

Are student affairs administrators racist? An analysis of drug sanctions using a field experiment
with vignettes

Matt A. Starcke
mstarck@ncsu.edu

Stephen R. Porter
srporter@ncsu.edu

Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Human Development
North Carolina State University

Recently, Smith and Harper (2015) produced a longitudinal report indicating Black students enrolled in K-12 public schools in southern states were suspended or expelled at disproportionately higher rates than other students. Though alarming, this is not the first study of its kind. In fact, a number of researchers have observed significant ties between race and K-12 student discipline, almost all of which pose serious questions regarding the equity and fairness of the K-12 student discipline process (Alvarez et al., 2009; Balfanz, Byrnes, & Fox, 2014; Butler, Lewis, Moore III, & Scott, 2012; Fabelo et al., 2011; Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010; Marchbanks III et al., 2014; Morris, 2005; Rocque, 2010; Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002; Wallace, Jr., Goodkind, Wallace, & Bachman, 2008). Moreover, these disciplinary actions seem to result in a number of long-term, detrimental outcomes including increased risk of dropping out of high school, not attending college, and interacting with the juvenile justice system (Balfanz et al., 2014; Fabelo et al., 2011; Gregory et al., 2010; Marchbanks III et al., 2014). However, while research of this nature has been conducted at the K-12 level, the same cannot be said of post-secondary education. Research on postsecondary student conduct indicates that college students have differing perceptions of process value and fairness (Howell, 2005; R. H. King, 2012; Mullane, 1999), but the literature does not look at actual disciplinary outcomes. Thus, we cannot answer a compelling and important question for higher education: are minority students treated equitably in the student discipline process?

To address these questions, this study made use of vignettes in a randomized field experiment. Vignettes are notable in their ability to provide participants a brief, consistent account of a given situation, and they have been used successfully in research for a number of years (Hughes & Huby, 2002; Schoenberg & Hege, 2000; Spalding & Phillips, 2007). Importantly, vignettes allow for customization, making them excellent tools for selective

information sharing (Hughes & Huby, 2002). Within the framework of a randomized field experiment, the causal nature of a particular phenomenon may be explored by adjusting specific aspects of the vignette text (Booth, Leigh, & Varganova, 2012; E. B. King, Hebl, Morgan, & Ahmad, 2013; Prager & Western, 2012).

This study explores racial disparities in postsecondary student discipline through the use of vignettes randomly assigned to a national sample of student affairs administrators involved in the student conduct disciplinary process at their campus. The vignettes, describing a hypothetical disciplinary situation involving marijuana possession, were identical except for the name of the student and the amount of marijuana involved. Similar to the many résumé studies in labor economics, administrators received vignettes with randomly assigned names commonly associated with different racial groups to see whether recommended sanctions differed between Black and White students. We answer the following research questions:

1. Do Black students receive more severe sanctions for marijuana violations than White students?
2. Does the amount of marijuana affect sanction severity for Black and/or White students?

Answering these research questions provides an important contribution to the higher education literature. First, while racism within student conduct is and continues to be explored at length in K-12 literature, it remains virtually unexamined among higher education researchers. Although it may be reasonable to assume racial disparities in student conduct carry over from K-12 to college, there is little existing evidence to support or counter these claims. Put simply, there is great concern regarding racism on college campuses, but our empirical understanding of racism in the context of higher education student conduct is practically nonexistent. Further, the methodology employed by this study differs from other studies conducted on the topic at any

level. Making use of a random field experiment, this study allowed for the exploration of causal claims about racist behavior, specifically those suggesting a student's race played a role in their discipline sanctioning process

Literature Review

Race and Discipline in K-12

Evidence of racial bias in student discipline for grades K-12 has been well-documented in the literature (Alvarez et al., 2009; Balfanz et al., 2014; Butler et al., 2012; Fabelo et al., 2011; Gregory et al., 2010; Marchbanks III et al., 2014; Morris, 2005; Rocque, 2010; Skiba et al., 2002; Smith & Harper, 2015; Wallace, Jr. et al., 2008). As previously mentioned, Smith and Harper's (2015) recent report documented suspension and expulsion rates for the 2011-2012 academic year among school districts in thirteen southern states, finding evidence Black students were subject to these disciplinary actions at rates as high as five times their enrollment proportion in many districts. The data, collected by the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR), clearly demonstrated an imbalance in disciplinary practice, one the authors suggested went "beyond student behavior and bad parenting—they also are attributable to racist practices and policies in K-12 public schools across the South," (Smith & Harper, 2015, p. 1). But are these discrepancies tied solely to racial discrimination, or do other factors play a role?

A number of studies have attempted to isolate the role of race in K-12 student discipline. Socioeconomic status and gender, for example, have been used to further explore associations between race and process outcomes. Generally, when socioeconomic status was included as a controlling factor, results changed little—non-White students remained subject to higher rates of suspension, expulsion, or principal referrals than their peers (Skiba et al., 2002; Wallace, Jr. et

al., 2008). Differences in concerning behavior between genders have been observed, but these, too, do not explain gaps in suspension or expulsion rates (Skiba et al., 2002). Rather, what has been suggested is that Black students are more likely to be referred to the principal or discipline officer for behaviors that are more subjectively concerning, and these referrals result in disproportionately higher rates of suspension or expulsion (Fabelo et al., 2011; Morris, 2005; Rocque, 2010; Skiba et al., 2002).

While a majority of findings indicate race remains a factor in K-12 discipline outcomes, there are exceptions. Butler et al. (2012), for example, found non-significant links between race, socioeconomic status, and suspension or expulsion decisions among elementary school students. However, the authors did identify race as a significant predictor of the number of days a student would be suspended (Butler et al., 2012).

Indeed, while disproportionate rates of suspension or expulsion are concerning on the face, perhaps more worrisome are the subsequent effects of these events. Gregory et al. (2010) argued disproportionate disciplinary actions often negatively impacted eventual academic outcomes. This is not surprising; Fabelo et al. (2011) demonstrated a connection between suspension or expulsion and a greater likelihood of repeating a grade or dropping out of school completely, while Balfanz et al. (2015) noted being suspended even once in the ninth grade reduced a student's graduation and post-secondary educational prospects. Additionally, students who were suspended or expelled were more likely to have experiences with the juvenile justice system than were their peers (Fabelo et al., 2011). Ultimately, these consequences impact both the individual student and society at large, as students who drop out represent both an economic and social drain on their community (Alvarez et al., 2009; Marchbanks III et al., 2014).

Higher Education Context

Studies exploring student experiences with college discipline processes are lacking, although a small number of studies explore student perceptions of fairness and value in the disciplinary process. Generally speaking, students view their experiences with student conduct as beneficial, although there were exceptions (Howell, 2005; R. H. King, 2012; Mullane, 1999). For example, Mullane (1999) identified a connection between perceptions of value and fairness and a student's measure of moral development, noting the more developed a student was, the more likely they were to believe their experience was fair and educational. Interestingly, while Howell (2005) found students with alcohol violations reported learning from their experience with student conduct, none of those interviewed expressed an intent to cease drinking. Finally, and perhaps most topically, King's (2012) study highlighted demographic differences among student conduct participants and their respective perceptions of fairness, finding both older students and males perceived the process as being less fair than younger students or females, respectively. That said, King (2012) found no differences in perceptions of fairness based on student ethnicity.

More recently, Milkman et al. (2015) explored faculty behavior toward racially diverse students. In this study, faculty across several disciplines received e-mails from fictional, prospective doctoral students; these "students" were given names suggestive of a gender and racial identity, but the e-mails were otherwise identical. Interestingly, the authors found students with names suggesting a white male identity were more likely to elicit responses than others, even when women and minorities were more represented in the faculty, suggesting significant racist attitudes among higher education faculty.

Thus, the literature tells us little about the possibility of racial disparities in the student disciplinary process in higher education. Studies of secondary education show significant racial

disparities, with minorities receiving higher rates of discipline. A study of higher education faculty suggests that these faculty, perhaps surprisingly, treat White students better than minority students. Together, these studies suggest the possibility that minority students may not be equitably treated during the student conduct process at colleges and universities.

Methodology

Within economics, field experiments have long been used to measure discrimination across a number of areas, including employment and hiring decisions (Pierné, 2013; Prager & Western, 2012). Generally, these experiments occur in one of two ways, via written correspondence or through the use of actors. The former involves sending identical correspondence in response to a job posting, for example, while varying only the name of the job applicant, using names highly correlated with race (Booth et al., 2012; Milkman et al., 2015; Pierné, 2013); the latter makes use of actors portraying applicants, allowing for a physical interaction not found in correspondence studies (Prager & Western, 2012).

Regardless of the method, these field experiments (and others like them) represent an excellent vehicle to measure discrimination in a given context. Surveys of discrimination, for example, may provide insight on the subject, but they likely include responses from individuals seeking socially acceptable positions (Booth et al., 2012; Prager & Western, 2012). These biased results may mask discriminatory attitudes, suggesting discrimination does not exist when, in fact, it does. In contrast, field experiments seek to measure the true behaviors and attitudes of respondents by “creating a context in which all other factors except ethnicity are held constant,” (Booth et al., 2012, p. 548). In this way, researchers are able to “directly observe discrimination in real-world settings” (Prager & Western, 2012, p. 223) allowing for causal inference (E. B. King et al., 2013).

Research Design

While the labor market experiments discussed previously relied solely on correspondence involving resumes, CVs, or cover letters, the setting for this study—student conduct—required different interactions with study participants. Student conduct administrators generally come into contact with a student once a situation requires their involvement. As such, cold correspondence from a “student” on an administrator’s campus would generally not occur, especially given the context of this study. Similarly, it would not be feasible to hire actors at campuses nationwide to portray students and meet with conduct administrators regarding a discipline issue.

Instead, we developed a vignette depicting a hypothetical disciplinary scenario in which a student on the administrator’s campus was discovered with marijuana in their possession (see Appendix for text of vignettes). The vignette was structured to mirror a typical scenario that a student conduct officer might face. Participants were told that they arrived at work in the morning to discover a police report describing how a certain amount of marijuana was found on a student, and they were provided text from a dialogue between the participant and the student. At the conclusion of the scenario, participants were asked to recommend one or more sanctions for the student involved, based on both the information provided and their professional experience. Respondents were given the following possible sanctions as options from which to choose:

- Warning
- Disciplinary probation
- Alcohol/drug education program
- Alcohol/drug assessment (conducted off-campus by an external party)

- Drug counseling
- Drug testing
- Community service
- Reflective paper
- Suspension
- Expulsion
- Other: (text)

Following data collection, we reviewed the text responses from those who selected “Other”. In many cases, text responses included sanction recommendations directly applicable to pre-existing categories. In these cases, responses were recoded appropriately. We did, however, receive several categories of sanction recommendations not included in our original list that we felt warranted the creation of new categories. The revised sanctions used in analysis are representative of these changes, and include the following sanction recommendations:

- Warning
- Fine or fee
- Reflective paper
- Community service
- Parent notification
- Educational program (alcohol/drug/decision making)
- Alcohol/drug assessment (conducted on/off campus)
- Drug testing
- Drug counseling
- Disciplinary or deferred probation

- On-campus housing suspension or expulsion
- Deferred or partial suspension
- Suspension
- Expulsion

“Other” responses not applicable to existing or additional sanction groupings remained coded as “other” and were not placed into an alternative category.

In addition, respondents were then asked whether or not their particular campus enforced mandatory sanctions for on-campus marijuana violations. We also collected demographic information about the respondents, including their full-time experience with student conduct, gender identity, and racial/ethnic identity.

Obviously, we could not tell participants that the study was exploring racial disparities in student conduct, because that might cause some participants to alter their responses. Participants were instead told that the study was an investigation of national marijuana sanctioning consistency. After the vignette survey website was closed, they were notified of our use of IRB-sanctioned use of deception and given the option of removing their response; 28 administrators exercised this option.

We altered the vignette content to create four vignettes that varied on two dimensions: small (1 joint) versus large (1.02 ounce) amounts of marijuana, and White versus Black sounding student names. We differentiated amounts to represent a small quantity compared to something that could be considered more substantial and, thus, might warrant a different sanction response. In some states, for example, possession of 1 or more ounces of marijuana elicits much harsher legal penalties than possessing less than 1 ounce.

Given our research questions, selecting appropriate names for inclusion in the vignettes was of the utmost importance. We first selected several last names based on racially prominent surnames found in the 2000 U.S. Census data. We then paired these surnames with a variety of first names as reported in vital records birth certificate data from Virginia, Texas, Arkansas, and Colorado between 1995 and 1997. Specifically, the first names selected each had greater than 100 counts and were highly (if not almost entirely) skewed toward a single racial identity. The years 1995 through 1997 were selected because the names from those years represent the first names of today's traditionally aged college students.

Once paired, we surveyed faculty at two institutions, asking them to assign racial/ethnic identities to each name. The names ultimately selected—Connor Schmidt and Darius Jefferson—were those most associated with White and Black racial identities, respectively (see Table 1). Additionally, the vignettes mentioned the name of the reporting police officer, Officer Williams. This name was intentionally selected as our survey of faculty members indicated the surname Williams was not associated with a specific racial identity.

Participants

Our study population was student affairs administrators responsible for determining sanctions for student code violations. To identify and contact study participants, we first generated a list of potential institutions. We began by identifying all four-year public and not-for-profit institutions with a Carnegie classification of research, masters, or baccalaureate based on 2013 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics. Six institutions were eliminated from this list for not providing a web address or for providing a web address not ending in .edu, resulting in an initial pool of 1,588 institutions. We then eliminated institutions from Guam, Puerto Rico, the

Marianas, and the Virgin Islands, as well as service academies. These reductions produced a final sample of 1,539 institutions.

Next, each institutional website was individually searched for a number of terms, including “student conduct,” “student rights and responsibilities”, and “student discipline.” Ideally, these searches produced links to a given institution’s office and the administrator(s) responsible for administering student conduct. However, in many cases these searches proved fruitless. In these situations, we then searched for the office, name, and/or title of individual(s) responsible for student conduct in the institution’s student handbook. From these searches, we identified a participant pool of 1,781 administrators at 1,039 separate institutions.

These individuals were then randomly assigned to one of four experimental groups—White student, small amount; Black student, small amount; White student, large amount; or Black student, large amount. Importantly, individuals employed at the same institution were clustered into the same experimental group in an effort to minimize treatment contamination between participants. Descriptives for the four experimental groups are provided in Table 2; as can be seen, the groups are similar across a range of administrator and school characteristics, with no statistically significant differences across groups. This research design allows us to test for overall racial disparities in student conduct sanctions, and whether Blacks and Whites receive differing levels of sanctions for minor and more significant drug violations.

Finally, in an effort to ensure our results measured only the behavior of administrators currently responsible for student conduct, we asked respondents if they were responsible for deciding or recommending sanctions for students. Respondents who said yes were allowed to participate in the study, while those who said no were not permitted to continue and removed from the survey.

Validity of Vignettes in Studying Administrator Behavior

The major assumption underlying our research design is that participants' responses match what they would do in a real-life situation. While we cannot directly verify this assumption, we can determine if their responses are similar to what we would expect to see, if participants' responses did indeed mirror their actions in real-life. From this perspective, we would expect to see three patterns in the overall distribution of responses. First, given the nature of the offense, assignment to some type of drug education program should be one of the most common sanctions. Second, given the growing acceptance of marijuana use in American society, the average level of sanctions given should be relatively low. In other words, participants should rarely recommend strong sanctions such as suspension and expulsion, and instead recommend less punitive sanctions. Third, when comparing sanctions for the two different amounts of marijuana, the larger amount should yield more punitive sanctions than the smaller amount.

Table 3 shows the proportion of respondents choosing a sanction for a given amount of marijuana (proportions do not sum to 100 because respondents could choose multiple sanctions). As can be seen, assignment to an education program is by far the most common sanction, with two-thirds of respondents choosing this sanction. Looking at the severity of sanction, suspensions and expulsions were almost never chosen. Instead (and besides educational programs), respondents chose disciplinary or deferred probation (56-66%), writing a reflective paper (34-35%), and a warning (18-27%). Clearly respondents chose much less punitive punishments for simple drug possession.

In addition, we can see that possession of the large amount of marijuana was more likely to yield a severe sanction, and less likely to result in a less severe sanction. For example, being found with 1.02 ounces resulted in higher probabilities of suspension (4% versus 1%, $p < .02$) and

disciplinary or deferred probation (66% versus 56%, $p < .02$), yet also resulted in lower probabilities of receiving a warning (18% versus 27%, $p < .01$) and receiving a fine or fee (9% versus 14%, $p < .04$). Together, these results suggest that participants were indeed assigning sanctions based on how they would behave if the vignette took place in real life.

Limitations

As with any study, there are a number of limitations applicable to this work. Specifically, our research design assumed participants would both register the name used in the vignette text, and associate that name with its intended racial identity. Regarding the first assumption, we see distinct differences in the visibility of the name when comparing this research design to a similarly formulated resume study. In resumes, names are often presented at or near the top of the document, and may be written in larger and/or different font than the rest of the document. In our context, however, presenting the name in this fashion would likely have appeared unusual, and may have resulted in participants suspecting the true purpose of the study. As such, we adopted a more subtle presentation, providing the full name only once, followed by two further mentions of the first name only.

Of course, even if participants read and remembered the name provided, there is no guarantee the connection between that name and a particular racial identity was made. We hoped to minimize this possibility by purposefully selecting names that would strongly suggest a particular identity, and our initial survey of name and racial identity associations suggests we were able to do so (see Table 1). However, the possibility remains some participants may have drawn alternative associations to those we intended.

Finally, we must mention the possibility that some participants suspected the true purpose of the study and, in doing so, consciously responded to the survey in ways differing from a

“true” response. We attempted to mitigate this possibility by overtly stating an alternative purpose for our study—consistency of marijuana sanctions—that might appear plausible to participants. However, as previously mentioned, the names we selected for use in each vignette were evocative of particular racial identities, and these may have triggered suspicions among some participants.

Results

We investigate whether student affairs conduct officers take race into consideration when meting out discipline in two ways. First, we test for differences in the probability of receiving a sanction by race. Second, we test whether Blacks and Whites receive differing probabilities of sanctions based on the amount of drugs found. In other words, we test for the possibility that minorities may be more likely to receive a sanction when the offense is more serious.

We test for these differences with a series of logistic regression models, using a binary dependent variable indicating whether or not the respondent would recommend a specific sanction for their vignette. We run four sets of models, including only a race dummy variable to test for overall effect, and adding a drug amount dummy variable and race by amount interaction terms to test for differences at the two drug amounts (1 joint and 1.0z oz.). Although covariates are not necessary given the experimental design, we rerun the models with the covariates listed in Table 2 to increase the statistical power of our tests. The results are similar, so we present only the results without covariates.

The left section of Table 4 presents results for all participants. Entries in the table are percentage point differences in the probability that a sanction is levied between Blacks and Whites. For example, the probability that a student with the Black-sounding name, Darius Jefferson, received a warning is .21, while the probability that the student with the White-

sounding name, Connor Schmidt, received a warning is .23, yielding a difference of -.02; this value appears in the upper left-hand cell of the table. In other words, the probability that Jefferson received a warning is 2 percentage points lower than the probability for Schmidt (this difference is not statistically significant).

Looking at the first column in the Table 4, only two of the 13 sanctions show statistically significant differences between Jefferson and Schmidt, parental notification and assignment to an alcohol/drug assessment. Both of these differences are relatively small from a practical perspective, 5 and 6 percentage points, respectively. Moreover, with 13 statistical tests at $\alpha=.05$, one statistically significant result is to be expected. In general, the results in the first column of the table do not reveal a pattern of discriminatory behavior by the participants.

The next two columns of Table 4 show the same differences in probability, but at differing levels of drugs found. The pattern here is similar, with only two statistically significant differences indicating Jefferson was less likely than Schmidt to receive community service (8 percentage points) and more likely than Schmidt to receive a parental notification if found with a joint (9 percentage points); there were no statistically significant differences between Jefferson and Schmidt at the larger quantity of marijuana. As with the overall results, sanction probabilities do not differ between the Black- and White-sounding names, regardless of the severity of the offense.

One possible issue with these analyses is that some institutions have mandatory sanctions for drug violations. Because sanctions in these situations are mandated, conduct officers may have lesser discretion when meting out sanctions. The last three columns of Table 4 show the results when the sample is limited to participants who indicated their institution did not have mandatory sanctions for on-campus marijuana violations ($n=245$). The pattern here is similar to

the results for the full sample, with small differences in probability of sanctions between the two names, and almost no statistically significant results.

Discussion

Based on our findings, a student's perceived racial identity does not seem to play a role when sanctioning college students for marijuana violations. While we observed some differences in recommended sanctions based on quantity difference (e.g., students with 1.02 oz were less likely to receive a warning when compared to students possessing a single joint), student affairs administrators did not appear to take race into account when meting out sanctions. This seems surprising, as it stands in stark contrast to findings from both the K-12 discipline and postsecondary faculty behavior literature discussed above.

One explanation to consider is the training student affairs administrators receive, both generally and within the field of student conduct more specifically. We know the faculty studied by Mikman et al. (2015) are not necessarily analogous to student conduct professionals, who are often specifically trained administrators whose job functions include upholding "...the integrity of the student conduct process," (ASCA, n.d.-a). Members of the Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA), the primary professional organization for student conduct administrators, agree to uphold a number of principles, including nondiscrimination and acceptance of all students as individuals (ASCA, 1993). These motifs are again captured in ASCA's Statement of Diversity (n.d.-b), and in statements from more broadly representative student affairs organizations as well (ACPA, 2013; NASPA, n.d.). Taken in full, these professional statements suggest student conduct administrators are keenly aware of the expectations and role they play in ensuring an impartial conduct experience for students on campus.

Based on these findings, a number of questions and opportunities for future research remain. First, while we speculate that the training of student affairs administrators practicing student conduct is a significant factor explaining the lack of racist behavior observed, this assertion remains—for now—speculation. Future studies might investigate the training student conduct professionals receive and seek to understand if and how these individuals embrace and embody the equitable treatment of the students with whom they work. Second, as mentioned in the limitations, it is possible we did not observe racist behavior because our instrument was too subtle. Future studies using a similar approach might explore racism within postsecondary student conduct in ways that more overtly suggest the racial identity of the student. This might include the use of a picture, additional mentions of the student's name, or providing a "student data file" as part of the vignette containing demographic information for the student, including race.

Finally, we note that vignettes and field experiments provide opportunities to understand postsecondary behavior that might appear to be difficult, if not impossible, to study. Many areas of policy interest, such as alcohol and drug abuse, cheating, and discriminatory behavior, can be problematic research areas, given that respondents have incentives to provide socially desirable responses. Vignettes and experimental designs offer one way to elicit more accurate responses than can be analyzed at the group level.

References

- ACPA. (2013, March). Mission, Vision, and Values. Retrieved November 16, 2015, from <http://www.myacpa.org/values>
- Alvarez, R., Brennen, S., Carter, N., Dong, H.-K., Eldridge, A., Fratto, J., ... Taylor, L. (2009). *The ABCD's of Texas education: Assessing the benefits and costs of reducing the dropout rate*. The Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- ASCA. (1993). Ethical Principles and Standards of Conduct. Retrieved November 16, 2015, from <http://www.theasca.org/files/Governing%20Documents/Ethical%20Principles%20and%20Standards%20of%20Conduct.pdf>
- ASCA. (n.d.-a). Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved November 16, 2015, from <http://www.theasca.org/faq>
- ASCA. (n.d.-b). Statement of Diversity. Retrieved November 16, 2015, from <http://www.theasca.org/files/Governing%20Documents/ASCA%20Statement%20of%20Diversity.pdf>
- Balfanz, R., Byrnes, V., & Fox, J. (2014). Sent home and put off track: The antecedents, disproportionalities, and consequences of being suspended in the 9th grade. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 17–30). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Booth, A. L., Leigh, A., & Varganova, E. (2012). Does ethnic discrimination vary across minority groups? Evidence from a field experiment. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 74(4), 547–573. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0084.2011.00664.x>

Butler, B. R., Lewis, C. W., Moore III, J. L., & Scott, M. E. (2012). Assessing the odds:

Disproportional discipline practices and implications for educational stakeholders. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 81(1), 11–24.

Fabelo, T., Thompson, M. D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks III, M. P., & Booth, E.

A. (2011). *Breaking schools' rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students' success and juvenile justice involvement*. New York: The Council of State Governments Justice Center. Retrieved from https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Breaking_Schools_Rules_Report_Final.pdf

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap:

Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 59–68.

<http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357621>

Howell, M. T. (2005). Students' perceived learning and anticipated future behaviors as a result of

participation in the student judicial process. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(4), 374–392. <http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0035>

Hughes, R., & Huby, M. (2002). The application of vignettes in social and nursing research.

Journal of Advanced Nursing, 37(4), 382–386.

King, E. B., Hebl, M. R., Morgan, W. B., & Ahmad, A. S. (2013). Field experiments on sensitive

organizational topics. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(4), 501–521.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112462608>

King, R. H. (2012). Student conduct administration: How students perceive the educational value

and procedural fairness of their disciplinary experiences. *Journal of College Student*

Development, 43(4), 563–580. <http://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2012.0058>

- Marchbanks III, M. P., Blake, J., Booth, E. A., Carmichael, D., Seibert, A. L., & Fabelo, T. (2014). The economic effects of exclusionary discipline on grade retention and high school dropout. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 59–74). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Milkman, K. L., Akinola, M., & Chugh, D. (2015). What happens before? A field experiment exploring how pay and representation differentially shape bias on the pathway into organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Advance online publication. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000022>
- Morris, E. W. (2005). “Tuck in that shirt!” Race, class, gender, and discipline in an urban school. *Sociological Perspectives*, 48(1), 25–48. <http://doi.org/10.1525/sop.2005.48.1.25>
- Mullane, S. P. (1999). Fairness, educational value, and moral development in the student disciplinary process. *NASPA Journal*, 36(2), 86–95.
- NASPA. (n.d.). Aiding student affairs professionals in higher education. Retrieved August 21, 2015, from <https://www.naspa.org/index.php/about>
- Pierné, G. (2013). Hiring discrimination based on national origin and religious closeness: Results from a field experiment in the Paris area. *IZA Journal of Labor Economics*, 2(1), 1–15. <http://doi.org/10.1186/2193-8997-2-4>
- Prager, D., & Western, B. (2012). Identifying discrimination at work: The use of field experiments. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(2), 221–237. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01746.x>
- Rocque, M. (2010). Office discipline and student behavior: Does race matter? *American Journal of Education*, 116(4), 557–581.

Schoenberg, N. E., & Hege, R. (2000). Using vignettes in awareness and attitudinal research.

International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 3(1), 63–74.

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline:

Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review*,

34(4), 317–342. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021320817372>

Smith, E. J., & Harper, S. R. (2015). *Disproportionate impact of K-12 school suspension and*

expulsion on Black students in southern states. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania,

Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education. Retrieved from

http://www.gse.upenn.edu/equity/sites/gse.upenn.edu/equity/files/publications/Smith_Harper_Report.pdf

Spalding, N. J., & Phillips, T. (2007). Exploring the use of vignettes: From validity to

trustworthiness. *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(7), 954–962.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/1049732307306187>

Wallace, Jr., J. M., Goodkind, S., Wallace, C. M., & Bachman, G. G. (2008). Racial, ethnic, and

gender differences in school discipline among U.S. high school students: 1991-2005. *The*

Negro Educational Review, 59(1-2), 47–59.

Table 1. Results from Name-Race/Ethnicity Faculty Survey

Name options	Associated race/ethnicity			
	African American/Black	Caucasian/White	Hispanic	Other/unsure
Malik Washington	83%	1%	1%	15%
Tanner Olson	2%	87%	0%	11%
Darius Jefferson	90%	4%	1%	5%
Marquis Robinson	83%	5%	2%	10%
Tucker Branch	6%	76%	0%	18%
Connor Schmidt	0%	94%	0%	6%
Colton Meyer	4%	77%	1%	18%
Cesar Gonzolez	0%	1%	96%	2%
Jorge Ramirez	0%	0%	99%	1%
Louis Hernandez	0%	0%	99%	1%
Tony Williams	22%	45%	0%	32%

Note: *n*=254.

Table 2. Descriptives for Respondent Sample and Experimental Groups

	National population	Email sample	Respondent sample	Experimental groups				<i>p</i> value ³
				White/ small	Black/ small	White/ large	Black/ large	
<i>Response behavior</i>								
% responding ¹	-	-	35%	35%	34%	35%	35%	0.98
% responsible for sanctions ²	-	-	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
<i>School characteristics</i>								
Carnegie: Research	18%	24%	31%	24%	36%	31%	33%	0.21
Carnegie: Masters	41%	44%	41%	44%	40%	42%	38%	0.78
Carnegie: Baccalaureate	41%	32%	28%	32%	24%	26%	29%	0.54
Private	64%	55%	49%	53%	46%	50%	49%	0.81
Undergraduate FTE	5,515	6,895	8,690	8,674	8,868	8,464	8,766	0.99
% nonwhite	40%	39%	38%	40%	39%	36%	36%	0.41
Region: Northeast	29%	30%	31%	33%	30%	30%	29%	0.93
Region: South	32%	32%	32%	33%	33%	29%	33%	0.84
Region: Midwest	26%	24%	24%	19%	21%	31%	26%	0.11
Region: West	13%	14%	13%	15%	15%	10%	12%	0.45
N schools	1,539	1,039	489	118	117	125	129	0.85
<i>Administrator characteristics</i>								
Nonwhite	-	-	20%	25%	20%	21%	16%	0.32
Race unknown	-	-	6%	3%	7%	7%	6%	0.48
Female	-	-	46%	44%	49%	42%	49%	0.48
Gender other/missing	-	-	6%	4%	6%	7%	5%	0.68
Greater than five years experience	-	-	66%	67%	68%	58%	70%	0.10
N administrators	-	1,781	618	154	151	158	155	0.98

¹Calculated using total *n* of consenting participant responses to the first survey question, "In your current professional role, do you decide and/or recommend (individually or as part of a panel) sanctions for students who are found responsible for violating your student code of conduct?"

²Calculated as the percentage of consenting participants who indicated they decide and/or recommend sanctions for students found responsible for violating the student code of conduct.

³*p*-values based on chi-square for categorical variables (responsible for sanctions, Carnegie classification, private institution, region, number of schools, and all administrator characteristics) or ANOVA for continuous variables (undergraduate FTE and % nonwhite)

Table 3. Distribution of Sanctions by Amount

Recommended sanction	Proportion selecting		<i>p</i> for difference
	sanction for		
	1 joint	1.02 oz.	
Warning	0.27	0.18	0.01
Fine or fee	0.14	0.09	0.03
Reflective paper	0.34	0.35	0.85
Community service	0.10	0.16	0.06
Parent notification	0.10	0.08	0.50
Educational program (alcohol/drug/decision making)	0.72	0.68	0.27
Alcohol/drug assessment (conducted on/off campus)	0.11	0.14	0.23
Drug testing	0.07	0.08	0.60
Drug counseling	0.09	0.11	0.33
Disciplinary or deferred probation	0.56	0.66	0.01
On-campus housing suspension or expulsion	0.02	0.02	0.82
Deferred or partial suspension	0.03	0.02	0.37
Suspension	0.01	0.04	0.01
Expulsion ¹	0.00	0.01	0.50

¹Fisher's exact test used as the expected frequency was <5.

Table 4. Black-White Differences in Probability of Receiving a Sanction

Recommended sanction	All respondents			No mandatory sanctions		
	Overall	1 joint	1.02 oz.	Overall	1 joint	1.02 oz.
Warning	-0.02	-0.04	0.00	-0.01	-0.04	0.00
Fine or fee	0.02	0.05	-0.02	-0.03	0.00	-0.06
Reflective paper	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.06	-0.09	-0.03
Community service	-0.05	-0.08 *	-0.02	-0.02	-0.05	0.01
Parent notification	0.05 *	0.09 *	0.02	0.06 *	0.10 *	0.02
Educational program (alcohol/drug/decision making)	-0.05	0.00	-0.10	0.00	0.01	-0.01
Alcohol/drug assessment (conducted on/off campus)	0.06 *	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.00	0.09
Drug testing	0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.01
Drug counseling	-0.01	0.01	-0.04	-0.03	-0.01	-0.04
Disciplinary or deferred probation	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.00	-0.07	0.07
On-campus housing suspension or expulsion ¹	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-	-	-
Deferred or partial suspension	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Suspension ²	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-	-	-

Note: cell entries are the percentage-point difference in probability of receiving a sanction for Black students compared to White students, calculated from binary logistic regression models with and without a race by drug amount interaction term; * $p < .05$.

¹No respondents selected on-campus housing suspension or expulsion when responses were limited to those without mandatory sanctions.

²Too few cases chose suspension for analysis by quantity.

Appendix

In your current professional role, do you decide and/or recommend (individually or as part of a panel) sanctions for students who are found responsible for violating your student code of conduct?

Yes

No [*skips to end*]

Following, please find a brief vignette describing a fictional incident that recently occurred on your campus. Then, using the information provided and your professional experience in student conduct, please answer the question that follows.

Coming to work Monday morning, you received the following report:

At approximately 3:45 a.m. Saturday night, I, Officer Williams, was patrolling campus when I came upon a lone male with a backpack walking in the middle of the street. I shined my light on the male, who then proceeded to walk quickly toward the sidewalk. I stepped out of my patrol car and asked the individual to stop. He did so, and I approached him slowly.

I asked the young man his name, and he initially refused to provide one. After further questioning, he told me his name was **[Insert Name]** and stated he was a current student. When I asked what he was doing prior to my arrival, he stated he was walking home from a friend's house.

I asked the subject what was in his backpack, and he told me he had several books in the backpack. I asked to see inside, and he agreed. I next asked him to open his bag. Inside, I saw what appeared to be a jacket stuffed inside the bag, and I asked him to pull out the jacket. As the subject removed the jacket from the backpack, one joint fell out of the coat onto the ground.

The subject initially denied knowing the marijuana was in his bag, claiming a friend must have placed it in the bag without his knowledge. When pressed further, however, he admitted the marijuana was his and that he was fully aware the marijuana was in his backpack.

Following your standard procedure, you contacted the student named in the report, informed him his behavior represented a potential violation of the student code of conduct, and confirmed a meeting with him later in the week. On the appointed date and time, **[Insert Name]** arrived at your office. After introducing yourself and reviewing the potential violations, the following exchange occurred:

You: Talk to me more about that night. The report we received says you were walking in the middle of the street?

Student: I was walking home from a friend's dorm and there was no one else around. I didn't really think much about it, to be honest.

You: Okay. Let's talk about the marijuana.

Student: What about it?

You: How often would you say you use marijuana?

Student: Not often, maybe a few times a month. I always do it off-campus, though.

You: What about other drugs?

Student: No, I just use marijuana.

- You: And alcohol?
 Student: Oh, I guess I drink occasionally, too. Maybe once or twice a week?
 You: When you say you drink once or twice a week, how much are we talking about?
 Student: I don't know. A few beers. Five or six?
 You: Were you under the influence of drugs or alcohol when the officer stopped you?
 Student: No. My friend and I were studying for a test that night. I was on my way home to go to bed.
 You: What was the marijuana doing in your bag, then?
 Student: I honestly forgot it was even in there. I haven't worn that coat in a while.

Following this exchange, **[Insert Name]** accepted responsibility for possessing marijuana on campus. In addition, you confirmed he was a junior at your institution with a cumulative GPA of 3.02. According to your records, he has no other violations on file. When asked what was learned from this experience, he struggled to answer the question, saying only "I guess I shouldn't be using marijuana." Finally, when asked what he thought an appropriate sanction would be for this violation, he said he did not know.

Based on the information provided and your professional experience, you would recommend the following sanction(s) for this student (select all that apply):

- Warning
- Disciplinary probation
- Alcohol/drug education program
- Alcohol/drug assessment (conducted off-campus by an external party)
- Drug counseling
- Drug testing
- Community service
- Reflective paper
- Suspension
- Expulsion
- Other: (text)

Which of the following best describes your level of experience with student conduct?

- Less than one-year full-time experience
- Between one and three years full-time experience
- Between three and five years full-time experience
- Between five and ten years full-time experience
- More than ten years full-time experience

Does your institution have mandatory sanctions for on-campus marijuana violations?

- No
- Yes

If "yes" above... Please indicate which sanction(s) are mandatory for on-campus marijuana violations on your campus:

- Warning
- Disciplinary probation
- Alcohol/drug education program

Alcohol/drug assessment (conducted off-campus by an external party)

Drug counseling

Drug testing

Community service

Reflective paper

Suspension

Expulsion

Other: (text)

Does your campus allow students to possess legally obtained marijuana on-campus?

No

Yes

I identify as:

Female

Male

Another gender identity

I identify as:

Native American

White

Hispanic

Black/African-American

Asian

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

Multiracial