments of discontent, students coming

to class unprepared, students answering cell phones, and students arriving to class late or

leaving early, all of which disrupt the remainder of the class (Feldmann, 2001). Faculty

members have also reported in studies witnessing students' texting during class and

shopping online using their laptops (Dechter, 2007). Weeks (2011) explained that there

is a crisis of incivility on college campuses. Issues of incivility occur both inside and

outside of the classroom, and range from acts of plagiarism and cheating to inappropriate remarks and rude outbursts.

Poor behavior such as students acting disengaged, disrespectful, and unruly were found mostly in secondary schools, but these types of behavior have made their way to higher education (Forni, 2008). Faculty, students and administration are oftentimes unprepared to deal with this growing issue. However, this is an important problem to confront, because college campuses that are more civilized are more likely to have students who persist and graduate (Hirschy & Braxton, 2004). Benton (2007) stated that the culture of incivility on college campuses is a large impediment to student success, much larger than anything they fail to learn in the classroom. Students subjected to classroom incivility may lose interest with the course material and are less inclined to think critically during the class (Hirschy & Braxton, 2004).

To address the growing crisis of incivility, many colleges have implemented programs and campaigns to educate the campus community about civility and the importance of acting civil on a college campus. In 1997, Forni co-founded the Johns Hopkins Civility Project to both promote and study civility on Johns Hopkins' campus (Troop, 2012). Other colleges and universities around the country followed suit, and the number of civility campaigns and programs on college campuses quickly increased. Institutions developed intervention programs, committees, workshops, courses, and websites in hopes of positively affecting campuses and decreasing instances of incivility both in and outside of the classroom (Connelly, 2009). These actions led to an initial feeling within higher education circles that incivility was on the decline. However, issues

of incivility both inside and outside of the classroom continue to be problematic and colleges must find the best way to promote civility on their campuses.

Background

Civility on college campuses is a new area of exploration; therefore, the research is limited, and subsequently not current. The research line began with Boice landmark study in 1996; since this study, research has been completed that is specific to academic disciplines or colleges, or is anecdotal. Studies indicate that incivility on college campuses is problematic for faculty, staff and students; however, research has yet to define best elements to promote civility on college campuses. This study fills this gap by providing best practices from Student Affairs Professionals in promoting and creating civility initiatives on college campuses.

Civility/Incivility

Oftentimes the term *civility* can be difficult for one to define and may evoke images of fancy dinners and tea parties with the queen or letters written to Miss Manners. Rookstool (2005) described civility as "an ethical principle that promotes respect for people and thus is a foundation of the civil state" (p. V). Where etiquette is a prescribed set of behaviors, civility is a mutual respect for others (Rookstool, 2005). Civility is a mix of moral principles and manners (Connelly, 2009). Forni (2002) stated that civility is "being constantly aware of others and weaving restraint, respect, and consideration into the very fabric of this awareness" (p. 9). Connelly (2009) described civility as part of the overall good "to serve the common good, not just function out of self-interest" (p. 52). Weeks (2011) explained that civility is "living according to the Golden Rule, doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, with respect for individual differences" (p.

2). For the purpose of this study, civility will be defined as acts committed by a person

that display respect, and uphold manners and awareness for how those actions affect

others.

As well as the word *civility,* the word *incivility* may be difficult for one to simply

define and can be a broad term to describe. Acts of incivility may range from small

annoyances, such as a person not returning a shopping cart at the grocery store and

leaving it in the middle of the parking lot, to more extreme acts, such as a person

screaming at a server for not bringing out the correct food order. On a college campus

acts of incivility may be a student making unreasonable demands on a staff member, or a

student texting and talking during class. Some researchers use the term "in/civility" to

express the range between civility and incivility (Brookes, Marini, & Radue, 2011). For

the purpose of this study, incivility will be defined as acts committed by a person that are

rude, disrespectful, and lacking in an awareness of others.

Campus Incivility

The term *campus incivility* can be used to describe specific incidents that occur on

a college campus that may be rude or disrespectful. More particularly, the term

classroom incivility may be used to describe uncivil behavior that takes place in the

classroom. Feldmann (2001) described classroom incivility as "any action that interferes

with a harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere in the classroom" (p. 137).

Feldmann categorized classroom incivility into four types: annoyances, classroom

terrorism, intimidation of the instructor, and threats or attacks. Annoyances are acts that

have a small impact on the learning environment, but students may not be aware of the

impact that they are having. Annoyances may also be arriving to class late or wearing

inappropriate attire. Classroom terrorism is an action that disrupts the learning environment such as a student attempting to shift the class topic to something in which he or she is more interested, or a student dominating class discussion. Intimidation of the instructor may be threats to pressure the instructor, for example a student may threaten to go to the department chair or dean to complain about a professor. The final category of threats or attacks is the most serious and would include acts such as threatening a professor to obtain a certain grade (Feldmann, 2001). For the purpose of this research, campus incivility will be defined as acts committed by a student that does not reflect behavior that is mannerly and polite, as well as any act that may place inappropriate demands and/or requests on a faculty or staff member.

Incivility on College Campuses

Incivility on college campuses is a prevalent problem that affects students, staff, administrators, and professors. Today's professor is often dealing with behavior in the classroom that the professor never anticipated and may not know how to best address. Professors are usually trained researchers in a certain subject matter, not in classroom management (Knepp, 2012). However, uncivil behavior in the classroom must be addressed because the outcome of it can have a negative impact not only on the students who are involved, but the students nearby as well (Schroeder & Robertson, 2008). Uncivil behavior such as students talking on the phone during class could impact the learning of other students around them (Schroeder & Robertson, 2008). In addition, incivility in the college classroom can result in less productive dialogue, less learning time, and may also negatively impact retention (Schroeder & Robertson, 2008). These factors make it important for leaders in higher education to promote civility on their

campuses; however, current studies do not suggest best practices for civility programming, instead current studies indicate the problem of incivility on college campuses and that something should be done to combat this phenomenon.

Forni (2008) explained that some professors are bullied by students who use profanity toward them, threaten professors, or physically abuse them. Unfortunately, some professors have unrealistic expectations of their students, such as students being interested in the class material at all times, and that students should blindly accept the authority of the professor (Knepp, 2012). When these expectations are not met, professors may respond in an uncivil manner toward students, which only serves to escalate the problem of incivility further (Knepp, 2012). Because of this it is crucial that leaders in higher education educate their campus bodies on civility both inside and outside of the classroom. Current studies do not indicate the best practices for creating civility programs and initiatives on college campuses.

Boice (1996) was one of the first to promulgate on the research of classroom incivility to try to better understand this growing phenomenon. Boice observed sixteen classrooms for five years at one large, public university, and focused on large survey courses. Boice observed the classes and took notes on background noise, attentiveness, enthusiasm, room comfort, and incidents of incivility. After each class Boice would interview a few students, and would also speak with each professor on a weekly basis.

In completing this research Boice proposed that faculty themselves can behave in an uncivil manner and that faculty need to use more positive motivators (encouraging student participation in the classroom) and more immediacies (walking around the class and making eye contact with each student). It was found that students seemed to notice

classroom incivilities less than professors did, and that senior professors tended to use more kinds of positive motivators and immediacies. The research showed that students displayed more acts of incivilities prior to exams, but in classrooms where professors assisted students in test preparations this uncivil behavior decreased. It was also found that classrooms were more civil when students had an increased opportunity for interaction with the professor outside of the classroom. Students expressed a greater respect and understanding of the professor through outside class interactions (Boice, 1996). Boice's study is crucial because it established much of the foundation for future research on campus civility; however, this study does not propose best practices for addressing civility and further research is needed.

In 2000 the Center for Survey Research at Indiana University conducted research regarding what acts of incivility professors observed. A questionnaire was mailed to all faculty and graduate instructors. Upon completion 1,009 faculty and 440 graduate instructors had completed the questionnaire. The questionnaire asked participants to classify a variety of acts as uncivil or not. In addition, participants had to indicate the frequency as to how often they observed the potential uncivil acts. Lastly, participants were asked how they respond to classroom incivility. Over seventy-seven percent of respondents indicated that they spoke with the students involved outside of class time to address unacceptable classroom behavior with specific students, and to educate students on acceptable classroom decorum.

Connelly (2009) reviewed the research conducted by Indiana University and highlighted the acts that are found to be most serious, such as "threats, harassing comments, hostile verbal attacks, cheating, student taunting other students, vulgarity,

inappropriate emails, not paying attention, distracting conversations, cell phones during class, sarcastic remarks and computer usage during class" (p. 48). The results also indicated that professors found undergraduate students more likely to engage in classroom incivility, and that classroom incivility is more likely to occur in larger sized classes. The respondents also replied that female instructors and/or younger instructors are more likely to be the targets of incivility. The results also indicated that over 50% of the faculty respondents did not have any formal training in dealing with classroom incivility whether in graduate school or while currently teaching. This study conducted by Indiana University is valuable because it provides quantitative data on the frequency and types of acts of incivility professors address, and it also informs how professors respond to acts of incivility. However, this study is lacking because it does not offer best practices for addressing campus incivility.

Benton (2007) wrote of his own experiences as a professor and the acts that he observed. Benton was an English professor, but he also taught large general-education courses. Benton described acts of incivility, such as students who refuse to address professors appropriately, make rude comments in class, arrive late, yawn throughout class without covering their mouths, come to class unprepared, and/or send demanding emails requesting meetings and then not attending the meeting. Benton explained that some students may be self-absorbed and, therefore, do not care about the professor or the professor's opinion of them. Benton found the behavior in the classroom to be like that of a cafeteria in which students are eating, putting their feet up on chairs, playing video games, and/or checking email on their laptops.

Uncivil behavior in the classroom can distract even the most serious learner and can negatively affect the learning environment. Benton argued that this behavior could be likened to Wilson and Kelling's essay "Broken Windows" with regard to how if one broken window is left then more windows will be broken on the building. Benton claimed that professors must address the issue of classroom incivility in a manner similar to remedial coursework; that is, by addressing issues of incivility at the start of the semester and working to maintain a classroom environment that is civil and respectful. Benton stated, "the student culture of incivility is a larger impediment to their success than anything they might fail to learn" (Benton, 2007, p. 73). Benton's personal account of classroom incivility is valuable because it describes the daily interactions that a professor may face and the burden that incivility can put on the learning environment. Although this article is powerful it is limited in that it does not provide recommended best practices for addressing campus incivility.

Bjorklund and Rehling (2010) conducted a study involving 3,615 students at a midwestern public university to better understand the type and frequency of uncivil behavior that students experienced. This is helpful information because what a professor may consider uncivil behavior a student may not. For example, another student sleeping in the back of the class may not bother a student, but the professor may perceive this behavior to be uncivil (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010). This study conducted by Bjorklund and Rehling was also conducted to fill a void in the literature, because prior to this the research was anecdotal and either discipline-specific or institution specific. The study included a list of 23 behaviors that previous literature found to be uncivil classroom behavior. The results of Bjorklund and Rehling's 2010 study indicated that students

found "continuing to talk after being asked to stop," "coming to class under the influence of drugs or alcohol," "allowing a cell phone to ring," and "conversing loudly with others" as the most uncivil behaviors (p. 16). The study found that those behaviors deemed most uncivil were also found to occur less frequently. However, students do observe a fair amount of somewhat uncivil behavior on a regular basis. It was recommended by Bjorklund and Rehling (2010) that this study be used to educate students on what types of behavior may interfere with student learning, and that classroom expectations be established to discourage uncivil classroom behavior. According to Bjorklund and Rehling (2010), the findings of this study can be used to guide expectations and to discourage uncivil behavior. This study is valuable because it looks at incivility through the lens of the students, which previous studies had not done. However, now research must take the next step in suggesting best practices to promote campus civility. Little is known as to what elements are successful in promoting civility, and with incivility on the rise it is important to know what is working in the university setting.

Boyson (2012) conducted a study to determine how students perceive professors' responses to acts of incivility in the classroom. The purpose of the study was to provide the first research-based suggestions for instructors' responses to classroom incivility. The study included one hundred and fifty participants from a medium-sized college in the Northeastern United States. Students were asked to rank different scenarios of incivility and the instructors' responses given to the scenarios. The study found that students rated direct confrontation and private confrontation the highest ratings of effectiveness, and ignoring the behavior was rated as the least effective. Confronting uncivil behavior can be difficult for professors to engage in, however, this study indicated that it is the

response for which students are hoping (Boyson, 2012). This study is beneficial in that it instructs professors to respond swiftly and promptly to acts of incivility. However, this study is limited in that it does not address how a professor can promote civility prior to acts of incivility even occurring. Promoting civility on a college campus is imperative, and this study will inform higher education leaders how to do so best.

Studies have been conducted that focus on the problem of incivility in the college classroom specifically for nursing students. There is a concern within the nursing field that individuals within this study should not be experiencing acts of incivility at the rate that they do, considering that this is a field typically associated with caring and compassion. Lasiter, Marchiondo, and Marchiondo (2012) conducted a study of 152 senior nursing student participants from two Midwestern public universities. The study found that 133 of the 152 student participants indicated experiencing at least one uncivil treatment by professors. These incidents were categorized into four categories: "in front of someone," "talked to others about me," "made me feel stupid," and "I felt belittled" (Lasiter et al., p. 121). Participants of this study indicated that they felt embarrassed when professors belittled or threatened them in front of patients during clinical (Lasiter et al., 2012). It was also found that students were upset when nursing faculty spoke badly about them in front of their peers. One participant likened it to the confidentiality that must be displayed when discussing patients, and that, unfortunately, is not always displayed when discussing other students (Lasiter et al., 2012).

It was found that incivility in the classroom could have a profound affect on nursing students who are already coping with a great deal of academic pressure. Classroom incivility does not follow the prescribed care that nursing programs exemplify,

and it also negatively impacts student retention and program satisfaction (Lasiter et al., 2012). One participant shared his/her reason for not returning to this particular school for graduate studies was because of the treatment by one of the professors (Lasiter et al., 2012). Acts of incivility committed by faculty members can have a deep effect on nursing students and can potentially harm the field of nursing (Lasiter et al., 2012). The researchers suggested that a best practices manual for addressing incivility be created, as well as ongoing training and orientation for faculty members. This research by Lasiter et al. is impactful because it suggests that further work must be done to promote civility, and that acts of incivility can be very harmful for the success of everyone involved. This study will highlight best practices that can be introduced to leaders of higher education to utilize in promoting civility on their college campuses.

Zieziula and Calhoun (2014) conducted a survey among Student Affairs Professionals to answer the research question of: What acts of incivility are witnessed by student affairs professionals and what is the perceived severity and frequency of these acts? Over 400 professionals participated in the survey, and over 300 of the respondents were from public institutions. More than half of the respondents had worked in Student Affairs for less than ten years. Respondents were provided a list of common uncivil acts and were asked to use a 5-point Likert scale to rate the severity of these acts, ranging from being "very uncivil" to "very civil", and also indicate the frequency of how often they witness such acts. The two scenarios that received the highest percentage for being perceived as very uncivil were emails or voicemails with explicit language (62%) and attending campus programs under the influence of drugs or alcohol (72%); however, over ninety percent of respondents reported these acts to be witnessed almost never. The

findings indicated that acts that were perceived to be more uncivil were rarely witnessed (Zieziula & Calhoun, 2014).

In the open-ended questions, respondents expressed concern over students' use of social media, particularly Facebook. Some respondents explained that students utilized Facebook as a means for airing their grievances about particular departments on campus, described by one respondent as "micro-aggressions." Similarly, another respondent explained that students had posted inappropriate pictures of other students on social media. Respondents also indicated concern for the overuse of cell phones and students always texting, and not paying attention to others on campus. Additionally, respondents reported that students make unreasonable demands on them. One respondent specifically stated "students often act entitled - as if they are deserving of special treatment, when in fact they are not." The concerns that respondents indicated regarding increased demands and a more customer focused attitude may be a reflection of the shift in higher education into a commodity that focuses on increased finances, and allows for students to be viewed as the customers and for faculty and staff to be the providers of the service (Zieziula & Calhoun, 2014). This study is helpful in that it further solidifies the need for civility programming, but this study does not offer best practices for leaders in higher education to achieve civility programming.

Generational Theory

Today's traditional college student is part of the Millennial Generation, otherwise known as Gen Y (Weiler, 2004). For the purpose of this study, the term *Millennial* will be used to refer to this group. This generation has spent most of their growing years in a post September 11th environment, meaning that they have often lived in a country at war

and a fear of terrorism. Also, the Millennials rely heavily on technology, being connected to their peers, and a great amount of parent involvement. This generation has a different style of communication because of the prevalence of technology and social media. Because of these characteristics Millennials pose a new set of problems for faculty and staff to overcome, both in and outside of the classroom.

Forni (2008) found that today's students display "oversized portions of self-esteem" paired with "their massive exposure to coarse popular culture on television and the Net" (p. 16). Millennial students and their parents present a new set of challenges with their consumerist attitudes and an inability to take responsibility for their own education (Knepp, 2012). Today's college student is much more engaged with technology and the desire to be constantly entertained. Millennials are often characterized as having a short attention span and a need to multitask, which can make classroom management and engaging students challenging for college professors (Knepp, 2012). Julie Reiser, a lecturer at Towson University, stated that this generation of students "are addicted to multi-tasking. They need a soundtrack to their lives" (Dechter, 2007, p. 1F).

Some have also labeled this generation the "entitlement society" meaning that students feel entitled to good grades and college degrees (Barett, Rubaii-Barett, & Pelowski, 2010). An increased sense of entitlement paired with a consumerist attitude and a need to constantly be entertained can create an environment that promotes acts of incivility if a student does not feel connected and engaged on a college campus. The characteristics of the Millennials also place increased demands on professors to be entertaining, responsive to students' immediate needs, and more likely to receive

pushback from parents if students' demands are not met. The changes and increased

demands that the Millennials bring to college campuses must be addressed by increased

civility programs, and initiatives in order to promote a more civil campus environment

for students, faculty, and staff.

Student Affairs Professionals

Within higher education it is the student affairs staff who most often see and

experience the stresses that students face; and, it is those same individuals who would be

in the best position to provide information and education regarding civility and incivility

to the campus community. Within a Division of Student Affairs or Department of

Student Affairs there is typically a Dean of Students who oversees the programs and

outreach that is done to support the success of the students both inside and outside of the

classroom. According to the State University of New York (SUNY, 2015), the Dean of

Students is "concerned with the administration of the student affairs program to include

planning, development of overall policy and the operations of the student personnel

program" (SUNY, 2015, Human Resources).

The Dean of Students areas of oversight may vary depending on the size of the

campus and the needs of the campus; however, the Dean of Students typically oversees

programs that support the student body and promote a more successful learning

environment by aiding in the development of student both "intellectually, socially,

culturally and personally" (SUNY, 2015, Human Resources). More specifically, the out-

of-class educational programs that are developed within the Division of Student Affairs

should "help develop meaningful personal values, and ethical standards" for all students

(SUNY, 2015, Human Resources). If a campus does not have a Vice President for

Student Affairs, the Dean of Student may be tasked with acting within that role; subsequently if a campus does not have a Dean of Students, the Vice President for Student Affairs may act within that role.

The Dean of Students is often responsible for the development and implementation of policy within Student Affairs (SUNY, 2015). The Dean of Students may supervise the Office of Student Conduct, and may be the first to receive complaints of acts of incivility on the college campus, whether from a faculty or staff member. Oftentimes, the Dean of Students is at a loss as to how to handle acts of incivility, and more importantly at a loss as to how to promote civility on the campus. However, establishing a more civil student body is an important component of the Dean of Students' responsibilities, as he/she tries to create and implement programs that aid students in the development of personal values and ethical standards. As a leader in higher education it is important for the Dean of Students to be equipped to address problems and find solutions. This study assists Student Affairs Professionals in being better prepared to educate the campus community about civility and to promote a more civil campus environment.

Civility Programs

With the increase of incivility on college campuses it is necessary for universities to create intentional programs, workshops, and/or initiatives to address campus incivility. There is a common misperception that students arrive to college understanding the etiquette of a college classroom, and the proper decorum to use when corresponding and addressing faculty and staff on campus; however, this is no longer true. In order to fill this gap in higher education, there is a need for civility education in

all first-year classrooms (Connelly, 2009). In addition, civility education should be implemented outside of the classroom as well, in order to promote civility across the entire campus (Zieziula & Calhoun, 2014).

Typically, college students learn about the norms of higher education when they first arrive on campus, through orientation, first-year seminars, student activities, residential living, and involvement with clubs and organizations. However, Connelly (2009) further recommended that a Code of Academic Civility be used to start a discussion in first-year classes. "Civility is not another piece to be added onto the plate of an educator, it 'is' the plate upon which all else is placed" (Vincent as cited in Connelly, 2009, p. 55). The syllabus should include classroom expectations, appropriate classroom behavior, expectations for email communication and/or online decorum. In conjunction with this, the syllabus should include a policy on academic integrity. These are good starting points; however, this is not sufficient. More is needed to clearly articulate to students what the professor values and what the institution values. There are student and faculty handbooks that can be valuable; however, professors often assume that students come to university with a better understanding of expectations and values than they do. A Code of Academic Civility can be valuable because it would introduce students to the culture and expectations of the new community into which they have entered.

It is necessary that the education of civility for students be intentional and well planned out. The hope of implementing a Code of Academic Civility is that by introducing civility to students during their first-year that an environment of trust is created that evolves into student learning success. Connelly (2009) suggested that

professors conduct an in-class survey near the beginning of the semester that asks students to rate how civil their experiences in high school were. This information can then be used to engage the class in a discussion about civility and what it means to be civil on a college campus. This in-class conversation can be starting points to introduce the Code of Academic Civility, and to further discuss the expectations for civility inside of a college classroom. However, civility education must occur both inside and outside of the classroom, and this study will address the need for civility education both inside and outside of the classroom.

Civility programming in First-Year Experience classes has been successful; however, it is essential for programming to extend beyond this. In response to incivility, universities have implemented different programs. For example, Harvard University asked students to take a "kindness pledge," Florida State University initiated the "Uphold the Garnet & Gold" program that encourages the campus community to pass along tokens to others that act with integrity, and Project Civility at Rutgers University is a campus-wide initiative to promote civility (Troop, 2012). These programs are a good starting point; however, with incivility on the rise, it is now more important than ever for higher education professionals to know what practices work best for promoting civility on college campuses and why those practices work best. It is necessary that civility programs and initiatives are implemented that are proactive in promoting civility, rather than reactive in addressing problems of incivility. This study determines best practices for promoting civility as shared from Student Affairs Professionals at State University of New York Colleges and Universities. The outcomes of this study are beneficial for

leaders in higher education as they work to promote a more civil campus environment through different programs, initiatives, and events.

Statement of the Problem

Incivility on college campuses is a known problem, and research has found that this is an issue both inside and outside of the classroom. Today's college student has evolved and shifted into a consumer with increased demands, and therefore increased incidents of incivility if demands are not met. Students are not educated on civility and, therefore, do not understand basic behavior, such as classroom decorum, email etiquette, and how to appropriately address others on campus. Other students in the classroom are affected by poor classroom behavior as this can disrupt the learning environment, and may stop students from attending class. Professors are not trained to deal with classroom incivilities, and the effects of not appropriately addressing classroom incivilities can be damaging to other students and their success in the classroom. Professors may choose not to teach anymore and to change professions as to not have to deal with rude students and inappropriate classroom behavior. Research has shown that this is a problem that must be addressed, as it impacts the entire campus community (Benton, 2007; Bjorklund & Rehling, 2010; Zieziula & Calhoun, 2014). Some campuses have begun different civility campaigns, classroom behavior contracts, faculty workshops and lessons; however, it is unknown what the best practices are for campuses.

In order to know the best practices for addressing on-campus civility, it is important to know what is already being done that has had positive results. Therefore, the purpose of this qualitative study is to explore civility initiatives being instituted by Student Affairs Professionals across State University of New York campuses to

determine best practices for campus-wide civility initiatives. A Dean of Students

oversees many programs and initiatives for students, and will be able to share information

regarding civility initiatives being implemented. Student Affairs Professionals were

asked what practices are working best on their campuses and why. By reviewing the

different elements from Student Affairs Professionals, the learning outcomes and goals,

and the assessments of the elements, a list of best practices related to civility initiatives

was then created.

Significance of the Study

Higher education leaders are interested in their students' success in the classroom,

which will hopefully result in progression and graduating to become responsible

members of society. However, incivility on college campuses can harm this success even

for the most focused and high-achieving student by disrupting the learning environment,

distracting from the goals of the class time, and in extreme cases stop the entire class

session's lesson plan. Because of this, it is important for universities and colleges to

know how to best educate the campus community about civility in a manner that is

proactive rather than reactive. This study may inform universities and colleges as to the

best way to coordinate and implement civility programs and initiatives. Student Affairs

Professionals can then utilize this information to implement civility initiatives on their

own campuses. This study shows that the implementation of more civility initiatives on

college campuses will lead to a more successful, respectful and engaging learning

environment, which will positively impact faculty, staff and students.

Research Questions

In an effort to explore practices related to civility and incivility on college campuses, this study will be guided by the following overarching research question: What are the best practices regarding the promotion of campus civility in and outside of the classroom? For the purpose of this study, *best practices* will be defined as those that are currently being used that promote civility and decrease incivility, specifically in the SUNY system. To further answer this question, the following questions were asked:

1. How do colleges and universities in the SUNY system address classroom incivility?

2. What initiatives do colleges and universities in the SUNY system implement to address incivility outside of the classroom?

3. What supports are available for civility initiatives in and outside of the classroom within the colleges and universities of the SUNY system?

4. How are the civility initiatives implemented?

5. How do the colleges and universities in the SUNY system assess civility initiatives?

In addition, if there are no programs for civility on the campus the Student Affairs Professionals were asked why no such programs exist, and if there are any plans for future programs. Also, if available, Student Affairs Professionals were asked to provide additional resources and materials that are available for each program (pamphlets, presentations, training materials or classroom contracts) that were further reviewed to gain a fuller understanding of each program.

Procedures

To better understand campus civility initiatives, the researcher used a qualitative approach with a multiple case study design. The case study approach is an appropriate design for this study because it is an exploration to find the best practices for SUNY institutions. The case study approach also allows for the researcher to look at each university, and to determine the elements of civility programs that are most successful inside of the university setting.

The State University of New York System (SUNY) has been selected for this study because the researcher lives in New York and should be able to travel with ease to various institutions, if needed. SUNY consists of sixty-four campuses total, which include the community colleges and technical colleges in New York as well. Of the SUNY institutions, twenty-four are university centers or university colleges. These twenty-four institutions still have unique differences among them, but tend to be more similar than the community colleges and technical colleges; therefore, these twenty-four institutions are included in this research. The twenty-four institutions were categorized by size (small, medium and large), and institutions were utilized within each category for a total of eight institutions. Small institutions are categorized as 2,999 students or less, medium institutions are categorized as 3,000 to 9,999 students, and large institutions are categorized as 10,000 students or more, according to the Carnegie Classification System (Carnegie Foundation, 2011). This study was limited to undergraduate programs and not graduate programs.

The researcher contacted the Student Affairs Professionals at the selected institutions for retrieval of documents, and one Student Affairs Professional from each

category was interviewed by phone. The eight institutions were selected using a convenience method, using institutions that the researcher had a connection to, and the goal of the researcher was to connect with institutions that have a Dean of Students, as well as a civility statement. If an institution did not have a Dean of Students then a person who served in a similar role was used, such as a Vice President of Student Affairs or Director of Student Affairs. Similarly, the Senior Student Affairs Administrator was contacted if a Dean of Students or a similar position is not at an institution. The Student Affairs Professionals being interviewed were asked a series of questions found in Appendix A. Additionally, the researcher attempted to collect five forms of data: website information, interviews, documents (including the Code of Conduct and Civility Statement), faculty training (including syllabi language and orientation), and current data of reported incidents of incivility both in and outside of the classroom. Also, the researcher attempted to collect observational data; however, no observational data was made available to the researcher, and instead the researcher collected data, such as materials used for the presentation and facilitation of civility programs.

The researcher conducted data analysis vis-à-vis constant comparative methods. In the initial phase, the researcher began by reviewing the elements of the civility initiatives and the interviews by their categorized campus size—within case analysis; a second level of analysis was done by conducting a cross-case analysis across all categories. The researcher presented the findings using descriptive statistics analysis and interview narratives. This research design allowed the researcher to obtain information on civility initiatives from many institutions while still focusing on a set geographical area of New York State.

Definition of Terms

While several words and phrases used in this study are commonly known; the following will define each as it is used for the purposes of the study.

Campus Civility: For the purpose of this research, campus civility means any act committed on campus by any member of the campus community that display respect, uphold manners, and awareness for how those actions affect others.

Campus Incivility: For the purpose of this research, campus incivility means any act committed by a student that does not reflect behavior that is mannerly and polite, as well as any act that may place inappropriate demands and/or requests on a faculty or staff member, and may disrupt the learning environment.

Civility: For the purpose of this study, civility will be defined as acts committed by a person that display respect, and uphold manners and awareness for how those actions affect others.

Dean of Students: For the purpose of this research, the Dean of Students is one that oversees Student Affairs, Student Services or certain aspects of Student Affairs on a college campus.

Incivility: For the purpose of this research, incivility will be defined as acts committed by a person that are rude, disrespectful and lacking in an awareness of others.

Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

As with all studies, this line of research has inherent limitations, delimitations, and assumptions. Bias is to be expected in qualitative studies, however, the researcher may have a greater bias due to her involvement implementing and coordinating a civility campaign at her previous employment. The researcher has involvement working on a

civility campaign, as well as teaching a first-year seminar class on civility. Because of the researcher's involvement with civility campaigns and initiatives, the researcher has a greater interest in seeing civility initiatives on college campuses, and to see that these campaigns are effective. The researcher engaged in reflectivity and wrote in a journal of her biases to note them throughout the research process, to limit the affect that they may have on the study.

The delimitations are that this study only focused on SUNY institutions and does not extend outside of New York State. Additionally, this research only includes SUNY institutions that are state public institutions and does not include private institutions that may also have civility initiatives. Lastly, this research utilized the Dean of Students and/or Vice President for Student Affairs who may not know all of the civility initiatives that are being implemented on a particular campus; this may be especially true for a large university such as SUNY with many colleges within it. For example, the Dean of Students and/or Vice President for Student Affairs may not be aware of a civility initiative a particular college is doing. However, as with most qualitative studies, this study does not seek generalizability.

The assumptions of this research are that institutions value civility and want to implement programs to promote civility on their campuses. By promoting and educating the campus community about civility, institutions are more welcoming, respectful, and less likely to have incidents that distract from the learning environment. It is also assumed that the Student Affairs Professional has knowledge of the civility initiatives on his or her particular campus.

Chapter Summary

Research has shown incivility is on an increase; as a result, many institutions have implemented civility initiatives. Acts of incivility on college campuses has become a major concern. Professors are often not prepared to address uncivil behavior in the classroom, and this type of behavior can distract from the learning environment. Today's college student has a consumer mentality that places increased demands on colleges and universities. This consumer mentality coupled with increased technology and decreased direct communication feeds into an uncivil environment. Incivility in the classroom can negatively affect the students and the professor, and may cause students to be unsuccessful. College incivility can negatively impact a student's retention, progression, and subsequently graduation rates.

Colleges and universities must address campus incivility and must be proactive with their programs and initiatives. This issue must be addressed in order to create an environment that supports learning inside of the classroom, and not acts of incivility. By supporting civility on college campuses; students, faculty and staff will be more successful and better engaged in the campus environment. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to understand the elements of civility initiatives that SUNY institutions have implemented both in and outside of the classroom, and the results of such elements in terms of reducing incidents of incivility. The findings of this study may assist leaders of universities and colleges in planning and initiating civility initiatives that are the most effective.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of the literature is presented to further explain the issue of campus incivility, how it affects the campus community and what is currently implemented to address campus incivility. Suggestions for best practices that were found in the literature will be described. The theoretical construct of workplace incivility will be explored to further understand this growing phenomenon in the workplace and how it relates to college campuses. Also, the theoretical construct of generational theory will be utilized to further examine the issue of campus incivility by examining today's traditional college student and the characteristics of the Millennial Generation. Lastly, the review of the literature will conclude with an overall summary of the literature that was found.

This chapter included a search of relevant literature by primarily using the online system for electronic databases through the Georgia Southern University online library. In addition Google Scholar was used to search for specific articles that were referenced in landmark studies. These searches predominantly used keywords and phrases such as, "campus incivility," "campus civility," "workplace incivility," "Millennials," and "civility programs." The researcher also searched Dissertations and Theses with Full Text through ProQuest for Dissertations, which the search focused primarily on campus incivility. The dissertations that were found were then cross-referenced to check for reoccurring references that indicated to the author the importance of these particular references. The researcher then located these references by searching the Georgia Southern University online library and Google Scholar.

The researcher also utilized an article "alert" option in Google Scholar that alerted the researcher of new articles that had been posted online relating to the topics of "campus civility" and "college incivility." The articles within this literature review are predominantly peer-reviewed educational journals, though some of the articles that reference latest trends and civility programs, the researcher found within the Chronicle of Higher Education.

The current literature focused mainly on campus civility as a problem at colleges and universities, and there are not many studies that research the programs and initiatives to promote campus civility on college campuses. Therefore, the gap in the literature can be identified as a need to determine best practices for promoting civility on college campuses.

<p style="text-align:center;">**Campus Incivility**</p>

Incivility is a concern in our society as technology has increased, consumerism mentality has increased, and concern and awareness for others has decreased. Incivility on college campuses has become a great concern as it can affect the success of the students in the classroom, and can oftentimes harm the learning environment. This section will introduce the concern of incivility on college campuses as found in the review of the literature.

The previous chapter established definitions for civility and campus civility for the purpose of this research. However, it is worth noting again, that civility can be challenging to define, and the definitions that are used are often broad. Still, even though "you may not be able to specifically define civility, you certainly know incivility when you see it" (Seganish & Holter, 2013, p. 57). Anderson and Pearson (1999) described

uncivil behaviors as "acting rudely or discourteously, without regard for others, in violation of norms for respect in social interactions" (p. 455). It is important to note that acts of incivility may range from minor annoyances to major disturbances, all of which fail to uphold an awareness of others, and how one's actions may affect others.

In 1997 Forni founded the John Hopkins Civility Project, now known as the Civility Initiative, which conducts research on civility (Santovec, 2011). Forni found that behaving in a civil manner goes against the American ethos of looking out for oneself (as cited in Santovec, 2011). Guidelines for civility, such as raising your hand before one speaks may feel constricting and harmful to individual freedom; because of this, an individual who is motivated by self-interest may decide to rebel against the set standards of civility (Connelly, 2009). Media has highlighted recent stories that make one question the existence of civility; such stories range from political debates to professional athletes being arrested, to celebrities behaving badly. Examples include Kanye West arguing on stage with Taylor Swift, Congressman Wilson yelling "you lie" during President Obama's speech, and Serena Williams yelling at the line judge during the 2010 U.S. Open (Santovec, 2011). In 2002 the Sarbanes-Oxley Act was passed which requires all public companies to develop a Code of Ethics (Seganish & Holter, 2013). Because of the passing of this act more universities had begun to implement Codes of Conduct/Ethical Behavior; however, acts of incivility continue to be on the rise (Seganish & Holter, 2013).

Higher education is a microcosm of the larger society, so issues of incivility can be observed on a college campus at all levels (Connelly, 2009). The need for civility on college campuses is still necessary today; in fact, some may argue that it is even more

necessary today as cases like Tyler Clementi's suicide, student protests over the George Zimmerman trial, increased concerns of sexual assaults on college campuses, and heated debate over race issues take center stage. "There is a direct link between incivility, lack of respect and disciplinary problems" on college campuses (Popovics, 2014, p. 130). Campus incivility is a problem that affects professors in the classroom, student interactions with their peers, and also college administrators. Some students indicated that classroom incivility caused them to lose their focus and become distracted during the class time (Ausbrooks, Jones, & Tijerina, 2011).

Popovics (2014) found that during his tenure as Vice President at Hudson Valley Community College he was increasingly engaged in conversations, both formal and informal, regarding civility and respect. Rookstool (2005) explained that promoting civility on a college campus should be the responsibility of everyone and that civility is necessary in order to create a learning environment in which students are open to ideas of their peers, rather than trying to defend their own ideas. Rookstool (2005) further stated that it is important for a professor to display mutual respect for those who are learning and going through the learning process.

Examples of Incivility in Higher Education

In higher education today there is a crisis of incivility on college campuses. Professors often discuss the poor behavior of both undergraduate and graduate students in the classroom (Schroeder & Robertson, 2008). Disruptions in the classroom, such as students arriving late, texting and surfing the Internet, are all examples of acts of incivility. A lack of courtesy and respect for the professor through acts such as using slang, not addressing the professor properly or using profanity are also examples of

incivility. Additional acts of incivility may be students eating in class, failure of students to attend group meetings, professors arriving late, students not completing assignments, students reading non-related materials in class, and students and professors making rude comments during class (Seganish & Holter, 2013).

Ausbrooks, Jones, and Tijerina's (2011) conducted a mixed methods study of faculty and students in a Social Work Program to determine what issues of incivility occurred within Social Work Programs. The survey was distributed among faculty and students, and fifteen faculty members responded, and 28 students responded. This study found that faculty perceived acts of incivility to occur less frequently and to be less serious than students did. These faculty members explained that this was because they create clear expectations, model appropriate behavior themselves, engage their students, focus on professionalism, and because of the maturity of their students. However, some of the faculty reported observing "side conversations" during class time, texting, students arriving late or leaving early, rude behavior towards peers, and students openly challenging professors during class (Ausbrooks, et al., 2011). In this study students also reported witnessing their peers surfing the internet, checking Facebook, being disrespectful to both the professors and peers, talking on cell phones during class, texting and talking to peers during class (Ausbrooks, et al., 2011). Students reported their desire to see professors take stronger actions against students that are committing uncivil acts. Some of the difference in opinions between faculty and students in this study may be because students have a different viewpoint of the classroom than faculty do, and therefore students may be able to observe more of the classroom than faculty (Ausbrooks, et al., 2011). Despite the differences in responses from students and faculty in this study,

the study still highlights the need to address incivility on college campuses, and the manner in which it can disrupt the learning environment inside of the classroom.

In order to feature workplace morale and civility in higher education an online news source, Inside Higher Ed, began a column entitled "A Kinder Campus". One of the articles highlighted the need to address incivility on college campuses and the author was saddened when she found that by Googling "bullying in college," she accessed more than 5 million hits. Acts of incivility, bullying, microaggressions, and unkindness can potentially morph into violence. An act of violence or other such tragedies should not need to occur in order to get academia to begin to think about incivility and how it can best be addressed (Stewart, 2011). Higher education must promote civility and address all acts of incivility, before any larger acts of incivility occur which could potentially escalate and result in tragedies involving acts of violence. This study will fill this void in higher education by informing campus leaders of best practices for promoting civility on college campuses.

Why Increased Incivility

Although some may argue that the increase in incivility is a sudden phenomenon; many others would describe the increase of incivility as slow erosion over a period of time (Seganish & Holter, 2013). There are many reasons as to why researchers have found a rise in incivility, such as the characteristics of the Millennial Generation; however, other explanations are more targeted. Some researchers believe that the lack of a traditional family who sits down for nightly dinners and communicates is one of the reasons for an increase in incivility. Today's families are often two-career families that are rushed from one after school event to another. Additionally, fewer families interact

with grandparents and other extended family daily who can instill manners and etiquette in children (Seganish & Holter, 2013).

There have also been cultural shifts that may have impacted the rise of incivility. For example, today's music and movies would have been seen as inappropriate and vulgar years ago. Additionally, electronic devices, such as cell phones, iPods, computers, and video games have replaced much direct interaction with people. Even toddlers learn from the electronic Leap Pad Learning systems at a young age. Texting and social media has allowed for people to eliminate the use of proper greetings and manners. Much information that at one time would remain personal is now shared on social media, and social media has become an avenue for bullying (Seganish & Holter, 2013).

There are greater political and social implications, which may have led to the increase of incivility. For example, economic instability has led to some employees doing the work that would have previously been done by several employees. There is also insecurity about the social security system, unemployment, the financial system, and the future in general. In addition to these problems there is a greater sense of entitlement, and with this comes fewer people that display a high level of civility. Even members of Congress have not sought reelection because of the lack of bi-partisanship on the Hill (Seganish & Holter, 2013).

However, trying to seek the reasons for increased incivility on college campuses is not easy to do. Of course some of the larger factors that were just described may impact civility on college campuses. Other reasons that students engage in uncivil behavior is not fully known; however, some reasons offered by faculty members were, "student entitlement, not being held accountable, boredom, students having their own

agenda, professors being uncomfortable with authority and professors wanting to be friends with students" (Ausbrooks, et al., 2011, p. 270). Students offered similar reasons, and additionally added that students "were not taught better, unaware of their behavior, and lack of respect and rude" (Ausbrooks, et al., 2011, p. 270). Students also fail to take responsibility for their own learning, and this factor coupled with a consumerist mentality can lead to an increase in incivility (Knepp, 2012). These suggested reasons are merely anecdotal and not supported by research; however, one could surmise that these reasons may be true, and if so, something must be done to combat this problem and to create a more civil college campus. The findings from this study will close this research gap by offering best practices for promoting civility on college campuses.

Faculty and Incivility

The discussion of classroom incivility among faculty seems to be a taboo topic and one of embarrassment that professors shy away from having (Boice, 1996). Classroom incivility is discussed more at the primary school level, as well as very urban or rural elementary schools rather than universities. When universities discuss incivility they seem to discuss it in an abstract manner and there is a strong desire to try to protect the institutional image by not publicly sharing these concerns (Boice, 1996). However, discussing and learning more about incivility is important for professors to do, because oftentimes professors are not prepared or trained to address classroom incivility. Dealing with classroom incivilities is an aspect of teaching that faculty are not prepared for, do not expect, takes the most time and energy from a faculty member, and oftentimes leaves the faculty member questioning the choice of a career in higher education (Boice, 2000).

The topic of campus incivility is not one that can be ignored anymore, rather it must be addressed, and campuses must learn of ways to promote civility.

Faculty members have an important job of managing their classes, addressing any acts of incivility and promoting a civil learning environment. It is recommended that professors work to prevent uncivil behavior and disruptions by reviewing institutional policies with students, making class time challenging and engaging, and modeling the behavior professors expect from their students (Harrell & Hollins, 2009). Professors must address disruptive behavior immediately and explain to the student what behavior is appropriate for the classroom. Although much research has focused on major threats and violent acts of disruption, it is also important to remember that major acts can often be avoided by addressing minor acts (Harrell & Hollins, 2009). Acts of incivility can escalate to behavior that disrupts the learning environment. If the situation is hostile or aggressive, it is important for a professor to contact university police or a trained staff member (Harrell & Hollins, 2009). Baker, Comer, and Martinak (2008) remind faculty to rely on the support of fellow faculty members, accept the responsibility of preparing students, reframe incidents of incivility to determine if it truly needs to be addressed, and be proactive in addressing incivility.

Boice's later work in 2000 addressed classroom incivility more specifically for new faculty members. Within this literature Boice (2000) cautioned new faculty members to not prepare too much material at too fast of a pace because it discourages discussions. He also recommended that new faculty set the rationale and context for what is being taught to help engage the students. Faculty are also encouraged to learn how to connect with their audiences, especially for large lecture style classes. Boice

(2000) also cautioned new faculty members to not only "preach to the converted"; meaning that it is important to reach those students that are not excelling at a high rate and fully grasping all of the material, and that it is important to also engage the average learner that may not pay attention or come to class prepared.

Boice's work of 2000 presented a new study in which he compared fourteen novice faculty members who had recently received poor evaluations from their students to fourteen faculty members who had been on campus for at least five years and had won teaching awards. Boice observed these faculty members for ten class meetings, and noted that the highly rated faculty members had quiet classrooms in which students seemed more engaged. In comparison, the classrooms of novice faculty members appeared to have fewer students taking notes and more students unable to explain general concepts of course material. However, Boice did mention that minor classroom incivilities were observed in the highly rated faculty members' classes; however, the response that those faculty members provided was more respectful, and with a well thought out response, such as, "I'm seeing some big yawns… let's all stand and stretch for a minute" (p. 94).

In response to these findings, Boice coached several novice faculty members for 10 individual sessions for approximately 10 minutes each which addressed issues such as positively responding to students incivility, open postures with forward leans, and smiling at students. Boice found that after a semester of coaching novice faculty members that students were more engaged in class material and fewer acts of incivility were observed. Boice concluded his findings by stating that faculty members were the main initiators of classroom incivilities, and that he observed this most during the first

few classes. Because of this it is important for faculty members to be self-aware, and know how to address classroom incivilities (Boice, 2000).

Although faculty experience incivility inside of the classroom, there are also uncivil acts that faculty members are subjected to from students' behavior outside of the classroom. Bjorklund and Rehling (2011) researched the uncivil behavior that faculty experienced outside of the classroom, specifically the type of behavior and the frequency of it. This behavior is important because it can impact the relationship between faculty and students, the classroom dynamics, and the level of enjoyment faculty members may experience in their profession. One hundred fifty-three faculty members at a midwestern university participated in this research. The findings indicated that faculty experience somewhat uncivil behavior on a regular basis. The behavior that ranked as most inappropriate was "missing a scheduled appointment, wearing apparel with explicit language or images, and insisting that you force register a student" (p. 31). Although all faculty may not agree on the definitions of civility and uncivil behavior, it is recommended that faculty include expectations for outside classroom behavior in course syllabi. It is also suggested that faculty openly discuss their expectations with students and engage students in a dialogue regarding uncivil behavior (Bjorklund & Rehling, 2011).

The academic discipline of nursing has experienced an increase in acts of incivility inside and outside of the classroom. Of course this is quite concerning for a field that is supposed to be coupled with a sense of caring and compassion. Because of this concern within the nursing field, research studies have been completed to gain a better understanding of this problem. Incivility is a key reason for the increased levels of

turnover within the first two years of new graduate nurse employment (D'Ambra &

Andrews, 2013). A review of literature related to nursing, incivility, bullying, and similar

concepts was conducted. This review included 16 studies and found that incivility is

associated with the nursing workplace environment and can impact job satisfaction and

retention. This is especially problematic for newly graduated nurses. The conclusion of

this literature review was that more must be done to address this growing problem in the

nursing field and changes must be made to address this cultural problem. It was also

found that incivility in the nursing workplace has become acceptable behavior, and that is

certainly a major problem as it negatively affects retention and job satisfaction of nursing

graduates (D'Ambra & Andrews, 2013).

Hunt and Marini (2012) used a mixed method design to better understand the

incivility that clinical nursing teachers experienced. Thirty-seven clinical teachers

working with undergraduate students at a large urban center were participants of this

study. The clinical nursing teachers completed a survey that found all teachers reported

experiencing some form of incivility. The survey indicated that indirect incivility was the

most dominant type of incivility experienced. Indirect civility would be acts such as

gossiping about others rather than speaking to the person directly. In comparison, a staff

member belittling new hires in front of patients would be an example of direct incivility.

This study also found that reactive incivility is experienced at a higher rate. Reactive

incivility is when one is retaliating for something that one feels may have provoked them,

such as a nurse yelling at a patient because the nurse felt the patient questions his/her

orders. In comparison, proactive incivility is when one acts uncivil to assert their power

and control over a situation, and this type of incivility was experienced less than reactive incivility (Hunt & Marini, 2012).

The results of this survey were placed on the Multidimensional In/Civility Identification Model (MIIM), which was created for a previous study and is based on bullying behavior. This model places direct and indirect form on either end of the horizontal axis, and proactive and reactive function on the vertical axis. The findings of this study are important particularly to the nursing field because nurses are often seen as moral agents, and with this it is important for students in the clinical field to learn what behavior is uncivil. Also, it is important for clinical teachers to be aware of uncivil behavior and to set the tone of a civil environment, so that uncivil behaviors do not escalate into worse behavior. Lastly, incivility in the nursing environment can negatively affect students' learning, as well as cause graduate burnout, because of this it is important for studies to be conducted, so that incivility can be properly addressed (Hunt & Marini, 2012).

Alberts, Hazen, and Theobald (2010) studied early-career geography faculty and their experiences with classroom incivility. The researchers selected geography faculty to control for the discipline, and selected early-career faculty as they may be more likely to need assistance with their new teaching career and they may also be more likely to experiment with different teaching approaches. Early-career faculty were defined as faculty that have not yet received tenure. The researchers emailed a survey to the Association of American Geographers, and received 397 completed survey responses. The study found that inattentiveness was the most commonly reported form of incivility, and close behind was disrespectful behavior such as interrupting class or arriving late.

The open-ended questions indicated that faculty described a change in the student population in recent years. One faculty member responded that he/she observed "virtual incivilities," meaning behavior that can be found online such as email etiquette. Additionally, the researchers did not find many statistically significant differences between types of institution; however, they did find that faculty at public institutions reported more problems with inattentive students than private institutions. Reports of hostility were greater at research institutions, and reports of hostility were also greater in large lecture classes (Alberts, et al., 2010).

Similar to Bjorklund and Rehling (2011), Alberts, et al. (2010) also wanted to examine acts of incivility beyond the classroom to outside of the classroom as well. Alberts, et al. (2010) found that faculty experience students demanding make-up exams, extra credit or extensions for unsubstantial reasons. Faculty also experience plagiarism and/or cheating, as well as students complaining that the standards set by the faculty member are too tough. Strategies to respond to these specific problems suggested that faculty are often far more willing to be flexible with deadlines, but far less likely to be flexible with grades. Faculty respondents also suggested being willing to look over a student's graded assignment again for further feedback, and other faculty respondents would seek another faculty member's opinion over a grade dispute. Faculty also suggested creating grading rubrics to make the process more transparent, and less likely for students to complain about their grades. Another suggestion to reduce grade complaints was to throw out the lowest score for all students (Alberts, et al., 2010).

The response to students demand for extra credit was mixed, as some professors felt that extra credit is valuable, whereas others found extra credit to be unnecessary.

However, some of these suggestions create a philosophical divide in which some faculty members support extra credit and being flexible with assignments, whereas other faculty members do not support such notions (Alberts, et al., 2010). Unreasonable demands on faculty members are often perceived as uncivil acts, so it is important for faculty members to know how to respond to such demands and to be prepared in doing so. Though these suggestions and findings are important, they are more reactive to the problem of incivility on college campuses, rather than proactive in promoting a civil campus and creating programs to promote civility. This study will fill this void in the literature by informing leaders in higher education of best practices for civility programs and initiatives.

Although community colleges pose their own unique challenges in comparison to four-year institutions, there is still value in what professionals are experiencing on community college campuses. Schnee and VanOra (2012) reported that coupled with a great increase in student enrollment, also came an increase in incivility on their community college campus in New York. Their Dean of Students Office reported approximately ninety disciplinary incidents per semester over the past few years. This increase in issues of incivility prompted the college to implement a college-wide campaign for civility. This campaign is largely driven by faculty and staff, and includes a code of civility posted in every classroom, efforts to include civility statements in syllabi, the implementation of a Care Team to respond to students of concern, and a forum on campus civility. The college has also drafted a survey regarding acts of incivility that seem to indicate that the college does not have a clear definition of incivility and what is actually a criminal offense instead.

In this reflective essay the authors explained a situation in which a described "clique" of four students were disruptive in their learning community of three different classes. Although the professors attempted to speak to the students and address the matter, the situation evolved and worsened as the students continued to behave uncivilly in the classroom. Because of this behavior the Dean of Students Office responded with safety officers removing the students from the classroom and the dean meeting with the students to have them all sign a behavior contract. Schnee and VanOra (2012) proposed that the college's authoritative response to these students behavior only worsened the matters and did not encourage the students to learn inside of the classroom in a respectful manner. Rather than an authoritative response to classroom incivility, the authors suggested a response that fosters student engagement and empowers students.

Schnee and VanOra (2012) suggested review committees that include student representation to address classroom concerns, and for faculty to work with students in their classroom to develop appropriate ground rules for the classroom. It is suggested that professors consider negotiating with students on such matters as cell phone and electronic devices in the classroom to come to some agreement as to what establishes the best learning environment. This reflective essay and its suggested practices for faculty are unique because it promotes a democratic learning environment, which empowers both the faculty member and the students. Though a unique approach to addressing incivility, this article is not based on sound research and does not suggest best practices for promoting civility campus wide. This study fills this research gap by defining best practices for promoting campus civility.

Affects of Gender and Race

Managing incivility on a college campus can be challenging, and, unfortunately, professors who are young, female, non-tenured, and minorities must overcome the greatest obstacles (Knepp, 2012). Feldmann (2001) stated that as a "BWOM" (big white older male) Feldmann experienced fewer instances of classroom incivility. An instructor who is not a "BWOM" has an increased likelihood of experiencing more classroom incivilities (Feldmann, 2001). Feldmann (2001) recommended that institutions implement a comprehensive incivility policy statement, especially for professors that are not a "BWOM."

Alberts, et al. (2010) surveyed faculty in the Association of American Geographers regarding incivility, and received 397 completed survey responses. The researchers found that 21.3 percent of respondents reported hostility against a faculty member for being in a certain group, such as race, nationality or sexual orientation. It was also reported that female respondents felt that they were particular targets for acts of hostility much more so than their male counterparts. One female respondent indicated that the actions she has endured go beyond hostility to sexual harassment such as, comments about her appearance and being asked on dates by students. Many female respondents believed that they were treated in a more informal manner than male faculty members.

Alexander-Snow (2004) proposed that Boice's landmark research was limited as it may not be as helpful to faculty who are female or are of color. Therefore, Alexander-Snow (2004) conducted theoretical based research to examine more closely classroom incivility from a multicultural perspective. Students will often formulate their own

perceptions of professors prior to even attending the first class. These perceptions can be from what the student has heard about the professor from other students or known attributes about the professor (professor's demeanor, ethnicity, language style). "These perceptions then become the student's expectations of the teacher" (Alexander-Snow, 2004, p. 27). Because of this, it may be necessary to address classroom incivility not only from the notion that professors need to act with more immediacy and prosocial motivators, as Boice proposed, but rather that students need to reevaluate their cultural perceptions.

Dynamics within a classroom reflect a power struggle between students and faculty. Female faculty and faculty of color are aware of how their cultural identities may affect the power struggle within the classroom. For example, if a white teacher acts in a way that is urging student engagement, it may be perceived as intellectually challenging, but if an African American teacher displays the same behavior it may be perceived as hostile and aggressive (Alexander-Snow, 2004). When uncivil incidents occur women are more likely to avoid confrontation and tend to focus on building relationships (Santovec, 2011). However, women are more likely to respond to rude emails with a quick rude reply right back, whereas men may be more likely not to reply at all (Santovec, 2011). Researchers must recognize these important cultural, gender and racial differences in order to better promote civility on college campuses, as these are unique matters that cannot be ignored.

It is unfortunate that faculty members must deal with acts of incivility at all; however, research does indicate that the majority of the times the acts that faculty are faced with are minor acts of incivility (Alberts, et al., 2010). Some of these acts may be

attributed to a lack of students fully understanding how their actions may be perceived and affect others (Alberts, et al., 2010). However, it is of concern that research indicates that faculty who are female, international or of color are dealing with a higher rate of incivility in the classroom. Oftentimes these particular groups of faculty members are already dealing with power dynamics in the workplace and other unfair disadvantages. Women and minority faculty members may experience greater acts of incivility because of students' misperceptions of these particular groups. For example, students may perceive a female faculty member to be more easily intimidated. It is also possible that women and minority faculty may feel more vulnerable in their positions, and therefore more likely to report acts of incivility. For example, an international faculty member may feel vulnerable if their visa depends on their employment. These differences also lead to a different response in how incivilities are addressed; for example, female professors are more likely to use a more diverse set of strategies to address classroom incivility than their male counterparts (Alberts, et al., 2010). These differences in responses to incivility are important to be aware of when moving forward in promoting civility programs and education on college campuses, because without addressing these differences programs and initiatives may not be as successful as one had hoped.

Administrators and Incivility

Though there is more research regarding faculty and classroom incivility, the issue of incivility is not limited to just inside the classroom. Administrators and staff also deal with campus incivility, and the responsibility to promote civility is not just the responsibility of professors, but of the entire campus (Popovics, 2014). Administrators and staff should seek opportunities to promote civility during orientations, as well as pre-

registration and registration activities (Popovics, 2014). Posters and signs around campus may also be used to foster civility on the college campus. Popovics (2014) asserted that "words combined with actions speak the loudest" when speaking of civility and respect (p. 132). It is important that administrators and staff members be a part of these conversations and initiatives in order to best promote civility across college campuses.

Administrators may have a larger scope of issues to consider regarding incivility outside of the classroom, as this can range from behavior in the dining hall to uncivil acts at student run events and programs. It was found that students who attend a large university are able to feel a greater sense of anonymity, and this allows for students to behave poorly with less fear of being caught (Santovec, 2011). Because of this it is important for administrators to be diligent in promoting civility both in and outside of the classroom. Administrators may also need to address acts of incivility on social media and emails. The increased use of email on college campuses also allows for more informal interactions that remove normal barriers (Santovec, 2011). Also, there is often an expectation with email for an immediate response during anytime of the day from faculty and staff (Barrett, Rubaii-Barett & Pelowski, 2010). Email can also be problematic because one may be more quick to send an upset email without thinking how it would sound if read aloud (Santovec, 2011). In conjunction with uncivil behavior online, staff may also have to respond to students' behavior inside of the residence hall, which can range from students who trash residence halls or fail to make it to the restroom after a night of drinking alcohol. Administrators and staff often deal with students behaving uncivilly at a time when perhaps students did not know there would be a

response to their behavior, such as in the residence hall, dining hall or campus workout center.

It is important for staff and administrators to set strong examples of promoting civility on college campuses. Staff and administrators must display civility not only toward students, but toward one another as well, even if that means being kind to colleagues that you may dislike (Santovec, 2011). Civility does not require that a person accept when others treat him or her poorly; rather, it means confronting the other person in a relaxed and rational manner (Santovec, 2011). These responses from staff are important, as they may set the tone for others on campus, especially for the student population.

A department chair also has a responsibility to support faculty and assist with matters of classroom incivility. "Effective leadership at all levels is a key to promoting civility in academia" (Richardson, 1999, p. 77). A department chair can sponsor seminars, and encourage professors to attend workshops or leadership institutes to learn more about leadership and teaching techniques. It is also pertinent that a department chair educate faculty on their rights and responsibilities, as well as the applicable policies and procedures. It is important for leaders to emphasize values and promote civility (Richardson, 1999).

Although the research is limited regarding civility and college staff and administrators, it does stress the importance of the promotion of civility for everyone on college campuses, including staff and administrators. In order for campuses to best promote civility it is necessary for faculty, staff and students to all be involved in such initiatives. This research focuses on civility programming from Student Affairs

Professionals, and suggests best practices in civility programming that set the tone for all those on campus regarding civility.

Students and Incivility

When reviewing literature on campus incivility it is important to not only look at how incivility affects faculty and staff members, but also how it affects students, and how students respond to incivility. Students' involvement in acts of incivility may range depending on the circumstances, and the students' responses. Acts of incivility may range from intentional and aggressive acts, to cases of students being unaware of their uncivil behavior because they are too focused on their own needs rather than how their behavior may affect others (Baker et al., 2008). A professor at the University of Maryland, College Park, observed a seventy-five minute lecture class of forty students, and noted that there were over 50 instances of students entering or leaving the class (Dechter, 2007). Professors have reported students shopping online in class, texting and making rude comments during lectures (Dechter, 2007). Acts of incivility can negatively affect a student's achievement and persistence, as well as a student's commitment to their university (Hirschy & Braxton, 2004). Classroom incivilities may distract a student's attention so that the student is disengaged and is not thinking critically about the course material (Hirschy & Braxton, 2004).

Similar to Bjorklund and Rehling's study, another study was conducted at Kuwait University to better understand the acts of incivility students observe (Alkandari, 2011). The researcher developed a Student Incivility Questionnaire consisting of 21 questions that was given to 505 participants. The results showed that the most common act observed was students asking the professor to leave the class during a lecture. The results

also indicated that students arrived late for class often and students talked with other students during the class lecture. Results also showed that students used cell phones during class and some students became intolerant to other specific ideas during discussions. A few students engaged in arguments with the professor and peers (Alkandari, 2011).

As previously described, Ausbrooks, Jones, and Tijerina's (2011) survey of 28 students in a Social Work Program, reported that students found classroom incivility to be more serious and frequent than faculty members did. Students within this particular social work program also reported that females were more likely to disrupt the class than male students. Almost half of the respondents indicated that undergraduate students are more likely to behave disruptively than graduate students. Student respondents also indicated observing students text-messaging, eating, acting bored or apathetic, and challenging the professor at a rate more frequent than faculty members did. Both faculty and students reported that talking to peers during class, texting and computer use for personal tasks were the most troublesome. Both faculty and students reported that the best strategy for addressing such uncivil behavior was to talk privately with the student or address the entire class (Ausbrooks, et al., 2011).

Brooks, Marini, and Radue (2011) researched the relationship between classroom civility and academic integrity. It was proposed that acts of incivility share common roots as acts of academic dishonesty. This study included two hundred and thirty-nine first-year students, with the goal of better understanding students' own attitudes and beliefs regarding this topic. The researchers utilized the Academic Integrity and Civility Questionnaire that they had created for previous research in 2009. This questionnaire is a

seventy-three item Likert scale, and also includes an open-ended response. An analysis of the results generated four themes: "perceptions and attitudes" (these responses were mixed with some students arguing that all students that plagiarize or cheat should be punished, and other students stating that it depends if the plagiarism is intentional or not), "high school experience" (students responded that high school must do a better job preparing students for the rigor of college coursework and expectations), "transition: hierarchy of understanding" (some students indicated that they are now fearful to make a mistake, as they were not prepared for this in high school), and "is the institution doing a good job of informing students?" (responses indicated that the university did a good job informing students of expectations, but that teachers need to also provide a clear and consistent message) (Brooks, Marini, & Radue, 2011).

The researchers proposed that academic dishonesty are acts of incivility because of the impact they may have on the learning environment, that this behavior may be uncivil and immoral, and that the effect of such poor behavior can be felt across the campus. For example, if a student steals answers to a test and sells it to his/her peers, such an act can have a great affect across the campus. This research suggested that methods used to create awareness for classroom incivility should also be used for academic dishonesty. Drawing from the literature the researchers made the following suggestions: include academic dishonesty and civility as part of the college curriculum, include discussions on both topics, create a consistent message across campus, and focus on creating programs to prevent acts of incivility and academic dishonesty (Brooks, Marini, & Radue, 2011). These suggestions are important to this particular study because the researchers encouraged campus leaders to be proactive in creating programs to

address campus civility. This specific study further determines what those civility initiatives look like, how to make them successful, and the best practices for implementing such initiatives.

Literature describing students' perceptions of campus incivility is necessary to be aware of when creating successful civility initiatives in order to best address the concerns that students have. This research further determines best practices of civility initiatives on college campuses, and reviews how such programs can positively affect the entire campus.

Theoretical Construct: Work Place Incivility Theory

Incivility on college campuses is a phenomenon that has only begun to be researched in more recent years. However, unlike campus incivility, incivility in the workplace has been studied in greater detail. Researchers Anderson and Pearson (1999) described a theory relating to workplace incivility and the "incivility spiral." During the time of this research the nineties were described as a time of rudeness when individuals skipped appointment times without notifying people, dialed wrong numbers and then hung up, and tailgated cars even in the slow lane. During this time many people thought that the workplace was one of the last few places to still promote and display civility; however, with increasing budget cuts, increased part-time employees and increased pressure for productivity, the workplace has also become a place where incivility manifests itself (Anderson & Pearson, 1999).

Acts of incivility have the potential to escalate to violent behaviors and crime. This upward spiral of uncivil events in the workplace often occurs due to the culmination of uncivil behaviors between individuals. Therefore, minor uncivil acts may be viewed

as a potential precursor to more serious events to come. Workplace incivility is defined as acts that ignore the workplace norms for respect and regard for others in the workplace. Anderson and Pearson (1999) suggested that incivility in the workplace overlaps with portions of the definitions for aggression and deviant behavior, but that uncivil behavior is less intense with ambiguous intent to harm a particular person. The researchers also proposed that workplace incivility is an interactive event that involves at least two or more individuals, and because of this a social interactionist perspective is used to review incivility and the escalation of it in the workplace. In using an interactionist perspective, Anderson and Pearson (1999) opt to use the term "coercive actions" which is often associated with this perspective. Coercive actions is used to refer to more intense situations that extend beyond acts of incivility to those acts that involve intent to harm within an organization. Because of this perspective the researchers proposed that acts of incivility are an interactive event that may evolve into an exchange of coercive actions. By examining the progression of incivility in this manner it allows for it to be reviewed as a process, rather than a singular event (Anderson & Pearson, 1999).

Through their research of the concept of the incivility spiral, Anderson and Pearson (1999) explained that the negative action of one person could lead to the negative action of another person, leading to increased harmful acts. This theory proposed that incivility may be a prelude to coercive actions, and because of this it is important for leaders to be aware of the key points in these exchanges that may lead to harmful acts. The incivility spiral indicated ongoing negative behavior between individuals; however,

it is important to note that some individuals may choose to leave the situation, ignore the situation, or not respond to the behavior.

This theory weighed in on two key factors: a person's temperament, and the organization's climate of informality. The temperament of an individual can greatly affect how one responds to acts of incivility, and the practices and procedures of an organization may affect how the climate of an organization may lend itself to increased acts of incivility. Individuals with a "hot" temperament may be more likely to engage in acts of incivility, and organizations that have a more informal environment may be more likely to promote an environment that has greater acts of incivility. In conclusion, Anderson and Pearson (1999) recommended that organization's leaders display behavior that promotes civility, organizations recruit and hire people who behave in courteous and civil manners, and that organizations respond to acts of incivility quickly and swiftly. This theory is important for this study because these recommendations should also be used when reviewing campus civility initiatives and programs for the purpose of this research.

Estes and Wang (2008) further researched the growing problem of workplace incivility, but as it specifically related to human resource development (HRD). HRD departments are responsible for the creation and promotion of healthy and productive work environments, and workplace incivility often hinders this. The researchers conducted a literature review to further understand this issue, and how HRD employees can work to better design effective interventions for addressing workplace incivility, and to avoid a decrease in work productivity and higher employee turnover, which may be caused by workplace incivility.

From this literature review, Estes and Wang (2008) created a conceptual framework that displayed eight constructs that relate to workplace incivility. The eight constructs are: performance (meaning that workplace incivility may negatively impact employees' work performances); organizational context (the workplace environment may enable incivility in the workplace); social systems and social interactions (when individuals work so closely together there is a dependency on one another and an inherit need for dignity and respect); coworker beliefs (environments that promote organizational rather than personal beliefs are more likely to be civil); mental disorders (individuals with personality disorders may be more disruptive in the workplace); moral maturity (reviewing Kohlberg's theory on moral maturity development it is important for employees to display a high level of moral maturity in order to appropriately respond to issues in the workplace); and psychological contract (this relates to the unwritten implied expectations of a workplace). Workplace incivility is different from other acts of organizational misbehavior because it is direct toward another individual, it violates organizational norms but is minor acts, and it is not intended to harm others. However, it is important to note that although not intended to harm others, uncivil acts in the workplace may still result in harm (Estes & Wang, 2008).

Trends regarding workplace incivility indicated that this is a growing phenomenon. The workplace has become more diverse, more informal, and with increased power dynamics and hierarchies, and these factors are leading to a more uncivil workplace. Incivility in the workplace can harm the performance of both the organization and the individuals. A negative workplace environment can also create an unpleasant work environment for other individuals that may not be directly affected by it

(Estes and Wang, 2008). This research reflected what Anderson and Pearson (1999) theorized with the negative spiral effect of workplace incivility. Because of this it is important for HRD employees to address this growing issue, and work to create a more civil work environment. Estes and Wang (2008) suggested that similar to workplace sexual harassment policies, organizations should consider a zero tolerance policy for incivility in the workplace. In addition, HRD employees can help create leadership development opportunities in which leaders learn how to set good examples of civility and create clear expectations for civility in the workplace. This research by Estes and Wang (2008) highlights the important need for leaders to address uncivil workplace environments, particularly because of the potential for incivility to manifest itself into a greater problem. Similarly, leaders in higher education must address incivility on college campuses, and this study addresses this need by highlighting best practices of civility programs and initiatives.

Porath, Gerbasi, and Schorch (2015) studied the benefits of behaving civilly, and examined the benefits of behaving civilly in a social network study of employees from the research and development department at a biotechnology firm. This study focused on warmth and competence, meaning how trustworthy and liked someone is, and how able someone is to do their job well. It was proposed that civility creates positive feelings because it helps build strong relationships, and people are drawn to others who make them feel good about themselves. The study suggested that those that are perceived as warm and competent are more likely to also be perceived as leaders. Ideally, civility should bring out the best in people, and encourage the best in others as well.

The researchers conducted an online survey that was sent to forty-six employees with questions related to civility, work advice, leadership and performance. The results of this study were that people who are perceived as civil are more likely to be sought out for work advice, and that others are more likely to see that person as a leader. Also, the more an employee is perceived as civil, the better his or her work performance was. The second phase of this research was to figure out why this was happening. To do this, the researchers utilized one hundred eighty-one students in a management course at a large university in the United States. These students watched three different work scenarios, one with civility, one without civility, and one that was neutral. The findings indicated that individuals perceived as civil were more likely to be perceived as both warm and competent. This was an interesting finding because previous research had indicated that strength in one area is a weakness in the other; however, individuals that behave civilly are perceived as both warm and competent, which would explain why these individuals are more likely to have influence and effectiveness in the workplace (Porath, Gerbasi, & Schorch, 2015).

This study determined that civility in the workplace is important in that it benefits people and workplace productivity (Porath, Gerbasi, & Schorch, 2015). The findings of this research are applicable to higher education in that it is important for campuses to also create and promote civility in order to produce better outcomes and results, and to create a more improved learning environment. This particular study displays how campus leaders can promote and initiate civility initiatives on their college campuses.

Theoretical Construct: Generational Theory

The previous theoretical construct section reviewed incivility in the workplace, and the next theoretical construct will look more closely at incivility in higher education as it relates to today's traditional college student. Many higher education leaders have been abuzz with conversations regarding today's traditional college student, and how they can best work to address the needs of this unique generation while still pursing the colleges' mission and vision. Today's traditional college student is part of the Millennial Generation or otherwise known as Gen Y, this generation is born between 1980 and 1994 (Weiler, 2004). For the purpose of this study, the term *Millennial* will be used to refer to this group. Millennial students have been characterized with certain qualities that may lead to these students acting in an uncivil manner or being more accepting of their peers acting in an uncivil manner. This section will review this generational theory and how it relates to incivility on college campuses.

The Millennial Generation relies heavily on technology, collaborative learning and a structured environment. Despite this, many professors still rely on lecture styled class structure in order to move through the material in a more timely fashion; however, Davis and Minifie (2013) suggested that professors utilize a different method, the class preparation assignment. This method embraces the "flipped classroom," which is a method that requires students to learn the basic material outside of class before coming to class, so that the professor can use class time for deeper instruction and learning. The class preparation assignment is done prior to a student arriving to class that increases the student's participation in class and the student then sees the material multiple times. Therefore, in using class preparation assignments, students are typically more engaged,

more satisfied with the class, and more likely to earn higher grades (Davis & Minifie, 2013). The flipped classroom method is important for professors to consider when trying to promote a civil learning environment and decrease acts of incivility that may disrupt the learning environment.

Millennial students have been described as being incapable of thinking critically about classwork (Weiler, 2004). These students are often limited to sharing information in which they are comfortable with and have prior knowledge. Class discussion among peers was found to focus on students trying to convince peers of their viewpoints rather than gaining new information. Further, not all college students come prepared to think critically at the same level as their peers. Millennial students are more likely to seek out information on the Internet first. This generation's learning style tends to be that of visual learners. For these reasons it is necessary for hands-on activities to be implemented in the classroom in order to better engage the students. It is also important for classroom activities to relate to an idea that the student can connect to more easily. Also, Millennial students will participate in classroom discussions and dialogues better than they would for class lectures (Weiler, 2004).

Millennial students' use of technology is unlike anything ever experienced before, and information is constantly at this generation's fingertips. The use of cell phones goes beyond constantly talking and texting, to using cellphones to cheat in class (Knepp, 2012). Podcasts have become increasingly more popular, and although podcasts were originally intended to provide the course lecture for students to review, instead many students allow for podcasts to substitute the actual time in the classroom (Knepp, 2012).

Millennial students are often associated with a desire for grade inflation; consumer mentality and a strong sense of entitlement, when coupled together these characteristics can present itself in a form of rudeness and uncivil behavior. Although students who display this behavior account for only approximately 10 percent of students, this type of student population can be very demanding on a professor's time and energy (Lippmann, Bulanda, & Wagenaar, 2009). These students tend to interact in a less formal, but more demanding manner, with a need for immediate responses.

Student entitlement seems to come with a sense of disregard for the traditional faculty-student relationship; instead, higher education is viewed as a commodity one pays for to get a better career or greater income. Due to state and federal funding cuts for higher education, universities look at students as their "customers, their instructors as service providers, and good grades as something students deserve" (Lippmann et al., 2009, p. 199). The rising cost of tuition has accounted for students and parents expecting a greater return on their investment. Therefore, it is important for professors to make clear expectations for students and for professors to receive appropriate orientation and training regarding these issues (Lippmann, et al., 2009).

Baker, Comer, and Martinak (2008) reviewed six characteristics of the Millennial Generation more closely: family and community ties, peer-centrism, conventionality, achievement, digitalism, and consumer orientation. Millennials tend to have parents who are heavily involved in their lives; because of this they often lack experience making their own decisions. They socialize with large groups and because of this, they look to their groups of friends for support and approval. Millennials may ask for classroom rules to be altered in their favor and this comes from a sense of entitlement that was rooted in them

since childhood. Millennials are all awarded ribbons and they have parents who have the financial means to help them achieve. Millennials are constantly connected and rely on social media sites and technology. They are also consumer-focused because they want what they have paid for, including college (Baker et al., 2008).

The literature describing the uniqueness of Millennial Students, and how faculty and staff can best meet their needs is important in order to promote campus civility. However, this literature does not address best practices for promoting civility on college campuses, which is what this study does. Campus leaders must be aware of best practices in order to create a more civil campus community for all.

Suggested Practices

Research indicates that today's college student does not understand proper email decorum, classroom etiquette, and how to behave in a civil manner. Because of this civility programs, initiatives and practices have been suggested. This section will discuss the recommended practices that were found in a review of the literature. Some of these practices are more applicable for students, whereas others are more applicable for universities and professors.

Connelly (2009) suggested that colleges and universities take the responsibility of educating all of their students about civility awareness and do so at the start of students' tenure on their campuses. Higher education institutions must dedicate resources to further research the problem of incivility. Once policies and programs have been initiated, it is necessary to evaluate how civility initiatives are working, if at all (Connelly, 2009).

Barett et al. (2010) reviewed the literature and discussed their own experiences in the classroom to determine a list of suggestions to address incivility in colleges and universities: establish clear policies and practices; provide education and training for campus community on policies; respond quickly to minor acts of incivility; create a support group for faculty who experience incivility; and provide a serious response to those students who do not alter their behavior. It is recommended that the training for faculty occur during new faculty orientation, as well as ongoing training for tenure-track faculty.

Also, it is important to provide a support network for faculty; this support network may be a group of staff members on campus who are trained on disruptive behavior or it may be a counselor on campus. Clear consequences must be established and professors must document all incidents of uncivil behavior in case a student should ever reach the extreme consequence of removal from the program or class (Barett et al., 2010).

Professors are encouraged to have discussions with their students regarding civil behavior and the consequences for those that do not behave in a civil manner. Minor incivilities must be addressed and should not be ignored, as minor acts still disrupt the learning environment and the class time. Barrett et al. (2010) asserted that even if the professor is not bothered by minor acts of incivility, he or she has a duty to respond to it in order to improve the campus environment for all other faculty, staff, and students. Students who are making minor disruptions may be used as a starting point for a discussion with the class and an opportunity for the entire class to learn from others behavior.

Barett et al. (2010) explained that stricter guidelines are needed for professional graduate programs, as it is not acceptable to graduate students to serve in the workforce when they cannot behave in the classroom. Stricter admissions guidelines may be considered, which require students to sign civility contracts or a stronger commitment to civility is necessary (Barrett et al.). Some suggestions for accomplishing this may be by checking applicants social media presence, conducting professional background checks, utilize civility contracts as a means for removal from programs, treat the first semester as a probation period for newly admitted students, and more fully support and promote civility (Barett et al.)

First-year experience programs for undergraduates have been helpful in educating students about appropriate classroom behavior and how to behave civilly (Forni, 2008). However, Forni (2008) argued that this is not enough and professors must also train themselves. Forni suggested that professors learn how to create a climate of "relaxed formality" meaning that boundaries must be created and maintained between the professor and the students. Students should be addressed in a formal manner (Mr., Miss, and Mrs.,) and, in return, students should address the professor in the same manner. Whoever is speaking should have the attention of the entire classroom, whether professor or students. Additionally, a professor should keep his/her private life separate and only share when it is relevant to the class lesson.

The Internet has created a world in which students are easily able to seek and find a variety of different things without understanding the value of it. It is suggested that professors discuss values on a regular basis, and discuss what makes information trivial or important (Forni, 2008). Today's students are able to retrieve a great deal of

information from the Internet, and, because of this, the job of the professor is diminished as students think they do not need the professor to retrieve information as they can retrieve it even quicker online instead. It is important for a professor to be proactive in balancing the retrieval, retention, and application of information. It is necessary for professors to clearly convey their role, the importance of their role, and why it is pertinent for a student to come to class and be engaged. Forni (2008) explained that there must be a transition within students that take "students from information to knowledge and from knowledge to wisdom" (p. 19). It is further suggested that professors establish a written covenant with their students that clearly states what the professor expects from the students and what the students can expect from the professor. It is also important for professors to address disruptions right away and to be consistent in doing so. Lastly, Forni (2008) stressed the importance of professors to never raise their voices, and, instead, to imagine that all acts in the classroom will be recorded for a future training that other professors will someday learn from.

Seganish and Holter (2013) explained the importance of creating a Student Code of Civility. This code must include both the professor and the students, and if the professor is addressing the student for a violation of the code the professor must give positive reinforcement to best promote a civil learning environment. The pillars of the Student Code of Civility are: respect, increased tolerance/appreciation of diversity, punctuality, professionalism, freedom of inquiry, courtesy, apology and remediation. The disconnected pillars must also be addressed in the code, which are: class disruption, lack of courtesy, lack of respect for learning, profanity, harassment/bullying and violence. The code should be created utilizing an office, such as Student Affairs. Once

finalized the code should be included in the university's policies, posted online and in the classroom and in the college catalogue. Also, incoming students must sign the code to reflect their acceptance of it. The code should become part of the learning process inside of the classroom, and responding to acts of incivility should be constructive actions not punitive. The classroom is a good environment to introduce the code, educate students about it, and further address acts of incivility (Seganish & Holter, 2013).

Alkandari (2011) recommended that professors learn students' names, as students seem to pay more attention to professors who pay more attention to them. Alkandari recommended that professors utilize online teaching as another means for connecting to the students. Explaining student expectations during orientation is another recommendation of this study. Professors should reserve at least 5% of students' overall grades for behavior in the classroom as a way to promote positive engagement in the classroom. Professors should create a mid-semester teaching evaluation allowing students the opportunity to provide feedback about teaching strategies. Lastly, it is recommended that class sizes should be 25 students or less because classroom incivility tends to increase in classes of more than 35 students (Alkandari, 2011).

Schroeder and Robertson (2008) created a list of suggestions for faculty members to consider to best promote civility in the classroom. The suggestions encourage professors to be proactive by setting clear expectations and including information from the Code of Conduct as well as consequences for violating serious infractions. Additionally, they suggest that professors be specific with their expectations, as one can no longer assume that a student has learned what it means to "be respectful" in K-12 education, but rather the professor needs to clarify exactly what that statement means.

Also, it is recommended that professors model the behavior that they wish to see in their students. Professors must understand why a student is behaving in a certain manner in order to best address the behavior with a more specific response. It is suggested that professors have a plan for how to address uncivil behavior. Without a plan, one may react impulsively rather than correctly following the university policy and procedures. Additionally, a professor should follow through with the plan, although for some instances ignoring the behavior may be appropriate, but many times it is best to address the behavior promptly in order to maintain control of the classroom. Lastly, it is recommended that professors document all incidents of incivility should any future concerns arise (Schroeder & Robertson, 2008).

In reviewing characteristics of Millennial students the following six suggestions were made to address classroom incivility: use the syllabus; present classroom policies similar to work policies; develop a "Code of Civil Classroom Conduct," which the students contribute to and sign; create a student handbook; behave professionally and courteously; and, reevaluate classroom pedagogy to meet the Millennials learning style (Baker et al., 2008). Additionally, Baker et al. (2008) suggested ways to address incivility in the classroom, such as addressing it immediately and showing students that what is stated in the syllabus will actually be done. It was recommended that faculty explain to students how their behavior may affect their peers since this generation cares more about the opinion of their peers. It is also recommended that faculty be aware of their rights and their own institution's rules on when it is appropriate to ask a student to leave the classroom (Baker et al., 2008).

In 2003, American University initiated a campus-wide civility campaign, "Civitas," that includes a "civitas week" at the start of the fall semester. Similarly, P.M. Forni founded the Hopkins Civility Project at John Hopkins University. Forni is a sought-after speaker and his book, "Choosing Civility" is often required reading for campus communities. However, Forni does not recommend that universities implement forcible codes of civility, but rather he stresses the importance of society behaving with integrity "not because we are compelled by a written statement, but because we believe that it is the right thing to do" (Dechter, 2007, p. 1F). Forni recommended that universities implement civility projects that are utilized across the campus and in to the classroom curriculum (as cited in Troop, 2012). Topics for civility projects can include such things as sportsmanship, environmental responsibility, and cross-cultural understanding (as cited Troop, 2012).

In conjunction with this list of suggestions, Schroeder and Robertson (2008) also construct a group contingency plan in their classrooms. A group contingency plan is an agreement that the behavior of one person and/or all persons in the classroom affects the entire class. Therefore, by utilizing a group contingency plan the entire classroom is working toward the same goal, and all students are held responsible for whether or not the class achieves their goal. Schroeder and Roberton's (2008) classroom size is typically 20–30 students, and all students are asked to create and design the plan, and all students must vote on the elements of the plan. The professors reserve the right to veto any elements of the plan. The students also design a reward system within the plan, and within each class one student monitors the class and keeps track of the behavior as it relates to the contingency plan (Schroeder & Robertson, 2008).

Lasiter et al. (2012) described the importance of having a means for students to document incidents of incivility without fear of retribution, especially for nursing students. It was also suggested that nursing schools develop guidelines for preventing and managing faculty incivility (Lasiter et al., 2012).

Recently, Pocket Points was created, which is an application for smartphones that students can use in the classroom. This application is currently being piloted at certain universities. Pocket Points is an application that students can turn on at the start of class and then lock their phones. The longer the students phones are locked the more points they receive and the more students logged into the application, the more points the class will receive. Points can then be redeemed for discounts and rewards at local businesses (Szkaradnik, 2015). This phone app is a new attempt to try to engage students in the classroom by encouraging them not to use their phones while in class and, instead, place the phones in the locked mode. If a phone app has been created then the issue of incivility must be an issue of great magnitude that extends beyond the classroom and even the college and university setting. However, due to the fact that the researcher works in higher education, for the purpose of this study incivility will be addressed as it relates to the college and university setting.

Suggested practices for addressing incivility are useful; however, this review of literature still lacks best practices that are grounded in research, and not merely opinions of professors and authors. This study fills this gap by providing researched best practices in promoting civility on college campuses at SUNY institutions.

Chapter Summary

Civility is an important element for students to learn on the college campus in order to be productive in their future work environments. In many work settings, one is expected to participate in teams, show respect for others, and operate productively, all of which require one to act with civility. The review of the literature shows that campus incivility does exist, and because of this, it must be addressed in order to improve the learning environment for students. Students from the Millennial Generation pose new challenges that professors must overcome to better promote learning in the classroom, which may require universities to increase civility initiatives and programs. This study seeks to determine best practices for promoting civility on college campuses that will be necessary for leaders in higher education to have in order to promote a more civil environment at colleges and universities.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will reintroduce the research questions and describe the research design. For this study, the researcher utilized a qualitative approach for determining the components of successful civility initiatives at SUNY colleges and universities. Therefore, it is important to describe the assumptions of the researcher and the reasons why the researcher selected a qualitative study design in this chapter as well.

Research Questions

In an effort to explore practices related to civility and incivility on college campuses, this study was guided by the following overarching research question: What are the best practices regarding the promotion of campus civility in and outside of the classroom? For the purpose of this study, *best practices* was defined as those that are currently being used that promote civility and decrease incivility, specifically in the SUNY system. To further answer this question, the following questions were asked:

1. How do colleges and universities in the SUNY system address classroom incivility?

2. What initiatives do colleges and universities in the SUNY system implement to address incivility outside of the classroom?

3. What supports are available for civility initiatives in and outside of the classroom within the colleges and universities of the SUNY system?

4. How are the civility initiatives implemented?

5. How do the colleges and universities in the SUNY system assess civility initiatives?

In addition if there are no programs for civility on the campus, the Student Affairs Professional was asked why no such programs exist, and if there are any plans for future programs. Also, when available, Student Affairs Professionals were asked to provide additional resources and materials that are available for each program (pamphlets, presentations, training materials or classroom contracts) that were further reviewed to gain a fuller understanding of each program.

Researcher's Role and Philosophical Stances

This researcher, a student affairs professional at a community college in New York, assumes that civility programming is necessary and beneficial at colleges and universities in order to promote and create a more civil learning environment. Additionally, the researcher assumes that the use of a qualitative study to research the best practices of civility initiatives at colleges and universities is the best approach to provide the findings that will be most useful and helpful to leaders in higher education.

Campus civility is a topic that the researcher feels passionate about, and as such, may create some bias. The researcher has previously worked on a civility campaign in a prior position, as well as taught a First-Year Experience course with the main topic of the coursework being how to behave more civilly at college. In conjunction with that, the researcher has worked within the realm of student conduct for many years, which means that the researcher is aware of uncivil acts that occur on college campuses, and oftentimes the researcher is the professional who adjudicates such uncivil acts. Because of these experiences the researcher views herself as an advocate for civility initiatives on college campuses.

In addition to the known bias of the researcher being an advocate of civility initiatives, the researcher also works at a community college within the SUNY system. The researcher also previously worked at a different SUNY college, as well as graduated from two different SUNY colleges and universities. Because of this, the researcher has a desire to see SUNY campuses in a positive manner. This desire should create a strong study, as the researcher should want to seek out all aspects of all civility initiatives to make SUNY campuses appear with a high level of prestige regarding civility initiatives. The data analysis section of this chapter describes how the researcher will work to overcome these known biases.

The researcher is still further determining the paradigm that fits her best, but at this time considers herself to be a Critical Constructivist. The Constructivist paradigm believes that humans create their own knowledge and focuses on understanding the "why" (Hatch, 2002). Within this paradigm the researcher deconstructs programs to better understand the how and why to improve and advance the social society. The researcher was interested in questioning why civility initiatives are successful, as well as the factors that make these programs successful. As a Constructivist the researcher wanted to research the topic of civility initiatives to understand it and interpret it. And as a Critical researcher there is a focus on purpose of research for change and empowerment which is also what the researcher hoped to accomplish by creating best practices of civility initiatives for leaders in higher education.

Research Design

This study was designed to determine best practices to promote civility on college campuses both in and outside of the classroom. Since campus civility is a topic with

limited research, an exploration to further understand this area of research is needed.

Because of this, the researcher utilized a qualitative approach. A qualitative approach

was appropriate because it acknowledges that multiple realities exist, allows for the

researcher to be a participant, those that are being observed can participate, and multiple

sources of data are used (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Because of this, a qualitative

study was an appropriate approach to further understand practices that are currently being

used to promote civility on college campuses. A quantitative approach would not fit well

with this study because it only allows for a single source of data to be used, and seeks to

find the right answer. With this study design there may be multiple right answers, but the

researcher sought to find the practices that are most successful regarding civility

programming. Also, the topic of campus civility is complex and requires further

investigation, for which a quantitative approach would not allow. Therefore, a qualitative

approach bests fits this study.

Qualitative research allows for a variety of different methods, such as

observational data, surveys, archival analysis, history and case study. However, case

study is the method that best fits this study because it focuses on the "how/why", does not

require control of behavioral events, and is a contemporary event (Yin, 2009). More

specifically, this study design utilizes a multiple case study design because the researcher

reviewed civility initiatives at multiple institutions to help determine the best practices

that are being implemented. A case study is an appropriate approach because it is

"bounded," meaning that it is focused and limited in scope, this applies to both topic and

approach to data (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). This case study is focused in that it only

reviews data related to campus civility campaigns and initiatives, and only reviews a

finite number of evidence and sources. Although a single case study provides an in-depth analysis, a multiple case study design allows for stronger evidence to be collected from multiple sites; therefore, providing stronger evidence for the study to be replicated (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Utilizing a multiple case study approach is the obvious fit for this study as it allows for the researcher to better determine best practices.

The case study inquiry relies on many sources of evidence (Yin, 2009). In order to collect multiple sources of evidence, the researcher attempted to collect five forms of data: website information, interviews, documents (including the Code of Conduct and Civility Statement), faculty training (including syllabi language and orientation), and current data of reported incidents of incivility both in and outside of the classroom. The researcher attempted to collect data of reported incidents of incivility; however, this information was not made available to her, and some institutions did not collect this data. Also, the researcher attempted to collect observational data in the form of the researcher attending civility trainings, workshops or orientations; however, this data was not made available to the researcher, and the workshops that were offered did not fit the data collection timeframe. Data was collected from a total of eight institutions, and interviews were conducted at a total of 3 institutions. The researcher had decided to conduct interviews from three Student Affairs Professionals rather than eight, as this still provides a strong example as to what Student Affairs Professionals are witnessing regarding civility on college campuses, and how they are working to promote civility on their campuses.

This section has established the rationale for selecting a multiple case study design using a qualitative method for this study. However, it is also important to note

how the findings were interpreted and analyzed. The researcher utilized the case study

method described and outlined by Yin (2009) in which the researcher selects cases,

conducts each case study, writes individual case study report on each case, and draws

cross-case conclusions by comparing all case studies, and finally develops implications

and writes cross-case report. This method was altered slightly as the researcher first

wrote cross-case reports for each size of the institution (small, medium and large), and

then conducted a second cross-case report of all institutions totaled together. By

interpreting and analyzing the data in this manner, the researcher attempted to present

best practices by size of institution, as well as best practices across all institutions.

Selection of Sites

Determining what cases to study is an essential component of a successful case

study design. Creswell (2007) described "purposeful sampling" when the researcher

selects cases that show different perspectives of the problem he/she is studying. The

researcher may also select cases due to accessibility of them (Creswell, 2007). The

researcher for this study utilized "purposeful sampling" as well as accessible cases for the

selection of the sites. The issue of incivility on college campuses can be found at many

different types of institutions, and the acts of incivility can range from each institution,

depending if classes are solely online, large lecture rooms, or small intimate classrooms.

The types of campus incivility can also vary depending on if the college is in a rural or

urban setting, or two-year or four-year colleges. The researcher reviewed these different

possibilities, and determined that for accessibility of cases it would be best to utilize four-

year, public institutions within the SUNY system.

In order to utilize a more "purposeful sample" the researcher selected institutions

that are large, medium, and small from the SUNY system. Small institutions are

categorized as 2,999 students or less, medium institutions are categorized as 3,000 to

9,999 students, and large institutions are categorized as 10,000 students or more,

according to the Carnegie Classification System (Carnegie Foundation, 2011). The

researcher categorized the twenty-four institutions within the SUNY system by size

(small, medium and large). This study was limited to undergraduate programs and not

graduate programs. These selections were made from convenience, and the researcher's

ability to connect with each institution due to distance and personal connections at each

institution. In addition to this, the researcher attempted to select institutions that have a

Dean of Students or a similar position of leadership within Student Affairs. If the Dean

of Students is not available at an institution then the researcher attempted to connect with

the Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs or a similar Senior Student Affairs

Administrator. The researcher also attempted to select institutions that have a civility

statement. In an effort to maintain confidentiality of the selected institutions, the

researcher has given code names to each institution.

Sample and Sampling

In addition to the selection of cases, the researcher selected one Student Affairs

Professional at each size of institution (small, medium and large) to be interviewed, for a

total of three interviews. This initial selection was made using a maximum variation

strategy in that the researcher selected three Student Affairs Professionals at three

different sized institutions. This strategy is beneficial for qualitative studies because by

selecting criteria that differentiate participants and using participants that are varied, the

researcher increased her chances of obtaining findings that reflected different views, which is essential for qualitative research (Creswell, 2007). In addition to this strategy, the researcher also used a convenience strategy to obtain Student Affairs Professionals, who would be available and easily accessible for interviews, and follow up questions, when needed (Creswell, 2007). The researcher also selected the Student Affairs Professionals to be interviewed based off of the civility information in which they shared, and those that shared more information and data were selected for interviews.

In addition to interviews, the researcher also attempted to collect observational data. The researcher sought out observational data through initial interviews with the Student Affairs Professionals (or the institutions' equivalent to a Dean of Student, whether that be an Associate Vice President or Assistant Vice President). The researcher was unable to obtain observational data due to only limited data made available to her. Because of this the researcher collected materials used for civility presentations and workshops instead.

Creswell (2007) recommended that researchers not select more than four or five case studies in a single study. The design of this research is strong in that eight institutions were selected to provide evidence regarding civility programming, but only three institutions are selected for interviews. This design provides good evidence of civility programming in order for the researcher to determine best practices.

Instrumentation

The interview questions for the Student Affairs Professionals and/or their equivalent staff member used an open-ended question method. The interview questions can be found in Appendix A. A table outlining which interview question correlates to

which research question can be found in Appendix B. The first interview question was emailed to all eight Student Affairs Professionals, and then the researcher selected three Student Affairs Professionals to further interview. These questions have been designed based off of the initial research questions shared in the previous section. If necessary, additional follow-up questions were asked for clarity, and for the researcher to better understand the elements of the civility initiatives.

When conducting interviews it is always important to be mindful of participants' confidentiality, and because of this the researcher has referred to each institution using code names. Because the interview questions do not relate to specific students or behavior of certain individuals, the researcher believes that utilizing email and phone as a means of obtaining this information should be sufficient in terms of maintaining confidentiality. If a Student Affairs Professional did not want to share information via email, and would prefer to be contacted directly for the interview, the researcher made the arrangements necessary in order to meet this request.

Data Collection

The data collection process for a qualitative researcher has many activities within it, and there are multiple variations of phases for qualitative researchers to take in collecting their data (Creswell, 2007). For this study, the researcher collected data from eight different sites. The data included website information, interviews, documents (including the Code of Conduct and Civility Statement), and faculty training (including syllabi language and orientation). The researcher collected this data via email, websites and personal contact.

Prior to collecting data, the researcher obtained permission through the Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board to interview Student Affairs Professionals and collect data. The researcher outreached to preselected institutions; however, the initial response rate was poor and the researcher had to outreach to different institutions than the original selection in order to obtain the eight selected institutions. Because of this, the researcher contacted twenty-four four-year SUNY institutions to determine if institutions had civility initiatives. Through this outreach the researcher was able to select eight institutions to include in this research. She then emailed the eight selected Student Affairs Professionals to introduce her, the study and the purpose of the study. As needed, the researcher then contacted the Student Affairs Professionals for further follow up and data collection.

Once the eight Student Affairs Professionals agreed to be participants of the study, the researcher collected the data listed above via a website search of the college's website. If information such as civility statements was not found online, the researcher asked the Student Affairs Professionals for further data and for additional documents to be emailed to the researcher. If data from faculty trainings, civility programs or other civility data could not be found online, the researcher asked the Student Affairs Professionals to mail the materials to her, if the materials were available. After collecting all data, the researcher then contacted the three Student Affairs Professionals who had been selected for interviews. The interviews were conducted via phone, and follow up questions were emailed as needed.

Data Analysis

The researcher began the data analysis by reviewing the data obtained from each institution in an attempt to create general themes from each institution's civility initiatives. The responses to the interview questions were also analyzed for general themes. Once general themes were created, the researcher coded the data by each institution, then by size of institution, and conducted a cross-analysis of this data. The researcher utilized both in vivo codes (words that are the exact phrases which participants used), as well as prefigured codes (words that are previously found in the literature review) (Creswell, 2007). The researcher then classified the codes into themes to create a more concise picture. Analyzing data in this manner allowed for the researcher to highlight the different elements of civility initiatives, and created a list of positive and negatives of the different elements of the civility initiatives.

The researcher also evaluated how successful each institution described their civility initiatives to be. The process of data analysis that the researcher used mirrored the "data analysis spiral" which Creswell (2007) described as a process that is fluid and not fixed. This process allows for the researcher to reflect and review data throughout the data analysis process. In reviewing data in this manner the researcher went back and reviewed data multiple times, and constantly reflected and reviewed on the data and the themes that emerged from the data. The researcher wrote notes in the margins of the data to track new themes and codes as they were established. By reviewing the data, the researcher also sought to find patterns, and looked for a connection between two or more themes (Creswell, 2007). Once all data were analyzed, they were displayed by comparing cases, and comparing cases against a standard, as suggested by researcher

Wolcott (as cited in Creswell, 2007). And finally, the researcher suggested best practices

found from the study. The findings of this research are presented using narrative and

figures to display best practices for civility initiatives as found within the SUNY system.

Standards of Quality and Verification

Yin (2009) defined three principles of data collection, which if used properly,

help establish validity and reliability. The researcher utilized these three principles in the

following way for this study. First, the researcher used multiple sources of evidence that

lead to data triangulation. By using data triangulation the researcher used multiple

sources of data to provide multiple measures of the elements of civility initiatives at

SUNY institutions, which address construct validity (Yin). Triangulation allows for the

convergence of evidence through multiple sources of data (Yin).

The next principle outlined by Yin (2009) is to create a case study database. Yin

described the importance of creating a database in which the report and notes from the

researcher are separate from the data and evidence collected. By maintaining two

separate collections, the study maintains a higher level of reliability by allowing for

others to solely review the raw data without the notes of the researcher obstructing the

data (Yin, 2009). With the increased use of computers to help collect data, the researcher

was easily able to do this by keeping the raw data separate from the researcher's notes

and reports. This is particularly important to do when the researcher was coding the data,

so that an independent inspector could still review the raw data.

The final principle is to maintain a chain of evidence (Yin, 2009). The researcher

did this by clearly articulating the steps taken from creation of the research questions to

the conclusion of the case study. This chain of evidence is clearly described in this

manuscript. The researcher had previously disclosed her biases; and she also made every effort to condense those biases through the implementation of reflective journaling throughout the research process to describe any of her biases, and to make note of them. The researcher also did not lose any evidence through carelessness. In doing all of this the researcher increased reliability of this study, and more specifically determined construct validity (Yin, 2009).

Lastly, the researcher conducted a pilot study of the interview questions to assure face validity. The interview questions had been piloted to Student Affairs Professionals in Georgia to assure that the questions are viable, and that the questions answer the research questions.

Ethical Considerations

Creswell (2007) described the importance of ethical issues when conducting qualitative research. It is especially important for a researcher to convey to participants how the research will be conducted, how the findings will be used, and the researcher must obtain informed consent. The researcher of this study has completed training through the Institutional Review Board, and the researcher obtained approval through the Institutional Research Board at Georgia Southern University. After approval was received, informed consent procedures were shared with all participants. This was especially important to conduct prior to the interviews. Due to the nature of this research study, the risk to participants were minimal; however, the researcher did anticipate that participants may want their institutions to be shed in a positive light and may be hesitant to share information about acts of incivility on their campuses. Because of this the

researcher explained through informed consent procedures the importance of using code names for all institutions that were included in the research study.

Although the anticipated risks are minimal (if any) the researcher explained to participants that should they wish to end their participation at any time or refuse to respond to any question they may do so without penalty. For any documents or data the researcher obtained she was certain to maintain necessary confidentiality with them by not sharing materials that have institutions' names on them, and taking the necessary steps to not allow for information to be identifiable. Lastly, the researcher followed all standards set by the Institutional Review Board for her study.

Chapter Summary

Promoting civility on college campuses is important and necessary for leaders in higher education to do. Creating a civil environment both in and outside of the classroom is crucial to promoting an effective and healthy learning environment. However, best practices for accomplishing this are unknown. This qualitative research looked at institutions within the SUNY system to determine elements of civility initiatives that are used and suggested best practices for promoting civility. The researcher interviewed Student Affairs Professionals and collected additional evidence from websites, institutions, and workshops. The goal of this research is to inform higher education leaders as to the best practices for promoting civility on college campuses.

CHAPTER 4

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to determine best practices for promoting civility on college campuses within the SUNY colleges and universities. The study utilized a qualitative approach in the form of a multiple case study. The researcher obtained data through interviews with Student Affairs Professionals, website information, documents (including the Code of Conduct and/or Civility Statement), faculty training materials, and current data on reported incidents of incivility. The findings from this research will be presented in this chapter with a focus on the five individual research questions, as well as the overarching research question: What are the best practices regarding the promotion of campus civility in and outside of the classroom? For the purpose of this study, *best practices* will be defined as those practices that are currently being used that promote civility and decrease incivility, specifically in the SUNY system. To further answer the overarching question, the following research questions are:

1. How do colleges and universities in the SUNY system address classroom incivility?

2. What initiatives do colleges and universities in the SUNY system implement to address incivility outside of the classroom?

3. What supports are available for civility initiatives in and outside of the classroom within the colleges and universities of the SUNY system?

4. How are the civility initiatives implemented?

5. How do the colleges and universities in the SUNY system assess civility initiatives?

Research Design

This research was to be conducted using preselected SUNY institutions; however, when the researcher began to outreach to these institutions, the response rate was very low, and some of the institutions did not have any civility initiatives. Because of this the researcher had to alter the research design slightly by contacting all 24 four-year SUNY institutions and seek to find Student Affairs Professionals that could provide information regarding civility initiatives on their campus. This initial outreach to all institutions also helped the researcher determine if institutions had specific civility initiatives, no civility initiatives, or some variation of civility initiatives. Upon completion of this outreach, the researcher then collected data at eight institutions that indicated some variation of civility initiatives on their campuses, as well as interviews with three Student Affairs Professionals. No observational data was provided to the researcher, and the researcher preceded with the interviews and collecting data on websites and materials that were made available to the researcher from Student Affairs Professionals.

The researcher transcribed the three interviews and as the researcher reviewed the interviews, themes began to naturally formulate. The researcher then conducted data analysis of all materials that were provided from all institutions and additional themes were formed. The researcher then reviewed what research questions the themes answered. This process was conducted by using Creswell's (2013) data analysis spiral that allows for a fluid process in that the researcher can go back and review data multiple times to reflect on the data that is provided and the themes that emerge from the data analysis. The researcher reviewed the data for themes throughout the data collection process, and continuously as new data were collected. This was important for the

researcher to do as it allowed for her to naturally reflect on the data as new themes emerged. Themes emerged due to repeated statements, and common phrases that were shared by multiple respondents. Because of the low response rate the researcher was especially interested in determining why civility initiatives were not being implemented at a high rate, and what initiatives were implemented instead. Prior to reviewing each research question and the themes that answered the research question, it is important to review the participants who were utilized in this study.

Participants

The institutions that were selected were those that responded to the researcher and described some type of civility initiatives on their campuses. All institutions are a part of the SUNY system and are 4-year public institutions. Although some institutions offer graduate programs, the researcher focused on the initiatives and Student Affairs Professionals who work with the undergraduate population. The researcher was able to use three small sized institutions, two medium sized institutions, and three large institutions. Two of the small institutions that were selected are unique in that they are colleges within the SUNY system, but are located on campuses that are private and not a part of the SUNY system. Despite this difference the researcher found it was important to still include these colleges to provide a variety of institution type. Of the eight institutions selected the researcher was able to interview three Student Affairs Professionals within them. The researcher had hoped to interview Vice Presidents or Dean of Students only; however, the response rate for these particular positions were rather low, and the researcher proceeded with those who made themselves available to her. The researcher interviewed a Director of Residence Life, Associate Director of

Diversity and Inclusion, and Associate Vice President/Dean of Students. Information

regarding the participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Information

Name	Size (approx.)	Type of Institution	High School GPA	Percent receiving Financial Aid	Percent Students of Color	Main Contact
SU-1	1,000	Small college within large university	N.A.	50%	39%	Associate Director of Diversity and Inclusion*
SU-2	3,400	Located in small town with one branch campus	75-85	85%	31%	Director of Residence Life
SU-3	600	Small college within small university	82-91	98%	N.A.	Assistant Vice President/Dean of Students
MU-1	7,800	Located in small town with 53% of students who live off-campus	90-95	58%	32%	Assistant Vice President and Director of Residence Life*
MU-2	7,000	Located in small town with 91% of freshman who live on-campus	87-93	82%	25%	Vice President
LU-1	13,000	One of SUNY's 4 University Centers, campus is located in medium sized	92-97	58%	29%	Associate Vice President/Dean of Students*

		city and all freshman are required to live on-campus				
LU-2	10,000	Located in a city and approximately 25% of students live on-campus	82-89	82%	47%	Associate Vice President/Dean of Students
LU-3	19,000	Located in a city with three campus locations	90-96	80%	43%	Associate Director of Intercultural and Diversity Center

*Denotes contact was also interviewed for this research

Findings

Before reporting the findings from the eight institutions that were selected as participants for this research, it is important to note the general findings that emerged as the researcher contacted all twenty-four institutions. In contacting the 24 institutions, the researcher discovered the eight institutions that have some form of civility initiatives on their campuses that were selected for this study. Of the 24 institutions, the researcher also found seven institutions that stated they did not have specific civility initiatives and nine institutions that did not respond. The researcher further reviewed the responses of the seven institutions that stated they did not have civility initiatives on their campuses, and obtained the following responses: one respondent indicated that their campus does not have anyone to lead the endeavor; two respondents replied that they do not use that specific term in their programs; one respondent indicated that this is an important initiative but one they have not been able to get to the top of their priority list; and, three

respondents indicated they do not have civility initiatives centralized on their campus in any manner. One Vice President further explained that their campus considered creating a more centralized civility effort; however, they have diversity and inclusion initiatives on their campus instead. Another respondent explained that although there are no specific programs that she can think of, she likes to think that everything her campus does relates to the promotion of civility in some fashion or another.

The researcher determined that these seven institutions did not have civility initiatives, though they most likely have programs that relate to the promotion of a more civil campus, and most likely those programs seem to be established from a Residence Life Office or Office of Diversity and Inclusion. However, these seven respondents could not provide further details for the research at this time. It is important to note the researcher found when contacting institutions that respondents seemed uninterested in the concept of civility and several respondents seemed confused by the idea of civility initiatives and what their campuses do to promote civility. The researcher did find that when reviewing these institutions' websites they did have some civility programs on their campuses, whether anti-bullying statements, bystander training, diversity programs or value statements; however, the researcher was unable to obtain further information from these particular respondents.

The next section will discuss the findings from the eight respondents who were able to provide further information on civility initiatives on their campuses. The researcher reviewed the data that were collected, and formulated it into themes in order to answer the five research questions.

Classroom Incivility

The first research question the study addressed asked: How do colleges and universities in the SUNY system address classroom incivility? Review of the data from eight institutions and interviews from three Student Affairs Professionals led to two main themes, lack of faculty connection and handbook statements. These themes will be discussed in this section.

Lack of faculty connection.

The Student Affairs Professionals did not provide information as to how they address classroom incivility, rather respondents indicated there is disconnect between Student Affairs and Faculty members. Due to this disconnect, Student Affairs Professionals know what is occurring inside of the classroom because students tell them, but they do not have documented information from faculty members. The respondent from "SU-1" explained "I'm trying to get more connected with faculty members and getting them on board to also talk about civility in their classrooms." However, the respondent went on to explain that he creates programs for the students as the main way to promote civility on the campus. The respondent from "SU-1" further elaborated by describing the classroom as an area that needs more attention with regards to civility initiatives:

> I think in the classroom. I think we need to get faculty more involved in promoting civility, because most of the time when students come in or are talking about how they feel [in my office], there is a hostile uncivil environment, it's in the classroom. Because you know, the students will say really derogatory things, a student [will ask] have you ever thought about this, and the other student will

shut them down and be rude and disrespectful, and the faculty member doesn't do

anything about it. And so I think that faculty are very hard to get involved in this

type of work.

The respondent from "MU-1" shared similar sentiments by explaining the faculty are

"wonderful, but they don't understand what we do. A lot of times they don't understand

what we do… in Residence Life." The respondent went on to explain:

You know, a lot of times they'll ask you… what are "we" going to do about this.

You know they're always [asking], what are you going to do about this? And my

question is… let's all do this together. Together, together. Because together

we'll speak volumes.

The respondent further explained that in Residence Life she would promote faculty

programs that relate to civility and encourage her staff to walk students over to the

faculty-led programs. The respondent further described how her staff work to support

faculty programs and workshops. However, she explained that she is busy with her work

in her department, so she does not have further knowledge on what initiatives faculty

members are doing as it relates to civility inside of their own classrooms. Similar

sentiments were shared from respondent "SU-1" who explained that the culture on his

campus is "that you can't require faculty to do anything, which is so frustrating".

Respondent "SU-1" explained that this disconnect between faculty and Student Affairs

Professionals is troubling, and further described:

They [faculty] are such an important component because students are listening to

them. Right? Because these are the people that are training you, teaching you the

things about your career, so you're probably more likely to hear from the faculty

than you are from a Student Affairs Professional. So they hold a lot of influence.

Unlike the previous respondents, it is worth noting that the respondent from "LU-1"

explained that she conducts training during new faculty orientation to assist faculty in

developing classroom structure and in managing disruptive behavior in the classroom.

The respondent also explained that she responds to reports of disruptive student behavior

in the classroom, and that she works to train faculty on how to create civil spaces that

invite dialogue not debate. However, this response was an outlier to the other

respondents who did not provide examples of promoting civility inside of the classroom.

Handbook statements.

The respondents do not have language relating to civility inside of the Code of

Conduct, rather the language relating to civility is found elsewhere in the Student

Handbook. Some of the respondents were unsure of the language that is found in the

Student Handbook, but the researcher looked on the websites and reviewed the

handbooks and civility statements herself to gather further evidence of initiatives to

promote civility. For example, at "SU-2" civility was presented in the faculty

responsibilities section of the handbook: "maintaining civility in the classroom", and the

introduction to the Student Handbook states, "civility reflects our consideration for others

and our appreciation of the diversity exemplified" here. The "SU-3" handbook does not

mention civility, but does mention respect and the importance of it. The "MU-2" has a

Better Community Statement that includes the language, "we choose to be a part of an

academic community that is dedicated to the principles that foster integrity, civility and

justice." The "LU-2" has a Compact for a Civil and Caring Academic Community,

which includes a pledge that students are informed of during orientation. This compact states, "members of our campus community should treat each other with civility and respect, with care and concern, and with a commitment to the academic purpose for which LU-2 exists." The respondent from "MU-1" provided a new policy on classroom civility that outlines for faculty members their responsibility for establishing a learning environment, as well as guidelines for how to proceed should a student act disruptively or disorderly in class. The researcher reviewed these statements to gain an understanding of their existence; however, the researcher was limited in her understanding of the statements and how they are utilized since the Student Affairs Professionals could not speak about them in great detail. The institutions did not provide standardized syllabi language relating to civility in the classroom, though one respondent indicated this is something he is working to incorporate.

Out of Classroom Incivility

The second research question the study addressed asked: What initiatives do colleges and universities in the SUNY system implement to address incivility outside of the classroom? In reviewing the data, three main themes emerged that relate to this question: dialogue and conversations, current issues, and diversity and inclusion. These three themes will be discussed in this section. However, it is worth noting that no institution had an initiative that was implemented only to promote civility on their campus, rather the initiatives that were shared had elements of promoting civility within them.

Dialogue and conversations.

Six of the eight institutions included in this research shared initiatives that relate to creating dialogues on their campuses around difficult topics in order to promote a more civil campus. All three of the Student Affairs Professionals who were interviewed explained the importance of programs that create dialogue and conversations rather than debate and conflicts. The respondents explained the importance of engaging students in these conversations, and teaching students how to properly dialogue with others who do not agree with you, without erupting into arguments, or worse, violence. The respondent from "LU-1" explained the importance of programs that teach "how to use dialogue as a tool, as opposed to debate." The respondent went on to state:

> If we don't teach people the skills of discussion and facilitation skills, and how to engage with other people, they can't do that and conflict arises. That's where we have violence erupt in our community. So I would say, you know, when we talk about civility, we need to talk about the role that dialogue and facilitating discussions plays in avoiding future violence.

The respondent from "SU-1" explained how he attempts to engage students who have opposing opinions to him during programs as a means of showing students how to engage in difficult conversations while still being respectful of your differences. He explained that he asks students to explain their opposing views, and that students are responsive to that because students describe how so often people do not ask for one to explain their opposing view, and that opens up the opportunity for further dialogue. He described situations in which students may disagree with him, but they practice this style of

conversation and see that "it's possible to have kind dialogue and still disagree." He further elaborated by stating:

> I didn't name call; I presented my feelings on what was happening, and we had a really good educational moment where I got to learn more about them and where they're coming from, and they got to hear from me on why I may have been offended.

The respondent from "SU-2" also shared this style of initiative with a Residence Life program that their staff implemented entitled, "Conversation without Confrontation." According to the respondent from "SU-2", these programs are especially important to implement for students who are taking classes together, and also living together, sharing their living quarters, and spending a great amount of time together. The staff at "SU-3" created a program with their Public Safety Department to encourage students to meet with police on campus, ask difficult questions of them and engage in civil dialogue with those that you may disagree with. The Student Affairs Professionals at "MU-2" implemented Community Conversations, which are town hall style conversations to engage the campus in discussing difficult and relevant topics such as Black Lives Matter, Muslims in the Time of Trump, and other timely and controversial discussion topics.

Current issues.

All eight of the institutions included in this research provided examples of initiatives that include current events and relevant issues as a means of attracting students' attention, and utilizing a controversial topic to increase students' involvement and engagement. The respondent from "MU-2" offered a workshop entitled "Teachable Moments: Ferguson, Yik Yak and Charlie Hebdo as Catalysts for Critical Thinking."

The respondent at "MU-1" had her staff facilitate a discussion with students around the recent presidential election and the outcome of the election. Respondents explained the importance of engaging students in these difficult conversations to have a better sense as to what their peers think, even if they disagree with their peers, and to learn how to disagree with one another in a civil manner. The respondent from "LU-1" explained that

> There are very few programs you will see advertised that are about civility. You
> can't call it that if you want people to attend. The programming has to have a
> different kind of "wow factor", it has to have a different plug to get students to
> come to it, so you'll often see programming with a controversial title or
> controversial speaker, but the goal of the program is to get controversial issues in
> the discussion, so that we can talk about how we discuss these things.

Three of the respondents shared programs or workshops that are related to Black Lives Matter and the use of police force. Two of the three interviewees described how the current presidential election has affected their initiatives and topics that they use for their programs. The respondent from "SU-1" had created a program "Black Lives, Blue Lives and All Lives Matter", and it was described as "a conversation around for people who believe in all those different things come together and all sit in a room, and engage in this tough dialogue in a way that allows us to be heard." Programs with these controversial topics are then utilized to develop civil conversations among students, and to engage different groups of students to come to an agreement and uphold a certain level of respect for one another. The respondent of "SU-1" stated,

> Where are people looking, what kind of conversations are people looking to have,
> what are some of the current issues that people are already sort of facing, and then

really going through and creating programs and adapting programs to fit the needs

of the community.

Creating programs and initiatives in this manner is pertinent in order to get students'

attention and to increase awareness of programs and to create educational opportunities

for students to learn more about civility through current events and topics in the media.

Diversity and inclusion.

While the researcher was contacting institutions and gathering data, it was noted

that many institutions forwarded the researcher's request for information to Student

Affairs Professionals who work within Offices of Diversity and Inclusion, or similar

departments. Even the respondents who do not work directly in such offices, mentioned

programs that relate to diversity and inclusion, and how such programs can assist

campuses in creating a more civil environment. The respondent from "SU-1" shared

materials from Diversity Zone training which is a ninety minute training offered to

faculty, staff, and students that encourages participants to engage in self-reflection and

cross-cultural conversations. The respondent from "SU-1" explained the importance of

sharing different experiences and understanding "how do we have a conversation through

difference, and in that we talk about the civility piece, how do we listen to each other,

how do we hear and seek to understand each other." "SU-2" respondent described how

professional staff in the Residence Hall engage residential students in discussing about

issues of racism, inappropriate language, and how issues of diversity can be discussed to

create a more civil community. "SU-3" respondent explained how the campus created an

Institute for Cultural Unity, which provides a space for cultural clubs and organizations to

meet and share programs.

The respondent from "MU-2" provided their "Better Community Statement" which also included a list of Campus-Wide Efforts to Create a More Inclusive Community. This list includes initiatives such as diversity training for staff, Campus Climate Survey, signing of a joint-resolution pledging to combat racism, and even a letter from the university's president to YikYak's founders asking them to disband their app. "MU-1" described a situation in which hate speech was being used in the residence halls, and they created a program called, "Love Speech Instead" to address the issue of hateful language that was used and that hate speech will not be tolerated. The respondent from "LU-1" shared that the university has an inclusive community pledge intended to call on all members of the campus community to engage in challenging and difficult conversations in order to create a more welcoming environment for everyone. Respondents that discussed recent events, such as Black Lives Matter, highlighted these programs and initiatives and how conversations around this topic have sparked institutions to create welcoming and inclusive environments.

Supports for Civility Initiatives

The third research question the study addressed asked: What supports are available for civility initiatives in and outside of the classroom within the colleges and universities of the SUNY system? In examining the data, two main themes emerged which relate to this question: Student Handbooks, and community and collaboration. These two themes will be discussed in this section; however, prior to doing so, it is important to note that the researcher found that civility initiatives are decentralized on the eight campuses she reviewed. The researcher did not find a SUNY institution within her research that had a centralized initiative for civility. This is important to note, because

without a centralized effort the supports that will be described below are what were

shared from the Student Affairs Professionals who were contacted in this research;

however, other Student Affairs Professionals on the same campus may consider a

different support for civility initiatives that others may be unaware of due to the

decentralized efforts.

Student handbooks.

As previously described in "Classroom Incivility," the language found within the

Student Handbooks can be helpful in supporting a more civil campus. Student Affairs

Professionals, who were examined, review this language, and often refer to this language

when meeting with students and especially when meeting with students for conduct

violations. "LU-1" respondent explained that within the Student Handbook is the Code

of Conduct, "and for things that would violate one of our policies – disruptive behavior,

behavior that endangers others, those kind of things, are all things that would be

addressed by the college policy." Three of the seven participants who did not have

civility initiatives they could speak to; however, did mention the value of their Codes of

Conduct found within their Student Handbooks and the language in the handbook that

addresses civility. The language may not say *civility* directly, but does use words such as

respect, *community*, and *inclusive*. Despite efforts to utilize Student Handbooks, it is

worth noting that the respondent from "LU-1" stated that

> So your university handbook kind of statement that exists probably in every
>
> university handbook [referencing the university's community values statement],
>
> about who we are as a community, and I mean, that's in the front of the Code of
>
> Conduct, and you know, do people read it? Is it visible? Is it posted? No.

This quote is important because although statements or pledges may be included in the Student Handbooks, if students or the college community are unaware of these statements then they may not be as beneficial as one might think.

Community and collaboration.

When discussing civility initiatives the three respondents who were interviewed referred to *community* and *collaboration* multiple times in a few different ways. One way that respondents used the term *community* were by discussing how important it is for students to learn to respect one another and to be able to create the community that they both live and study in. "LU-1" respondent described the support she receives in civility initiatives from the Office of Residential Life:

> Residential Life is a pretty big player in [civility initiatives] because the students live there; so, it's in the best interest of Residential Life to engage about civility in a broad sense because it helps maintain the civility of their communities.

Similarly, the respondent from "MU-1" explained the importance of civility initiatives, such as training and workshops, and that these things are done so that everyone can "live in this community in a more peaceful way with each other."

"MU-1" respondent also expressed the importance of collaboration and that it is needed to create successful programs, and that "the initiatives aren't just one person doing it, it should really be a community, so we focus on being a cohesive group." Community initiatives are important, and creating cultures of communities on the college campuses is necessary, but this cannot be achieved without everyone on campus collaborating to create programs that promote civility. "SU-1" respondent explained the importance of collaboration to create successful programs, and specifically described

working with the Office of Career Services on a "Making It Series" which is intended to

assist students in career preparation, but addresses the topics of diversity, inclusion and

civility in the workplace. The respondent from "SU-3" shared how they have

collaborated with their Office of Public Safety to create programs that provide students

with the opportunity to engage in difficult conversations with the campus police officers.

The researcher found that it is important for Student Affairs Professionals to have the

ability to collaborate with others across campus in order to create better and stronger

initiatives that promote civility and reach a greater number of students.

Implementing Civility Initiatives

The fourth research question the study addressed asked: How are the civility

initiatives implemented? The Student Affairs Professionals shared civility initiatives that

were decentralized and not intended to have the sole purpose of promoting civility. The

manner in which the respondents described how these initiatives are implemented was in

general terms, by describing the use of student clubs and organizations to develop

programs, using flyers and social media to promote them, and utilizing collaboration as a

way to develop these programs. Respondent "SU-1" stated, "I think that the conversation

of civility is an indirect conversation and not a more strategic one." Similarly respondent

"LU-1" described, "there hasn't been a sort of university-wide initiative, that we should

talk about civility, I haven't seen that." However, despite the general items and ideas that

were described, one common theme did emerge, and that is, student-led programs, which

will be described in this section.

Student-Led programs.

The respondents described the importance of having programs led by students and peers, rather than by administrators. Respondent "LU-1" explained that

I can't put upon the students what I think that civility means because I'm a different generation, I have different life experiences, because on our campus 7,000 live here 24 hours a day, so it's really their measure that we need to be paying attention to. So they have to be a part of every single step.

The respondent also explained that she attempts to involve students during every phase of the process in developing a program, as well as in the conduct process by having students serve on the conduct board to having students be a part of the annual review of policies and procedures. Respondent from "SU-1" described how civility related initiatives on his campus began by students speaking up about how the campus was becoming an unsafe space in their opinions. This conversation then spread on campus and eventually made its way to administrators who agreed that something needed to be done, and five University Diversity Officers were appointed.

Many of the respondents described peer-to-peer initiatives as a way to better involve students and allow for students to be involved in the process. "LU-1" has a peer-led restorative justice mediation program. This program has trained students who are able to meet with students in the residence halls or in a student organization, and discuss any issues that may be going on. "LU-3" has Diversity Advocates who are trained students who serve as peer educators and can facilitate workshops on difficult conversations and diversity topics. "MU-1" has a Bystander Training workshop that many of their student leaders are required to attend; they also have a Cultural Advocates

program that is student-led. Involving students in the implementation of programs is important in order to get the student buy in and to create successful programs.

Civility Assessment

The fifth research question the study addressed asked: How do the colleges and universities in the SUNY system assess civility initiatives? The researcher came to understand that assessment is a main component of much of the work that Student Affairs Professionals do in order to justify the work they are accomplishing. However, specific assessment of civility initiatives was not found. In fact, respondent from "LU-1" explained, "I can't say that we've done specific civility measures, I don't know what a tool would be to measure civility." Respondents described utilizing general assessment tools, which will be described in this section.

General assessment.

Respondents described the use of pre-test and post-test surveys to measure what students have learned after attending workshop series. The basic measure that is also used is if students show up for programs and if students are utilizing the resources that are available to them. Programs have intended learning outcomes, and one way respondents assess the learning that occurs is by facilitating focus groups after programs. Respondents also indicated using informal measures such as conversations with students after a program as a way to gauge the success of the program and what students learned from the program.

Respondents explained that, for them, students expressing that they learned something, were challenged in their thinking, or thought about something in a different regard, determined the success of initiatives. "SU-1" respondent stated that when

students report to him and say "hey, I felt challenged but I also didn't feel like I'm a bad person, but I do know I have to work on it. That to me is the ultimate sign of success." "MU-1" respondent further explained, "it's not about how many people come to a program… I've always said for my whole career, it's not the quantity of people that come… it's the fact that someone came and they feel like they learned." When questioned further regarding the measurement of civility initiatives, "MU-1" respondent explained that "I don't know if that's kind of impossible thing to measure at this point because you… can't help when someone feels a certain way and wants to lash out in a way." The researcher gathered that much of the assessment of program and initiatives is anecdotal and shared among staff member and students after programs occur.

Civility Best Practices

The overarching research question the study addressed asked: What are the best practices regarding the promotion of campus civility in and outside of the classroom? The research questions and themes previously described help provide a framework for answering the overarching research question. Student Affairs Professionals value student-led programs and peer-to-peer initiatives, as well as programs that relate to current issues, promoting community, and creating an inclusive and diverse culture. Student Handbooks are valuable resources for Student Affairs Professionals to utilize, and many campuses have added statements and pledges to assist in the creation of a more civil campus environment. In reviewing all of these themes and the overarching question, two main categories develop: inclusion and diverse communities, and areas of improvement.

Inclusion and diverse communities.

In conducting this research, the researcher realized that the data had pointed to a changing shift in which civility education stems from diversity and inclusion education. Prior to this study, the researcher would have guessed she would have been more likely to find institutions were promoting civility, and from the civility programs stemmed programs relating to diversity and inclusion. However, after conducting this research, the researcher now sees the opposite is true: Student Affairs Professionals are focusing on programs relating to diversity and inclusion, and the promotion of civility falls within this programming. Given the current events and trends that college campuses are facing today, especially after the 2016 presidential election, the issue of creating a more inclusive campus environment is now at the forefront more than ever. Student Affairs Professionals must work to create inclusive communities, and by doing so a culture of civility should develop. Engaging students in difficult conversations, such as Black Lives Matter and the presidential debate, are difficult conversations, but the researcher found that these are the challenging dialogues in which Student Affairs Professionals are engaging students in order to create an inclusive and civil campus environment.

"SU-2" respondent shared a program entitled "Conversation Without Confrontation," and this program highlights what Student Affairs Professionals are aiming to do in order to create a civil campus environment. Challenging conversations and difficult dialogues are one of the main components of these types of programs, and by engaging students in this matter it is the hope that students learn how to behave civilly towards one another, even if there is a difference in opinion. Creating programs that are led by other students is important as it allows for students to hear from their peers and to

be guided through difficult and challenging topics with their peers, who are typically close in age to other students and are sharing similar experiences as other students. Many of the responding universities shared their peer-led initiatives and highlighted these programs as some of their more successful programs that encourage other students to learn from their peers, and to engage their peers in challenging dialogues.

Lastly, utilizing the Student Handbook as a space to include community pledges and civility-related statements were found to be done by institutions. This is helpful because it assists in creating shared language across the campus; however, if others are unaware of this language or seldom ever review the language, then Students Affairs Professionals must work to bring this language to the forefront and to create initiatives which engage the campus community in learning more about these statements and pledges. The Student Handbook is a valuable resource on college campuses, but the community must be aware of this resource in order for it to best serve a purpose.

Centralizing initiatives.

No institutions reported centralized initiatives for the promotion of civility. Without centralized efforts everyone on campus does not have awareness for what others are doing and shared goals are not evident. Student Affairs Professionals need to create centralized efforts to promote civility on their campuses. By having centralized efforts then staff and resources can be shared and the entire campus community can be working towards shared goals. Without a centralized initiative everyone on campus does not know what others are doing to promote civility, and efforts of some are being diminished because others are unaware of them. Also, shared values need to be established at universities, so that by having the campus community understand the university's values,

then one can create civility initiatives around these shared values. "LU-1" respondent explained:

> Well I think understanding what our value is, and the definition for what is civility on our campus. We don't talk about those terms, we talk about violence, we talk about policies, but we don't talk about what does civility mean, so I think a more conscious discussion as part of the campus dialogue around what are our values would be helpful.

Student Affairs Professionals need to include civility initiatives in their annual program plans. The respondents indicated that civility initiatives are an outcome, though they do not directly plan for them. This needs to change so that civility is one of the key matters in which Student Affairs Professionals are creating programs around, and working to educate the campus community about.

The researcher found disconnect between faculty members and Student Affairs Professionals. Student Affairs Professionals were unaware of the needs of faculty members and only knew general information as it relates to what is going on inside of the classroom. This gap must be filled in order to create more seamless campus environments in which all professionals are working towards the same goals, and working to create civil campuses. Student Affairs Professionals will be better suited to support the needs of faculty members if they are aware of what is going on inside of the classroom.

Summary

This chapter described the main themes that emerged from this research. The respondents explained the importance of civility initiatives being student-led, as well as

the importance of utilizing dialogues and conversations to engage students. Respondents also described how diversity and inclusion is utilized as a means for promoting civility on college campuses. However, there are still challenges to overcome, such as the disconnect between faculty members and Student Affairs Professionals in the promotion of civility on their campuses, as well as Student Handbooks that may have civility statements, but that are not promoted across campus. Lastly, civility initiatives are decentralized, and this can pose an additional challenge for Student Affairs Professionals. The next chapter will further review these findings and what the implications are of these findings for Student Affairs Professionals.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This qualitative study in a case study design was intended to establish the best practices for promoting civility inside and outside of the university classroom. The researcher reviewed all SUNY four-year institutions and selected eight universities within the SUNY system to use for this research. The researcher interviewed three Student Affairs Professionals, as well as collected various data from the eight universities. Previous chapters described the research design, the research methodology, the literature used to inform the research, and the findings of the research. This chapter will summarize the research, present conclusions and the implications for Student Affairs Professionals.

Summary

Universities and colleges are faced with an increase in incivility that may occur inside or outside of the classroom (Connelly, 2009). Acts of incivility can disrupt the

learning environment and can harm students' ability to learn (Schroeder & Robertson, 2008). The research on the topic including suggestions for how to create a more civil classroom have been shared in previous literature. In addition, literature exists that established the issue of incivility on college campuses, and how this issue impacts college campuses. However, no research exists that informs Student Affairs Professionals as to best practices for the promotion of a more civil campus, which is what this research does. Student Affairs Professionals interact with students daily and engage with students outside of the classroom by creating different initiatives, such as workshops and programs. This research informs Student Affairs Professionals as to what are the best practices for creating civility initiatives by reviewing the current initiatives that are implemented at eight SUNY institutions.

The researcher reviewed 24 universities within the SUNY system and found that seven respondents indicated they had no civility initiatives, six universities did not respond, and eight institutions shared some form of civility initiatives. Of these eight institutions, the researcher interviewed three Student Affairs Professionals, and collected data such as Code of Conduct and Student Handbooks statements, program materials such as learning outcomes and PowerPoint presentations. The collected data were analyzed and the researcher extracted themes that emerged from the data sets. The findings of this research were described in Chapter Four.

Summary of Findings

The findings described in Chapter 4 sought to answer the five sub-questions and the one overarching research question. The researcher did not find universities that had centralized civility initiatives and, because of this, the research evolved into looking at

general initiatives related to the promotion of civility on college campuses. In doing so, the researcher found that institutions have an increased focus on Diversity and Inclusion efforts, and how those efforts can be used to inform the campus community on engaging in difficult dialogues and, therefore, creating a more civil campus. In reviewing all of the data, the main themes that evolved were: Lack of Faculty Connection, Student Handbooks and Handbook Statements, Dialogue and Conversations, Current Issues, Diversity and Inclusion, Community and Collaboration, Student-Led Programs and General Assessment. These themes were reviewed as a whole to determine the themes for the overarching research question, which were: Inclusion and Diverse Communities and Centralizing Initiatives.

Discussion

The promotion of civility on college campuses is imperative for leaders in higher education to initiate. Acts of incivility on college campuses can potentially harm the learning environment, and possibly the reputation of the institution (Hirschy & Braxton, 2004). Institutions should work to avoid the "incivility spiral" as explained by Anderson and Pearson (1999) as negative action of one person leading to increased harmful acts of the whole group. Student Affairs Professionals have a unique opportunity to influence the civility initiatives that their campuses are implementing. The Generational Theory can be connected to the findings of this study, particularly as it relates to how students prefer to interact with one another, and the positive impact that peer-to-peer learning can have on students. Because the researcher was not provided with reported incidents of incivility she is unable to connect the findings with the Work Place Incivility Theory. The researcher reviewed eight SUNY institutions and their current efforts to promote

civility. These findings were described in Chapter 4. The following section will review the findings as they relate to each research question.

Prior to discussing the findings of each research question, it is important to note that the researcher was surprised by some of her findings, particularly the focus of respondents on discussing diversity and inclusion as it relates to civility. The focus of creating a welcoming and accepting campus environment, and addressing issues such as hate speech and harmful language, overshadowed other pieces of civility, such as respectful use of cell phones and social media (which are topics the researcher anticipated). It is worth noting that this research was conducted during the 2016 Presidential Election, and that the "Trump Effect" was currently being experienced across college campuses. The debates and the topics that the presidential election covered were being experienced on college campuses, and because of this, Student Affairs Professionals had shifted their focus slightly in order to address these issues brought up by the presidential election. The researcher believes that the "Trump Effect" and the corresponding topics being discussed during the presidential election also impacted her research.

Classroom Incivility

How do colleges and universities in the SUNY system address classroom incivility?

This question was intended to show how Student Affairs Professionals also impact the classroom in promoting a more civil learning environment. However, the respondents did not show a clear connection between Student Affairs Professionals and impact inside of the classroom. The data suggested that Student Affairs Professionals create initiatives to positively impact the learning and living environment of students, and

by doing so, the researcher assumes that classroom civility is also impacted. However, it is important for Student Affairs Professionals to better connect with faculty members to coordinate initiatives with better intentionality for issues inside of the classroom. Also, one of the respondents explained how she trains new faculty members on classroom management and responding to disruptive classroom behavior. Barett et al. (2010) recommended that faculty be trained on how to respond to classroom incivility. This is a valuable way in which Student Affairs Professionals can impact classroom incivility and directly work with faculty members. The findings indicated that Student Affairs Professionals are aware of classroom incivility, but do not directly create initiatives to impact behavior inside of the classroom. Despite this outcome, the researcher would propose that Student Affairs Professionals actually do have an impact on civility inside of the classroom; however, this is most likely not their main focus, and therefore, there is not the data to support such assumptions.

The Student Handbook is a common way in which classroom civility is promoted. Institutions that do not have a statement directly in the handbook tend to have some type of corresponding community statement or pledge. This finding coincides with previous research citing the importance of student handbooks and similar behavior statements (Baker et al., 2008; Connelly, 2009). The Student Handbook is perhaps one of the easiest methods that institutions can implement to promote civility, as it does not require a lot of involvement to create a statement, such as a values statement or civility pledge, and include it in the Student Handbook. However, the trouble with such statements is if students are unaware of them, then they are not serving a great benefit. It is important for

students to be educated about the Student Handbook and what are the expectations of being a part of the campus community.

Out of Classroom Incivility

What initiatives do colleges and universities in the SUNY system implement to address incivility outside of the classroom?

The respondents explained different workshops and programs that have been created with creative titles that attract students' attention and encourage debate and discussion. Therefore, it is important for civility initiatives to be developed around current issues and trends in order to spark discussion and debate. Universities are a microcosm of the larger society, so current events can manifest on college campuses (Connelly, 2009). These programs are intended to encourage disagreement so that students can learn how to work through difficult discussions that may otherwise lead to acts of incivility. It is necessary for students to learn how to be open to new ideas from their peers, rather than being defensive (Rookstool, 2008). Diversity and Inclusion is a major component of initiatives across college campuses today. Because of events and movements, such as Black Lives Matter, police brutality, and the 2016 presidential election, it is important for campuses to create an inclusive and welcoming community for all students to learn. By creating such welcoming environments, it is the hope that there will be fewer acts of incivility and a greater sense of belonging.

The respondents shared examples of racism and hateful language being used by students. These incidents can have a negative impact on campus communities, and can even harm the reputation of the campus if the media picks up the incident. Because of these issues, higher education administrators must work to be ahead of these matters, to

engage students in difficult conversations, and to work to create an inclusive environment. Previous research (e.g., Baker et al., 2008) found that Millennials care what their peers think, enjoy being entertained, and prefer learning opportunities in which they can participate. Because of these factors, Students Affairs Professionals should be certain that their programs are timely in topic, allow for participation, and foster a community in which students feel that they belong among their peers.

Support for Civility Initiatives

What supports are available for civility initiatives in and outside of the classroom within the colleges and universities of the SUNY system?

The respondents all indicated that their civility initiatives are decentralized and that there is no one main office that oversees the promotion of civility. Respondents shared the importance of collaboration to create successful programs. Collaboration also allows for the initiative to reach greater audiences by having more people on campus develop and create an awareness of the program. It is no surprise that financial resources are low on many college campuses, so by collaborating, Student Affairs Professionals are able to pull together resources and share budgets for initiatives. The promotion of civility should be the responsibility of everyone on a college campus (Rookstool, 2005).

Creating a community and having a community to work with on various initiatives is important in creating civility initiatives (Popovics, 2014). Offices of Residential Life oversee the community that students study and live in. Student Affairs Professionals who work within Residential Life oversee the development of that particular community, and because of this it is necessary for them to develop a community that values civility. Residence Halls that have strong communities with

fewer acts of incivility will be more likely to produce students who are engaged in the campus and are attending the institution to study and be successful.

Implementing Civility Initiatives

How are the civility initiatives implemented?

This question was important for the researcher to gain a better understanding of how civility initiatives are being implemented at varying levels. On a general level, various student clubs and organizations create programs that support a more civil campus. However, as the researcher dug deeper into this question, a common response was the use of peer-led programs. The respondents explained that there is great value in having students learn from their peers, and this is certainly true in programs that relate to civility. According to the respondents, allowing students to learn the importance of how to intervene if they are a bystander to an incident from their peers, is often more valuable than learning from administrators or staff. Similarly, peer-led programs that discuss issues of diversity and inclusion are also found to be more valuable when other students lead those conversations. Oftentimes students feel more comfortable engaging in conversations with other students rather than with professional staff with whom they may not feel as comfortable engaging in conversations. Millennials value their peers, and often look to this group for support and approval (Baker et al., 2008). Student Affairs Professionals should work to train student leaders on their campuses who can then lead such initiatives and can positively impact their peers.

Another important component is having student involvement at every level and encouraging student feedback. Many of the SUNY institutions have a large population of students who live on-campus in the residence halls. The respondents explained that a

valuable asset in creating civility initiatives is student involvement at every level.

Millennials have a consumer mentality, and seeking their opinion and approval can help

with the overall buy in of an initiative (Lippman, et al., 2009). Students who live on

campus are aware of the concerns on the campus that occur every day, even on weekends

when some faculty and staff may not be present; because of this, their feedback and

involvement is necessary according to the respondents in this study.

Civility Assessment

How do the colleges and universities in the SUNY system assess civility initiatives?

The respondents explained that assessment is a major component in higher

education and it is crucial that all initiatives be assessed to prove they are worth staff's

time and financial resources. It is necessary that civility initiatives be evaluated to

determine if they are working and how so (Connelly, 2009). Despite the importance of

assessment, the respondents shared limited responses as to how they assess civility on

their campuses. Student Affairs Professionals utilize pre-test and post-tests, focus

groups, and surveys as a means of assessing the learning that occurs during programs.

Respondents also indicated the importance of student's informal feedback, and most

importantly, that students indicate they have learned something. Learning is always a

main goal of initiatives created by Student Affairs Professionals; therefore, it is

imperative that students to learn how to engage with others in a civil manner.

Despite the importance of assessment, respondents did not indicate a manner to

assess civility initiatives. Two of the respondents indicated that they would like to have a

way to do this, but they were unfamiliar with how to do so. The evaluation and

assessment of programs and incivility must be conducted and resources must be

dedicated to assessment (Connelly, 2009). Unfortunately, data on incidents of incivility were not shared with the researcher. This type of information could be used to gain a better understanding of incivility on a campus, which of course could assist in the creation of future programs and the development of new initiatives.

Civility Best Practices

What are the best practices regarding the promotion of campus civility in and outside of the classroom?

After reviewing the data that were collected the researcher found that using current events, such as Black Lives Matter, police brutality, and the 2016 presidential election were valuable ways that Student Affairs Professionals are able to engage students in a challenging topic, and teach the students how to engage in this topic in a civil manner. Millennials prefer to engage in dialogue rather than lectures, and prefer discussion and involvement with their learning (Weiler, 2004). The core components of dialogue and conversation were utilized at all eight of the institutions in some form. Millennials are constantly connected to their peers via technology (Baker et al., 2008). Students utilize social media as a way of airing their grievances, and are always on their cell phones, and not paying attention to others around them (Zieziula & Calhoun, 2014). The researcher thinks that perhaps the growing emphasis is on teaching students how to engage in dialogue and conversation in a civil manner, because students are so accustomed to communicating with others through cell phones and social media, rather than actual in person conversations.

The other response to the overarching question was the use of Offices of Diversity and Inclusion to oversee and coordinate many of the programs and initiatives. Teaching

students how to value differences and engage with others who may be different from them is a valuable component of these initiatives, and one that was commonly found. It is important for college campuses to create an environment in which students are open to ideas of their peers, rather than only trying to defend their own ideas (Rookstool, 2005). It seems that this type of programming is also valuable for students after they graduate and join the workforce, engaging with others who may be much different from them, or perhaps moving for a job to another area of the country that is different than their home. One must remember that college campuses are microcosms of the larger society, and therefore, experience similar issues of incivility at all levels (Connelly, 2009). It is essential for college campuses to best prepare students to know how to engage with others that may be different, and how to celebrate those differences with respect and civility.

Institution Size

This research was designed in hopes of reviewing differences in size of institutions and civility initiatives. However, the institutions that participated had some unique elements to them which made the size comparison a bit unusual. For example, both of the small-sized institutions that participated are located on large campuses. Therefore, these small universities may utilize the resources that are available to them on the large campus on which they are located. Because of this unique factor, it was not easy to make clear distinctions in initiatives within size of the institutions. However, it is worth noting that the one university that is located within a large campus is also part of a private university. This is a very unique setup. The respondent from this institution was the only respondent who described the importance of having the financial funding from

the institution to support such initiatives and staffing. The other institutions did not

describe finances. However, it is worth stating that when the researcher contacted all of

the institutions prior to selecting the eight that were used, two institutions, which were

both medium sized, indicated that they currently do not have the staffing to focus on

civility initiatives. Further data are needed to determine if size of institution and type

impact resources, staff, and funding available to create civility initiatives.

Conclusions

This qualitative research sought to inform best practices for civility initiatives on

college campuses. The researcher initially reached out to 24 SUNY institutions, and

discovered eight Student Affairs Professionals to use as respondents for this research who

could provide data regarding civility initiatives on their college campuses. The

researcher then collected data on civility programs, code of conducts, Student

Handbooks, and interviews with three Student Affairs Professionals. After collecting the

data from the Student Affairs Professionals, the researcher then analyzed the data and

themes emerged from the data. The findings indicate that the best practice for creating

civility initiatives are through diversity and inclusion events, as well as educational

dialogues and conversations. The other component of best practices is to utilize

collaboration with other departments in programming, as well as working to create a civil

community both inside and outside of the classroom. Lastly, it was found that student-

led initiatives are pertinent to successful programs, and valuing student feedback is

essential to creating civility initiatives. The researcher believes that her research may

have been impacted by the "Trump Effect" of the 2016 Presidential Election, and because

of this further research is recommended to gain a fuller understanding of how Student

Affairs Professionals create civility initiatives.

Implications

Review of the previous literature did not show any research relating to Student

Affairs Professionals and civility initiatives. Previous research focused on civility

initiatives inside of the classroom. Therefore, this research is beneficial to Student

Affairs Professionals because it provides best practices for civility initiatives that Student

Affairs Professionals may utilize to inform their practice. The following section will

share implications for Student Affairs Professionals regarding civility initiatives.

 The findings indicate that Student Affairs Professionals and faculty members do

not work closely on civility initiatives. In order to create a campus community that

values civility and is working toward shared common goals, it is important for Student

Affairs Professionals to work with faculty members on such initiatives. It is also

necessary for Student Affairs Professionals to have a greater understanding as to what are

the issues inside of the classroom, so that initiatives can be developed to address behavior

both inside and outside of the classroom.

Some of the universities in this research had Diversity Officers, and some of the

universities had Offices of Diversity and Inclusion, or at least a similar office. It is

important for Student Affairs Professionals to advocate for such positions to be

developed. Diversity and inclusion is a major theme that emerged from this research, and

it is a key area in which civility initiatives develop from. Because of this it is important

for these positions and offices to be fully staffed. The universities that indicated they did

not have civility initiatives also indicated that they currently did not have the staff to

oversee such initiatives. In order to create strong civility initiatives, universities must have the proper staffing established to develop, create and oversee civility initiatives.

Student Handbooks are valuable resources, and many times universities include some type of civility statement or pledge within the handbook. However, these handbooks are not marketed to students in a way that garners their attention, and therefore, does not gain the attention of the greater campus community. Student Affairs Professionals must seek out a way to market Student Handbooks, so that the campus community is aware of what is included inside of the handbook. A recommendation is to include this language as part of orientation, which is what "LU-2" has done. A session of orientation can be utilized to inform students of the pertinent material in the Student Handbook and can be presented to the students in a manner that catches their attention, such as YouTube videos or social media memes.

Student Affairs Professionals do not have a means for assessing civility on their campuses. It is important for civility to be assessed in some fashion in order to better understand the key issues, and therefore, be able to create or improve programs to address these issues. One way in which Student Affairs Professionals may be able to assess civility is by reviewing the reported incidents on their campuses. These data would assist Student Affairs Professionals in knowing current trends on their campuses, what type of incidents occur most often, who they occur with, where they occur, and other such information. These data should be used to assist Student Affairs Professionals in creating purposeful civility initiatives.

Lastly, student involvement is essential to civility initiatives. Student Affairs Professionals must utilize the student leaders on their campuses to assist in their civility

initiatives and efforts to program. Student-led programs and peer-to-peer workshops are valuable to the growth of students and their understanding of civil campuses. Training students to coordinate workshops on how to facilitate civil conversations and how to engage students in difficult dialogues is beneficial to all members of the campus community. Students can learn a great deal from their peers, and also, students value peer-to-peer leadership.

Recommendations for Future Research

To the researcher's knowledge this is the first study to review best practices of civility initiatives through Student Affairs Professionals. Because of this, the researcher has several recommendations for future research that would continue to inform this topic:

1. This study researched four-year institutions within the SUNY system. It would be valuable for further research to be conducted at two-year colleges, as well as institutions outside of the SUNY system.

2. This study focused on Student Affairs Professionals, which the researcher finds to be valuable in that it informs civility initiatives from a lens outside of the classroom. However, the findings of this research indicated that much of these efforts are occurring from Offices of Diversity and Inclusion. Because of this, the researcher recommends further research into Student Affairs Professionals who work within Offices of Diversity and Inclusion.

3. This study described the use of Student Handbooks, and statements within handbooks; however, further research is needed to determine how such statements align with the mission of the institution. Research is also needed to know if the mission of an institution is reflected in its civility initiatives.

4. This study was unable to obtain observational data of civility initiatives and data of number of incidents of incivility. Further research is needed which includes this data.

5. Student Affairs Professionals indicated that they do not know how to measure civility on their campuses. Further research should be conducted to determine best practices for measuring civility on college campuses.

6. Student Affairs Professionals are informed in their practice by the needs of their students, and the needs of students are ever-changing as technology evolves. The researcher recommends studies are conducted to review the impact of technology on campus civility.

7. Lastly, the researcher recommends that a similar study to this one be conducted but as a single case study at one institution. This would allow for the researcher to interview multiple Student Affairs Professionals at one university to determine how civility initiatives are implemented in greater detail. This research would also allow for staff from athletic departments, faculty members, academic deans, and other employees to be further researched.

Reflections

The researcher learned much in conducting this research and engaging in this research process. Through her own reflection, the researcher came to realize how Student Affairs Professionals (such as herself) are quick to adjust programs and initiatives to meet the current trends and needs of the student population. Since this research was conducted during the Black Lives Matter movement, as well as the 2016 presidential election, the researcher noted how institutions were shifting their programs to

better make students feel welcome and part of the community, especially during such trying times. The researcher felt pride in being a part of a professional community that alters and adjusts to meet the need of students based on current trends. However, the researcher also reflected on how the field is constantly shifting in terms of the programs and initiatives that are being created which can make research such as this one challenging to stay ahead on. The researcher intends to take the findings from this study to engage her students in dialogue and challenging conversations in the hope of creating a more civil campus environment.

Dissemination

The researcher will share the findings of the study in the following manner:

1. The researcher will publish this research in a Student Affairs journal to assist others with informing best practices.

2. The researcher will present this research at Student Affairs related conferences, both regionally and nationally.

3. The researcher will create a roundtable webinar for Student Affairs Professionals who want to engage in further discussion about civility initiatives.

Conclusion

This qualitative study sought to gather information from Student Affairs Professionals in order to discover what the best practices are for civility initiatives. Previous literature did not address how Student Affairs Professionals create civility initiatives and the best practices for doing so. The findings of this study stressed the importance of being engaged with students, current trends and how to best educate students in a purposeful manner by utilizing recent events. Initiatives related to diversity

and inclusion are essential to the promotion of civility on college campuses. Student

Affairs Professionals must collaborate across campus to develop initiatives that work to

create a community that values civility.

References

Alberts, H. C., Hazen H. D., & Theobold, R. B. (2010). Classroom incivilities: The challenge of interactions between college students and instructors in the US. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 34*(3), 439-462.

Alexander-Snow, M. (2004). Dynamics of gender, ethnicity and race in understanding classroom incivility. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 99*, 21–31.

Alkandari, N. (2011). The level of student incivility: The need of a policy to regulate college student civility. *College Student Journal, 45*, 257–268.

Anderson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471.

Ausbrooks, A. R., Jones, S. H., & Tijerna, M. S. (2011). Now you see it, now you don't: Faculty and student perceptions of classroom incivility in a social work program. *Advances in Social Work, 12*(2), 255-275.

Baker, et al., (2008). All I'm askin' is for a little respect: How can we promote civility in our classrooms? *Organization Management Journal, 5,* 65–80.

Barrett, S., Rubai-Barrett, N., & Pelowski, J. (2010). Preparing and responding to student incivilities: Starting the dialogue in public affairs education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 16*(2), 143–159.

Benton, T. (2007). Remedial civility training. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(36), 73. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Remedial-Civility-Training/46532/

Bjorklund, W., & Rehling, D. (2010). Student perceptions of classroom incivility. *College Teaching, 58*, 15–18.

Bjorklund, W., & Rehling, D. (2011). Incivility beyond the classroom walls. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 6*, 28–36.

Boice, B. (1996). Classroom incivilities. *Research in Higher Education*, *37*(4), 453–485.

Boice, B. (2000). Advice for new faculty members: *Nihil Nimus*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boysen, G. (2012). Teacher responses to classroom incivility: Students perceptions of effectiveness. *Teaching of Pyschology, 39*(4)*,* 276–279.

Braxton, J. S., & Hirschy, A. S. (2004). Effects of student classroom incivilities on students. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 99,* 67–76.

Brooks, T., Marini, Z., & Radue, J. (2011). Linking academic integrity and classroom civility: Student attitudes and institutional response. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching, 4,* 81–87.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2011). *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2010 edition*, Menlo Park, CA.

Connelly, R. (2009). Introducing a culture of civility in first-year college classes. *The Journal of General Education, 58*(1), 57–64.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

D'Ambra, A. M., Andrews, D. R. (2013). Incivility, retention and new graduate nurses: an integrated review of the literature. *Journal of Nursing Management,* 1-8.

Davis, K. S., & Minifie, J. R. (2013). Ensuring gen Y students come prepared for class; then leveraging active learning techniques to most effectively engage them. *American Journal of Business and Management, 2*(1), 13–19.

Dechter, G. (2007). Not so long ago, most college instructors were treated with dignity

    and respect, but now, to the dismay of many academics, some students see them

    as service providers, to be ignored when they are not entertaining. *The Baltimore*

    Sun, 28 January, F1.

Dicker, R. (2015). Drunk UConn students wants "F-ing mac and cheese" gets arrested.

    The Huffington Post, 6 October. Retrieved from

    http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/drunk-uconn-student-wants-mac-and-

    cheese-arrested_56141f31e4b022a4ce5fc518

Elsner, P. A., & Boggs, G. R. (2005). *Encouraging civility as a community college*

    leader. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.

Estes, B. & Wang, J. (2008). Working incivility: Impacts on individual and

    organizational performance. *Human Resource Development Review, 7*(2), 218-

    240.

Feldmann, L. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities.

    College Teaching, 49(4), 137–140.

Forni, P. M. (2002). *Choosing civility.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Griffin.

Forni, P. M. (2008). The civil classroom in the age of the net. *The NEA Higher Education*

    Journal, 15–22.

Harrell, I. L., & Hollins, T.N. (2009). Working with disruptive students. *The Journal of*

    the Virginia Community Colleges, 69–75.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings.* Albany, NY: State

    University of New York Press.

Hirschy, A. S., & Braxton, J. S. (2004). Effects of student classroom incivilities on students. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 99,* 67–76.

Hunt, C., & Marini, Z. A. (2012). Incivility in the practice environment: A perspective from clinical nursing teachers. *Nurse Education in Practice, 12*, 366-370.

Indiana University Center for Survey Research. (2000). *A survey on academic incivility at Indiana University: Preliminary report.*

Knepp, K. A. F. (2012). Understanding student and faculty incivility in higher education. *The Journal of Effective Teachi*ng, *12*(1), 32-45.

Lasiter, S., Marchiondo, L., & Marchiondo, K. (2012). Student narratives of faculty incivility. *Nursing Outlook, 60,* 121-126.

Lippmann, S., Bulanda, R. E. & Wagenaar, T. C. (2009). Student entitlement: Issues and strategies for confronting entitlement in the classroom and beyond. *College Teaching, 57*(4), 197-204.

Popovics, A. J. (2014). Civility on community college campuses: A shared responsibility. *College Student Journal, 48*(1), 130-132.

Porath, C. L., Gerbasi, A., & Schorch, S. L. (2015). The effects of civility on advice, leadership and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(5), 1527-1541.

Richardson, S. M. (1999). Civility, leadership, and the classroom. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 77,* 77–86.

Rookstool, J. (2005). Foreword. In P. Elsner and R. Boggs (Ed.), *Encouraging civility as a community college leader* (pp. v–vi). Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Santovec, M. L. (2011). To improve workplace civility: 'Do unto others…' *Women in Higher Education, 20*(8), 24.

Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2013). *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice.* London: Routledge Taylor and Francis.

Schnee, E., & VanOra, J. (2012). Student incivility: An engagement or compliance model? *MountainRise, the International Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Winter 2012.*

Schroeder, J. L., & Robertson, H. (2008). Civility in the college classroom. *Observer, 21*(10).

Seganish, W. M., & Holter, N. C. (2013). A code of civility for the university setting: The architecture for implementation. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues, 16*(1), 57-71.

State University of New York (2015). *Human resources, Dean of Students*. Retrieved from https://www.suny.edu/hr/compensation/unclassified/d/dean-of-students-mp/

Stewart, M. S. (2011). Cropping out incivility. *Inside Higher Ed.*

Szkaradnik, M. (2015). Put your phone away in class and earn free food, rewards. *Onward State.*

Troop, D. (2012). Under the banner of 'civility,' campus programs find different paths. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from: chronicle.com/article/Under-the-Banner-of-/132006.

Weeks, K. M. (2011). *In search of civility: Confronting incivility on the college campus*. New York, NY: Morgan James Publishing.

Weiler, A. (2004). Information-seeking behavior in generation Y students: Motivation, critical thinking, and learning theory. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 31*(1), 46-53.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study: research design and methods.* Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Zieziula, A. J., & Calhoun, D. W. (2014). Student affairs professional's perceptions of campus incivility. *Georgia Journal of College Student Affairs.* Retrieved from: http://issuu.com/gjcsa/docs/gjcsa

Appendix A

IRB Approval Letter

Georgia Southern University	
Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs	
Institutional Review Board (IRB)	
Phone: 912-478-5465	Veazey Hall 3000
	PO Box 8005
Fax: 912-478-0719 IRB@GeorgiaSouthern.edu	Statesboro, GA 30460

To: Zieziula, Amy; Melton, Teri

From: Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
Administrative Support Office for Research Oversight Committees
(IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Initial Approval Date: 9/7/2016

Expiration Date: 8/31/2017

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research –
Expedited

After a review of your proposed research project numbered **H17017** and titled **"Campus Civility: Best Practices from Deans of Students"** it appears that (1) the research subjects are at minimal risk, (2) appropriate safeguards are planned, and (3) the research activities involve only procedures which are allowable. You are authorized to enroll up to a maximum of **9** subjects.

Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that the Institutional Review Board has approved your proposed research. Description: **This research will look at institutions within the SUNY system to determine elements of civility initiatives that are used and suggest best practices for promoting civility.**

If at the end of this approval period there have been no changes to the research protocol; you may request an extension of the approval period. In the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, **whether or not it is believed to be related to the study**, within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator **prior** to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, you are required to complete a *Research Study Termination* form to notify the IRB Coordinator, so your file may be closed.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Haynes
Compliance Officer