University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2016

Meaning-Making in Student Conduct Administration: A Developmental Perspective

Sean Robert Horrigan
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Developmental Psychology Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Horrigan, Sean Robert, "Meaning-Making in Student Conduct Administration: A Developmental Perspective" (2016). *Dissertations*. 46.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/46>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

MEANING-MAKING IN STUDENT CONDUCT ADMINISTRATION: A
DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

by

Sean Robert Horrigan

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2016

Dissertation Committee

Zachary Gabriel Green, Ph.D.
Cheryl Getz, Ed.D.
Lea Hubbard, Ph.D.
Theresa Monroe, Ed.D.

University of San Diego

© Copyright by Sean Robert Horrigan
All Rights Reserved 2016

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION SCIENCES

CANDIDATE'S NAME: Sean Robert Horrigan

TITLE OF
DISSERTATION: MEANING-MAKING IN STUDENT CONDUCT
ADMINISTRATION: A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

APPROVAL:

~~Zachary~~ Gabriel Green, Ph.D	Chair
Cheryl Getz, Ed.D	Member
Lea Hubbard, Ph.D	Member
Theresa Monroe, Ed.D	Member

DATE: March 1, 2016

ABSTRACT

The field of student conduct administration (SCA) in higher education has grown more complex. Researchers and practitioners have noted the tension for conduct officers between managing legal and policy compliance focused on the adjudication of cases and serving as restorative justice minded educators oriented towards student growth and learning. As a result, the knowledge required and the skills practiced by conduct officers are broad and varied. An overlooked dimension of SCA is how conduct officer development, especially as it relates to meaning-making, influences their experiences, knowledge, and skills. This study, utilizing a developmental theory known as “action logics,” explores how conduct officer meaning-making informs their thoughts, actions, and ultimately, how they take on their responsibilities for their institutions and for their students.

A three-stage analysis of data from two qualitative interviews and a photography exercise was designed to explore the relationship between meaning-making and action logic expression for nine SCAs. In stage one, an analysis of narrative was constructed, coded for meaning-making characteristics, and an action logic hypothesis was formed. In stage two, three methods of triangulation generated additional insights. These included member checking, participant results from the Global Leadership Profile instrument, and an external audit. Finally, a cross-case analysis explored how the action logic expressed was related to meaning-making and specific themes identified from the interviews and literature.

The findings from these participants suggest the presence of a developmental range rather than a fixed action logic expression influencing the exercise of their

responsibilities. Additionally, data analysis suggests that the developmental range is partly a function of organizational role. This first finding is inconsistent with previous research, providing a direction for future research. The study proposes a developmental leadership taxonomy that may be present and accounts for the range of actions logics available that could potentially be integrated into their conduct officer roles. This study has implications for training and practice of conduct officers and other student affairs professionals. The study also offers methodological considerations for research at the intersection of leadership, action logics, meaning-making, and human development.

DEDICATION

To Liam, Keaton, and Riley

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It truly takes a village... and this dissertation is no exception. I am forever grateful to everyone who supported me along this journey. Your patience, love, critique, and belief in me has been incredible:

To my wife, Krista, who has supported me in so many ways. We had no idea how much life would change during this process and you sacrificed more than anyone to support my goals. Throughout all of what life has brought to us these past few years you have continuously reminded me about what it most important.

To my three children Liam, Keaton, and Riley who were all born during this doctoral journey and have had to endure my late nights and weekends away. Despite my time away, you are the anchor I am tethered to and I learn from you every single day. Thank you putting so much joy and love into my life.

To Dr. Zachary Green who during our first individual meeting in the doctoral program hypothesized that we had both arrived at USD at that particular time for a reason. You have been a masterful teacher and thought partner who has helped create some of my most important developmental milestones.

To Dr. Cheryl Getz who I have never actually taken a class from but somehow you have become one of my most important life-teachers. If not from your direct instruction then from your modeling, I have learned so much from you about being a good educator, administrator, and mentor.

To Dr. Lea Hubbard who got excited over data and celebrated findings even when they were still not quite apparent to me. You challenged me to be a better researcher and supported me in seeing myself as a scholar.

To Dr. Terri Monroe who has informed so many developmental moments in my adult life. You saw something in me that took a long time for me to appreciate was present and I am so grateful that I have had the opportunity to have you as a teacher and mentor all of these years.

To my external auditors Dr. Jennifer Jones, Dr. Valerie Livesay, Dr. Cara Miller, and Ms. Elizabeth Castillo who spent hours reviewing my data and analysis. Thank you for giving of your time and expertise to support this work but most importantly for being a community of colleagues who I was able to rely on during a particularly difficult time in this dissertation process.

To Ms. Marie Minnick and Ms. Mariann Sanchez for their steadfast support of my professional work during this research. Thank you for cheering me on and creating a space where I could grow and feel supported.

To the Leadership Institute in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego and NASPA Region VI for their financial contributions to this study. Thank you for your gifts that made this research possible.

To the nine SCA participants in this study. Each of you contributed so much time and energy to this work and I am incredibly grateful. Through the quality of your presence, compassion, and dedication to students you inspired me to be a better administrator, educator, and researcher. I hope this study honors your experience and process of becoming as well as invites others to grow from your collective meaning-making.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xviii
LIST OF FIGURES	xix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Meaning-Making and SCA	7
Statement of the Problem	8
Purpose of Study	9
Research Questions	9
Significance of the Study	10
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Professional Growth and Development in Student Affairs	11
Graduate Education in Student Affairs	13
Entry-Level Competencies in Student Affairs	15
Mid-Senior Level Competencies in Student Affairs	18
Learning and Development in Student Affairs	21
Professional Competencies in Student Conduct Administration	21
Constructive-Developmental Theory	23

Neo-Piagetian Influences	24
Constructivism and Development	25
Core Propositions of Constructive-Development Theory	28
Constructive-development and Developmental Movement	28
Kegan's Orders of Consciousness	31
Subject-Object Understanding	32
Orders of Consciousness	33
Meaning-Making Structures	34
Kegan's Orders of Consciousness and Developmental Movement	37
Torbert's Action Logics	37
Action Logics	40
Action Inquiry	45
Torbert's Action Logics and Developmental Movement	48
Conclusion	49
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	50
Methodological Assumptions	51
Narrative Inquiry	52
Visual Narrative Inquiry	53
Global Leadership Profile	54
Participant Selection	57
Data Collection	60

Document Analysis	61
Narrative Interview	61
Visual Narrative Interview	62
Global Leadership Profile	64
Data Analysis	65
Stage One: Analysis of Individual Participant Data	66
Stage Two: Ensuring Trustworthiness	67
Stage Three: Analysis of Participant Expression of Multiple Action Logics	71
Researcher Rigor and Trustworthiness	71
Limitations	72
CHAPTER FOUR: PARTICIPANT NARRATIVES AND PRIMARY ACTION LOGIC	
ESTIMATE	74
Participant Introduction	75
Defining Seven Action Logics	77
Participant Narratives.....	79
Joy: I see you... ..	80
Thomas: Learn My Craft	82
Nicole: Stop and Consider	85
Tess: A Guide to Students.....	88

Mark: A Course Correction	91
Alex: Be Just; Just Be	94
Paul: Orientation Phase Two	96
John: Passionate and Compassionate	99
Carl: A Pretty Good Mess	102
Chapter Summary	104
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS OF MEANING-MAKING META THEMES	106
Theme 1: Philosophy or Approach to SCA	107
Conventional	107
Post-Conventional	111
Summary: Philosophy or Approach to SCA	116
Theme 2: Strategies and Practices for Learning	116
Conventional	117
Post-Conventional	120
Summary: Strategies and Practices for Learning	126
Theme 3: Current Focus of Learning and Development	127
Conventional	127
Post-Conventional	131
Summary: Current Focus of Learning and Development	137
Discussion	138

CHAPTER SIX: ANALYSIS OF MEANING-MAKING OF SKILLS KNOWLEDGE AND ATTRIBUTES IN SCA	141
Theme 1: Skills for Competent and Effective Practice in SCA	142
Conventional	143
Post-Conventional	145
Summary: Skills	151
Theme 2: Knowledge for Competent and Effective Practice in SCA	151
Conventional	152
Post-Conventional	155
Summary: Knowledge	159
Theme 3: Attributes or Disposition for Competent and Effective Practice in SCA	160
Conventional	161
Post-Conventional	164
Summary: Attributes or Disposition	171
Discussion	172
CHAPTER SEVEN: MEANING-MAKING AT THREE DIMENSIONS OF AWARENESS	175
Dimension 1: Individual or Personal	176
Conventional	176
Post-Conventional	180

Summary: Individual or Personal	186
Dimension 2: Interpersonal or Team	187
Conventional	187
Post-Conventional	191
Summary: Interpersonal or Team	197
Dimension 3: Organizational or Systemic	198
Conventional	198
Post-Conventional	202
Summary: Organizational or Systemic	209
Discussion	209
CHAPTER EIGHT: FINDINGS.....	213
Overview of Findings	213
Research Questions #1 and 2	214
Research Question #3	216
Discussion of Implications for Constructive Development Theory	217
Availability of a Range of Action Logics	217
Developmental Ingredients: Inquiry and Mutuality	220
A Developmental Taxonomy	224
Influence of Organizational Role	228

Implications for Practice	229
Implications for SCA Education and Training	230
Implications for SCA Practice	231
Implications for Supervision and Mentoring of SCAs	232
Methodological Considerations	233
Researcher as Instrument	233
Visual Inquiry	234
Trustworthiness and Integrity	239
Researcher Bias.....	239
Reactivity	241
Descriptive Integrity	242
Member Checking.....	243
Memo Writing.....	243
External Audit.....	244
Global Leadership Profile	255
Limitations	265
Instruments.....	265
Participant Sample and Selection Criteria	266
Aspirations for Future Research	267

Aspirations for the Field	269
REFERENCES	271
APPENDICIES	
A. First Interview Guide	278
B. Photography Exercise Guide	281
C. Photography Interview Guide	282
D. Memorandum of Understanding	283
E. Global Leadership Profile Instrument	284
F. Research Participant Invitation	287

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Comparison of Kegan and Torbert constructive-development theories	30
Table 2 Summary of Kegan's orders of consciousness (stages 2-5)	34
Table 3 Brief overview of Torbert's seven main action logics	41
Table 4 Participant demographics and results for researcher estimated action logic and global leadership profile	59
Table 5 Information collected and sources of data	60
Table 6 Analysis of participant AL expression based on the study's research questions	106
Table 7 Characteristics of meaning-making meta-themes	140
Table 8 Analysis of participant AL expression based on the skills, knowledge, and attributes or dispositions	141
Table 9 Characteristics of meaning-making of the skills, knowledge, and attributes	174
Table 10 Analysis of action logic based on meaning-making of dimensions of awareness	175
Table 11 Characteristics of meaning-making of dimensions of awareness	212
Table 12 Characteristics of inquiry in at the conventional and post-conventional action logics	221
Table 13 Characteristics of mutuality in at the conventional and post-conventional action logics	223
Table 14 Audit results for six participants	247
Table 15 Possible reasons for discrepancies between GLP and interview	265

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Data analysis procedure.....	66
Figure 2. Joy: Philosophy of student conduct.....	108
Figure 3. Paul: Philosophy or approach to SCA.....	113
Figure 4. Carl: Challenge in student conduct administration	115
Figure 5. Joy: Promote own development	118
Figure 6. Thomas: Promote own development	119
Figure 7. Tess: Current focus of growth and development.....	120
Figure 8. Mark: Promote own development	121
Figure 9. Current focus of growth and development	129
Figure 10. Nicole: Current focus of growth and development	130
Figure 11. Mark: Conflicted or torn.....	132
Figure 12. Alex: Current focus of growth and development	133
Figure 13. John: Focus of growth and development.....	135
Figure 14. John: Current focus of growth and development	136
Figure 15. Carl: Current focus of growth and development	137
Figure 16. Alex: Conflicted or torn.....	147
Figure 17. Tess: Growth and development	154
Figure 18. Alex: Current focus on growth and development.....	156
Figure 19. John: Current challenges	158
Figure 20. Nicole: Conflicted or Torn (1).....	163
Figure 21. Nicole: Conflicted or Torn (2).....	163
Figure 22. Alex: Promote own development	167

Figure 23. John: Focus of growth and development	169
Figure 24. Nicole: Made a stand	178
Figure 25. Tess: Conflicted or torn	180
Figure 26. Mark: Success or delight	182
Figure 27. Current focus of growth and development	183
Figure 28. John: Promote own development	185
Figure 29. Joy: Success or delight	188
Figure 30. Alex: Made a stand	193
Figure 31. Paul: Philosophy or approach to SCA	194
Figure 32. John: Current challenge	195
Figure 33. Carl: Philosophy or approach to student conduct	197
Figure 34. Nicole: Current challenge	201
Figure 35. Mark: Conflicted or torn	203
Figure 36. Paul: Conflicted or torn	205
Figure 37. John: Conflicted or torn	206
Figure 38. Carl: Conflicted or took a stand	208
Figure 39. Joy: Philosophy and approach to student conduct (2)	237

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Woven into the history of American higher education is the significant challenge of shaping student behavior on campus to promote individual growth, protect community safety, and uphold institutional values. Thomas Jefferson, then president of the University of Virginia, captured this challenge in his 1822 letter to, then president of South Carolina College, Thomas Cooper:

The article of discipline is the most difficult in American education. Premature ideas of independence, too little repressed by parents, beget a spirit of insubordination, which is the great obstacle to science within us and a principle cause of its decay since the revolution. I look to it with dismay in our institutions as a breaker ahead, which I am far from confident we shall be able to weather. (Stoner & Cerminara, 1990, p. 89)

Since Jefferson, university administrators have continued to face the ongoing challenge of addressing student behavior on campus. Not surprisingly, the dominant philosophies and processes for managing this work have evolved over time, but researchers agree that the current period is characterized by a higher degree of complexity as educational, legal, demographic, and organizational forces converge. As such, these complexities have created new pressures on those charged with addressing student behavior that are more varied and intense than at perhaps any time in our history.

During the colonial period and until the end of the 19th century faculty, tutors, and even college presidents, handled the discipline of students and were largely responsible for controlling young, male behavior. This period of time also saw a tremendous growth in the number of institutions of higher education in the United States with little government oversight. For example, Thelin (2004) documents this growth from 25 institutions in 1800 to 52 in 1820, and then to 241 in 1860. Universities exercised strict

control over students during this period and experienced intense and sometimes violent student rebellions (Geiger, 1999).

Partly in response to this controlling environment, students began to form clubs, societies, and Greek letter organizations. Universities soon found their campuses overrun with these new organizations, ushering in a new period of American higher education. As student enrollment increased and extra-curricular activities became more prevalent, university presidents began looking for a new type of professional to manage many of the students' non-academic tasks and roles that were becoming too cumbersome for faculty. In 1891 LeBaron Russell Briggs became the first Dean of Men at Harvard University and was responsible for nonacademic duties on campus including student discipline (Rentz, 2004). Briggs is considered to be the first nonacademic professional on a college campus and was followed a few years later by Alice Parker Freeman at the University of Chicago as the first Dean of Women (Waryold & Lancaster, 2008).

In addition to the roles of Deans of Men and Women that functioned as the primary disciplinarians on campus, universities began to create positions that focused on the more holistic development of students during the early part of the 20th century (Dannells & Lowry, 2004). These student personnel positions coincided with curriculum needs that focused on vocational guidance, applied psychology, educational psychology and measurement, and mental hygiene/health" (Dannells, 1997, p. 9). Although deans were seen as strict disciplinarians, student personnel professionals were guided by more holistic developmental principles often creating a conflict between the two roles. However, Dannells (1997) pointed out that any conflict between these values was unfortunate as early meetings between deans indicated a focus on character formation

rather than the traditional punishment and control that guided early forms of discipline in American higher education.

Legal and federal government oversight of higher education would change significantly from the beginning to the end of the 20th century. From 1913 to 1961 universities were protected from many of the oversight and accountability measures that exist today. This level of protection was afforded primarily by the landmark case *Gott v. Berea College* (1913), which created the legal protection for universities to establish the rules they deemed appropriate for the education of their students (Bickel & Lake, 1999). *Gott* was a local tavern owner who sued when Berea College created a rule barring students from going to certain off-campus locations. In its decision, the courts ruled that colleges “could stand *in loco parentis* concerning the physical and moral welfare” of students (Bickel & Lake, 1999, p. 23). As a result, universities could make any rule or regulation it felt contributed to the education and betterment of their students. The position of *in loco parentis* would define the relationship between students and the university until another landmark decision in 1961.

During the Civil Rights Movement, university campuses were a staging ground for student activism. One particular student protest that would change the nature of student discipline forever occurred on February 25, 1960 when St. John and 28 other students from Alabama State College entered the Montgomery County Courthouse to protest the public lunchroom’s refusal to serve Blacks. The sit-in prompted protests on-campus and the students were subsequently expelled without notice of the charges against them or an opportunity to defend themselves. The students brought suit in federal court and as a result, the landmark decision *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* (1961)

changed the face of university law (Bickel & Lake, 1999). This decision created the groundwork for the basic rights of students in the conduct process and would ultimately be the end of *in loco parentis* which had protected universities from the legal court system.

University discipline would significantly change during the 1960s as the result of a shifting legal landscape. Changes included “increased student input into the disciplinary codes and processes, broadened legal and educational conceptions of students’ rights and responsibilities, and the introduction of due process safeguards” (Dannells & Lowery, 2004, p. 181). As a result, universities across the United States instituted processes that began to mimic the judicial system and utilized more legalistic procedures. During the remainder of the 20th century, these processes would become more complex requiring professional roles on campus designed to specifically manage them.

In the late 1980s, these professional roles would grow so much that the Association of Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA), which would later be renamed to the Association of Student Conduct Administrators (ASCA), was created. This group of university administrators faced unique challenges as a result of their responsibility for both reactively and proactively managing the university’s response to the challenges of student behavior. At times, they would even refer to themselves as “The Besieged Clan” due to the experience of being besieged “by everyone from parents to campus police and by necessity they stick together to help one another” (Gehring, 2013, p. 4). The uniqueness of this university role led to the development of specific professional competencies and training programs to promote effectiveness in the field.

At the beginning of the 21st century student conduct processes had become so legalistic that in some instances universities had created mock judicial systems and courtrooms to address student behavior. As a result, both researchers and practitioners began to comment on the field's sacrifice of its goal to promote student education and have called for the field to shift towards focusing on student learning and development (Lowery & Dannells, 2004; Lake, 2009). This has resulted in reviews of institutional codes of conduct and processes as well as the introduction of alternative forms of dispute resolution such as restorative justice.

On April 4, 2011 the field of student conduct administration would experience another significant milestone when the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights, under the direction of President Obama, released a "Dear Colleague Letter." The letter provided a very direct reminder to higher education of its responsibility to address allegations of sexual assault under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. As a result, most institutions would begin the difficult work of interpreting the letter and revising their policies, grievance process, as well trainings, education, and prevention strategies to ensure compliance. Despite the directions provided by the Dear Colleague letter it also raised numerous questions for higher education about what was expected. The topic of Title IX and sexual violence on campus quickly became a frequent news headline and controversial topic for higher education and those interested in its management of these incidents. Eventually the federal government would form the "White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault" in order to listen to concerns from survivors, advocates, and universities in order to identify clearer action steps and recommendations for higher education. In April 2014 the task force released its

first report titled “Not Alone” and promised future reports that would continue to address institutional obligations regarding sexual assaults. At the time that this study took place institutions around the country were busy responding to the report and ensuring compliance. This is also the period of time when data was collected for this study and is a significant contextual variable that participants reflected upon.

Although great efforts have been made to shift towards the goal of student development in student conduct administration, the influence of legal processes are still present and help to inform institutional obligations for safety and due process of students. Therefore, student conduct administrators find themselves sitting at a complex nexus of legal, educational, demographic, and organizational challenges. As a result, the skills and competencies of today’s student conduct officer are complex, broad, and varied. To be effective, they must be both a campus educator and university compliance officer. They must be able to engage individual student learning as well as facilitate an environment that promotes campus safety and the academic mission. They must be well versed in federal and state laws and regulations as well as adept at both developing and enforcing university policy. They must have the public relations’ skills that allow them to successfully interact with parents, diverse students, faculty, police, lawyers, and other stakeholders interested in the university’s management of student behavior.

To help define the skills and competencies necessary for effective practice the Association of Student Conduct Administration (ASCA), “the premier authority in higher education for student conduct administration and conflict resolution,” (www.theasca.org/about_asca) developed a competency model for student conduct administrators and officers in 2001 that was revisited in 2012. In addition to the nine

specific competencies listed, Waryold (2013) argued that these skills and competencies must also be coupled with a “temperament that holds the student as central to our work and approaches each of every interaction with ethical and professional integrity” (p. 11). This suggests that the skills and competencies may only be sufficient to the extent that the conduct officer possesses the capacity to make meaning of the challenges of student behavior on campus while remaining mindful of both the individual and systemic dynamics at work in the environment.

Meaning-Making and SCA

Meaning-making is an internal process of organizing information and experience so that we can know what has happened and predict what will happen (Drath & Palus, 1994). Student conduct administrators who are concerned with the development of their students have a dual involvement with meaning-making. They are both engaging with the way students have made meaning of their behavior, including their experience of being in the conduct process, and SCAs are meaning-makers themselves who continually construct meaning during their interaction with others. In addition to many exterior influences (i.e. institution, campus policy, and processes), one of the most important influences on the effectiveness of an educational and legally compliant conduct process may be the meaning-making system of the conduct administrator.

The field of constructive-development focuses on the “growth and elaboration” (McCauley et al., 2006, p. 634) of an individual’s process of meaning-making that extends across the lifespan. Constructive-development examines how individuals continue to develop the ways in which they construct meaning from their experience in order to allow for a qualitatively more complex interpretation of reality (Kegan, 1980).

The literature shows that inhabiting more complex meaning-making systems provides access to enhanced and new capacities that strengthen the ability to respond to sophisticated challenges (Kegan, 1994; Rooke & Torbert, 1998; Strange & Kuhnert, 2009; and Torbert, et al., 2004). Research examining the increased complexity of meaning-making systems has generated a number of developmental stage models that are applied broadly and some focus on meaning-making in the context of leadership. However, little is actually known about what impact a conduct administrator's stage of constructive-development and meaning-making system has developmental stage on their professional experience and decisions regarding their learning and growth. While the literature offers some insights, there has been no empirical research in this area to date. This research will build on some of the foundational adult development literature in order to generate an understanding of the relationship between a conduct officer's stage of development and how they make meaning of their professional experience and the strategies and practices they use to promote their development.

Statement of the Problem

The field of student conduct administration has grown more complex and several researchers have noted the challenges for student conduct officers to be both legal and policy compliance managers as well as facilitate the education and development of students (Bickel & Lake, 1999; Lowery and Dannells, 2004; Lake, 2009). Additionally, the current research on professional development in the field is limited to what a practitioner needs to do (skills) and what a practitioner needs to know (knowledge). Research does not consider how conduct officers make meaning of their skills and knowledge in order to navigate this unique environment. An overlooked dimension of

development is how the ways in which conduct officers make meaning of their professional experiences, knowledge, and skills, informs their thoughts, actions, and ultimately, how they approach their responsibilities for their institutions and for their students.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this research is to better understand how student conduct officers develop the capacity for navigating and engaging with the complexities of the current environment surrounding student conduct administration. This research will explore questions of how conduct administrators at different stages of development make meaning of their experiences and development in student conduct administration. How might their stage of constructive-development shape the way they make meaning of the forces impacting their work and what are the ways in which conduct administrators promote their own meaning-making development in order to be more effective?

Research Questions

The three primary research questions addressed by this study are:

1. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of their professional experiences as a student conduct officer?
2. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of the strategies and practices they utilize in order to promote their own development as a student conduct officer?
3. What (if any) relationship exists between the student conduct administrators' meaning-making and their assessed stage of constructive development?

Significance of the Study

The ways in which conduct officers make-meaning of their experiences in student conduct administration impacts the way they perceive every dimension of their work, including the way that they engage, understand, and respond to student behavior and institutional challenges. Although researchers know quite a bit about the way students are likely to make-meaning of the college environment and therefore may also experience the university conduct process, they know far less about the implications of a conduct officer's developmental stage of meaning-making on the design and delivery of a campus conduct program. Furthermore, we do not understand how their meaning-making informs how they promote their own development in order to meet the demands of the environment. It appears that current research is missing an essential piece of this puzzle.

This research may help to influence student conduct administrator training and education programs in order to cultivate shifts in the conduct officer's ability to make meaning of the complex profession they are working in. The lack of attention to differences in constructive development amongst student conduct administrators has implications for how future professionals are trained. Due to the dearth of research in this area, it is unlikely that many student affairs graduate education programs as well as professional training programs account for the implications of diverse levels of constructive-development among participants. This research will help to understand how one's stage of constructive-development impacts the ability to implement the knowledge, skills, and competencies received as well as navigate the complex individual and institutional challenges faced by the student conduct administrator.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are two specific bodies of literature and theory that inform this study. The first is competency related literature that seeks to understand the various opinions and perspectives related to professional growth in student affairs. As a functional area within student affairs, literature related to specific competencies for student conduct administrators is also explored. Finally, perspectives on the need for professional development and the role of professional associations are reviewed. The second area examines the developmental psychology literature focusing on constructive-developmental theory (Cook-Greuter, 1999, 2004; Kegan, 1982, 1994; Torbert & Associates, 2004; Torbert, 2005), which is used as the primary hermeneutic lens to shape the research design and data analysis. This section describes the primary theorists and their conceptual frameworks as well as the relationship between the theory and developmental movement.

Professional Growth and Development in Student Affairs

Student Affairs practitioners seemingly have an endless number of skills, knowledge, and traits that they are asked to acquire and continue to expand and refine as they progress in their career (ACPA/NASPA, 2010). The number and range of skills, knowledge bases, and personal attributes necessary for effective student affairs practice has made it difficult for researchers and practitioners to reach a consensus about the focus of graduate preparation and professional development programs. This difficulty is understandable considering the number of functional areas within student affairs and the range of institutional needs. Also, changes in skills and competencies are not only a

function of an individual's career but also in how they make meaning of their organization and their responsibilities. Finally, throughout one's career there are changes in the context of the profession and the challenges presented by the environment. For instance, changes in student demographics and technology over the last two decades have altered the higher education landscape. As a result, the competencies required for effective student affairs practice continually change and evolve.

Professional associations have an important role in the culture of student affairs. After completing a graduate preparation program professional associations often become the practitioner's primary source of training, education, and development experiences. In 2010, the two primary professional associations for student affairs practitioners published the proceedings of a collaboration to "define the broad professional knowledge, skills, and, in some cases, attitudes expected of student affairs professionals regardless of their area of specialization or positional role within the field" (ACPA/NASPA, 2010, p. 3). The group identified 10 competency areas and distinguished between basic, intermediate, and advanced levels of development. Competency areas include: 1) Advising and Helping; 2) Assessment, Evaluation, and Research; 3) Equity, Diversity and Inclusion; 4) Ethical Professional Practice; 5) History, Philosophy, and Values; 6) Human and Organizational Resources; 7) Law, Policy and Governance; 8) Leadership; 9) Personal Foundations; and 10) Student Learning and Development. Many of the areas addressed being self-reflective, maintaining a sense of self, being open/flexible, and engaging a wide population of individuals. The publication represented an important step in synthesizing the areas of competency for student affairs practitioners. However, it did not identify how these competencies are developed or in what way practitioners might

promote their development throughout their career. This study sought to contribute to this work by examining the relationship between the ways in which practitioners promote their development and their assessed stage of meaning-making.

The current literature on practitioner development in student affairs focuses on the skills, knowledge, and personal attributes that develop the professional. Many of the valued competencies involve engaging with individuals, groups, and the broader institutional environment. The type of development these practitioners require involves high levels of self-reflection, increasing awareness, and engagement with an environment that is rapidly changing. This is the primary reason why constructive-developmental theory is used as a hermeneutic lens in this study. The theory and literature surrounding constructive-development discussed later in chapter two shows that these types of competencies are central to the development of an individual's stage of meaning-making.

A review of literature suggests that research in the competencies and development of student affairs professionals can be divided into three categories: graduate education, entry-level, and mid-senior level. Although this study will only include participants who are considered mid-senior level, a review of each area is necessary to provide a better idea of the general developmental trajectory for student affairs professionals.

Graduate Education in Student Affairs

A master's degree typically represents an initial requirement for entrance into the profession. For many researchers and practitioners in the field of student affairs, the range of necessary skills, knowledge, and competencies has created an intriguing inquiry into the design and structure of professional preparation programs. One attempt to conceptualize the curriculum and skills emphasized by these graduate programs was from

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). The CAS has articulated commonly accepted standards (Miller, 2003) and is highly regarded throughout the profession. The CAS does provide a self-assessment process for graduate programs, but does not require a formal reporting of results that would lead to accreditation. Without formal accreditation processes programs have developed varying emphases, making it is difficult to state exactly what preparation for the field should look like. As a result, student affairs professionals enter their careers with varying levels of knowledge and skills and are expected to engage in continued learning and development throughout their career.

The CAS represents a council of 32 professional associations that promote 12 standards and guidelines in 29 functional areas (Miller, 2003). These standards guide student affairs professionals in fulfilling their responsibilities and help them identify the knowledge and skills needed in their practice. Since most student affairs professionals enter the field through a master's degree program, the CAS suggests three key areas of study including: foundational studies (ethics, history, philosophy, culture); professional studies (student development theory, student characteristics, administration, assessment, research, and the effect of college on students); and supervised practice (generally in the form of two unique graduate assistantships). These graduate programs generally provide development of skills, knowledge, and experiences that are necessary for entrance into the field.

A high value is placed on the master's degree in student affairs in order to be hired at an entry-level position (Kretovics, 2002). Graduate education programs develop the new professional into a qualified and competent practitioner. Some, however, have

argued that graduate programs are not adequately preparing new professionals for the field. Recommendations to consider for what to integrate in graduate preparation programs include management theory, assessment skills, connecting theory to practice (Amey & Reesor, 2002), as well as the interpersonal and decision-making skills necessary for work with a diverse student population (Pope & Reynolds, 1997). In the end, the effectiveness of a graduate student affairs curriculum involves building upon foundational student affairs knowledge and skills. Thereby, allowing the curriculum to continually find alignment with the evolving expectations of the entry-level position in student affairs.

Entry-Level Competencies in Student Affairs

Entry level and new student affairs professionals, when defined in the literature, are considered to be full-time staff with five or fewer years of experience (Renn & Hodges, 2007; Scott & Bischoff, 2000; Waple, 2006). These positions require high student contact and program development and implementation on a daily basis (Burkhard et al., 2005). There is not a consensus about what skills and competencies are required for these professionals but the research can be synthesized into three categories: skills, knowledge, and personal attributes.

Skills. Herdlein (2004) surveyed 50 chief student affairs officers about competencies for new professionals. Management skills were most frequently cited as essential and included budgeting, collaboration, leadership, and written communication. Human relations skills such as communication, and interpersonal skills were also identified. Waple (2006) identified certain skills as highly valued including written and oral communication, problem solving, and program planning and implementation. Other

skills were moderately valued including crisis and conflict management, advising students and organizations, and the ability to deliver workshops and presentations.

Although communication is a broad skill set and referred to in different ways in the literature, studies have found that communication skills are consistently ranked as important for new professionals. Written and oral communication was ranked as highly important in a study of the perceptions of new professionals (Waple, 2006). A longitudinal study showed that the success of new professionals is supported from creating reliable relationships that utilize effective communication (Renn & Hodges, 2007).

Lovell and Kosten (2000) performed a meta-analysis to summarize 30 years of research on student affairs competencies. Of the skills that the study identified, 78% involved human facilitation and counseling skills such as advising students, advising organizations, and conflict/crisis management. Herdlein (2004) also found that chief student affairs officers valued counseling and helping skills. The emphasis on human relations, counseling, and helping skills is especially important considering this studies focus on meaning-making development. Development of meaning-making provides a greater capacity to the individual for examining multiple perspectives, including their own, which is vital to engaging in work focused on human relations and individual growth.

Knowledge. Waple (2006) identified several knowledge areas gained in graduate education programs that were also highly important for entry-level positions. These knowledge areas included student development theory, student demographics and characteristics, multicultural awareness, and ethics in student affairs. Other knowledge

areas were moderately valued including legal issues in higher education and theories of leadership and organization.

Knowledge of diversity is an area of critical importance for entry-level staff. Diversity education and cultural competence requires an understanding of the student needs related to identity development and must emphasize self-awareness and the ability to engage in self-examination (Armour, Bain, & Rubio, 2004). Theories related to diversity and multiculturalism were the second most important collection of theories to the practice of entry-level professionals (Burkhard et al., 2004). Waple (2006) supports this with a finding that entry-level professionals report these theories as being highly used in their work. The constructive-developmental literature that is foundational to this study is helpful for increasing self-awareness and self-examination (Kegan, 1982; Torbert et al., 2004). Central to developmental movement is the exercise of action-inquiry. Action-inquiry is a focus of discussion later in chapter two, but emphasizes noticing and inquiring about our internal experience (Torbert, 2004). Through this exercise we become less constrained by our own implicit and often untested assumptions.

Lovell and Kosten's (2000) meta-analysis found that knowledge of student development theory is the most desired knowledge base. This is a knowledge base that is often at the heart of graduate preparation programs. However, Waple (2006) found that although student development theory was valued in graduate programs it was only moderately used in an entry-level professional's work with students. This gap can be explained from employers placing a higher value on practical experience over theoretical knowledge (Kretovics, 2002).

Personal Attributes. In Herdlein's (2004) study of opinions of chief student affairs officers, personal attributes including flexibility, work ethic, critical thinking and problem solving were seen as essential for entry-level success. An overlap of personal attributes was found in a Delphi study of mid and senior level staff who perceived flexibility, interpersonal relations, analytical and critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, and assertiveness as vital (Burkhard et al., 2005). A meta-analysis of current research (Lovell & Kosten, 2000) identified personal traits/qualities less frequently, however, the study suggested that interactive qualities such as being able to work cooperatively are important in student affairs.

In summary, entry level positions involve both high levels of student contact and program management requiring a variety of human relations, counseling, management and administration skills. Research in recent years has identified new competencies such as legal issues, ethical standards, technology, and multicultural sensitivity. Additionally, practitioners must develop not only knowledge and skills but also certain personal attributes in order to be effective. Ultimately, expectations for today's practitioner reflect the importance of the whole person.

Mid-Senior Level Competencies in Student Affairs

Development among mid and senior level student affairs professionals is also studied in the literature, however, they are often intertwined and difficult to separate. Nevertheless, it is clear that researchers have found new and critical competencies for professionals as they advance in their careers. Similar to the previous section on entry-level professionals, this section will examine the competencies of mid-senior student affairs professionals using three categories: skills, knowledge, and personal attributes.

Skills. Communication and interpersonal skills consistently appear in studies examining mid and senior level student affairs professionals. This competency can be understood as the ability to understand, direct, and interact with stakeholders, colleagues, and peers, both in and outside of the university. Chief student affairs officers identified these skills as often or always important for mid-level professionals (Frey & Carenter, 1996; Saunders & Cooper, 1999). Communication is clearly a skill that student affairs professionals continue to develop and expand upon throughout their career.

At the mid-senior career levels, student affairs professionals often supervise other professional staff. Human resource management was identified by senior student affairs professionals as one of the most important skills for mid-level staff (Beatty & Stamatakos, 1990). This involves effective supervision and staff management as well as creating an environment that provides intentional staff development experiences (Komives, 1992).

Leadership is also identified in the literature as important for mid and senior level student affairs competencies. Senior student affairs officers consistently ranked leadership as an essential competency (Saunders & Cooper, 1999; Spigner-Littles, 1985). However, leadership has been difficult to define in the competency literature and includes concepts of transformation and vision (Komives, 1992), accepting responsibility and delegating (Gordon et al, 1993), and understanding how to motivate and direct people (Spigner-Littles, 1985). Defining the concept of leadership is not a new challenge in the leadership literature, and there are several ways that leadership can be conceptualized (Goethals & Sorenson, 2007). The literature on mid-senior student affairs professionals emphasizes trait and skill based leadership approaches (Bateman & Snell, 1999) with

some reference to relational (Uhl-Bien, 2006) and transformational (Bass, 1985) forms of leadership. Future research on student affairs leadership could explore other emerging models of leadership, including adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994), systems thinking (Senge, 1997), and integral theory (Wilber, 1997). Love and Estanek (2004) took an important step by providing a conceptual overview of how some emerging leadership models inform student affairs practice and leadership, but there is room for an empirical examination.

This study uses the framework of constructive-development to examine how mid-senior level practitioners make meaning of their experience, which includes leadership. However, this approach is not currently reflected in the literature on student affairs practice. Constructive-development theory has also been used to conceptualize leadership (McCauley et al., 2006), and will add an important dimension to this competency in mid-senior student affairs professionals.

Knowledge. At the mid-senior career levels, student affairs professionals supervise other professional staff. In a survey of senior-level student affairs administrators one of the three most important competency areas included knowledge of human development theory. These professionals must also increase knowledge of fiscal management and budgeting (Frey & Carpenter, 1996; Gordon et al., 1993; Scott & Bischoff, 2000; Spigner-Littles, 1985).

Personal Attributes. Gordon, et al. (1993) identified personal integrity and interest in students as two of the most important expectations for senior-level professionals. These professionals also face new challenges in regards to their own career as they seek clarity about who they are as a professional and manage issues related

to career mobility, assessment of career goals, balance, fulfillment in the profession, and developing broader perspectives (Scott & Bischoff, 2000). These personal attributes are closely linked to how practitioners make meaning of their life and career experiences. This study will help enhance the understanding of how they are developed and their relationship to developmental stages of meaning-making.

Learning and Development in Student Affairs

Given the number of skills, knowledge, and attributes required at varying levels of practice in the field of student affairs, there is need for ongoing learning and development by practitioners. Kreuger (2000) suggested, “the very practice and philosophy of student affairs implies on-going lifelong professional development” (p. 536). The literature explores several ways that student affairs practitioners engage in this on-going learning and development. For new professionals, graduate preparation programs are a common training ground (Kretovics, 2002). As the practitioner seeks advancement to mid and senior level positions a doctoral degree is often pursued. Outside of these formal academic programs practitioners find opportunities for development within professional associations as well as their individual institutions.

Professional Competencies in Student Conduct Administration

Student conduct administration is a functional area within the field of student affairs and central in developing community on a college campus. These administrators currently navigate an increasingly complex and contrasting set of organizational and societal forces. As a result, these administrators have developed their own competency model. Research for the model was originally conducted in 1993 by surveying chief judicial affairs officers about what is needed to be a competent practitioner (Waryold,

2013). The model was revisited in 2001 and again in 2012 by surveying members of the ASJA. Unlike the NASPA/ACPA competencies that include a basic three-tier developmental stage, student conduct competencies consist of a single level of achievement without expanding on a developmental trajectory. There are nine competencies that include: 1) The Code of Conduct: Policies and Processes; 2) Student Development Theory; 3) Multiculturalism; 4) Laws and Mandates; 5) Governance and Building Relationships; 6) Forums of Resolution; 7) Ethics, Professional Integrity; 8) Administration; and 9) Assessment. Waryold (2013) notes that the basic foundational competencies have remained almost consistent over the 15year period with the exception of adding the competency of Assessment.

There is almost no research related to the preparation and development of student conduct administrators. This is affirmed by Stimpson & Stimpson (2008) whose review of 27 years of literature in student conduct and judicial affairs revealed a lack of research on the development and competency building of conduct officers. Literature emphasized the importance of continued training and recommended the use of a variety of teaching methods including observations and experiential activities (Stimpson & Stimpson, 2008).

More recently, Waller's (2013) dissertation examined student conduct administrator's decision making using the theory of justice from Lawrence Kohlberg and the theory of care from Carol Gilligan. Both of these theories are examples of constructive-developmental theories. Waller's qualitative study of eight mid-level conduct administrators from public research institutions, found that conduct administrators used both justice and care in their decision-making. An ethic of justice was primarily used in decisions around findings about whether a violation occurred and

an ethic of care was used in the sanctioning phase and determining outcomes.

Additionally, gender was found to have no impact on the use of an ethic of justice or care.

The previous sections have highlighted the important work that has already been done in the area of understanding student affairs and student conduct competencies and development. The review has also pointed out several areas that can be further informed by constructive-development theory and how individuals develop greater meaning-making capacities. This includes an emphasis in student affairs and student conduct administration on counseling, human relations, and student learning and development. It also considers that higher education is an environment that is rapidly changing and leaders benefit from the development of broader perspectives to manage an increasing level of complexity. The review now transitions to examining the literature on constructive-developmental theory, which is used as the primary hermeneutic lens to shape the study's research design and data analysis. This section describes the primary theorists and their conceptual frameworks as well as the relationship between the theory and developmental movement.

Constructive-Developmental Theory

Constructive-developmental theory is a branch of developmental psychology that examines development across the life span. It is a stage theory that focuses on the growth and development of meaning-making processes in order to allow for more complexity in person's understanding of the self and world (McCauley et al., 2006). The theory is concerned with how we make sense out of our experiences, our world, and ourselves. Extending the work of Jean Piaget which suggests a series of qualitatively different

stages of children's physical and cognitive development, Robert Kegan sought to demonstrate how adults continue to develop in ways in which they construct meaning from their experience in order to allow for a qualitatively more complex interpretation of their reality. Kegan (1980) recognizes several prior theories that would fall into the category of constructive-development such as cognitive theories (Perry, 1970), psychoanalytic learning (Loevinger, 1976), and ethical reasoning (Kohlberg, 1969), but suggests a new framework that includes elements of each of these theories and focuses on the activity of making meaning. Prior to discussing the primary constructive-development frameworks that inform this study, an overview of the influences and assumption of the theory will be presented as well as how developmental movement is understood.

Neo-Piagetian Influences

The work of Jean Piaget (1954) is well known for its contributions to understanding how children construe the physical world as they develop and is often used in the design of child and adolescent learning curriculum. Piaget's work is based on a constructivist perspective that is not focused on the gradual accumulation of new knowledge, but on the transformation of knowledge as a result of moving through distinct stages of growth in order to understand the world (McCauley et al., 2006). As children grow and encounter uncertainty, complexities, and contradictions in the world they reconstruct and qualitatively transform their understanding in order to reduce the level of ambiguity. From the work of Piaget emerged a broad group of "neo" theorists working to extend Piaget's theories beyond both the physical world and children's development.

Neo-Piagetian theorists extended Piaget's work by suggesting that the developmental processes put forward by Piaget laid the foundation for how humans construct lifelong meaning from their emotional, social, and personal worlds. Kegan summarizes the contribution of the neo-theorists saying,

Indeed, what is “neo” about the constructive-developmental framework is that it moves from Piaget's study of cognition to include the emotions; from his study of children and adolescents to include adulthood; from the study of stages of development to include the processes that bring the stages into being, defend them, and evolve from them; from Piaget's descriptive, outside-the-person approach to include study of the internal experience of developing; and from a solely individual-focused study of development to include study of the social context and role in development. (1980, p. 374)

Ultimately, prior to Neo-Piagetian theorists, it was the view that development and transformation of our ways of making meaning of our experiences ended in adolescence. Any changes that occurred in the adult and late-adult years were thought to be a result of the psychological work of earlier childhood years and without significant organization or regularity (Kegan & Lahey, 1984). The contribution of the Neo-Piagetian theorists and the emerging field of constructive-development have been to move forward the study of how adults transform through an organized sequence of increasingly more complex ways of making meaning.

Constructivism and Development

Building on the work of Piaget and the neo-theorists that followed, constructive-development theory is concerned specifically with how individuals make meaning of internal and external experiences and how this meaning-making process changes throughout the lifespan. Understanding what makes these theories “constructive” and what makes them “developmental” is central to understanding the unique contribution of these theories.

Constructivists believe that individuals do not discover meaning in the world, but that they create the reality of their world. Individuals are constantly making sense of their experiences by constructing meaning from their reality, which includes their relationship with other individuals and the broader system. The individual's underlying system of meaning-making organizes this construction. These privately composed meanings help to give rise to our behavior (Kegan, 1980).

The developmental focus recognizes that growth and development are processes that occur across the lifespan. Furthermore, it contends that there is a general pattern of development such that individuals go through the same stages in the same order (Palus & Drath, 1995). As a stage development theory, each successive stage transcends and includes the previous stage. In order for development to occur individuals must sufficiently address the challenges and tasks of previous stages in order to ensure success in later stages. The abilities of the earlier stages are still available to us at the later stages but they are reorganized and implemented by the later stage.

This understanding of stage development distinguishes between development and learning. From a constructive-development perspective, development involves more than learning new skills and knowledge (Drago-Severson, 2004). Development is “a process of outgrowing one system of meaning by integrating it (as a subsystem) into a new system of meaning. What was the whole becomes part of a new whole” (Kegan & Lahey, 1984, p. 203).

There are two forms of human development described by developmental psychologists: lateral (or horizontal) and vertical. Both are critical, but occur at varying rates across the lifespan. Lateral growth is the process of learning new skills, information,

and knowledge. This is obtained through forms of schooling, training, and other self-directed forms of life-long learning. Vertical development refers to learning to see experiences with a new lens in order to change our interpretations and transform our view of reality. Cook-Greuter (2004) offers a metaphor of a mountain climber as helpful illustration for understanding the difference between these two types of development.

At each turn of the path up the mountain I can see more of the territory I have already traversed. I can see the multiple turns and reversals in the path. I can see further into and across the valley. The closer I get to the summit, the easier it becomes to see behind the shadow side and uncover formerly hidden aspects of the territory. Finally at the top, I can see beyond my particular mountain to the other ranges and further horizons. The more I can see, the wiser, more timely, more systematic, and informed my actions and decisions are likely to be because more of the relevant information, connections, and dynamic relationships become visible. (p. 277)

Lateral growth is a more frequent type of development “geared towards expanding, deepening, and enriching a person’s current way of meaning-making” (Cook-Grueter, 2004, p. 276). Vertical forms of development are much rarer and can require a much longer time frame that involves practices that include “self-reflection, action-inquiry, and dialogue, as well as living in the company of others further along on the developmental path” (Cook-Greuter, 2004, p. 277).

Individuals can make meaning throughout the day from a variety of available stages of development. However, they tend to have a preferred frame of reference for making meaning of experience. This preferred frame of reference is the most complex meaning-making system that the individual has mastered. During a crisis or high pressure situation an individual may regress temporarily to the earlier stages of meaning-making but will often return to their preferred stage once conditions have returned to an equilibrium. The opposite can also be true where individuals, under ideal conditions, can

make meaning from a more complex stage of development but will again return to the preferred stage when conditions have settled. The Global Leadership Profile instrument used in this study assesses the participants preferred or dominant stage of development (action logic) but it is possible that given the environmental conditions they may not always make meaning of their experiences from this stage.

Core Propositions of Constructive-Development Theory

Despite several different ways of labeling stages of development and some nuances to the organizing principles at each stage, there are several core propositions of constructive-developmental theory summarized by McCauley, et al. (2006, p. 636) including:

1. People actively construct ways of making meaning of themselves and the world instead of discovering an objective world.
2. There are identifiable patterns of meaning-making that are referred to in different ways, including stages, orders on consciousness, ways of knowing, and action logics.
3. This pattern of meaning-making unfolds in a specific invariant sequence and each successive stage transcends and includes the previous stage.
4. In general, individuals do not regress; once a stage of development has been constructed, the previous stage loses its organizing function, but remains as a perspective that can be reflected upon.
5. Because each subsequent stage includes all previous stages, later stages are more complex than earlier stages, but are not necessarily a better stage.
6. Developmental movement from one stage to another is driven by limitations in the current way of making meaning. As a result, development occurs when a person faces increased complexity in the environment and requires a more complex way of understanding themselves and the world.
7. A stage of meaning-making influences what an individual notices or can become aware of, and therefore, what they can describe, reflect on, and change.

Constructive-development and Developmental Movement

Torbert (1987) was one of the first to apply constructive-developmental theory to the study of leadership and has been followed by a number of others (Eigel, 1998; Torbert et al., 2004; Rooke & Torbert, 2005; Eigel & Kuhnert, 2005; Harris & Kuhnert,

2008; Strang & Kuhnert, 2009) who are interested in the impact meaning-making has on leadership and leadership effectiveness. As a result, a constructive-developmental approach to the study of leadership is now available. The approach developmental scholars take to studying leadership is represented by Eigel and Kuhnert (2005, p. 383):

Leadership effectiveness is not gained simply by piling more skills onto the same level, or by increasing the capacity to recite company leadership competencies. It is gained by fundamentally changing the way we address leadership development - it is not just what you know, but where you know it from that matters. The future of our organizations depends on successfully identifying and developing all leaders to higher LDLs [developmental levels] - to a place of greater authenticity - so that they can respond effectively to the increasingly complex demands of our times.

These scholars question some of the basic assumptions held by traditional leadership theorists. They suggest that effectiveness is not about the leader's traits, behavior, style, or knowledge, but how they make meaning of their traits, behavior, style, and knowledge. The epistemological root of our knowing is just as important as what we know.

This literature review examines more closely the constructive-developmental research that uses the frameworks from Kegan (1982, 1994) and Torbert/Cook-Greuter (Torbert & Associates, 2004) because they are the theorists that have turned their attention to leadership and have offered a different way of conceptualizing and assessing the developmental stages of meaning-making. McCauly et al., (2006) reviewed over 30 studies that employ constructive-developmental theory to understand leadership effectiveness and used an adaptation of Table 1 to align these theorist frameworks with each other.

Understanding developmental levels helps to understand many of the conflicts and misunderstandings that people in organizations experience. When we understand an individual's developmental level, we can better identify ways to interact with them as

well as support and challenge them. More importantly, it allows us to understand ourselves in relation to them. Cook-Greuter (2004) suggests that we can even make a better match between an individual's developmental stage and their job function. For instance, a post-conventional individual (i.e. Redefining or Transforming) may be better suited to lead their organization through a difficult period of change. Finally, while lateral development is often focused on by organizations, the concept of vertical development can help create personal development plans tailored to the individual's current stage of development. This review now turns toward a more detailed understanding of each theory and its contributions.

Table 1

Comparison of Kegan and Torbert constructive-development theories. Adapted from McCauley et al., 2006, p. 637

Framework	Dependent		Independent		Inter-Independent	
1) Kegan's Orders of Consciousness	<i>Interpersonal/Traditional</i>		<i>Institutional/Modern</i>		<i>Interindividual/Postmodern</i>	
What is object?	Enduring needs and dispositions		Interpersonal relationships		The autonomous self	
What is subject	Interpersonal relationships		The autonomous self		The transforming self	
2) Torbert's Stages	<i>Diplomat</i>	<i>Expert</i>	<i>Achiever</i>	<i>Individualist/ Redefining</i>	<i>Strategist/ Transforming</i>	<i>Alchemist/ Alchemical</i>
Action-logic	Norms rule needs	Craft logic rules norms	System effectiveness rules craft logic	Relativism rules single system	Most valuable principles rule relativism	Deep processes & intersystemic evolution rule principles
Main Focus	Social expected behavior, approval	Expertise, procedure, and efficiency	Delivery of results, effectiveness, success within system	Self in relationship to system; interaction with system	Linking theory and principles with practice, dynamic systems interactions	Interplay awareness, thought, action, and effects; transforming self and others

Kegan's Orders of Consciousness

Meaning-making is a developmental process through which the self continually emerges from being embedded in or subject to a culture or environment (Kegan, 1994). As a new meaning-making stage emerges it is able to take the former culture that it was embedded in and reflect upon it as an object. This continual process of increased differentiation and internalization between the self and the other is critical to understanding Kegan's orders of consciousness. The individual's meaning structure is never completely separate from the environment. The individual only understands the distinction between the self and his or her environment in a new way. Extending the work of D.W. Winnicott (1965), Kegan (1982) writes,

There is never "just an individual"; the very word refers only to that side of the person that is individuated, the side of differentiation. There is always, as well, the side that is embedded; the *person* is more than an individual. "Individual" names a current state of evolution, a stage, a maintained balance or defended differentiation; "person" refers to the fundamental motion of evolution itself, and is as much about that side of the self embedded in the life-surround as that which is individuated from it. The person is an "individual" *and* an "embeddual." (p. 116)

As a result of an individual's growing awareness of the embedded self in an ever-expanding environment, there is a continued dialectic between the self and environment. This dialectic causes a continual shift in what is object and subject in meaning-making being either the self or the environment. This is observed in adolescents who become more aware of their impulses, needs, and wants. Eventually adolescents develop the ability to better reflect on his or her immediate environment and to distinguish between their needs and wants and those of their family, friends, and teachers. In this case the environment (needs and wants of others) shifts from being subject to being an object that can be reflected upon. Individuals still have their own impulses, wants, and needs but

they are now a piece of their meaning-making structure rather than the whole.

Development of meaning-making or consciousness always involves an examination of the tension between the individual and the environment in order to create more complex awareness of the relationship between the self and the environment.

Subject-Object Understanding

Kegan's "orders of consciousness" are designed around two categories for how individuals organize their meaning-making. These categories are designed to describe what is subject and what is object for the individual. Constructive-development theory suggests that development involves a process of gradually increasing the individual's awareness of the meaning-making organization that the individual is subject to (Kegan, 1982, 1994). Being subject to something is being embedded in it and makes one unable to call it into question. Something that is object can be questioned because we are aware of its existence. In other words, it is the difference between something that we are (subject) and something that we have (object). The process of development involves moving beliefs, values, practices, assumptions, and environment (that which organizes our meaning making) from being subject to being object. Of course, development is never complete and when what is subject becomes object then a new organizing system of meaning making becomes subject. After each shift of subject to object the individual is capable of differentiating and internalizing more complex experiences.

A methodology designed by Kegan and his colleagues (Lahey, Souvaine, Kegan, Goodman, & Felix, 1988) seeks to measure an individual's order of consciousness using what is called the Subject-Object Interview. The individual is interviewed regarding recent and significant life events and the interviewer listens and probes for how the

individual constructs meaning of the experience. The goal is to determine the greatest level of complexity that the individual can use to make sense of the experience. The Subject-Object Interview has been used in several studies associated with leadership and differentiates between three distinct transitional phases within each order of development. Lahey et al., (1988) reported both levels of test-retest reliability (.82) and inter-rater agreement (.75 to .90).

Orders of Consciousness

Kegan organizes meaning-making structures into five developmental stages or orders where the individual gradually becomes more conscious of the culture in which he/she has been embedded. It is widely recognized that orders 0-1 are experienced between infancy and childhood while orders 2-4 may be experienced in adolescence and adulthood (Kegan, 1994). Stage five is rarely reached in the adult population, and if it is it is not typically achieved before mid-life (Kegan, 1994). In fact, as is true with many constructive-development theories, there is no certainty that an individual will develop through all stages. A sometimes counter-intuitive assertion is that the goal should not necessarily be to progress through each order of consciousness. Rather the goal is to match the individuals' stage of consciousness or meaning-making with the challenges he or she is facing. This is referred to as "goodness of fit" (Kegan, 1994, p. 76). If an individual's current meaning-making organization is sufficient for the tasks, challenges, and expectations of the developmental demands of his or her work and life, then it would not be necessary to operate from a more complex meaning-making system (Drago-Severson, 2004b). However, Kegan (1994) suggests that the mental requirements of

modern life are beyond the current meaning-making capacities of most individuals, which create situations that have us in over our heads.

Meaning-Making Structures

The discussion thus far has been about the fundamental elements that inform Kegan's theory. Understanding these elements is essential to the task of creating conditions that support development because movement between any two stages can span several years, making it unlikely that any single experience, teacher, coach, or consultant will be along for the entire journey. Therefore, understanding the developmental trajectory and the elements that undergird growth will be of more practical value to creating conditions that support development. Table 2 uses these elements to summarize the stages that are most often the focus of research on adult meaning-making in order to provide an understanding of the developmental trajectory of this theory.

Table 2

Summary of Kegan's orders of consciousness (stages 2-5). Adapted from McCauley et al. (2006) and Kegan, (1982).

Framework	Stage 2: Instrumental	Traditionalism Stage 3: Interpersonal	Modernism Stage 4: Institutional	Post-Modernism Stage 5: Interindividual
What is object?	Impulses, perceptions	Enduring dispositions, needs, preferences	Interpersonal relationships	The autonomous self
What is subject?	Enduring dispositions, needs, preferences	Interpersonal relationships	The autonomous self	The transforming self
Meaning-Making Structure	Dependent	Socializing	Self-authoring	Self-transforming

This review will only discuss those stages typically experienced by adults, but it is important to understand that there are also three transitional phases between each stage of development. In fact, most of our lives are spent in these transitional phases (Lahey et al., 1988), which create a layer of complexity and nuance to development. These transitional phases indicate an individual's gradual and incremental development and are measured by the Subject-Object Interview.

Instrumental/Dependent. The instrumental knower understands that there are realities and perspectives separate and distinct from his or her own perception. The world is understood in highly concrete terms and the other's perspective and interests are only important to the extent that they interfere with the interests of the instrumental knower. The limitation is that the other's perspective cannot be fully understood by the individual. They do not yet have the capacity to hold contradicting perspectives and will look for concrete rules so that they can do things the right way.

Interpersonal/Socializing. The socializing knower's meaning-making structure is organized around identification with the other's perspectives in the environment and he or she is unable to reflect upon this identification. Although this person is aware of and able to reflect upon his or her own perspective, they are unable to reflect upon how these perspectives are influenced by their relationship to the surrounding environment or culture. A socializing knower depends on others for approval and acceptance and is unable to reflect upon this relationship because his or her reality is co-constructed from the other (Drago-Severson, 2004b). Therefore, they rely on external authority for answers and are unlikely to exercise his or her own internal authority and own their way of working.

Institutional/Self-authoring. The self-authoring knower is now able to author his or her own perspectives and take ownership over his or her own internal authority (Drago-Severson, 2004b). They are able to examine competing values and contradictory perspectives and then evaluate them based upon their own standards of judgment. The distinction between self-authoring and socializing stages is that the individual is able to “make up their own system of beliefs rather than being made up by someone or something outside themselves” (Drago-Severson, 2004a, p. 27). They can now reflect upon the interpersonal context and maintain their authorship across various contexts establishing an identity. The limitation of this way of knowing is that the autonomous self is embedded in or subject to its own beliefs, principles, and assertions (Kegan, 1994). With the autonomous self constituting the whole self there is no space for new selves to emerge or identity to transform. This is often the root of conflict in leadership as the ideology of two or more autonomous selves disagree and are unable to transform (Kegan, 1994).

Inter-Individual/Self-transforming. Researchers estimate that this stage includes a small amount of the adult population (Kegan, 1994). In fact, several of the studies reviewed were not even able to sample individuals who are at this stage on the Subject-Object Interview. Individuals at the fifth order have authored their own identity but can now see the limitations of this identity (Kegan, 1994). They are able to revise and transform their experience to include multiple perspectives. Their self-authored identity is no longer the whole but a part of the self (Kegan, 1994). The identity is something they have rather than what they are and space to hold other identities has been created. This person is able to find common ground in what might appear to others to be

competing or contradictory perspectives. They are able to recognize the larger communities that are impacted by a perspective.

Kegan's Orders of Consciousness and Developmental Movement

McCauley, et al., (2006) reviewed literature associated with Kegan's theory and the study of leadership finding implications in three primary areas: leadership effectiveness (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Kuhnert, 1994; Van Velsor & Drath, 2004; Harris, 2005), evaluation of leaders (Drath, 2006; Roth, 1996), and leader development (Palus & Drath, 2005; Laske, 1999; Drath & Van Velsor, 2006). Kegan's work primarily focuses on developmental movement and the tensions between the demands placed on the individual by an increasingly more complex environment and the individual's capacity to make meaning in ways necessary to address the complexity. He goes on in his work to suggest that individuals create an "immunity to change" (Kegan & Lahey, 2009) that helps to reinforce familiar ways of making meaning of their experiences and challenges. Kegan suggests that creating a holding environment that both supports and challenges current forms of meaning-making is necessary for the development of one's stage of meaning-making. However, there is lack of research that examines the design of these types of holding environments and its impact on the individual's stage of development.

Torbert's Action Logics

Jane Loevinger (1966, 1976) worked to understand and measure a sequence of "inner logic" (1966, p. 204) for ego development where each stage builds upon and includes the previous stages. An individual's stage of ego development, or self-identity, creates a frame of reference for how to understand and make meaning of experience. Loevinger separated ego from other functions of growth such as intelligence and

psychosexual development and suggested that each ego stage results in “observable behaviors that tend to rise and then fall off in prominence as one ascends the scale of ego maturity” (Loevinger, 1966, p. 202). The ego development framework from Loevinger has been rigorously validated and extended over several decades making it one of the most significant constructs in developmental psychology.

The study of ego development relies on the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970), which was created to assess a participant’s stage of meaning-making. The WUSCT uses 36 sentence stems addressing self-perception, social situations, and interpersonal relationships (McCauley et al., 2006) and allow the participant to project their unconscious meaning-making on to an incomplete sentence. Validity results for the instrument were published (Loevinger, 1979) and showed trained raters had a median complete agreement 61% of the time and median agreement within a ½ stage 94% of the time. The results showed that the WUSCT is “adequately validated for research use, but is neither so valid nor so reliable that it can be used as a clinical instrument without confirming data” (Loevinger, 1979, p. 308). The WUCST is one of the most widely used and validated personality assessments in the field of developmental psychology (Cook-Greuter & Soulen, 2007). However, before Torbert and his colleagues it was rarely used in the study of leadership and organizations (McCauley et al., 2006).

When management sciences began to take an interest in constructive-development, Torbert refined Loevinger’s stages of ego development for application to organizational leadership. Torbert designed his own seven stages that were more applicable to leadership and the organizational context. Each stage is a form of “action

logic, that is, an overall strategy that thoroughly informs an individual's reasoning and behavior" (McCauley et al., 2006, p. 643). McCauley et al. (2006, p. 643) identifies four core propositions of Torbert's work:

1. An individual's order of development influences his or her approach to managerial tasks.
2. Leaders at later orders of development are more effective at leading transformative change.
3. Action-inquiry facilitates developmental movement.
4. Organization development can be understood from a constructive-developmental theory perspective.

Torbert worked with Suzanne Cook-Greuter to revise the WUSCT to reflect his stages of developmental action logics and to be more appropriate for a leadership and organizational context. Cook-Greuter in particular strengthened the definitions and assessment of the later and rarer stages of development that had been empirically linked to leadership effectiveness. The first revision of the WUSCT was called the Leadership Development Profile (LDP) and is commercially available through Harthill Consulting¹. Almost two decades later, Torbert and Cook-Greuter separated from the LDP and each created their own version of the instrument. Cook-Greuter created the Sentence Completion Test Integral - Maturity Assessment Profile (SCTi-MAP) and Torbert created the Global Leadership Profile (GLP). This study utilized the GLP instrument to assess each participant's meaning-making complexity or action logic (Torbert et al., 2004). Chapter three will review details about the GLP's validity and the rationale for selecting this instrument.

---

¹ Harthill Consulting Ltd. and LDP website <http://harthill.co.uk/the-LDF-profile/>

Action Logics

The focus of Torbert's work has been on the application of ego development in leadership and organizational studies. Therefore, he used the phrase "action logic" to align more with language of leadership practitioners and describe the internal developmental stage of meaning-making that drives their behavior. A total of nine action logics have been developed, but only seven are generally found in organizational leadership and assessed by the GLP. One of the two that was not expected to be part of the study is the earliest logic (Impulsive), which reflects a stage of meaning-making found in childhood. Children and adolescents at this stage are ruled by their impulses and characterized by language such as "mine" and "I want" (Cook-Grueter, 2005). The second action logic that was not expected to be part of the study is the latest action logic (Ironist), which is not generally present in the population and not assessed by the GLP. However, it is assessed by other ego development instruments and is characterized by the experience of being part of an "on-going humanity, embedded in the creative ground, fulfilling the destiny of evolution" (Cook-Greuter, 2005, p. 32). The Ironist deeply respects each individual as they are and does not need them to change because they are essential parts of an interconnected reality.

As individuals develop, they organize their experiences according to a particular logic that shapes their focus of attention and then broadens in subsequent stages (Cook-Grueter & Soulen, 2007; McCauley et al., 2006). Theoretically, all action logics are potentially available to us, although there is no guarantee that even mature adults will transition through all action logics. The earlier pre-conventional stage (Opportunist) represents less than 5% of organizational leaders. These individuals are characterized by

“mistrust, egocentrism, and manipulateness” and few remain in leadership and management roles for very long (Rooke & Torbert, 2005, p. 68). Most people (75-80%) will function at the conventional stages (Diplomat, Expert, and Achiever) and only 15-20% will function at the post-conventional action logics (Redefining, Transforming, and Alchemical). Table 3 provides a brief description of Torbert’s main action logics (Cook-Greuter, 2004; Cook-Greuter & Soulen, 2007).

Table 3

Brief overview of Torbert’s seven main action logics. Adapted from Cook-Greuter, 2004

<i>Stage/Action Logic</i>	<i>Main Focus</i>	<i>Percentage of adult population (n=4,510)</i>
Alchemist – deep processes and intersystemic evolution rule principles	Interplay of awareness, thought, action, and effects; transforming self and others	2.0
Strategist (Transforming) – most valuable principles rule relativism	Linking theory and principles with practice, dynamic systems interactions	4.9
Individualist (Redefining) – relativism rules single system logic	Self in relationship to system; interaction with system	11.3
Achiever – system effectiveness rule craft logic	Delivery of results, effectiveness, goals, success within system	29.7
Expert – craft logic rules norms	Expertise, procedure and efficiency	36.5
Diplomat – norms rule needs	Socially expected behavior, approval	11.3
Opportunist – needs rule impulses	Own immediate needs, opportunities, self-protection	4.3

Conventional Action Logics. Individuals begin to enter the conventional stages after age 12 and approximately 80% will remain in these stages of action logic. Conventional stages are characterized by clearly defined objectives and boundaries, linear causality, and variables that are treated as independent (Cook-Greuter, 2005).

Western and democratic society generally supports and rewards the achievement of these stages as they advance rational and deliberative thoughts and actions that protect the whole. However, these stages do not provide individuals the capacity to question the underlying assumptions about current knowledge and systems, which is a capacity that is necessary for personal and organizational transformation.

Following the pre-conventional Opportunist, the *Diplomat* seeks to observe rules and avoid conflict by suppressing their own desires. They act as the social glue within groups and teams and give attention towards the needs of others. This comes out of recognition that others have their own perspective, which is a stark contrast to the opportunist's self-orientation. Rooke and Torbert (2005) suggests that Diplomats make up most of the junior management in organization and can actually become problematic when placed in senior leadership positions. The tendency to avoid conflict and be overly polite presents a challenge for giving difficult feedback and initiating change due to the inevitable conflict.

The *Expert* action logic is the first stage in which the individual is able to reflect upon the self. As a result, they are able to differentiate from their immediate relationships and express the needs and wants that were previously suppressed. They can start to see alternatives and are interested in problem solving as well as being recognized for their solutions. They make great individual contributors but are difficult managers because they are so certain in their beliefs and are only receptive to feedback from knowledgeable authorities. Although experts can see multiple possibilities and alternative solutions, they do not yet know how to prioritize among their options and synthesize multiple possibilities (Cook-Greuter, 2005).

The third and final conventional action logic is the *Achiever* who represents the ideal target of a democratic Western culture that is rational, competent, and independent (Cook-Greuter, 2005). They can belong to diverse groups and manage multiple agendas without being paralyzed by competing priorities and loyalties. Achievers are focused on goals and actions and are well suited for management roles. They are also able to be curious and self-reflective about themselves and others in a way that invites feedback because they see themselves in a process of continually growing. Although Achievers are able to manage more complexity than the previous action logics, they are still unable to question the underlying assumptions of the system they work within (Torbert, 2004).

Post-conventional Action Logics. Individuals who develop post-conventional action logics are able to notice how they have a role in constructing their own reality and that different individuals will experience reality in a way that is consistent with how they make meaning of their experiences. At these stages, variables are seen as interdependent, causality is cyclical, and boundaries are open and flexible (Cook-Greuter, 2005). They are able to take a systems view because they can take as object of reflection systems of thought and organization. Unlike the conventional action logics, post-conventional action logics bring into question underlying assumptions and frameworks and can therefore be influenced (Torbert, 2004).

Also known as the Individualist, the *Redefining* action logic is a “bridge between two worlds” (Torbert, 2004, p. 102) where the individual engages in a developmental journey that reevaluates the prior action logics. Individuals realize that reality is not necessarily what it was perceived to be at earlier stages because the observer constructed the interpretation. They are capable of taking up a 4th person perspective that stands

outside of the system and recognizes that things are rarely as they seem (Cook-Greuter, 2005). They begin to see paradoxes where before contradictions once existed and are no longer compelled to explain them away. The Redefining action logic distrusts some logical and conventional forms of knowing and begins to favor more holistic approaches where feelings and contexts are considered. Unlike the Achiever action logic, the process is just as interesting as the outcome for individualists. This is informed by their new ability to be critical of their values, beliefs, and assumptions in order to generate creativity and development.

The Strategist or *Transforming* action logic does not just communicate with the prior action logics (like Individualists) but is capable of creating a shared vision across different action logics (Torbert, 2004). As a result, they manage conflict more comfortably and can handle others' instinctive resistance to change (Rooke & Torbert, 2005). Unlike the individualist who journeys through previous action logics, the strategist knows who they are and is capable of owning and integrating the disparate aspects of their identity (Cook-Greuter, 2005). The strategist is an effective transformational change agent that is committed to the development of both themselves and others (Cook-Greuter, 2005; Torbert, 2004).

The Alchemist or *Alchemical* action logic is the final post-conventional action logic in this review. The individual at this action logic has the capacity to renew or reinvent themselves in significant ways. This ability allows them to develop novel forms of work where they “take on the roles of catalysts or transformers, but readily leave when they feel their transformational work is done” (Cook-Greuter, 2005, p. 31). The Alchemist is able to access their own ways of meaning-making so that they can tailor

their interventions toward the recipient. This capacity lends itself well towards consultants, counselors, and mentor. These are individuals who often work with others to help them “reframe their experience, tell new stories, gain courage and experiment with the boundaries of their current way of meaning-making” (Cook-Greuter, 2005, p. 31).

Action Inquiry

Torbert (2004) described the behavior of action inquiry as attending to the dual task of bringing into awareness both what is to be accomplished and the manner in which it is accomplished. Awareness of how a task is accomplished involves noticing and inquiring about our intentions, strategies, actions and outcomes as we exercise leadership in the moment and over the long term. In order to accomplish this Torbert suggested that a shift in awareness is needed and that we must access this awareness in a timely manner. Action inquiry is an essential practice for helping individuals notice and understand the limits of their meaning-making structure or action logic (McCauley et al., 2006).

Torbert borrows from systems theory to discuss three types of feedback that an individual, group, or organization can potentially receive about four territories of experience in order to promote increasing levels of awareness. Single-loop feedback identifies our behaviors and action. Double-loop feedback prompts us to examine and possibly transform our basic structure, strategy, and goals. This is a much more difficult level of feedback to accept because it questions the individual's, group's, or organization's identity. Triple-loop feedback incorporates all four territories of experience including the outside world, our actions, our strategies, and our attention. Promoting development entails learning to include more territories of experience in order

to “become more aware of, and less constrained by, your own implicit and often untested assumptions about situations you find yourself in” (Torbert, 2004, p. 21).

Torbert suggested that the starting place for becoming more aware of these territories of experience is to begin with how we talk to one another. “Speaking is the primary and most influential medium of action in the human universe” (Torbert, 2004, p. 27). He presents four interweaving parts of speech that include framing, advocating, illustrating, and inquiring. Due to our limited attention of the four territories, and that we are primarily focused on the words being spoken, we are not fully aware of how much we are influenced by the dynamics of conversational action.

Framing. When we state the purpose for the present conversation or meeting we are engaged in framing. We intentionally put our perspective as well as the perspective of others on the table for examination. This explicit framing is essential because we often converse with the assumption of a shared frame.

Advocating. When we assert an option, perception, feeling, or strategy in relatively abstract terms we engage in advocacy. Individuals often engage in this form a speaking a lot or very little. They engage in advocacy at one of the extreme ends and often become more ineffective as a result. Advocacy that is timely and expresses a feeling that we are experiencing in the moment is very difficult because we are often reluctant to feel vulnerable. There are also social norms that can make certain feelings seem undiscussable. As a result, feelings are not expressed until they have become so strong that they are offered in a way that is less effective and invite defensiveness from others. If we can learn to be vulnerable in a timely manner, then we are more likely to invite honest conversation.

Illustrating. When we follow up advocacy by providing a concrete story or instructions in order to orient and motivate others we engage in an illustration. Advocacy without illustration does not provide a clear direction or strategy and is more likely to be heard as criticism or create an inappropriate response.

Inquiring (and listening). When we question others and listen deeply to their response in order to learn something we engage in inquiring speech. Torbert suggests that true inquiry is difficult to do because of our inclination to inquire rhetorically and because we do not give others the opportunity to respond or do not appear to really want the true answer. When we inquire the goals should be to encourage others to disconfirm our assumptions. Torbert also believes the inquiry is less likely to be effective if it is not preceded by the other three parts of speaking – framing, advocacy, illustration. This is because only using inquiry may result in wondering about the implied framing, advocacy, and illustration and they may respond carefully or in a way that is withholding.

Torbert believes that the four parts of speaking must be weaved together sequentially if we desire to increase the potential for shared purpose. However, doing this in the moment during intensive exchanges can be very difficult and requires the capacity to access the four territories of experience. Attention to these territories helps to determine what forms of framing, advocating, illustrating, and inquiring invites the widest possible understanding and coordinated action. This is where Torbert's developmental action logic has benefit. As our action logics develop we create the capacity to embrace truth based on mutuality. Transforming our action logic allows for greater capacity and desires to seek the truth about others and how they are experiencing a situation.

Torbert's Action Logics and Developmental Movement

The application of Torbert's action logic framework has been in the areas of managerial behavior and organizational change. McCauley, et al., (2006) reviewed literature associated with Torbert's theory and the study of leadership finding implications in three primary areas: approach to leadership and managerial tasks (Fisher & Torbert, 1991; Merron, Fisher & Torbert, 1987; Weathersby, 1993), leading change (Fisher & Tobert, 1991; Rooke & Torbert, 1998; Torbert, 2004), and developmental movement (Rooke & Torbert, 2005; Tobert & Associates, 2004). Studies have suggested that there is a relationship between developmental level and managerial behavior (Torbert, 1987; Tobert & Fischer, 1992). Individuals at the conventional action logics tend to rely more on external authority whereas post-conventional action-logics rely more on their own judgment and authority (McCauley et al., 2006). Individuals at the Strategist and Alchemist action-logic are more likely to lead transformational change in the organization due to their capacity for rethinking assumptions and purposes while also engaging in a form of mutual exploration among organizational stakeholders (Rooke & Torbert, 2005).

The literature explores experiences that promote developmental movement from one action logic to another. Rooke and Torbert (2005) suggest several external experiences that trigger and support development including: a promotion or new role that allows for the expansion of responsibilities, changes to work practices and environment, as well as planned and structured developmental opportunities. These external experiences support the idea that development occurs in response to limitations of our

current meaning-making structures and when the environment requires a more complex way of understanding our work and ourselves.

Conclusion

The literature highlighted current perspectives on competencies and development in student affairs and student conduct administration. It suggested that theory related to constructive-development can further inform this literature and its emphasis on counseling, human relations, and student learning and development. It also considers that higher education is an environment that is rapidly changing and leaders benefit from the development of broader perspectives to help navigate an increasing level of complexity. Experiences and interventions that are designed to promote developmental movement of one's meaning-making capacity would add an important dimension to professional development in student affairs. This study is designed to understand how conduct officers at various levels of constructive-development perceive their work and promote their own development. The results will support educators, trainers, and mentors in designing developmental experiences that invite student conduct administrators into their highest level of meaning-making which may improve the way they approach their responsibilities for their institutions and for their students.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This study examines how student conduct officers develop the capacity for navigating and engaging with the complexities of the current environment surrounding student conduct administration (SCA). It investigates how a conduct officer's stage of constructive development shapes the way they make meaning of the forces impacting their work. Finally, it identifies the ways that conduct administrators promote their own meaning-making development in order to be more effective. The three research questions used in this study are:

1. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of their professional experiences as a student conduct officer?
2. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of the strategies and practices they utilize in order to promote their own development as a student conduct officer?
3. What (if any) relationship exists between the student conduct administrators' meaning making and their assessed stage of constructive development?

Two qualitative techniques, narrative inquiry and visual inquiry, are used to understand how participants make meaning of their experience as a student conduct officer. Through an analysis of narrative data was analyzed for meaning-making themes and characteristics and the researcher estimated each participant's primary action logic. Additionally, participants completed the Global Leadership Profile (GLP) to provide a second assessment of their primary action logic. This approach will be discussed in more detail in the following sections. The subsequent sections include a review of the

assumptions underlying the methodology, a description of the data collected and procedures for analysis, and a discussion of the steps that were taken to ensure researcher rigor and trustworthiness.

Methodological Assumptions

Methodology generally involves two broad research paradigms – positivist and naturalistic – that hold very different approaches and assumptions. This study utilized a more naturalistic or qualitative approach that stems from a phenomenological perspective and focuses on the meaning that participants ascribe to their experiences. A qualitative approach to this study's research questions were appropriate because it investigated the experiences of SCAs and how they make meaning of these experiences in order to navigate their environment. The primary goal of the research involved accessing the experiences of participants and how he or she creates meaning and responds to their current reality. Patton (1991) states that a goal of qualitative research is to “describe and analyze the activities and reasoning persons use as they engage in organized social interaction” (p. 391).

This study sought to unearth *how* participants make meaning of what they know and experience instead of merely understanding *what* participants know and experience. In order to understand how one makes meaning, an approach that values and emphasizes the structure of the conduct officer's story in order to surface the complexities of their identity is required. As a result, narrative inquiry and visual inquiry were selected to help illuminate stories of how conduct officers navigate and develop in their current environment.

Narrative Inquiry

Stories or narratives have a long history both in and out of the research process and are used in every culture around the world. The earliest forms of story were oral and combined with gestures and expression. Stories also utilized forms of art such as painting, dance, and music to illustrate and help the storyteller remember the narrative so that it could be shared and passed down through family and community. Storytelling remains a dominant form of learning and communication today, especially in cultures with a low literacy rate. Stories represent how we make sense of the world and allow us to structure our experience in a narrative form. The methods of narrative inquiry in this study use stories as the focus for understanding how conduct officers make meaning of their experiences.

Narrative inquiry is a form of “retrospective meaning-making” (Chase, 2005, p. 651) influenced by several disciplines including education, psychology, anthropology, and philosophy (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), in order to understand an experience from the perspective of the participant. It holds as the focus of its analysis the story, and investigates how participants’ impose a structure and sequence on the story and ultimately make meaning of their actions and experiences. In other words, narrative inquiry asks, “why was the story told that way?” (Riessman, 1993, p. 2). In narrative inquiry the researcher uses both the content of the participant’s story as well as how it is organized in order to better understand the participant’s meaning-making (Reason, 2003).

Narrative inquiry is essentially the study of stories told by participants. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) believe that “humans are storytelling organisms, which individually and socially lead storied lives. The study of narrative, therefore, is the study of the ways

humans experience the world” (p. 2). Eliciting stories from participants helps to understand the latent “why” behind their actions and assertions. Denzin (1999) suggests that storytelling allows individuals to express the meaning in their lives and that these meanings act as "windows into the inner life of the person" (p. 14). In this study, the need to surface data that illuminates the ways in which participants make meaning of their experiences as a SCA and their decisions about how to promote their own growth and development in their work fit well with narrative inquiry.

Visual Narrative Inquiry

Visual narrative inquiry is a form of narrative inquiry that allows another layer of meaning to emerge in the stories told by participants. One of the ways in which people tell stories is through photographs. Current trends in social technology (Youtube.com, Instagram, Flickr, etc.) have made visual storytelling a more common method for communities around the world to share their experience. Access to visual representations of story are made frequently and immediately through the use of smartphones. As we take and share photographs the stories that accompany them are told allowing the patterns, themes, and differences, across stories of experience to be identified (Bach, 2007). Therefore, visual narrative inquiry is “an intentional, reflective, active human process in which researchers and participants explore and make-meaning of experience both visually and narratively” (Bach, 2007, p. 281).

In visual narrative inquiry, photographs are used to stimulate a quality of memory and richness of description and story that word-based interviewing does not (Harper, 2005). For many people, the practice of looking, observing, and picturing is a familiar and powerful way of making meaning of the world. Viewing and contemplating

photographs invokes emotions, memories, and stories about experience. Data collection that involved both visual images and the narrative surrounding those images from the perspective of the participant helped to surface additional understanding of participant meaning making, and their decisions around their development.

Global Leadership Profile

In order to understand the relationship, if any, between how student conduct officers make meaning of their experiences and their stage of constructive development, an adult development assessment of each participant was employed. There are five primary instruments – Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970), Subject-Object Interview (SOI) (Lahey et al., 1988), Leadership Development Profil (LDP) (Cook-Greuter, 2006), the Leadership Maturity Assessment Instrument (SCTi-MAP) (Cook-Greuter, 2006), and the Global Leadership Profile (GLP) (Torbert, 2014) – to choose from in order to assess the stage of constructive- development for each participant. Several factors were weighed in choosing the GLP and primarily reflect considerations surrounding validity and pragmatism.

The Subject-Object Interview (SOI) was the first instrument to be ruled out. The SOI has pragmatic difficulties as it involves a one-hour interview and several more hours of analysis conducted by a trained evaluator (Lahey et. al, 1988). This makes the SOI difficult to administer and score at a reasonable price given the size of this study. However, an understanding of the theoretical and methodological constructs of the SOI can be beneficial to any researcher. As a result, prior to beginning data collection I

engaged in a self-training in the SOI using the evaluator's handbook (Lahey et. al, 1988) to help provide insight into participant narratives and open up areas of inquiry.

The WUSCT is one of the most well validated ego development tests. A scoring manual (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970) is available and permits persons to train themselves in the process of assessment. Validity results for the instrument were published (Loevinger, 1979) and showed trained raters had a median complete agreement 61% of the time and median agreement within a ½ stage 94% of the time. The results showed that the WUSCT is “adequately validated for research use, but is neither so valid nor so reliable that it can be used as a clinical instrument without confirming data” (Loevinger, 1979, p. 308). Unfortunately, the WUSCT is not pragmatic for two reasons. First, it uses sentence stems that are not related to the organizational and leadership context (e.g. When I was a child ____, My mother and I ____, I suffer ____) and as a result loses face validity to leaders seeking insight into their development (Torbert, 2014). Second, Cook-Greuter (1999) showed that it lacks a methodology for scoring the rarer later stages of meaning-making (Transforming and Alchemical) that have been empirically shown to contribute to more effective leadership.

The Leadership Development Profile (LDP) was the first instrument to focus more on leadership and the later stages of development. It is commercially available through Harthill Consulting. Although it has produced important findings for understanding the relationship between leadership and stages of adult development, it has lost its two principle researchers – Dr. Susanne Cook-Greuter and Dr. William Torbert – and consequently does not conduct current research on validity and reliability (Torbert,

2014). The absence of ongoing validity and reliability studies of the instrument is problematic for a longer research agenda beyond this single study.

After leaving the Harthill Consulting and the LDP, Cook-Greuter and Torbert went their own way and each adapted the LDP. Cook-Greuter created the SCTi-MAP Assessment (MAP) and Torbert created the Global Leadership Profile (GLP). Both instruments involve slight modifications to the LDP but are based on the same sentence completion structure that the original WUSCT used. The language used in the instruments is also aligned with an organizational and leadership context. A distinction between the two instruments is that the GLP uses the same scorers formerly used for the LDP and the same scoring manual from the WUSCT.

Either the SCTi-MAP or the GLP could be used for this study. The decision to use the GLP was made because it is more oriented towards practicing leaders and there are more recently published reliability and validity statistics for the GLP (Torbert, 2013, 2014). The GLP established reliability of scorers on 805 measures using 13 possible levels (action-logics) of development for each measure. Results showed “a .96 Pearson correlation between the two scorers, with perfect agreement in 72% of the cases, with a 1/3 action-logic disagreement in 22% of the cases” (Torbert, 2014, p. 7). An added feature of the GLP is that any disagreement between scorers results in a negotiation prior to supplying feedback to the client. The limitation of these validity statistics is that they have not been independently verified. This would be especially problematic if the GLP served as the only or primary rating instrument. However, the utility of the GLP in this study is that it helps to triangulate participant data in order to facilitate inquiry and construct propositions about how SCAs make meaning of their experiences. It is not

used to replace or even confirm my own assessment. When considering the GLP's validity results and the validity and reliability results of previous instruments that the GLP is built upon, I felt confident in using the GLP for the purposes of triangulation and deeper inquiry.

Participant Selection

There were nine SCAs with five or more years of experience who participated in this study. The study utilized a purposeful sampling strategy in order to select information rich cases. The study sought to sample participants with different ages, years of experience, public and private university affiliation, and gender (see Table 4). There was a concentration of participant ratings at the Achiever and Redefining action logics in this study. This concentration of action logics informed some of the implications of the study, and, while recognizing the limits of generalizing from this study, the concentration of Achiever and Redefining action logics suggests some important considerations for the current state of the field of SCA. Ultimately, a purposeful strategy helped generate results that answered the research questions.

Participants needed to be willing to volunteer at least five hours of time to the study and complete the GLP. The request to participate in this study included information about participating in two 90-minute interviews that were scheduled approximately 2-3 weeks apart. In between interviews, participants completed a photography exercise necessary for the second interview and completed the GLP instrument. As a benefit of participating, participants received their results from the GLP. Additionally, the study provided them with information to help them interpret their assessment including a copy of the book "Action Inquiry: The secret of timely and

transforming leadership” by Torbert & Associates (2004). The instrument results and text represent a \$200 value.

Table 4 identifies the nine participants in the study and the demographic data that was collected. Since position levels and structures can vary among institutions, the position level column was broken down into three options. Mid-level positions included individuals whose primary responsibility was for SCA and had titles such as Assistant Director or Coordinator where they reported to another position that had primary responsibilities for oversight of SCA. Chief Officer referred to individuals whose primary responsibility was SCA and they represented the senior SCA in an office or department with the title of Director. Chief Officer/Dean of Students referred to individuals who had responsibility for the oversight over multiple functional areas (i.e. residential life, student services, academic services) including SCA.

Table 4 also includes two action logic ratings for each participant. The first rating is my own (the researcher’s) assessment of the participants’ estimated action logic based on the data collected. The second rating is the participant’s result from taking the Global Leadership Profile. The analysis that occurs in the subsequent chapters is based on the researcher’s estimated action logic and the GLP rating is used in the final chapter to help generate inquiry and suggest propositions about SCA meaning-making and development.

Each of the participants shared with me, in their own way, both their passion and challenges working in student conduct administration. In some instances, the estimated action logic I made was different than the action logic assessed by the GLP. estimated action logic I made is based on analysis of the data and was reached through a process of coding for action logic expression that is discussed in more detail in the section of this

chapter on data analysis. The participant's GLP results were not accessed until after each participant's analysis of narrative was created in order to not bias the study. Table 4 shows that both the researcher's estimate and the GLP assessed this sample of participants as concentrated at the Achiever and Redefining stages. However, analysis in later chapters will show that participants often expressed a range of action logics that are both more and less complex than the assessed action logic. The implications of this range of action logics for field of SCA will be discussed in chapter eight.

Table 4

Participant demographics and results for researcher estimated action logic and global leadership profile

Name	Carnegie	Position Level	Gender	Est. Action Logic	GLP Rating
Joy	4-year, public	Chief Officer	Female	Expert	Redefining
Thomas	4-year, public	Chief Officer	Male	Achiever	Achiever
Nicole	4-year, public	Mid-level	Female	Achiever	Achiever
Tess	4-year, public	Mid-level	Female	Achiever (late)	Redefining
Mark	4-year, private, not-for-profit	Mid-level	Male	Redefining (early)	Redefining
Alex	4-year, public	Mid-level	Male	Redefining	Achiever
Paul	2-year, public	Chief Officer/ Dean of Students	Male	Redefining	Redefining
John	4-year, private, not-for-profit	Chief Officer	Male	Redefining (late)	Achiever
Carl	4-year, private, not-for-profit	Chief Officer/ Dean of Students	Male	Transforming (early)	Achiever

Data Collection

In order to answer the research questions, different data collection and analysis processes were used. Table 5 outlines how the data collection and analysis procedures answered the study's research questions.

Table 5

Information collected and sources of data

Research Question	Information Collected	Data Collection Method	Data Analysis Method
1. How do SCAs make meaning of their professional experiences as a SCO?	Narratives and photographs of 9 SCA experiences as a SCO including their career path, significant experiences, and career trajectory.	Document analysis of website, policies, and procedures publicly available One 90minute interview that is semi-structured, conversational, and narrative based	<i>Stage 1:</i> Repeated listening to interview audio recording and reading interview transcripts to synthesize structure of SCA meaning making. Use of photographs to provide context, frame, and illustrate SCA meaning-making Constructing a narrative analysis and analysis of narrative for each participant utilizing a thick description. External audit of narrative data and researcher's estimate of participant action logic.
2. How do SCAs make meaning of the strategies and practices they utilize in order to promote their own development as a SCO?	Narratives and photographs of 9 SCA that elicit strategies and practices for professional development as well as meaning making about knowledge/ skills necessary for SCO	One 90minute visual narrative interview using photographs taken by participant	
3. What (if any) relationship exists between SCAs' meaning making and their assessed stage of constructive development?	Narratives and photographs of 9 SCA. Assessment of participant stage of development	Participant narrative and photographs from two 90minutes interviews Researcher estimate of participant action logic The GLP instrument	<i>Stage 2:</i> Use of researcher's estimated action logic, GLP ratings, and external audit to identify the relationship between participant action logic, meaning-making themes, and literature.

Document Analysis

The study also utilized document analysis of the content of each participant's student conduct website and any related policies and procedures. These public documents were helpful to the investigation of the research questions because they represent a thoughtful articulation of the basic hearing procedure that conduct officers are required to provide their students. Documents were reviewed prior to the first scheduled interview in order to provide maximum insight into the organizational expectations placed upon the work of conduct officers. These documents allowed me to probe during the interviews how each participant makes meaning of their experience in relationship to these policies and procedures.

Narrative Interview

The data collection process began with a 90 minute semi-structured and conversational interview designed to elicit participant stories about their experiences as a SCA. The less structured interview format (Appendix A) provided greater control to participants and allowed me to ask several probing questions. Interviews that utilize a narrative inquiry approach seek to draw out stories from participants. Stories are significant because they are thematically organized around a central plot that conveys meaning to others. Polkinghorne (1995) illustrates this through the example of the story "The king died; the prince cried" (p. 7). When broken into two parts the statements describe an event. However, if understood as a narrative story with a relationship and context, these two sentences describe a son's response to the loss of his father. As a result, the story conveys emotion and evokes empathy.

One purpose of this first round of interviews was to draw out and collect varied stories that explained participant experiences. Polkinghorne (1995) suggested that an extensive collection of stories helps create new insights:

The more varied and extensive one's collection of storied explanatory descriptions of previous actions, the more likely that one can draw on a similar remembered episode for an initial understanding of the new situation and the more likely that one will appreciate and search for the elements that make the new different from the recalled instance. (p. 11)

The interview protocol outlined several broad questions that were aimed at collecting stories related to research questions one and two. Despite these prepared questions, a narrative interview is paradoxical in that I was both prepared to ask good questions that invite the participants' stories but also recognized that the idea of "a particular story is that it cannot be known, predicted, or prepared for in advance" (Chase, 2005, p. 662).

Interviews for six of the participants were in person and at a place and time of the participant's choosing. I was unable to complete in person interviews with three participants (John, Mark, and Nicole). Therefore, a Skype virtual call was completed so that face-to-face communication would still occur. At the conclusion of the first interview participants were provided instructions for completing both the photography exercise and the GLP. They were instructed to complete both prior to the second interview, which was scheduled to take place 2-3 weeks later. Interviews were digitally recorded and labeled with pseudonyms in order to maintain the anonymity of the participant.

Visual Narrative Interview

At the conclusion of the first interview participants were provided a photography exercise guide (Appendix B) designed to assist them in taking photographs; the subjects

themselves could be literal, symbolic, or a combination of their choosing. Ideally this photography exercise guide and discussion will help participants be creative as well as minimize feelings of nervousness regarding their creative abilities. The photography exercise guide requested that participants take a minimum number of photos that relate to types of experience. The photography exercise guide mirrored questions asked in the first interview and sought to elicit stories about experiences in SCA of success and delight, being conflicted or torn, and making a stand for something important.

The second interview used the same face-to-face or virtual communication as the first interview. Participants were invited to speak about the photographs of their choosing in order to allow flexibility for the narrative of the participant's choosing to emerge. The aim was to utilize the photographs as a way of promoting thicker and richer descriptions to illustrate the way they make meaning of their experiences and the strategies and practices they use to promote their own development. Essentially, the photograph became a vehicle through which stories could be shared. The hope was that the photographs provided a reference point for initiating conversation, restoring memory, and allowing a level of spontaneity that decreased anxiety in the interview process (Jacobson, 2013). I encouraged participants to share freely about each photograph. The second interview utilized an interview guide (Appendix C) in order to ensure that the same general questions were asked about each photograph.

As with the first interview, the second interview was digitally recorded and pseudonyms used in order to maintain the anonymity of the participant. Transcriptions were shared with each participant as an opportunity to review and provide feedback in order to establish descriptive validity of the second interview.

Global Leadership Profile

At the conclusion of the first interview participants were provided instructions for completing and submitting the GLP, which uses a projective technique and consists of 30 incomplete sentence stems that the participant completes. A sentence completion technique is often used to understand the unconscious operations of the ego that help to organize our thoughts and make sense out of them and the world around us. Examples of these sentence stems include “When I am criticized...”, “My time...”, “A good leader...”, and “Rules are...”. The completed sentence stems are used to determine the participant’s stage of constructive development or what Torbert (2004) refers to as one’s action-logic. This action-logic is identified by the GLP as one’s most available and consistent way of making meaning of experience.

To score the GLP, completed instruments were submitted directly to Dr. Bill Torbert through his organization, Action-Inquiry Associates. By utilizing a memorandum of understanding (Appendix D), Dr. Torbert’s organization analyzed the completed instruments and shared them with two trained raters in order to ensure inter-rater reliability. I did not review the scored instrument until all analysis steps in stage one were complete. This guarded against the imposition of bias and provided me with a “veil of ignorance” (Rawls, 1999, p. 11). Once stage one of the data analysis was completed, I accessed the scored GLP instruments.

The utility of the GLP was not to confirm my estimate of the participant’s action logic. Rather, the GLP instrument served as one way to triangulate participant data as well as facilitate inquiry and construct propositions about how SCAs make meaning of their experiences. The GLP also represents a tangible benefit to participants for

participation in the study. Each participant was provided with his or her GLP results and information from Action-Inquiry Associates about the development of their primary action logic. The study also provided each participant with a copy of the text “*Action Inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership*” (Torbert et. al, 2004) in order to facilitate the participant’s understanding of their results.

Data Analysis

Referring to Table 4 and the more detailed description in Figure 1, data analysis procedures included three stages that will explained in detail in this section. In the first stage I analyzed data from the two interviews including the photographs. Analysis in stage one involved constructing a narrative analysis and analysis of narrative for each participant. Stage one concluded with hypothesizing the participants’ estimated action logic and writing a rationale. The second stage involved testing the trustworthiness of the analyses and action logic I had hypothesized. Trustworthiness was established in three ways including member checking, accessing the participant’s GLP results, and an external audit of the data that will be discussed later in this section. The purpose of these strategies was to triangulate that data in order to facilitate inquiry and construct propositions about how SCAs make meaning of their experiences. The third stage used a cross-case analysis to synthesize the data by examining the developmental action logic expressed by participants for specific overarching themes from participant interviews, literature on student affairs and student conduct developmental competencies, and literature on constructive-developmental theory. Each of these stages is discussed in more depth in the remainder of chapter three.

Figure 1. Data analysis procedure

Stage One: Analysis of Individual Participant Data

Using narrative inquiry, the first objective is for the researcher to become deeply familiar with each participant's story. Chase (2005) suggests that "rather than locating distinct themes *across* interviews, narrative researchers listen first to the voice *within* each narrative" (p. 663). This was a particularly important step for this research because it sought to understand the deeper structures of meaning-making represented by the data provided by each participant. Therefore, time was spent reviewing documents, listening to each recorded interview, reading transcriptions, and examining photographs prior to constructing participant narratives. Memo writing during this stage helped capture initial ideas and themes.

For each participant a narrative analysis was written and is shared in chapter four. In doing this, I set aside as much as possible any desire to formally analyze the

participants' story for developmental implications and tell their story as they would tell it by using the participants' own words and phrases. This approach honored the uniqueness and complexity of each participant's experience and provides the reader with an understanding of the context the participant lives and operates in.

Following the completion of each participants' narrative analysis, I conducted an analysis of narrative (Polkinghorne, 1995) using the interview data, participant photographs, and the narrative analysis. This involved two processes. First, I coded each transcript for themes and characteristics that might provide structure to the participants' meaning-making. Codes were collapsed into overarching themes in order to determine the meaning-making themes most dominant in each participant's narrative. These overarching themes were described in the analysis of narrative using participant quotes and photographs. This analysis of narrative became a first-level synthesis that was provided to the external auditors. The audit process is discussed later in chapter three but was a helpful step for ensuring trustworthiness and creating additional lines of inquiry into participant meaning-making. The audit process is discussed next in stage two of the data analysis. Second, I coded for expressions of Tobert's (2004) developmental action logics. Action logic codes were clustered in order to form my own hypothesis of each participant's action logic that is listed in Table 4.

Stage Two: Ensuring Trustworthiness

Although steps were taken throughout the data collection and analysis process to ensure trustworthiness and enhance the researcher rigor (i.e. memo writing and member transcript check), in stage two three methods of triangulation were used to deepen the analysis and support trustworthiness of the study. These triangulation methods were

added to the data analysis process in order to guard against potential bias. Ultimately, additional perspectives on the data analysis were helpful and a strategy to assist me in being critical. However, the triangulation methods did not replace my own analysis and when there was feedback that differed from my analysis they were attended to through further clarification, additional data to support a claim, or (and rarely) revised a claim to account for data that was not previously considered. The results of two of the three triangulation strategies (GLP Instrument and External Audit) are discussed in depth in chapter eight.

The first triangulation strategy involved sending each participant copy of their narrative analysis to review and offer feedback. The goal was to ensure their story was written in a way that was consistent with how they described themselves in the interview. Participants were asked to review the narrative analysis for factual accuracy and consistency with how they understand their own personal and professional experiences. Although I was unable to contact two participants (Mark and Paul) due to position changes, no other participant offered substantial changes to the narrative analysis. These analyses are shared in chapter four along with a rationale for the action logic estimate I hypothesized for each participant.

The second method of triangulation was designed to check the action logic estimate I made for each of the nine participants. This involved participant's completing the Global Leadership Profile (GLP), one of the prevailing instruments that assess individual action logics. Participants completed the GLP between the first and second interviews. Using a memorandum of understanding (see appendix) with Dr. William Torbert, the GLP was scored by trained raters at Action Inquiry Associates. I did not

review these results until after completing the analysis of narrative and making his own estimate of the participant's primary action logic. Determining my hypothesis of the participants' primary action logics before accessing the GLP results helped reduce any bias that might be introduced from the researcher knowing the GLP results. Any differences between my action logic estimate and the GLP's action logic are accounted for in chapter eight but the immediate utility of the GLP result was to help probe the data further and create propositions about the data.

The final method of ensuring trustworthiness was performing an external audit of the data and my analysis of individual participants. The audit procedure used in this research was adapted from Jones (2015) whose dissertation study of action logics in philanthropic leadership also used the GLP and qualitative interviews to determine a participant's stage of development. Four auditors from my doctoral program who possessed a strong understanding of adult development theory and have conducted research in the field were asked to review the two transcripts, narrative analysis, and analysis of narrative. Each auditor completed this process for two participants and were then asked to respond to four questions.

1. Does this description of the participant's background seem to be consistent with the story the participant tells about him/herself?
2. Do the meaning-making themes in research questions one and two reflect the participant's data? Are there dominant themes inadvertently missed that indicate something important about how the participant makes meaning of their experience or speaks to their developmental action logic?

3. Based on the data presented in the transcripts and the analysis of research questions one and two, does the overall action logic assessment seem accurate? If not, please identify why it is inaccurate and what other assessment should be considered. For example, were data available but not included, or, perhaps, was there not sufficient data available to make an assessment?

Although the results of the audit were not privileged over my own analysis of the data, it did serve as another perspective on the data and first-level analysis. Chapter eight includes a detailed accounting of the feedback from the auditors and how, if at all, the results were incorporated into my analysis. This step helped me remain aware of my own first-person meaning-making process and understand the degree to which personal biases and assumptions might be influencing the interpretation of the participants' meaning-making. Additionally, this step was helpful in opening new areas of inquiry in understanding the relationship between participant's narrative and assessed action logic. Two possible limitations to the external audit process are that 1) auditors were not asked to reflect and comment on my interpretation of the photographs, and 2) the external auditors in this study were all trained in the same doctoral program that I was. Similar training between the auditors and myself is significant because their training involves a more holistic and psychoanalytic lens to the study of leadership and organizations. It suggests a socialization or knowledge acquisition that may not allow a variety of perspectives or critique. Considering both the strengths and challenges of the audit process, the auditors' insights on the first-level analysis was an invaluable contribution to the findings of this study.

Stage Three: Analysis of Participant Expression of Multiple Action Logics

In order to make sense out of a complex set of qualitative and visual data, and ultimately address the study's research questions for this group of nine student conduct administrators, an analysis was employed and is presented in chapters 5-7. Each chapter examines the participant's action logic expression in three different domains. The domains were identified from both the research questions and the literature review presented in chapter two. Chapter five analyzes participant's action logic expression in their meaning-making of three overarching themes that correspond to the study's research questions 1) Philosophy or Approach to SCA, 2) Strategies and Practices for Learning, and 3) Current Focus for Learning and Development. Chapter six uses the literature reviewed in chapter two on professional growth and development in student affairs to analyze participant's action logic expression in their meaning-making of the 1) Skills, 2) Knowledge, and 3) Attributes or Disposition required for work in SCA. Chapter seven analyzes participant's action logic expression in their meaning-making of three dimensions of awareness including 1) Individual or Personal, 2) Interpersonal or Team, and 3) Organizational or Systemic. The analysis in these chapters provides representational data for the action logic estimate of each theme or dimension. They begin to illustrate a range of action logics that participants express and the relationship between their action logics and structure of meaning-making.

Researcher Rigor and Trustworthiness

In addition to some of the general threats to reliability and validity found in qualitative research, this study will take into consideration that I have my own assumptions and biases. During the time data was collected I had been a student conduct

administrator for over 10 years. As a former student conduct officer, there was likely data that aligned more or less with his professional philosophy and practice in regards to navigating the current environment and professional development. Despite this, I was careful to include relevant data described by participants with the understanding that their narrative enriches the data beyond my own experience and beyond the experience of any single participant.

To help counteract this bias I wrote reflective memos throughout the data collection and analysis stages. The memos sought to admit threats to reliability and validity and track assumptions and how they may influence the research. To assist with descriptive validity, the study included an opportunity for participants to review both their own transcriptions and the narrative analysis summary; this helped make the narrative as accurate as possible. I also completed an external audit by peer reviewers that understand the theoretical constructs of constructive development to help check coding and interpretations in both stages of the analysis process. The combination of member checking, peer review, and reflective memos combined to help create a strong level of trustworthiness in the results. Additionally, the use of thick and rich descriptions, multiple methods of data collection, and prolonged engagement increased the validity of the study.

Limitations

By construction, any methodological approach is partial and incomplete. A narrative inquiry approach to systematically studying SCA meaning making, combined with an assessment of each participant's stage of constructive-development is a valuable contribution to the literature but does not fully explain the experiences and decisions of

conduct officers. The intention of this study is not to generalize the findings to every SCA at every college or university. The study's methods required attention to the subtlety and latency as well as the structure and sequence of what was said and photographed. As a result, the approach of narrative inquiry is more slow and deliberate than other forms of qualitative research (Riessman, 1993). However, if the ultimate goal is generalization then it must begin with the study of individual story and meaning making and build towards an increased number of cases to show variation.

This study ultimately informs theory in student affairs practice and SCA as well as constructive-developmental theory that explores the intersections of leadership and human development. The findings can be translated into practice and integrated into the design of graduate preparation programs and professional education and training experiences for student conduct administrators. In addition to addressing the research questions, the purpose of this study is to create new knowledge that includes the dimension of meaning-making into the field of SCA and to understand how a focus on meaning-making can help to respond to the challenges of current and future professional environments in SCA. To this end, the study introduces implications for how concepts of meaning-making and constructive-developmental theory can help SCAs build upon their work with students and better support their institutions.

CHAPTER FOUR

PARTICIPANT NARRATIVES AND PRIMARY ACTION LOGIC ESTIMATE

The participant narratives are presented in chapter four. The introduction to each participant shares their personal and professional journeys in a way that is consistent with how they described themselves. The participant narrative concludes with a brief description of the estimated action logic I hypothesized for the participant and the range of action logics expressed in the data. Each narrative also includes a photograph taken by the participant but selected by me as being emblematic or representational of the participant's narrative and the estimated action logic that I identified.

As discussed in detail in chapter three, to address the research questions each participant completed two separate semi structured interviews, a photography exercise, and the Global Leadership Profile (GLP). I was able to estimate each participants developmental action logic from the interview and photography data as well as identify themes and characteristics of their meaning-making structure. The GLP provided a second estimate of each participant's action logic and is used to help generate insights into participant meaning-making. The GLP does not replace my own experience and analysis of the data but does serve as a way to help triangulate the data.

All of the participants were working full time in both mid-level and chief conduct officer roles at a variety of institutional types at the time of data collection. Participants who were identified as mid-level and chief student conduct officers had SCA as their primary responsibility. However, participants identified as deans of students (Paul and Carl) had responsibility overseeing multiple student affairs functional areas (i.e. residential life, student services, student leadership) including SCA.

Participant Introduction

The following section introduces the reader to the study's nine participants. Each narrative seeks to provide an account of the participant's personal and professional journey in a manner that is consistent with how it was shared during the interviews. It concludes with a brief description of the estimated action logic and indicates the range of action logics available to each participant. In addition to introducing the reader to each participant, the narratives function to highlight the various experiences and backgrounds that each participant holds and the uniqueness of their own journey. The action logic estimate that follows each narrative utilizes Torbert's (2004) seven action logic model presented in chapter two and briefly summarized in this chapter. Along with the action logic estimate I hypothesized for each participant, the primary themes and characteristics of their meaning-making structure are discussed and the GLP result is shared. This additional information functions to provide the reader with an understanding of the participant's foundational or most available action logic and meaning-making structure. This information sets up the analysis in chapters 5-7 that examines the possible range of action logics that participants express outside of their foundational action logic.

Table 4 from chapter three is displayed again to provide an overview of the demographics, the action logic estimate I identified, and the GLP rating. Although the narratives are arranged in an order based on the researcher's estimated action logic for each participant, this should not be confused with one necessarily being more or less "developed" in a hierarchical model. Rather, as an individual develops through Torbert's (2004) seven action logic model their awareness and focus is capable of addressing additional complexity. Furthermore, developmental meaning-making is complex, fluid,

and influenced by any number of variables both internal and external to the individual such as role, boundaries, task, and context. It is for this reason that analysis in later chapters recognizes the range of action logics available to each participant. The concept of a developmental action logic range refers to the participant's capacity to express action logics that are more and less complex than the estimated action logic I hypothesized. As the analysis to come in later chapters will show, operating from this range is not necessarily the result of developmental peaks and regression but can also be the result of seeking to be effective or functional.

Table 4

Participant demographics and results for researcher estimated action logic and global leadership profile

Name	Carnegie	Position Level	Gender	Est. Action Logic	GLP Rating
Joy	4-year, public	Chief Officer	Female	Expert	Redefining
Thomas	4-year, public	Chief Officer	Male	Achiever	Achiever
Nicole	4-year, public	Mid-level	Female	Achiever	Achiever
Tess	4-year, public	Mid-level	Female	Achiever (late)	Redefining
Mark	4-year, private, not-for-profit	Mid-level	Male	Redefining (early)	Redefining
Alex	4-year, public	Mid-level	Male	Redefining	Achiever
Paul	2-year, public	Chief Officer/ Dean of Students	Male	Redefining	Redefining
John	4-year, private, not-for-profit	Chief Officer	Male	Redefining (late)	Achiever
Carl	4-year, private, not-for-profit	Chief Officer/ Dean of Students	Male	Transforming (early)	Achiever

Defining Seven Action Logics

The brief definition of “action logic” used in this study is “an overall strategy that thoroughly informs an individual’s reasoning and behavior” (McCauley et al., 2006, p. 643) or how one might “interpret their surroundings” (Rooke and Torbert, 2005, p. 67). It is an internal logic, whereby, as individuals develop, they organize their experiences in a way that shapes their focus of attention and then broadens in subsequent stages to be able to take into consideration greater levels of complexity. The study uses Torbert’s (2004) seven action logic model to understand a participant’s stage of constructive-development. The model posits that the more complex (or later) action logics offer more choice for how an individual can deploy their attention, more flexibility in their decision-making, more methods for seeking feedback, and a broader range for how power can be exercised. Each participant’s foundational action logic was estimated before accessing the GLP ratings in order to avoid the imposition of bias. It is my own estimate of participant action logics that drive the analysis in chapter 5-7.

I used the Torbert’s (2004) seven action logics to assess each participant’s stage of constructive-development. These are the same seven action logics used in the GLP instrument. The characteristics, strengths, and limitations of each action logic is displayed in Table 5. During the analysis in chapters 4-7, when a participant or piece of data is labeled an action logic it is referring to one of the seven in this model. A more detailed review of each action logic can be found in chapter two.

Table 5

Characteristics, strengths, and limitations of Torbert's (2004) seven action logics.

Adapted from Cook-Greuter, 2004 and Rooke & Torbert, 2005

Action Logic	Characteristics	Strength	Limitation	Est. % in population
Alchemist – <i>deep processes and intersystemic evolution rule principles</i>	Generates social transformations. Interplay of awareness, thought, actions and effects. Transforming self.	Good at leading society wide transformations	Risk of scattering organizational efforts. Rarity	2.0
Strategist (Transforming) – <i>most valuable principles rule relativism</i>	Generates organizational and personal transformation. Exercises mutual inquiry and vulnerability for short and long term	Effective transformational leader, long-term perspective	Approach may be difficult to grasp or impractical	4.9
Individualist (Redefining) – <i>relativism rules single system logic</i>	Interweaves competing personal and organizational objectives	Creates unique solutions and structures to resolve gaps in performance	Paralysis, idealism, and lack of pragmatism at times. Conflict with prior ALs	11.3
Achiever – <i>system effectiveness rules craft logic</i>	Meets strategic goals, effective with teams, and juggles multiple duties and demands	Action and goal oriented, integration of issues and organizational objective	Difficulty questioning systems already in place	29.7
Expert – <i>craft logic rules norms</i>	Rules by logic, expertise, procedure, and efficiency	Individual contributor, development of knowledge	Limited vision and lack of collaboration	36.5
Diplomat – <i>norms rule needs</i>	Avoids overt conflict. Wants to belong. Socially expected behavior, approval	Supportive glue, brings people together	Superficial conformity, absence of critique	11.3
Opportunist – <i>needs rule impulses</i>	Win any way possible. Own immediate needs, self-protection, short time horizon	Good in emergencies and immediate opportunities	Pursuit of individual interests w/out regard for others	4.3

Participant Narratives

The structure of each participant's narrative is purposeful. The pseudonym was selected by the participants unless they declined to offer one, however; the phrase that follows the name was selected by me and the rationale is explained in the narrative. The narrative uses both participant quotes and paraphrased stories to represent the personal and professional journey of the participant. This might include the history of how they entered the profession, their philosophy or approach to SCA, and what they believe deeply informs or orients this approach to their work. The goal of this section was not to engage in interpretation of the participant's narrative but to highlight what the participant believed was important. To help ensure an accurate narrative, this first section of the narrative was shared with each participant and they were provided an opportunity to make any recommendations or clarifications. Additionally, the external auditing process discussed in chapter 3 reviewed the narrative and auditors were asked if the narrative was consistent with the data shared by the participant.

The second section of each participant's narrative is the "Action Logic Estimate." In this section I made an estimate of the participant's primary action logic. This estimate was determined by a process of coding for action logic expressions and then clustering to determine the primary action logic used by the participant. The section goes on to describe the evidence that supports this estimated action logic and the themes or characteristics that structure their meaning-making. A more detailed description of the action logic estimate I hypothesized for each participant is completed in chapters 5-7 and supportive data is provided. Finally, the GLP action logic rating is identified and I address any other action logics expressed in the participant's meaning-making.

Joy: I see you...

Joy's goal is to communicate to students "I see you, I see what you're trying to keep hidden, and I value that experience, and I want to help you." Joy believes that central to her work in student conduct is making students feel seen and to know that they are important even if they are one of many students that she sees. A first generation student, she finds comfort and passion working with underrepresented students in a position she has had in student conduct administration for the past nine years. Living in the same area of southern California for 46 years, Joy identifies her own experience with the experience of the students she serves. She said, "I've always felt quite comfortable there because of that. One, because I fit in, but also because I'm able to serve a population and help and advise and guide and mentor students who are like me."

Joy will admit that she is "a little bit far removed" from theory but uses the word "restorative" to describe her approach to student conduct. Her hope is for students to be comfortable moving on from an incident and to create an opportunity for restoration. She attributes some of her attraction to a restorative approach based on her own life experiences with managing blame. When it comes to experiences of blame and judgment she said, "that feeling that I've related to, over my lifetime, really drives me to make sure that other people aren't feeling that same way."

Joy began her career in residence life but transitioned to her current position focusing solely on student conduct nine years ago. She said,

I think it was just a natural progression of what I was doing with people I was working with. So when that position came open, I knew the skill set that that person had... I just ended up in that position. And have been here ever since.

Joy went on to describe the transition as the result of understanding that she already had a certain skill set and needed to place family as a priority rather than developing new skills.

She said,

I knew I was ready for a change in the position, but didn't necessarily know where I wanted to go. So I relied on the skill set that I already had, things that I already knew I needed to do. And then because during that time I had decided to make family my priority, I had put career development on the back burner.

She also reflected upon how the transition did not disrupt her current lifestyle that included raising two children and being a partial caretaker for her spouse. The position change made her feel good because it suggested that others saw a skill set in her. She said,

I didn't have a lot of self-confidence, to be honest, and I -- about going back into the job market and selling myself in any given field. So when this one came up, I just kind of measured yeah, this is something I've done before. I'm comfortable doing it. And they're offering it to me. And something about them seeing a skill set and drawing me to it was probably the most attractive part of it.

Joy now feels that she has been at a transition in her career for several years. She said, "Is this going to be the year that I attempt to leave the profession?" Each year she wonders about this question but has not found a way to make a change. She expressed an uncertainty about what other career options she would have and recently started exploring additional graduate education as a way to help create options for her.

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Joy's data is that she primarily operates from the Expert action logic. The Expert action logic is evident in her sense of knowing and how she replicates her own experiences in her work with her students and how she uses familiar craft resources for understanding and certainty. Her current aspirations for pursuing an academic certificate or doctoral program may stem from the Expert action logic in that it is influenced by her concern for developing her own knowledge ability to

improve her contributions to her organization. Joy described how she is beginning to understand and recognize the need for different skills and forms of knowledge in order to gain credibility in the work that is being required of her. She is seeking this credibility from authorities that can provide the knowledge and skills she is looking for.

Joy's data illustrated expressed other action logics besides Expert. The data includes evidence of "Redefining" and "Diplomat" expressions in her meaning-making. The Redefining action logic is present in her reflections that often represent an understanding of multiple perspectives, trusting her instincts and felt experience, as well as seeing the broader system and structure. To some extent her self-described paralysis can also be a function of the Redefining logic that is seeking to make meaning of the system's complexity. Additionally, the GLP instrument assessed Joy at the Redefining action logic. Joy also expresses the Diplomat action logic in her concern for maintaining harmony. This is most notable in her orientation towards relationships and expected norms. Joy can become paralyzed by competing perspectives and responds by conforming and suppressing her own needs in order to maintain a norm or remain comfortable – a characteristic often described as the action logic of a Diplomat.

Thomas: Learn My Craft

Thomas will be the first to recognize that he did not come to SCA in the typical manner and has spent years trying to do what he called, "learn my craft." He has come to appreciate the broad and varying skills and categories of knowledge that are necessary to be effective in SCA. He sees his role in SCA as the integration of many. As paraphrased from his own words, Thomas seeks to exercise the political acumen of a U.S. Senator, the

analytical skills of an attorney, the presence of a high school principle, the disposition of a counselor, and the wise perspective of a father figure.

Thomas believes it is important for people “to know that student conduct officers and student conduct directors come from very different backgrounds” and he is a prime example. Getting his start in sports administration, Thomas sought advice throughout his education from experts in the field who played a critical role in coaching his career and eventually encouraging him to go to law school. He said, “I struggled mightily my first year in law school... everybody there was going to be attorneys or going into law, and I was getting it for, really, the background and education.” Through an internship in a university athletic department he was introduced to the field of student conduct administration and a mentor encouraged him to apply for an Associate Director position in the student conduct office at a private religiously affiliated institution. He was eventually offered the position and said “they took a chance on me. I took a chance, too...I thought: I can try it. If I don't like it, I can always go back into athletics.” Looking back on his experience, he said, “it was a very roundabout way but it was meant to be, it ended up getting me to a spot I never thought I'd be in, but I'm glad that I got there.”

Thomas is very principled about what guides him in his work in student conduct. He speaks confidently and specifically about his belief in the values of fairness, education, and accountability in SCA. When he arrived at his current institution, where he serves as Director, he brought those values with him and incorporated them into the office's mission statement. He has allowed these values to guide his work and the offices growth over the past several years. He said, “it's just something in an ethos that I believe

in, and I think our office can really say what we believe in as well. 'Cause it's really what I think student conduct should be positioned as.”

Thomas reflected on several life experiences that have shaped who he is today and the values and principles that guide him. However, no one has been more impactful than the experiences he had with his father. He said,

He really believed in that idea of hey, okay, you made a mistake. Let's figure out how to move forward and let's not let that happen again. But we're going to talk about it... Tell me what happened, tell me what you were thinking about, what should you do differently in the future. So a lot of what I learned from my dad, and how he treated me, I use that.

The messages of his father show up in his work with students today when he says to them, “I want to hear your side of the story. Tell me what you think. I'm going to tell you directly what I think about it, and give you a straightforward sense, but I want to hear what you have to say.” Thomas’ father taught him a final lesson when he was diagnosed with cancer and passed away seven months later. Thomas said,

It changed me as a student conduct officer because I became much more compassionate and empathetic after helping somebody through the: basically, you know you're going to die in X number of months; how do we help get you there... I became much more -- I could feel it -- I became much more compassionate and understanding, and empathetic towards students, and, I think, a little softer in my approach... I don't have a formal training in counseling, like some of my colleagues do. But I've become much more in that way rather than just a general student conduct officer dealing with cases.

Thomas does view his role as having become more than what it may have once been.

The role has broadened and he sees himself as more capable of integrating the varying skills, knowledge, and attributes necessary for SCA into his current work.

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Thomas’ data is that he primarily operates from the Achiever action logic. The Achiever action logic is most notable through the ways in which he pursues both organizational and personal objectives in a

way that is guided by clear values, standards, and personal ethics. The ability to own and apply these personal ethics is a strength of the Achiever action logic but at times can feel constraining when there is conflict in the application of a value or personal ethic. The Achiever action logic allows Thomas to evaluate options for improvement and identify rational ways of creating change - a characteristic often described as the action logic of an Achiever. The GLP instrument also rated Thomas at the Achiever action logic.

Thomas' data also had evidence of the Expert action logic which is primarily used in how he approaches learning and development in his work. The Expert action logic keeps Thomas focused on learning that is context dependent or is practical for the current environment. Acting from within this Expert action logic, Thomas is supported in his ability to be a campus expert in SCA but the approach may limit his ability to develop new perspectives on old problems and unforeseen challenges. Furthermore, Thomas' Expert action logic uses craft expertise to promote the learning and development of his staff. This approach provides a mastery of knowledge to solve problems, but may be limited by its focus on stability and incremental change rather than transformational change capable of rethinking student conduct practice. Finally, Thomas' data suggested flashes of a Redefining action logic that is capable of seeing the organizational system and advocating across organizational boundaries to create change. Although Thomas may operate from a more Achiever action logic he presented signs of being able to gaze into a post-conventional Redefining action logic.

Nicole: Stop and Consider

Nicole describes herself as possessing a heightened sense of responsibility to others and it is a consistent theme in her work as a SCA. She said,

If I see a piece of trash on the ground, I feel compelled to pick it up. For the rest of the community; for the betterment. And when I make decisions, I think about the impact that it has on others.

She integrates this sense of responsibility into her student conduct practice and wants to help students understand “that we don’t live in a vacuum. That we need to consider others, in addition to ourselves, when we are making decisions and when we are living our lives.” As a result, Nicole seeks to provide students an opportunity to “stop and consider” what has happened and what they want to happen in the future. She gets excited thinking about non-traditional models of student conduct administration that focus more on student learning and less on adversarial processes. She hopes professionals in the field will “step out of that box and propose something different, that may be more time-consuming, that may be a little bit more messy, but that gets better results, and I think represents the values of the institution.”

Nicole characterized herself at the beginning of her career as the “typical future Student Affairs professional.” Highly involved in the co-curricular experience as an undergraduate student, Nicole remained at her institution after graduation for three years and worked in student affairs and residential life. In order to add theory to her practice she eventually went to graduate school and continued working in residential life. During this time Nicole developed a strong interest in student conduct administration saying, “I wasn’t your typical res lifer. I didn’t really enjoy doing door ‘decs’ [decorations] or programming. But I really enjoyed the interactions I had with students when I was meeting with them one-on-one.” About six months after completing her graduate degree she accepted a position as the only student conduct officer at a small private university.

She said, “It was my dream job at the time... I really got to dive in and learn a lot. So I think it’s always been my passion.”

About a year ago Nicole transitioned to a very prominent public institution. She started at a time in which the student conduct office was undergoing an audit by the Office of Civil Rights. She accepted the position believing the experience of an OCR audit would be valuable professional learning. However, she has found the personal experience of an audit to challenge her professional sustainability. Reflecting on the experience so far she said,

I think it's given me a little bit more confidence, moving it forward. If I were to go to a place, I can say yeah, I've been through that and I understand what goes into that. But at the same time, I'd be lying if there weren't days where I didn't come home and say "I don't think that I want to do this work anymore." Because of this scrutiny, and the judgments, and the criticism that happens with these types of things. Sometimes it just feels very gross to be the target of that.

Nicole has also struggled to find a professional fit with the organizational processes and culture at her current institution. She recently started questioning her abilities in student conduct and wonders if her current institution is really the best fit for her. She said,

Sometimes it feels a lot more adversarial. And just to give you an idea, the students call us the DA, and they are the public defenders. And so I'm not used to having that kind of a relationship with students.

Although deeply committed to the field of student conduct, Nicole is reflecting on the current sustainability of her work in the field. She asked herself, “is it something I can continue to do with the level of investment that I have in it? Is that going to be too exhausting for me, or is this really what I want to be doing?”

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Nicole is that she primarily operates from the Achiever action logic. The Achiever action logic is most notable through the ways in which she is focused on goals, setting personal standards, displaying confidence, and

remaining open to practical feedback and learning opportunities. Nicole's data also expresses Achiever characteristics such as being rational and objective in her work with students to examine their behavior and provide opportunities for learning and growth. Additionally, Nicole expressed the experience of being pressured – a characteristic typically ascribed to the Achiever action logic – and struggling to distinguish between the personal and professional dimensions of her life.

Nicole's data also expresses the Redefining action logic when it comes to her own development and inquiry into organizational ideology. This is characterized by her concern with the evolving practice of SCA and interest in questioning current models and processes. As she engages in traditional strategies for professional learning such as attending conferences and networking she is relating to these experiences from the Redefining action logic that is capable creating unique solutions to gaps in personal and organizational performance. Although operating within the system, she is capable of questioning the system which involves focusing on inquiry and releasing control in order to discover new insights that are beyond what is practical and rationally acceptable. Additionally, she can utilize her capacity for self-reflection and awareness to notice her felt experience and how it connects with action but shares that her capacity to act on her deeper knowing can feel constrained. The experience of constraint or paralysis is typically ascribed to the Redefining action logic and can trigger the use of less complex action logics. The GLP instrument rated Nicole with the Redefining action logic.

Tess: A Guide to Students

At the core of Tess's work is "assist[ing] students with second chances and making better decisions, not just on campus but in life." Tess sees herself as a guide to all

those involved in the conduct process including students, faculty, and staff. She will sometimes meet with students an entire year not just to guide them through the conduct process but once it is over to “guiding them through the process of being a student.” She views her conversations with faculty, TAs, and community partners as an opportunity to “give them the confidence that if they report something to [her] office [she is] going to follow through, [she is] going to help the students the best way that [she] can.”

What she appreciates the most is being in a position where she does not feel that she is telling students they did something wrong. Instead, Tess and the conduct process she administers sees her role as a “partner to everybody through the process, whether it's the student, the professor, two students, however many.” She said, “so I guide, I investigate, I interview, and I only sanction when we've reached an agreement that yeah, something happened.” She may need to help a student understand that they violated a rule but “it's never a situation where [she's] feeling, like, oh, I can't sleep at night because maybe I made the wrong decision.”

When starting her career in residence life Tess was moved to different residence halls and kept finding her way back to buildings with significant conduct challenges. This excited her and she “enjoyed the on-on-one, and learning about [students] and helping them in their development, while also getting to see them in their residence life setting.” Eventually Tess became challenged by the work/life balance in residence life but wanted to stay in student affairs. When a position opened up in student conduct at her first institution she transitioned and began doing student conduct administration full-time. As Tess progressed in her career she and her husband discussed where to raise a family and she made her way out to southern California. Her third and final institution

had a student conduct position open up at exactly the right time and she never had to apply for another position. She said,

Professionally, this is definitely a place where I know I can grow. I've had some tremendous opportunities in just the four years that I've been here. Hopefully, my personal life will continue to align with my professional values and there won't be a need to go anywhere else.

Tess believes that her work in student conduct at her current university aligns well with her professional values.

Tess has experienced her career path as “a tremendous blessing” and that the right position always seemed to open up at the right time. Now working in student conduct administration at her third institution, Tess believes she may be working at the place she eventually retires from. Tess said that one of the features that brought her to her current institution and will likely keep her there is that it is “a place where there [is] good work/life balance so I [can] raise a family.”

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Tess’ data is that she primarily operates from the late-Achiever action logic. The late-Achiever action logic is most notable through her relationship with her organization and focus on alignment between her personal and professional lives. The characteristics of her late-Achiever action logic a close relationship with institutions that allows Tess to pursue goals aligned with the university’s vision and create change within the system. Tess is continually balancing systemic and contextual pressures; however, the balancing and recognition of these pressures is not the same as influencing or disrupting them. It is simply functioning within them. The difference between Tess’ conventional Achiever action logic and the post-conventional Redefining action logic is the difference between recognizing and disrupting systems. Her attention is on noticing different priorities and creating processes

that juggle them effectively – characteristics that suggest Tess is on the boundary between the Achiever and Redefining action logic. The GLP instrument rated Tess at the Redefining action logic.

An indication that Tess has begun transitioning to the Redefining action logic is her ability to reflect upon and question her ways of making meaning. Her Redefining action logic may be limited by institutional boundaries of what is considered practical and valuable knowledge and skills to possess. However, the presence of the Redefining action logic helps Tess to create coexistence between what is practical learning for the organization and what she desires in order to bring more meaning and fulfillment in her work. The evidence also offers a potential that is being expressed beyond the Redefining action logic and stretches towards the Transforming (Strategist) elements of meaning-making. Tess expresses a capacity for a negative capability (stillness, contemplation, or presence in the midst of action) – a characteristic typically ascribed to the Transforming action logic.

Mark: A Course Correction

Mark believes that “people make mistakes all the time” and work in student conduct is about providing a “course correction.” The ultimate goal for Mark in student conduct is for students “to learn from the issue, be held accountable, and correct the issue.” He helps students in their transition from having guardians at home (parents) to being “guardians of themselves.” He also emphasizes that this guardianship occurs within a context that has standards of behavior and that after graduation they will enter a society and workforce that also has its own standards of behavior.

Mark loves having different conversations with different people. He views himself as highly empathetic as well as possessing a developed sense of what it means to be responsible. The combination of the two dispositions has led him to working in student conduct administration. He said, “I like having those conversations with people when they are at a crossroads. And it doesn't have to be the lowest of the lows, but it could be where they've made a bad decision and how they can learn from that decision, and what accountability looks like.”

He knew early in his undergraduate education that Student Affairs was the career path for him. Like many practitioners, he got his start as a Resident Assistant. He recruited his dean of students as an early mentor and pursued student leadership experiences in student government including its judicial branch for which he served as the Chief Justice and started to gain insights into what working in student conduct administration might entail.

After graduate school Mark accepted his first position, a dual role of residence life and student conduct. He started learning basic competencies such as reviewing reports, assigning charges, and advising hearing boards. Mark loved the work he was doing and realized that he had the type of personality that fit well with that of a conduct officer. He said, “I enjoyed making those decisions. And at the end of the day, I can make hard decisions and be a part of those decisions, and be proud to help uphold policies and missions and goals of the university.” After his first professional position Mark decided to make student conduct his primary focus in student affairs. He eventually moved to the west coast and started his current position as an Assistant Director for Student Conduct.

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Mark's data is that he primarily operates from the early-Redefining action logic. The early-Redefining action logic is expressed in his ability to notice difference, gain perspective on the multiple forces and dynamics in the organization, as well as demonstrate empathy for how those differences and dynamics came to exist. Mark's ability to be empathetic for the multiple perspectives that simultaneously exist helps him be reflective and make meaning about what is important to him. This early-Redefining action logic can create confusion or paralysis as Mark sorts through the different options available and seeks to establish or reinforce new commitments. However, his capacity for self-reflection allows him to draw lessons that help to inform more post-relativistic principles – a characteristic and challenge typically ascribed to the Redefining action logic. The GLP instrument also rated Mark at the Redefining action logic.

There is also evidence that Mark operates from the Achiever and Expert action logics that may function either as preferences or support during his developmental transition to the Redefining action logic. The literature about the Redefining action logic suggests that individuals in this developmental space reflectively revisit prior action logics in order to create a “growing recognition of alternative action logics” (Torbert, 2004, p. 92). It is not evident that Mark is able to reflect upon how these prior action logics influence him; rather, he is subject to or gripped by these less complex action logics at certain times. The inhabitation of multiple action logics in this way is somewhat inconsistent with the literature, and although the presence of prior action logics may serve as a bridge to a new action logic they may also serve as an anchor creating the forms of paralysis Mark can sometimes experience in his meaning-making.

Alex: Be Just; Just Be

As an undergraduate Alex studied both sociology and ethnic studies and was a highly involved student in the areas of social justice and student activism. His eventual transition to the field of student conduct administration may immediately appear to be in tension with his activist roots but Alex sees it as “a different means to the same end.” As a conduct officer and social justice advocate he feels that policy has an important place in the institution and what he brings to the role is the ability “to work and advocate the greys” around policy. He also finds that his passion for social justice helps him to “see how people function and work at the same time, and be able to represent people who are underrepresented.” Alex seeks to have “meaningful and genuine conversations with students” and to use his insights from his educational background to empathize with them while holding them accountable for their behavior.

Alex began his career in residential life but eventually found that he could no longer perform some of the on-call duties and desired more separation between his personal and professional life. He enjoyed what he referred to as the “genuine conversations” he would have with students about their behavior in college and the “opportunity to reflect on one incident in their life that may connect to other components of their lives.” His current position fits well with Alex’s student-centered philosophy and allows him to focus more on the education of students. He noted that when he entered his current position the university was in the midst of changing its code language from “judicial” to “student conduct” and was seeking to be more “user friendly... trying to have a different feel to the office than strictly being like the gavel on the desk.” This provided an important fit between the institution and Alex’s approach to student conduct.

Alex shared that a central part of his approach to student conduct is ensuring that it is both an opportunity to be accountable but also an educational experience. He said,

I think part of it is that we're all human, and that is to say that to error is to be human. And being able to learn from those experiences and how to move forward from it. And then hopefully, becoming, quote/unquote, a better person.

For Alex, this involves an understanding of how student conduct is about creating relationships. Even if it is a 30-60minute relationship, Alex tries to communicate to students “there's someone here that's there for you, and wants better of you.” The importance of relationships is a value instilled in Alex early in his life by his parents and he seeks to bring this into his work in student conduct. He said,

I grew up. I made mistakes. I was a brat. And she [mother] always valued the importance of me learning from that, and still knowing that I was important to her. So I think that translates into my work with students that I work with, in the sense that I still hold them accountable. They make poor decisions they have to be held accountable for it. But never in a way that they don't feel supported. And at the end of the day, me demonstrating to them that their success here is important for me.

For Alex, it's not only the relationship between him and the student that he is focused on but also the relationship between the student and the community and addressing any harm that was created. He said, “Really exerting the importance of recognizing that they're not alone here at the university... That they impact other people, or are impacted by other people. And being able to recognize that as well.”

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Alex's data is that he primarily operates from the Redefining action logic. The Redefining action logic is most notable in his capacity to stand back, observe, and be curious about the relationship between his role and the environment. Alex is concerned with the interplay between culture, policy, and behavior which informs how he navigates his work as a student conduct officer.

Although the complexity of the interplay can feel constraining for Alex, he is capable of noticing change and growth over time. The self-reflective characteristic of his Redefining action logic provides him with insight into his own values and those of the institution. These insights are often held internally because of a more nuanced meaning-making system that can create more confusion than certainty – a challenge typically ascribed to the Redefining action logic. However, Alex describes the results of this process as leaning towards challenging the norms and values of the institution.

There is also evidence that he operates from the Achiever and Expert action logics that may function either as preferences or support when experiencing challenges that are new to his post-conventional action logic. As a mid-level professional, Alex's Expert action logic is seeking to learn more about the field of student conduct and relies on traditional craft resources to gain knowledge and "benchmark" his own program. The Achiever action logic is evidenced in his collaboration with colleagues, his conscientious way of working, and how he balances goal attainment with interpersonal relationships. One interpretation of the presence of these two logics is that they represent support during his stabilization at the post-conventional Redefining action logic. However, one has to recognize that the use of these action logics may also just be what is functional for him as mid-level administrator at a public institution. The GLP instrument rated Alex at the Achiever action logic.

Paul: Orientation Phase Two

Paul's current student conduct case load at the Dean of Student for an urban community college regularly includes incidents of violent outbursts, disruptive behavior from students, and felony level drug use. He attributes the severity of the student conduct

case load to the open admissions practice of community colleges. Paul's approach to SCA is very environmental. This means he is focused on the system level and ensuring processes and resources are in place to engage student needs when they become evident.

He said,

I have to do a lot of stroking in the community, to kind of help people to understand, when students fall short of our expectations for them -- and there's a kind of mental illness, or veteran issues, or anger management, those kinds of things, that doesn't -- we're not in Columbine, we're not in -- immediately -- you know, there's certainly a line between that student and the student who shows up with guns and bullets.

He described his work in SCA as "orientation phase two." Paul described how all students go through the basic phase one orientation but in a community college environment some students will require phase two in order to revisit the expectations. He said,

Phase two is the student gets into a real problem or situation, and they've just completely forgotten. And they go back and rely on their skills that might have made sense in their non-college environment, but make absolutely no sense here.

He works individually with students to support them in navigating the college environment and coordinates with faculty and other support services to assist the student in reaching their academic goals.

Paul knew his sophomore year of college that he wanted to be a student affairs professional and spent most of his college career building a student leadership profile that prepared him to enter the field. He began his career working in residential life, multi-cultural affairs, and student activities before pursuing his doctorate. Towards the end of his doctorate he received an opportunity to serve as an Assistant Dean in an academic college and was introduced to academic support and intervention programs for struggling students.

Paul recently returned to having responsibilities in SCA after 16 years when he accepted his current Dean of Students position. Describing the difference between working at a large public institution and a community college, Paul said, “everything's very DIY [do it yourself]. There's a lot of -- as a dean, I really have to kind of roll up my sleeves and just get right in there.” Paul appreciates being able to stay connected to serving students directly and recognizes this is not always that case when you move into more senior level positions

At the end of the second interview for this research Paul shared that he would be resigning this position to become the dean of students at another community college. He shared that a driving force behind his decision to leave after 18 months was that he was never able to dedicate the time he wanted to his student conduct responsibilities He said,

Because of the litigious nature of student conduct and grievance, I've had to prioritize that aspect of my job over all the other aspects. And I have seen how the other elements of this operation have suffered as a result. And so that's a big thing that's pushing me out the door. It's just not feeling like I can run an operation that is up to my standards. I just don't feel like it's really possible... I don't feel like it's an environment that is prime for success.

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Paul’s data is that he primarily operates from the Redefining action logic. The Redefining action logic is most notable through Paul’s awareness and concern for context and environment. He shared multiple stories that valued different perspectives and an ability to deeply empathize with these perspectives while remaining committed to certain principles and objectives. Paul demonstrates an appreciation for being collaborative and desire to engage in creative work. Although a strong advocate for process and policy, he is capable of engaging in creative work within the margins of what is institutionally permissible - a focus that is typically ascribed to the Redefining action logic. The Redefining action logic can also be

observed in his decision to resign his current position when it became clear to him that he would not be able to continue to navigate the context successfully over a long-term period. The GLP instrument also rated Paul at the Redefining action logic.

There is also evidence that Paul operates using the Achiever action logic. The Achiever action logic is evidence by how conscious Paul is of how he is fulfilling his duties and is awareness of how underlying forces influence behavior. The Achiever action logic may, in part, be the function of his professional context and expectations of his role. Paul also discussed the challenges he has had in finding opportunities for reflection and the toll this has taken on him personally – a challenge typically ascribed to the Achiever action logic.

John: Passionate and Compassionate

John describes himself as both “passionate and compassionate” about the educational experience of his students. His goal is to,

Really connect with students, to help them understand the importance of the education that they're receiving, their commitment to it, as well as the importance of their personal accountability throughout that process, not only in achieving that education, but ensuring that they're doing it in line with the university's expectations.

As an employee of a Jesuit institution, he believes his work centers around students and engaging in a dialogue that explores their values. For John, the exploration of values is the critical connection between the mission of his institution and his work in student conduct. He has worked to create a conduct system that focuses on being educational and developmental.

John completed his graduate degree at the small private institution he currently works for but left after graduation to work in residence life at a large state institution.

Recognizing his comfort and ability to thrive in student conduct administration, he moved back to the institution where he completed his graduate degree to work as their only full-time student conduct officer. Within two years he developed the position into an assistant director level. Another four years later his position would change to a director level and eventually add the supervision of two full-time staff. In his own way, John has created opportunities to expand his responsibilities while remaining at his institution.

The progression of changes in his position has extended the life of his tenure at his institution. Where before he had created timelines for leaving the institution or possibly the field of student conduct, he now experiences the shifts in his responsibilities (i.e. supervising professional staff) as a way of creating more of what is meaningful in his career. He values the opportunity to mentor new professionals as a supervisor and has worked to create an active regional network of student conduct administrators who meet regularly to share and discuss their work and challenges in the field. This shift in focus has renewed his sense of passion and commitment for student conduct.

John also shared a lot about his personal experience lately of being in a very contemplative place in his life. He is asking himself, “Is this what I am bound to do for eternity, or is there going to be something else?” He has increasingly reflected on his own identity as a professional and who he is in the process of becoming. John discussed a growing sense that he may be approaching a transition in his career. For John the transition is less about position and responsibilities but working to enter a more “contemplative stage” of his career and “put some reflection and some more intentional thought into what it is that [he’s] been doing for almost a decade.” He expressed a

growing desire to align his new insights from reflection with his actions. Although the future is difficult for John to forecast, he is content with his current contemplative state and possesses trust in his own sense of self as the place where all things originate.

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of John's is that he primarily operates from the late-Redefining action logic. The late-Redefining action logic is most notable in his concern with expanding and deepening his connections with others. The late-Refining action logic is expressed in John's articulation of the nuances of experience and consideration of the influence of global educational context, increases in economic disparity, shifts in the student conduct officer role, and the existence of both beauty and shadow in his work. John experiences himself as being at a transitional place in his development. As a result, his focus has shifted away from roles and responsibilities and more onto who he is becoming and his relationship to his work and organization – a focus typically ascribed to the Redefining action logic.

There is also evidence that John is capable of accessing the Achiever action logic as needed to be effective in his work. The Achiever action logic is primarily available through his focus on pursuing his responsibilities in collaboration with colleagues and teams. The Achiever action logic recognizes that collaboration and teamwork are necessary to address complex organizational challenges. John understands that it is practical to learn from others and seek out the wisdom of experts while also being responsible for how knowledge is transferred to a specific context. His use of the Achiever action logic is in the context of being effective for the institution such as addressing challenges associated with Title IX where his late-Redefining action logic is

more expressed in his work with his own and his institution's development. The GLP instrument rated John at the Achiever action logic.

Carl: A Pretty Good Mess

Carl admits that he has been attracted some “pretty good messes” throughout his career. He started his career helping to build a campus ministry office at the same small faith-based university that he now serves as Dean of Students. He said, “I felt like I spent about ten years over there in the equivalent of a start-up company... living, working, being with students.” In the process of the decade he worked into a director level position and found that campus ministries “steeped [him] in being relevant to what was going on in the lives of students, being grounded in the issues in their lives.”

Having created something pretty special and now established in campus ministry, Carl began to wonder about what was next. He decided to continue working in university life and entered a PhD program that focused on the study of leadership in higher education. He felt as though he had primarily relied on good instincts in his work and now sought the academic credentials. His coursework introduced him to research and theoretical ways of thinking about what he had experienced over the past decade. He described it as “backfilling” his experience with students and helping him to put language around what he had experienced with them.

Still working in campus ministries and having two years left in the PhD program, he had been hearing from students about their experience in the student conduct process and described it as “very punitive,” “very protracted,” “toxic and hostile.” When the Dean of Students position became open he was attracted to the mess that his students had been describing. Wearing shorts, t-shirt, sandals and carrying some insecurity about his

preparedness for the position, he walked into the Vice President's office and shared with her his interest. A few weeks later he was offered the position.

Carl accepted the position as Dean of Students but was very upfront in recognizing that this was new professional territory. He spent the first year asking a lot of questions, developing relationships, and trusting his instincts. He said, "I had this concept of, like, look, it can be really good, and the way that it's getting done over here, to me, seems really bad." Carl imported some approaches from his campus ministry practice and just "immersed" himself in student culture. He described the experience as being "called into" beginning to "clean up what seemed like it would be a pretty good mess."

His first five years as Dean of Students would be filled with challenges including one of the largest recorded hazing incidents on a college campus in the United States. He created inroads to the development of critical alcohol and other drug services in spite of a more conservative campus culture. He fired five of nine professional staff members in the first three years and transformed the student conduct process to be more educational, integrated, and restorative. Now seven years into his tenure and reflecting back he said, "I don't know, really, how long these seasons last, but right now it's just, like -- it's like I'm kind of reaping all the benefits for a period of time. And it's really fun."

Action Logic Estimate. My analysis of Carl's data is that he primarily operates from the early-Transforming action logic. The early-Transforming action logic is most notable in his approach to organizational change remaining focused on a deeper connection to purpose while maintaining an awareness of self, role, and system. He uses his knowing at both the instinctual and intellectual level to interpret what is happening

and to design leadership interventions. Carl is capable of describing how he crafts interventions in a way that will communicate and act in a timely manner that is sensitive to the diverse action logics present in the system – a capacity typically ascribed to the Transforming action logic. Additionally, Carl described the importance of recognizing that he is also a system. He discussed noticing when his actions are inconsistent with his own principles and then taking steps to reduce the inconsistency. Sensitivity to individual and systemic disparities is a quality of the Transforming action logic, and Carl's capacity for this is present in how he understands and related to the need for change in the student conduct process. Carl instinctively trusts that creating a stage for actions that generate opportunities for evolving mutuality, expression, and development is the primary task of his work and is the signature of the Transforming action logic.

There is also evidence in his interview data that Carl utilizes the Achiever action logic. His use of the Achiever action logic was present in his strategies for managing the multiple daily tasks and challenges faced by a Dean of Students. The GLP instrument also rated Carl at the Achiever action logic.

Chapter Summary

Chapter four introduced the narratives of nine student conduct administrators and my analysis of their estimated action logic. Narratives were shared in a way that is consistent with how participants shared their stories through both the interviews and photography exercise. My estimate of participants' action logic was also supported with the characteristics identified in the data that support these estimates. Although I identified a single estimated action logic – which is consistent with the literature – it was also apparent from the analysis that participants expressed multiple action logic.

Additionally, the multiple action logics do not appear to be the function of developmentally peak or regressive experiences but function to support the participant's effectiveness. This raises questions about the complexity and fluidity of an individual's accessible action logics. Due to the presence of multiple of action logics, the next three chapters are organized to analyze more closely how and when different action logics operate and to synthesize the relationship between meaning-making and action logic development.

To accomplish this closer analysis of the multiple action logics expressed by participants the next three chapters will analyze the relationship between my estimate for each participant and meaning-making in three areas. Chapter five uses three meta-themes that reflect the three research questions including 1) Philosophy or Approach to SCA; 2) Strategies and Practices for Learning; and 3) Current Focus of Learning & Development. Chapter six examines the relationship between the estimated action logic and practitioner 1) skills, 2) knowledge, and 3) attributes or disposition that were identified in the chapter two literature for professional growth in student affairs and SCA. Chapter seven examines the relationship between the estimated action logic and participant awareness in three dimensions including 1) Individual or Personal; 2) Interpersonal or Team; and 3) Organizational or Systemic.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF MEANING-MAKING META THEMES

Participant narratives were analyzed for themes related to the primary research questions including 1) Philosophy or Approach to SCA, 2) Strategies & Practices for Learning, and 3) Current Focus on Learning and Development. This section will provide representational data for my action logic estimate of these themes. The purpose of this analysis is to illustrate the ways in which participants expressed action logics outside of their primary or assessed action logic. Table 6 displays each participant's estimated primary action logic that I hypothesized. A symbol is then used to indicate for each theme whether the participant's meaning-making represented an action logic of consistent, more, or less complexity than the primary action logic that I estimated.

Table 6

Analysis of participant AL expression based on the study's research questions

	Conventional				Post-Conventional				
	Joy	Thomas	Nicole	Tess	Mark	Alex	Paul	John	Carl
Researcher's Action Logic Estimate	E	A	A	A(+)	R(-)	R	R	R(+)	T(-)
<i>Theme 1: Philosophy or Approach to SCA</i>	Ø	Ø	↑	↓	↑	Ø	↑	↑	↓
<i>Theme 2: Strategies & Practices for Learning</i>	Ø	Ø	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	Ø	Ø
<i>Theme 3: Current Focus of Learning & Dev.</i>	Ø	↓	↓	↓	↑	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø

E = Expert

A = Achiever

R = Redefining/ Individualist

T = Transforming/ Strategist

(-) = Early Stage

(+) = Late Stage

↑ = More complex meaning-making than AL est.

↓ = Less complex meaning-making than AL est.

Ø = Meaning-making complexity consistent w/ AL est.

The brief definition of “action logic” used in this study is “an overall strategy that thoroughly informs an individual’s reasoning and behavior” (McCauley et al., 2006, p. 643) or how one might “interpret their surroundings” (Rooke and Torbert, 2005, p. 67). Torbert’s (2004) seven stage action logic model is used in my estimate of each participant’s action logic. The model posits that the more complex (or later) action logics offer more choice for how an individual can deploy their attention, more flexibility in their decision-making, more methods for seeking feedback, and a broader range for how power can be exercised. In terms of the analysis presented, the labels of conventional and post-conventional as well as the up and down arrows in Table 6 should not be confused with one necessarily being more or less “developed” from a hierarchical perspective. Rather, the later action logics express an attention focused on an increased level of complexity that is given consideration by the participant.

Theme 1: Philosophy or Approach to SCA

Participants were asked to talk about their approach and philosophy to SCA in the interviews as well as prompted to take a photograph that represented their approach. Participant interview and photography data was categorized based on the philosophy and approach to SCA theme and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants’ primary action logic (as identified by the researcher) is consistent with the expressed action logic during meaning-making of their philosophy or approach to SCA. The results are also displayed in Table 6.

Conventional

Participants whose primary estimated action logic, as assessed by the researcher, operates from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever),

Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed in her philosophy or approach to SCA was consistent with her estimated primary Expert action logic. An example of this is data from a photo (Figure 2) Joy took of a painting at her home that depicts Jesus Christ sitting and a women kneeling at his feet. For Joy this photo represents repentance and forgiveness, which is central to her approach to SCA.

Joy said,

I think for me, [the painting] evoked kind of the emotion behind my philosophy or approach for student conduct administration because I really look at it for students coming to this process, and hopefully, in the way that they're open for just that personal development, forgiveness, and kind of moving forward. But if not, hopefully that by the end of my time with them, I will get them to the point where they are taking responsibility in a way that's going to make -- have a meaningful change in their life.

Joy's use of "I" in the quote reveals how she sees herself as providing the forgiveness and second chances and that she is responsible for getting a student to the place they need to be. This is consistent with the Expert action logic in which a person is focused on being an individual contributor and the role of authority as being the holder of knowledge.

Figure 2. Joy: Philosophy of student conduct

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed in his philosophy or approach to SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Achiever action logic. Early in Thomas' career he made an intentional effort to decide for himself what would guide him in his work in SCA. He gleaned insights from mentors, his father, and organizations whose philosophy resonated with him. He said, "what guides me are three things: education, fairness, and accountability." In example after example in describing challenges of student conduct, Thomas' actions reflect a consideration of these values. He said,

You have to do it in different ways with different students. But I really try to take what I value personally and put it into what I do as -- professionally, so I don't have to turn on the switch. It's not like I come into the office and go: okay, well, I've got to make sure I'm fair, because I try to work that out in my life, in who I am and how I am, you know. And take those things that I experienced when I was younger, that I readily talk about, and the mistakes I've made, the things I've learned, and then be able to impart that to others.

Thomas demonstrates a capacity to learn from the experience of multiple others in order to establish a commitment to his own principles and values. Furthermore, the principles and values are strongly communicated and he understands how he came to this belief system. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person employs well-considered principles, values, and standards to guide system effectiveness.

Nicole (Achiever ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed in her philosophy or approach to SCA was more (Redefining) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Nicole's approach to addressing student behavior focuses on creating opportunities for growth and learning. She wants students to have an opportunity to understand their decision-making in the past and identify new decisions to help them move forward. According to Nicole, a central element of being

able to provide this opportunity is to “understand, from their [student’s] perspective, why they chose to do the things [they do]. And then, asking them questions that may help them think about -- why did they do that?” This involves considering others, their own values, and the possible consequences of a decision. She said,

The student ultimately filters what they're giving me -- what they decide that they want to share, or offer up... Then I can provide that door; whether or not they choose to go through it, or they see it, is a whole other conversation.

Nicole’s recognizes and appreciates the existence of multiple meaning-making systems that are at work as opposed to only enacting her own perspective or that of the institution. This is consistent with the Redefining action logic in which a person focuses on multiple experiences, perspective taking, and a desire to navigate or address the gaps as opposed to reducing them to a single logic system.

Tess (Achiever + ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed in her philosophy or approach to SCA was less (Expert) than her estimated primary late-Achiever action logic. Tess described her philosophy of SCA with a photo of a pair of student and faculty guidebooks for academic integrity (not displayed to protect confidentiality) that she is responsible for updating annually. In discussing why this was an important project for her she said,

My philosophy, as I had mentioned earlier, is that I am here as a guide. It's not just about sanctioning people when they make a bad decision but doing what you need to do before, during and after. So that at the end of the road, at the end of the day, they feel like they are not alone.

Tess understands the guidebooks to serve as a tool to communicate the process in a transparent way and develops the trust of community members in the process. This is consistent with the Expert action logic in which a person values clear, consistent, and knowledgeable guidance. Complicating this assessment, however, is the expression

compassion and solidarity by Tess at the end of the quote. It is not immediately clear what, if any, action logic this data reflects.

Post-Conventional

Participants whose primary estimated action logic, as assessed by the researcher, operates from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - ⬆). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed in his philosophy or approach to SCA was more (Redefining) than his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Early in his career Mark learned that the formality of the conduct process weighed heavily on many of the students and created an isolating experience from their peers and the institution. Through his case management and student follow up experience, Mark realized that the real work of student conduct begins after the actual hearing. He said,

It's not just about them completing their letter and completing their reflection paper and paying their fines. It is about -- essentially, you could say it's about not seeing them in that light again, but it is about them learning from that, and using that as a tool to really step into some light of positivity and creativity.

For Mark this type of work is about creating connections that outlast the conduct process and helping the student become more positively involved in the community. Mark's philosophy appreciates that students are in their own developmental place and process of becoming. Typical of a Redefining action logic is the focus on experience as a tool for

development and desire to identify creative solutions that resolve the gap between the current and future space.

Alex (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed in his philosophy or approach to SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. The importance of relationships was a value instilled in Alex early in his life by his parents and he seeks to bring this into his work in student conduct. He said,

I grew up. I made mistakes. I was a brat. And she [mother] always valued the importance of me learning from that, and still knowing that I was important to her. So I think that translates into my work with students that I work with, in the sense that I still hold them accountable. They make poor decisions they have to be held accountable for it. But never in a way that they don't feel supported. And at the end of the day, me demonstrating to them that their success here is important for me.

Alex is focused on the task of student accountability but also sees that there is a relationship between him and the student that needs to be valued and supported. Additionally, he is capable of reflecting on a relationship in his own experience that helped create this approach and can see beyond his relationship with a student to understand how it may impact their success at the institution. Typical of the Redefining action logic, and subtle in the example, Alex demonstrates the capacity to work with multiple layers of experience (intrapersonal, interpersonal, and systemic) in his approach to student conduct.

Paul (Redefining ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed in his philosophy or approach to SCA was more (late-Redefining) than his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul took a photo (Figure 3) of a new area of grass on campus that was being protected by a set of orange pylons. He shared how he

understands student conduct to often serve as phase two of student orientation and that many students in a community college may not have been in school for years or decades and have no idea what it means to be in an educational environment. Paul grows concerned that some students are looking for a reason to suggest that they should not be in college. He said,

And so I see myself like the pylons. Kind of a protector, to tell students: you're college material; you clearly belong here; and you're welcome here; we want you here. But there's also some things that you need to learn about being here. There are rules that you don't know about. There are standards. There are practices. There are traditions. And some of it's written down. Some of it's not.

Paul is seeking to orientate students to the environment and how they can successfully navigate it. He notes that it does not take much to kill the baby grass in the photo (Figure 3). Similarly, students often find themselves in student conduct before they end their time at the college and Paul's responsibility is to see if he can help turn them around, learn new skills, and understand the campuses expectations for them.

Figure 3. Paul: Philosophy or approach to SCA

Paul understands that student behavior is situated within a broader environment and is influenced by the student's history. He engages students with this in mind and

draws upon his ability to influence and persuade students through his orientation phase two approach. Typical of a late-Redefining action logic, Paul is aware of an influence between individuals and the environment that is guided by both formal and informal rules, principles, and history. The late-Redefining action logic focuses on engaging the student as they navigate the environment and supporting personal change.

John (Redefining + ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed in his philosophy or approach to SCA was more (early-Transforming) than his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. Throughout John's data it was clear that he has been reflecting on his own personal development and sees himself as being in a transitional space with how he understands his work and career. What is striking about John's philosophy and approach to SCA is that he understands his own development as being linked to how he supports the development of others. He said,

It stands out at my current stage, because I see myself willing to figure out what it is right now that I'm doing, and what it is that I'm going to be doing, and how does all of that play out in the scheme of what I'm -- how I'm supporting others in the work that they're doing as well.

John is articulating that part of attending to his own development is developing others or supporting their work. Typical of the early-Transforming action logic is the recognition of greater mutuality between himself and others and recognizing individual and organizational development is linked and can occur in parallel.

Carl (Transforming - ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed in his philosophy or approach to SCA was less (Redefining) than his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. Carl tries to create a conduct process that is integrated in such a way that it creates space for individuality, growth, and fulfillment. Carl described a primary challenge in the field of SCA is remaining tied to it's

developmental goals for students. He reflected upon how difficult it is to create policies and processes in the current student conduct climate that will do this. He said,

One of the challenges is not so much responding to the image that the students have put out for us -- this guy that's partying, or this girl that's -- and sanctioning that person. I'm trying to have conversations with who they really are.

He used a photo of artist/singer Kesha (Figure 4) who is popular for portraying a party lifestyle. He shared how he recently read an article she wrote about her experiences in rehab for an eating disorder. Carl summarized the article saying, “so much of what she's manifested has been selling out to the industry and feeling like it's who she had to be... She almost killed herself through this stuff, trying to live out her own image.” He believes, “we want to live in the reality of who we are, not trying to just be this thing that we think college should be.” Carl finds this to be a helpful image for college students and the message he wants the student conduct process to send.

Figure 4. Carl: Challenge in student conduct administration

In each story Carl shared about specific incidents of addressing student behavior he communicated a focus on supporting students to live more fully into their aspirations for college and their own identity. He recognized that students are complex and that student conduct processes are responsible for addressing the gap between a student's

espoused and actual values. Typical of the Redefining action logic, Carl is focused on individuality and creating a process that can be responsive to each student and their needs.

Summary: Philosophy or Approach to SCA

Through their stories and/or photographs, a majority of participants made meaning of their philosophy or approach to SCA in a way that was outside of the primary action logic estimate. Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics can also be seen in participant's philosophy and approach to SCA. Meaning-making structure of participant's philosophy or approach to SCA assessed at the conventional action logics is characterized as relying on positional authority and knowledge; taking responsible and transparent actions; and adherence to principles and objectives that are informed by well-considered values and assumptions. Meaning-making structure of participant's philosophy or approach to SCA assessed at the post-conventional action logics is characterized as creating opportunities for inquiry that leads to deeper connection and perspective taking; seeks to envision more of who the student is and is becoming; and valuing individuality and context.

Theme 2: Strategies and Practices for Learning

Participants were asked to talk about their strategies and practices for learning in SCA in the interviews as well as prompted to take a photograph that represented their approach. Participant interview and photography data was categorized based on the strategies and practices for learning and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants' primary action logic (as identified by the researcher) is consistent with their estimated action logic during

meaning-making of their strategies and practices for learning in SCA. The results are also displayed in Table 6.

Conventional

Participants whose primary estimated action logic, as assessed by the researcher, operates from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed in her strategies and practices for learning in SCA was consistent with her estimated primary Expert action logic. The recent changes in how university's address Title IX incidents and investigations has presented Joy with areas of needed growth. She recently became the institution's designated investigator and has been learning more about the investigation process. Joy took a photo of a magnifying glass (Figure 5) to represent her new investigation skills. Joy shared that she is enjoying the learning process that is helping to put some clear processes and knowledge around what has been fairly instinctive until now. She explained learning these new skills,

It's legitimizing what I already have. I think I'm good at what I do, but when I can really break it down and show people my line of thought, the process that I use, and how detailed and -- I don't know the word I'm trying to find -- thorough; I think detailed and thorough, I think it really gains me some legitimacy.

This is consistent with the Expert action logic where Joy is concerned with legitimizing areas of competence she already possesses as well as being able to demonstrate and articulate those externally to the organization.

Figure 5. Joy: Promote own development

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed in his strategies and practices for learning in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Achiever action logic. Thomas often described strategies to promote his own learning that demonstrated curiosity and the appreciation for involving multiple sources of knowledge to inform decisions. For example, Thomas enjoys being able to follow the thoughts of people who he sees as experts or knowledgeable resources in the field of student conduct. He said, “it kind of flattens the world a little bit.” The ability to connect with individuals, offices, and resources allows Thomas to get out of his own institution for information. He said, “I think you develop as a professional by seeing the approach, the thought, the ways of doing things that other professionals have. You always pick something up from everybody.” He took a photo of the #stuconduct Twitter feed (Figure 6) to represent this strategy. Thomas’ description of this practice for development demonstrates his interest in gathering information from multiple sources and an ability to then form his own opinion. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person is an openness to learning and appreciates learning from the experience of others.

Figure 6. Thomas: Promote own development

Nicole (Achiever ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed in her strategies and practices for learning in SCA was more complex (Redefining) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Nicole shared her excitement about several strategies for development. Many are commonplace in the student affairs field but when asked about the desired results from these activities she said,

I think it's continued evolution. I think it's-- We have an intern with us this summer, and she asked me what I thought my best quality was – I said, I think its my best and my worst. And I think it's continuing to question what we're doing. And I think that's what I hope to get when I'm talking with others, or when I'm reading things, or when I'm going to conferences, is that we're continuing -- or that I'm continuing to evolve as a student conduct professional.

Nicole is advocating for curiosity about the SCA field and recognizes that insight will result from inquiry into several sources as well as questioning basic assumptions about her practice. This is consistent with the Redefining action logic in which a person is focused on questioning current system boundaries and exploration of future possibilities.

Tess (Achiever + ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed in her strategies and practices for learning in SCA was more complex (Redefining) than her estimated primary late-Achiever action logic. Tess shared a desire to move beyond

her functional role in student conduct and improve her skills in supporting international students. She took a photo of a globe (Figure 7) in her office to illustrate this interest. When asked about what strategies she might use to meet this goal she imagined “getting down in the trenches with them [international students], working through some of the issues, and how they get through it?” Tess is expressing a desire to help walk international students through an experience and “give people hope and confidence that things are going to get better.” Tess’ desire to be “in the trenches” suggests a more immersive experience with international students as opposed to a more distant or disconnected form of learning. Typical of the Redefining action logic is an ability to engage is perspective taking and inquiry in the practice of understanding difference. Also representing Redefining action logic is the representation of a globe that invites a more complex and systemic (or global) awareness of the student experience.

Figure 7. Tess: Current focus of growth and development.

Post-Conventional

Participants whose primary estimated action logic, as assessed by the researcher, operates from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex

(Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed in his strategies and practices for learning in SCA was less complex (Expert/Achiever) than his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Mark enjoys reading and learning new things. He tries to engage in a variety of sources of information on any number of subjects. He took a photo of the library stacks (Figure 8) to represent his interest in “ingesting” new knowledge. Mark believes “our biggest hang-ups in life is that we are curious about something and we don't pursue it, and we don't ask questions.” For Mark, curiosity in life is important to being a holistic person. Mark also took a photo of road sign with multiple destinations and a chair beneath it (Figure 8) to represent that “no matter what path you go in, you're going to learn something.”

Figure 8. Mark: Promote own development

Mark's statements suggest learning from a variety of locations. However, his examples and photographs illustrate only third person or expert sources of learning. Additionally, both the statement and photograph privilege movement as associated with learning. From Mark's perspective, there is no value in just sitting still or just being. This practice expresses a blend of the Expert and Achiever action logics. Typical of the Expert action logic is gaining credible knowledge and typical of the Achiever action logic is continued learning and curiosity.

Alex (Redefining ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed in his strategies and practices for learning in SCA was less complex (Expert/Achiever) than his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Alex is currently in his second year working within the public/state university system and shared that an impactful strategy for development has been the regular workshops of his peers from other state institutions. At the most recent meeting he was able to present on a project he has been working on to create a peer advisor program in the conduct process. He said,

I guess it was a boost to my confidence; I don't know what it was, but being able to say this is -- like, the peer advisor program, for instance. I talked to a woman about that. Being able to talk about the program and knowing that it's not 100% where I want it to be, but saying that we have this program, and describing it, and having the opportunity to do so is something I'm really proud of.

Alex enjoyed sharing something he was proud of and it has helped him feel more confident in his work. He had a similar experience during a period of time when the position for his direct supervisor was vacant and he had to represent the office in cross campus meetings. He said,

Being able to represent the office of student conduct, being able to represent our strengths, being able to speak at the table as far as what our perspective is as the office. I think that was a boost to my confidence because I felt more invested in

the office of student conduct as a large body, as opposed to just me just being on the staff of the office of student conduct.

Both of these experiences represent opportunities Alex has had to challenge himself to step out of his comfort zone and have the responsibility of representing the office. What is striking about his meaning making is that in both strategies he places himself in the expert position where his own sense of authority is based on the skills and knowledge that he possesses. Typical of the Achiever action logic is the interest in stepping out of his comfort zone and typical of the Expert action logic is a focus on being perceived as knowledgeable.

Paul (Redefining ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed in his strategies and practices for learning in SCA was less complex (Achiever) than his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul returned to SCA this past year after being gone for 16years. When he thinks about improving his student conduct program he starts very basic and examines his own practice. For example, he is currently looking on his intake process and described creating a checklist to help ensure that he follows the process he set up for himself. He said,

I'm making checklists for myself, and almost treating myself like a new professional. I'm gonna set a checklist here, next to me. And when I do my next set of intakes, I'm going to go down my checklist. Not because I don't know how to do an intake, but because I want to make sure that the things that I told myself that I'm going to incorporate into my intakes aren't forgotten. When you've done a lot of intakes, it's easy to -- it's hard to change the way you do intakes.

Paul's strategy reflects a concern for both delivery and tracking of how he meets his duties. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person focuses on the desire to work very conscientiously in order to fulfill responsibilities.

John (Redefining + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed in his strategies and practices for learning in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. John is invested in providing opportunities for development and learning to his staff members and understands that they possess feedback and perspectives that can serve his learning too. Supervising new student conduct professionals provides important meaning to John's work. He took a photo (not displayed to protect confidentiality) of his staff members engaged in a conversation to illustrate this strategy for growth and development in his work. He said,

They are my direct reports, they are the folks that I work on, trying to figure out how to be a better supervisor... So using the two of them as my source of, obviously, immediate feedback, and that response to how and what it is that I'm doing, and how, then, that I can become a better supervisor.

John is not only interested in their development but recognizes opportunities for his own learning and development while engaged in the supervisory relationship. He specifically discussed using his staff as a source of feedback when he said,

I ask them to always tell me what are those areas that I need to be better in, and what can I do to better support you? I don't need you to tell me the things that I'm doing well. It's fine and dandy and it helps affirm that maybe I'm doing a good job, but to be better, I need you to tell me what I can do to improve. And so I try to make sure that that message is consistently communicated, so that they know, and to reinforce that as best and as often as I can.

This is an important way of receiving feedback and seeks to create a climate where it can be freely offered. John is confronting the inevitable gaps that exist between what he is doing what staff need from him in order to be effective. He understands that multiple perspectives will exist and makes himself vulnerable to them. This is consistent with the late-Redefining action logic in which a person focuses on behaviors that express mutuality, vulnerability and weaving together personal and organizational learning.

Carl (Transforming - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed in his strategies and practices for learning in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. Carl reflected on a strategy for his learning. He described this strategy as being able to “listen to the messiness” for feedback by sharing a story about a mentor during his doctoral program that he observed being called out by a student. He remembered asking the mentor one day how they were able to remain so calm and responsive. He paraphrased the response as,

There are so many people in our lives like this, where the minute they start on their deal, people lean away from them... I think part of our work becomes leaning into people like that. Because they want to be engaged, they want to be heard. And the further we lean away, the worse it gets. That just puts gas on fire for them, many times.

This was an important lesson for Carl who said,

The reality is if you can't take a punch, you shouldn't be working with college students [laughter]. 'Cause they will just say all kinds of crazy crap that they don't even know if they mean yet or not. But it feels important at the time.

For Carl, the task is to “stay in my own head and my own heart, and listen and try to kind of help make meaning out of what it is that they're saying.” As a result, Carl focuses on leaning in during times of discomfort because that is when it really matters and when he feels there is something important to learn. He concluded by saying,

Anybody can be cool when I've got RAs telling me that the program's great, or whatever. But I want to be good when I've got a 19-year-old yelling at me. That's when I want to be good. And that's taken a lot more work.

Carl is articulating the need to listen from both a head and heart space in order to hear what is happening beneath or beyond what is being articulated. This is consistent with the Transforming action logic in which the focus is on sitting with discomfort, seeing feedback in atypical places, and remaining connected to a more somatic sense of

knowing. The strategy or skill Carl is describing requires understanding that the messiness is feedback and provides valuable insight.

Summary: Strategies and Practices for Learning

Through their stories and/or photographs, the participants varied in consistency of making meaning of their strategies and practices for learning in SCA from the primary action logic that I estimated. Examining Table 6 suggests that the action logic participants use to identify their focus of learning and the action logic they use to identify a strategy or practice of learning are not consistent. Participants I assessed with a primary action logic of Achiever (Thomas, Nicole, and Tess) expressed more complexity in their meaning-making of the strategies and practices for learning than they did for their current focus of learning. On the other hand, participants I assessed with a primary action logic of Redefining (Mark, Alex, and Paul) expressed more complexity in their meaning-making of their current focus of learning than they did for their strategies and practice for learning. This suggests that as the primary action logic develops the meaning making complexity shifts from strategies to areas of focus.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics can also be seen in the theme of strategies and practices for learning. Meaning-making in the theme of strategies and practices for learning at the conventional action logics is characterized by building a legitimate professional identity; curiosity and drive to keep learning; and a focus on craft knowledge that is seen as valid by authorities. Meaning-making in the theme of strategies and practice for learning at the post-conventional action logics is characterized by creating immersive experiences; valuing continuous feedback loops; and close listening to one's experience.

Theme 3: Current Focus of Learning and Development

Participants were asked to talk about their current focus of learning and development in SCA in the interviews as well as prompted to take a photograph that represented this focus. Participant interview and photography data was categorized based on the themes and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants' primary action logic (as identified by the researcher) is consistent with their estimated action logic during meaning-making of their current focus of learning and development in SCA. The results are also displayed in Table 6.

Conventional

Participants whose primary estimated action logic, as assessed by the researcher, operates from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert ▼). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed in her current focus for learning and development in SCA was less complex (Diplomat) than her estimated primary Expert action logic. In a discussion of burnout in both her work and personal life, Joy discussed a focus on the integration of faith into her life through prayer, reflection, and scripture reading. She described these sources of support as,

Things that at any one time in my life I've done, done well, and had proven results that they helped me to -- my stress level to stay low. But for some reason right now, even though my head knows that all those things will work, I'm not making the commitment to do them.

Joy sees this as a serious struggle for her and her understanding of it suggests a tension between what she is able to see and what she is able to take responsibility for and do.

She said,

I'm trying to deal with this, big-time. So I'm wondering, when you look at me God, like, God, are you doing this to me? Like, why are you doing this to me? Or is it more like I hear you telling me what I need to get out of this, but I'm not ready to listen to you right now, so I'm struggling. Is it -- like, is it being done to me? But then in my mind, you know, I know -- part of it is I know that I'm resisting, but I'm in that -- I think I'm in that really upset mode. I don't know if it's fighting with God or if it's fighting with myself.

Joy is scared to do the things she senses may be helpful in her life. Caring for her own development and well-being means that she will have to take more responsibility for a way of being in the world that is not satisfying her. Typical of the Diplomat action logic is an internal hesitancy to take responsibility creating an experience.

Thomas (Achiever ♡). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed in his current focus for learning and development in SCA was less complex (Expert) than his estimated primary Achiever action logic. Thomas' meaning-making has an orientation towards seeing his work as a craft that can be learned and perfected. He discussed how he engages in exercises specifically designed to learn how to be a better SCA. He described his thought process earlier in his career.

I needed to learn my craft as a student conduct officer. Because I didn't have a master's program in counseling or higher ed or anything like that. I felt like I needed to learn my job and learn how to do it and do it well.

He also took a photograph of his current learning focus that includes two psychology textbooks (Figure 9) that he is studying to better understand the increased mental health challenges being experienced in SCA. Typical of the Expert action logic is a focus on knowledge development. However, the expression of the Expert action logic by Thomas

supports an improved functioning of his Achiever action logic. The relationship between the Expert and Achiever action logics demonstrates how less complex action logics inform and support our primary action logic.

Figure 9. Current focus of growth and development

Nicole (Achiever ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed in her current focus for learning and development in SCA was less complex (Diplomat/Expert) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Nicole's current focus of learning and development is her ability to be more transparent or clear in her decision-making and the reasons for why a decision is made. She took a photo of a box of clear plastic wrap (Figure 10) to represent her current goal. She said,

Sometimes I struggle to be able to articulate why we've chosen a particular sanction... that's not a place that I want to be. I want to be in a place where I can clearly explain and competently explain what I'm doing... And being transparent in that, rather than shrinking away sometimes and being, like, oh, I don't really know how I'm going to have that conversation, or I'm afraid about what's going to happen, and not have that conversation.

In several experiences Nicole shared that she was critical of her lack of ability to be more confident in her decisions and engage with those who had a different position. Here Nicole is communicating a desire to develop her own sense of authority based on skills and knowledge. Additionally, she is concerned with others' perception about her own

competence. The data expresses two less complex action logics at the same time. This is consistent with the Diplomat action logic in which a person is focused on the perception of others and typical of the Expert action logic is concern for developing authority based on skills and knowledge.

Figure 10. Nicole: Current focus of growth and development

Tess (Achiever + ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed in her current focus for learning and development in SCA was less complex (Achiever) than her estimated primary late-Achiever action logic. An important capacity that allows Tess to develop and grow as a student conduct administrator is the ability to increase her awareness of her own patterns of behavior. At several points in the interview Tess demonstrated a capacity to reflect upon her interior or subjective condition and then create new behaviors and actions accordingly. For example, Tess' current focus is on being and staying happy. As a result, she recognizes when she becomes unhappy and intentionally takes steps to return to happiness. She shared an experience of being in a staff meeting and hearing something that upset her, saying,

I pause... I am trying to get rid of all the negativity, all these words are starting to come out, and in my brain I'm knocking it down... I know that about me. I have to pause to think about what it is I need to say and maybe that first thought is not it.

Tess is able to recognize this pattern and has personal rules (e.g. pause to think) for how to manage her experiences of unhappiness. Typical of the Achiever action logic is a capacity for creating personal insight and awareness.

Post-Conventional

Participants whose primary estimated action logic, as assessed by the researcher, operates from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - ⬆). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed in his current focus for learning and development in SCA was more complex (Transforming) than his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. After three years in his assistant director position, Mark is focusing on a career move in the next year to promote his development. However, he is experiencing an internal tension between the desire to advance his career and possibly pursue a doctorate or move to be closer to family. He said,

That's even taken a lot of time for me to admit, because I feel like I've been such a career-driven person, and that's been my identity in my family -- that I have this great job, I have a master's degree, I might be getting a PhD one day. So that's been very challenging for me. And it's hard for me to admit.

Mark took two photos (Figure 11) to represent this internal tension. One photo represents his desire to be with family while the other represents the “zenith” of where he could be or a “dream position.” Mark describes this internal conflict as,

I think it's a conflict because I often, in my head, think I'll do anything to get to the top, in the sense of making hard choices. And then at the same time I think to myself: I need to think about my family. I need to think about location of my family. The family is a huge thing, how I've been torn in my career.

Figure 11. Mark: Conflicted or torn

Both the narrative and photography data demonstrate a capacity to reflect upon an internal conflict while holding multiple system levels in mind. Mark goes on to reflect upon the need to embrace these types of choices. He said,

I don't think anybody in life can have it all, necessarily. You're going to miss something for something else. It's just the way of life. Unfortunately, we cannot clone each other... I think life is a lot about choices, and embracing and making the best of it.

Typical of the Transforming action logic is a personal reflection that holds an awareness of broader system levels. Even more complex of an action logic (Alchemical) is expressed in his desire to embrace difficult choices and dispel the idea of an easy solution. Typical of the Alchemist action logic is an awareness of deep processes that influence the development of consciousness.

Alex (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed in his current focus for learning and development in SCA was consistent with his primary Redefining action logic. Alex shared that a main focus for his current development is managing the increasing number of expectations placed upon his work. He said,

I think it's just -- we're just growing so fast, in so many different ways. And I think one of the challenges that -- in student conduct we're facing is how do we still contain it. 'Cause sometimes it can feel so overwhelming.

To illustrate this focus and challenge Alex took a photo of a potted plant (Figure 12) that has grown too big for the pot it rests in. He noted that at one point the plant was much smaller but is now starting to outgrow the pot it is planted in. He said,

It's growing and you can't stop it growing, and it's going to sprout in different ways, and you can't stop that. And it's a matter of: okay; so how do we still sustain that, so that, with all these other expectations going on, how do we just make sense of it. You still manage with what resources and energy you have in that moment. However, we ultimately need to be more intentional about what we do as student conduct officers and the resources that we need to contain the work effectively.

Alex is noticing the slow but steady growth of expectations in SCA and he is sitting in the midst of his work asking questions about the system that contains the work and the deeper intentions that drive the work. Typical of the Redefining action logic is an awareness of how systems change and a curiosity about the gaps performance.

Figure 12. Alex: Current focus of growth and development

Paul (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed in his current focus for learning and development in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul discussed the current challenge of SCAs seeing themselves as part of the student education process and the need to engage faculty. He said,

I think that if we are to continue to see ourselves as educators, to see ourselves as part of the educational process, I think it's really important that we find the time to do more -- have more dialogue with the academic -- with the faculty side of the house

Paul's focus is both on knowing his own role and recognizing the need to dialogue with faculty about that role. His current focus seems to be on doing just this. During the interviews he discussed connecting with faculty to educate them what exactly his role is with students and how he can be a resource to faculty. Typical of the Redefining action logic is a capacity to work collaboratively across organizational boundaries.

John (Redefining + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed in his current focus for learning and development in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. John placed a high value on self-fulfillment when he discussed his current focus on growth and development. He shared his sense that he is currently in a transitional process to a state of development that he is not certain about yet. He represented this with a photo he took of a hawk (Figure 13) at the initial stage of taking flight from the science building on campus. John said,

I was going to take a picture of him just chillin' there, but then he decided to take off, so I was able to capture it right as he was taking off. So the whole correlation to taking flight, and spreading those wings, and growing, developing, moving forward. It was something that I felt like I could tie into.

John believes that he is at a point in his career where needs to spread his own wings. He wonders about what he needs to continue to do in order to promote his own development and begin to “figure out what is going to be that long-term plan.” He went on to say, “This hawk could be out there flying for miles and miles and miles, and see a whole bunch of things, and then ultimately maybe come back to the same place.”

Figure 13. John: Focus of growth and development

The hawk taking flight is a helpful metaphor for understanding John’s internal process for thinking about his current focus of growth and when asked how this manifests in his actions he shared another photo of a book shelf (Figure 14) with several titles representing diverse topics. When asked about the variety of book titles represented on the shelf and if there was a title that represents his current interest in development John selected the book *“The Eye of the I: From which nothing is hidden”* (Hawkins, 2001). The book describes and explains advanced stages of consciousness. John admitted that he has yet to find the time to read the book but that it represented where he currently experiences his own development. He said,

You caught me in that very much of an introspective phase, and trying to figure out: oh, man, where am I at, right now? What are my visions and goals for -- how much longer am I going to be doing this and that?

This quote does two things. First, it is a reminder that the data in this study represents a moment in time for the participants. Second, John is reiterating the belief that he is in a transitional space of his own development. He senses the transition's presence and wonders about it but has yet to really step into it and explore what changes or decisions the developmental transition might mean for his life and career. Typical of a late-Redefining action logic is deeper inquiry and interest in personal transformation.

Figure 14. John: Current focus of growth and development

Carl (Transforming - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed in his current focus for learning and development in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. Carl reflected on how he is generally thought of as a very likeable person who connects well with students. He will even joke about how much street credibility he has with students. However, he also shared a recognition that there is a shadow side to his likeability. He is currently focused on how his likeability can also make him arrogant and can prompt him to become upset and frustrated when basic technical tasks are not accomplished correctly. He took a photo (Figure 15) of an example of this type of technical task illustrating a time when facilities staff painted over and incorrectly placed Velcro on a set of signs creating \$3,000

worth of damage in the residence halls. When he discovered this mistake he shared that he became visibly and verbally angry. He insulted the staff and he did this in front of a student. He recognized this as a shadow side of his identity by saying,

I've got the skill set and the savviness to take 85 people in and out of Mexico. And I didn't think twice about it. Had a great time, never got rattled, never got worried. The amount of frustration that I had over just this sign was easily ten times what I had over Mexico. This is the stuff that just eats my lunch.

Figure 15. Carl: Current focus of growth and development

Carl's current focus of growth is working to find ways to address this gap between his actions and his espoused values. He reflected on the systemic impact of this frustration when he said, "the way that we live this stuff out on campus is seen and noted. And so I think when I lose my mind over a painted sign, it sends a message." Carl's developmental aim is to better "live out who we say we are" and that fundamentally this incident connects back to student conduct because it is an issue of integrity. Typical of the Transforming action logic is the capacity to reflect upon and address shadow elements of one's identity and connect personal action to a systemic influence.

Summary: Current Focus of Learning and Development

Through their stories and/or photographs, this group of participants illustrate a stark difference between those whose meaning-making was estimated at the conventional

versus the post-conventional action logics. Each participant estimated at the conventional action logics made meaning of their current focus of learning and development at an action logic less complex than the primary action logic I assessed. However, the participants estimated at the post-conventional action logics made meaning of their current focus of learning and development at an action logic consistent with where they were estimated. This may suggest that the post-conventional action logics provide an enhanced awareness of the potential areas for focus on learning and development.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics can also be seen in participant's current focus of learning and development. Meaning-making at the conventional action logics is characterized as being focused on enhancing traditional or acceptable areas of skill and competence; concern with how to communicate (often to authority) an area of focus; and creating rules, principles, and objectives to guide focus. Meaning-making at the post-conventional action logics is characterized by reflecting on the experience of both internal and external tensions; prone to paralysis as a result of one's awareness of multiple and competing perspectives; inquiry into the broader system that is a work; insight into self and sense of purpose; and recognition that one's own development is tied to the development of others.

Discussion

This chapter analyzed the expression of participant action logics and meaning-making characteristics in the area of three overarching themes from the interview and photography data. Data were analyzed in a way that separated *how* they thought from *what* they thought about the themes of 1) Philosophy or approach to SCA, 2) Strategies and Practices for Learning, and 3) Current Focus of Learning and Development.

Recognizing there are numerous ways to approach SCA and seek to learn and grow in the field, *what* participants are doing is not as important as *how* they think about and relate to what they are doing. This study's sample of participants were separated by conventional action logics (Expert and Achiever) and post-conventional action logics (Redefining and Transforming) in order to understand the changes in a participant's meaning-making characteristics when expressing the more complex action logics. The previous analysis suggested two things. First, some participants expressed multiple action logics in their meaning-making of the themes rather than just the primary action logic I assessed. Participants operating outside of a primary action logic and from a range of action logics is noteworthy for the findings of this research.

Second, characteristics of a participant's meaning-making there is a conventional or post-conventional action logic there was a noticeable contrast in the participants' meaning-making.

The majority of the participants at the Achiever (conventional) and Redefining (post-conventional) action logics. Since these two action logics represent the boundary of development between conventional and post-conventional, the data provides interesting opportunity to understand this transitional space. When examined through the action logic theory, meaning-making of participants displays a noticeable contrast in the three meta-themes. Table 7 displays the characteristics of meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional levels of development in the three meta-themes. The developmental shift to a post-conventional action logic in the three meta-themes can be characterized in a few ways (see Table 7). There is a release of control that allows post-conventional meaning-making to inquire and thereby invite new insights. Their curiosity

moves from habitual practices for learning and areas of growth to an immersive experience with the self and others. Their concern with creating deeper connections with others serves to help them gain perspective on individuality and context. Additionally, post-conventional participants create and value continuous feedback loops and listen closely to their own experience as a source insight. This increase in sources of insight (external and internal) they are interested in can sometimes leave them prone to paralysis as they sort through new options that are available to them. The data analysis now transitions to understanding how participant action logics influence their meaning-making of the skills, knowledge, and attributes necessary for SCA.

Table 7

Characteristics of meaning-making meta-themes

Conventional Action Logics	Post-Conventional Action Logics
Philosophy and Approach to SCA	
Reliance on positional authority and traditional knowledge and structures	Creating opportunities for inquiring that may lead to deep connections and perspective taking
Taking responsible and transparent actions	Seeking to envision more of who the student is and is becoming
Adherence to principle and objectives that are informed by well-considered values and assumptions	Valuing individuality and context
Strategies and Practices for Learning	
Branding a legitimate professional identity	Creating immersive experiences
Curiosity and drive to keep learning	Valuing continuous feedback loops
Focus on craft knowledge that is seen as valid by authorities	Close listening to one's experiences
Current Focus of Growth and Development	
Enhancing current and traditional areas of skill and competence	Insight into self and sense of purpose
Concern with how to communicate an area of focus	Reflecting on the experience of both internal and external tensions
Creating rules, principles, and objectives to guide focus.	Prone to paralysis as a result of one's awareness of multiple and competing perspectives
	Inquiring into a broader system that is at work

CHAPTER SIX

ANALYSIS OF MEANING-MAKING OF SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE, AND ATTRIBUTES IN SCA

Participant shared stories and took photographs that illustrated how narratives were analyzed for their meaning-making regarding the skills, knowledge, and attributes for competent and effective practice in SCA. This section will provide representational data for the action logic estimate of these themes. The purpose of this analysis is to illustrate the ways in which participants expressed action logics outside of their primary or assessed action logic. Table 8 displays each participant's primary action logic. A symbol is used to indicate for each theme whether the participant's meaning-making expressed an action logic of consistent, more, or less complexity than the primary action logic.

Table 8

Analysis of participant AL expression based on the skills, knowledge, and attributes

	Conventional				Post-Conventional				
	Joy	Thomas	Nicole	Tess	Mark	Alex	Paul	John	Carl
Researcher's Action Logic Estimate	E	A	A	A(+)	R(-)	R	R	R (+)	T(-)
<i>Theme 1: Skills</i>	Ø	Ø	↓	↑	Ø	↓	Ø	Ø	Ø
<i>Theme 2: Knowledge</i>	Ø	Ø	↓	↓	↓	Ø	Ø	↓	↓
<i>Theme 3: Attributes or Disposition</i>	↑	Ø	↑	↑	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	↓

E = Expert

A = Achiever

R = Redefining/ Individualist

T = Transforming/ Strategist

(-) = Early Stage

(+) = Late Stage

↑ = More complex meaning-making than the AL est.

↓ = Less complex meaning-making than the AL est.

Ø = Meaning-making complexity consistent w/ AL est.

The literature review in chapter two synthesizes professional learning and growth in student affairs and student conduct administration based on three themes that are used in this chapter to analyze the expression of participant action logics and the structure of their meaning-making. The first theme includes the skills suggested by the literature that are required of competent and effective practitioners in SCA. These skills might include collaboration, communication, human relations, problem solving, conflict management, and crisis management. The second theme includes the knowledge suggested by the literature that is required of competent and effective practitioners in SCA. This knowledge might include student development, multi-cultural awareness, ethical standards, policy and legal issues, and leadership and organizational theory. The third theme includes the attitudes and dispositions required of competent and effective practitioners in SCA. The literature suggests these attributes might include integrity, work-life balance, fulfillment in the position, flexibility, critical thinking, and developing broader perspectives. Analysis was completed for each of the three themes on how participants made meaning of these skills, knowledge, and attributes during the data collection process and what action logics seemed to influence this meaning-making.

Theme 1: Skills for Competent and Effective Practice in SCA

Participants shared stories and took photographs that illustrated the skills of competent and effective practice in SCA. Data was categorized based on their skills and then coded for the action logics they expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants' primary action logic (as identified by the researcher) is consistent with the expressed action logic during meaning-making of the skills for competent and effective practice in SCA. The results are also displayed in Table 8.

Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed for in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were consistent with her estimated primary Expert action logic. The developmental student conduct conversation is a primary skill used by professionals in SCA. It often involves simultaneously building rapport, investigating, and seeking student accountability. Joy discussed how she thrives on connecting with students who may be more difficult to employ an effective conduct conversation. To connect, she described asking about a student's background while starting to form assumptions about the student's experience. Joy said, "I'll state my assumptions, which I almost know are more than assumptions. I'm sure I'm hitting it right on the dot." This is consistent with the Expert action logic in which a person is focused on individual certainty and firmness in knowing what steps are most efficient and effective.

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were consistent with his estimated primary Achiever action logic. As the Chief Student Conduct Officer at a large public institution, Thomas must navigate a large system with competing interests. He described the skills required to conduct this navigation as requiring thoughtful and political timing in order to create change. He said,

So I try to really gauge the room and see, is this something I can get now, or am I going to have to wait? And if I have to wait, what's my process? And so I try not to extend myself too much, 'cause I know if I really want something in the end, I've just got to be patient with it.

Thomas' comments highlight the importance of focusing on priorities and understanding the need to conscientiously work across power structures. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person juggles multiple goals and priorities and seeks to integrate them into the established system.

Nicole (Achiever ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were less complex (early-Achiever) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Nicole reflected on her current skills related to decision-making and communication when she said, “sometimes I know that what I'm doing is the right thing to do, and it's figuring out how do I communicate that to my supervisor, or a responding party, or a complainant. And how am I firm in that?” Nicole provided insight into what influences this kind of focus when she said,

I think that when I appear to be more uncertain, I think it opens up or provides an opportunity for others to question my thought process and my ability... I think when I appear more confident in things, it's easier for people to trust that decision.

In this example, Nicole is concerned with the form of the communication in order to maintain her authority and be effective. Additionally, she is aware of and adapts to how she may be experienced in a particular context. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person is focused on clear and effective communication, however; Nicole's emphasis on appearing confident rather than being confident suggests an early Achiever action logic that is slightly less complex than her primary action logic.

Tess (Achiever + ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were more complex (Redefining) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Tess frequently discussed acting as a guide to students and being capable of accompanying them through the conduct process. She placed importance on being alongside them as a guide as opposed to placing something upon students or doing something to them. This form of guiding students involved building trust and being transparent about the process. She also discussed wanting to immerse herself in the experience of international students and working to gain a deeper understanding of how they experience the university. This is consistent with the Redefining action logic in which a person emphasizes trust, transparency, accompaniment, and immersion.

Post-Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were consistent with his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Mark reflected on the difficulty of using his voice to advocate for some student populations because of his own identity and what he believed he could express with credibility. He discussed

bringing his voice to the table when he spoke about a theory from graduate school called the “table theory.” He said,

We're taught to sometimes be the voice of the person that is not at the table. So that we could be the minority voice, that could be the woman voice, the LGBT voice. Always thinking about those students, because if that's not your perspective, you shouldn't be making decisions that could adversely harm those other groups.

He goes on to share that sometimes he is uncomfortable bringing his own voice to the table because others may perceive conflicts between his institutional role and aspects of his personal identity. He shared an example about the perception his colleagues might have about him when sharing perspectives on LGBT issues. He said, “because of the way I identify, or just as simple, because perhaps I am a straight male, or they assume that I am a straight male, I don't have a voice in that [LGBT] conversation.” In this example Mark uses a theory from graduate school to help articulate the challenge and expresses the experience of a paralyzed voice due to a perceived limited authorization to speak and uncertainty about how to navigate the experience. This is consistent with the Redefining action logic in which a person has the experience of paralysis. The paralysis is often the result of the individual reflexively revisiting a less complex action logic and working to reintegrate the less complex action logic into the self in a new way. In the example of Mark’s paralysis, he is revisiting the Expert action logic. Evidence of this revisiting is in his conscious reflection on the tension he is experiencing and using a theory to help him navigate the tension. This is not simply an Expert action logic that is concerned with credibility and who is allowed to speak to an issue. It is evidence of his Redefining action logic that reflectively revisits less complex action logics for the purpose of possible reintegrating them into his meaning-making in a new way.

Alex (Redefining ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were less complex (Achiever) than his estimated primary Redefining action logic. To illustrate how he uses his skills to address stressful experiences in his work, Alex took a photo of a beta fish (Figure 16) in his office. Alex experiences stress when he feels as though he is in the fishbowl and all eyes are on him. He said,

Part of it is when I feel like there's going to be all eyes on me, or when everyone's going to be looking at this, and it's either going to be in the -- you always hear -- what's that phrase? It's CYA. It's cover your ass.

Alex believes that this is appropriate for the type of work he is doing. He said,

You have to be cognizant of everything you do. You have to be aware of the long-term ramifications of a report or a letter, or what this means should it result in a lawsuit. You always have to do that. But sometimes it gets a little bit too much, in the sense that you are always super-anxious.

Figure 16. Alex: Conflicted or torn

Alex described one incident he was managing that caught local media attention and sparked student protest on campus. He said, “what became easiest was kind of to ignore anything else and sticking to your process. You know, sending letters. When you

send a letter, it's meeting with the student. And just move forward with it.” When asked to describe how he felt while managing this incident he said,

I think part of it is not letting myself get deterred by the hooplah around it -- the bells and whistles -- and just focus on what my job was. I think there's different ways you approach different meetings, and I think the way I approached this meeting is different than my personality in a different meeting, but hopefully, at the end of the day, like I said, you get to the same thing that you set out to accomplish.

Alex’s comments and the photograph he took (Figure 16) describe his experience of feeling very pressured. As a result, he becomes focused on fulfilling his duties and producing the best result. Through his photograph he suggested that he experiences all eyes on him but he has also helped to insulate himself in this metaphoric fishbowl through his close focus on process and results. Alex is aware of the context and adapts his style but does not question it. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person has the experience of being pressured and working conscientiously while also being less likely to question systems or patterns that are in place.

Paul (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul shared the experience of working on his campus and with his counterparts at other community colleges to advance work on new Title IX guidelines. He described the desire to be collaborative in this work but frustrated with the lack of urgency at times. He said,

I know I'm not the only one who's feeling this way, but it's, like, when I talk to other conduct officers and, like, "I'm, like, in the middle of the quad, yelling 'Hey! We're all going to get in trouble if you don't fix this!'" And people are, like, "Okay. Well, let's fix it." And I'm like "I can't fix it by myself!"

Paul is jokingly describing a concern for the challenge of being collaborative across the system given competing priorities or varying levels of understanding of the issue. His behavior and attitude toward the work is typical of the Redefining action logic which privileges an orientation towards collaboration on an urgent issue as well as expresses frustration with those who may not see the urgency.

John (Redefining + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were consistent with his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. John often discussed his desire to be collaborative in efforts to address campus challenges. For instance, his approach to new guidelines impacting Title IX compliance was to leverage campus collaborations to ensure the university is proactive in its discussions. Although an element of this is a function of campus culture, John is clearly focused on collaboration in and out of his institution. For instance, he is proud of recent work he did to establish a regional SCA meeting where his counterparts from local campuses can meet to exchange ideas and how they are addressing current challenges. Attention to this form of collaboration moves from the campus level to a systemic level where the impact can be more far reaching. A focus on collaboration that interweaves various priorities is typical of a late-Redefining action logic. John's demonstration of this collaboration at the campus level and in the broader field, and his focus on the use and development of his skills is consistent with his estimated late-Redefining action logic.

Carl (Transforming - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed in explaining the skills necessary for competent and effective practice in SCA were consistent with his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. In his work

to change the student conduct system, Carl worked to collaborate with many partners on campus and specifically avoided placing himself at the center of the change process where decisions got routed through him. He preferred to influence the change as opposed to controlling it. Part of Carl's instinct "was to bring faculty advisors in, to bring resident directors in, to bring in resident assistants so that they hear and see these stories." He wanted to bring in fresh perspectives into the process to hear student concerns and ultimately did not want to be the "only one holding all the responsibility for the process." Typical of the Transforming action logic, Carl seeks to intentionally spread responsibility and involvement in the conduct process throughout the community represents a collaborative form of advocacy.

On a broader scale, Carl sees a challenge for the field of student conduct as the ability for conduct administrators to mobilize other sectors of campus. He said, "I think that student conduct officers are often a dumping ground for really hard stuff that people don't really want to talk about and deal with." In his own work Carl has found it helpful to start with just one colleague in the faculty at a time. He said, "as cliché as it may sound, people that do it end up doing it one relationship at a time." Its not about big rollout programs where 100 faculty sign up but "you get two, and you put them on your website and you publish it. And you use those two to get two more, and then you're kind of down the road further than you were." This is consistent with the Transforming action logic in which a person emphasizes co-creation and understands that change is incremental and purposeful while recognizing that systems move slowly and build on themselves.

The skills Carl is describing for creating change shows that he recognizes the limits of exercising unilateral power and the importance of generating new forms of power in the system to support a major change effort. The skills also suggest an appreciation for incremental change and how this helps to build a shared vision. Typical of the Transforming action logic, Carl is capable of situating these action logic behaviors both on his campus and the broader SCA field.

Summary: Skills

I made action logic estimates for participant meaning-making of the skills necessary for competence and effective practice of SCA. Six of nine participants expressed an action logic of consistent complexity to that of my primary action logic estimate.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics for these participants can also be seen in this discussion of the skills they used. Meaning-making about the skills utilized in their practice at the conventional action logics was characterized by control and certainty of knowing; acting and communicating conscientiously; aware and adaptive to context. Meaning-making about the skills utilized in their practice at the post-conventional action logics was characterized by increased movement into collaboration and towards a co-creative process; valuing purposeful, incremental change and recognizing the limits of unilateral power.

Theme 2: Knowledge for Competent and Effective Practice in SCA

Participants shared stories and took photographs that illustrated the knowledge for competent and effective practice in SCA. Data was categorized based on knowledge and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to

illustrate if the participants' primary action logic (as identified by the researcher) was consistent with their expressed action logic during meaning-making of the knowledge for competent and effective practice in SCA. The results are also displayed in Table 8.

Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed in her knowledge of competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with her estimated primary Expert action logic. Joy's comments as to how she makes meaning of new knowledge in SCA suggests she has an implicit approach to new knowledge that she uses to reinforce what she already knows. For instance, she said about recent training in Title IX investigations that,

It's legitimizing what I already have. I think I'm good at what I do, but when I can really break it down and show people my line of thought, the process that I use, and how detailed and -- I don't know the word I'm trying to find -- thorough; I think detailed and thorough, I think it really gains me some legitimacy.

Joy is using a new training to develop her expertise and create an individual contribution. This is consistent with the Expert action logic in which a person valued legitimacy and clarity of what is known.

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed in his knowledge of competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Achiever action logic. Thomas seems to recognize that

knowledge is created and can be influenced. Currently, he is very concerned about how the field of SCA creates knowledge about its work. He said,

If we were able to tell our story better, people would understand. And it's hard sometimes because we have to follow FERPA, and we have to be careful in how we say things. But I think we can tell the narrative through assessment, through generalized narrative stories, through our statistics, through our professionalism, through our expertise. That people know that the people that are in student conduct are well-trained, they're very professional-based, they have a lot of knowledge, background and experience.

The examples Thomas used as ways to tell the SCA story suggests he is aware that the form of communication is important. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person focuses on the form that communication takes and has an orientation towards action and goals.

Nicole (Achiever ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed in her knowledge of competent and effective practice in SCA was less complex (Expert) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Recently Nicole attended a training institute where she gained advanced knowledge about conflict resolution strategies. The experience was personally meaningful as it resonated with a passion she is continuing to explore. Her relationship to this knowledge provided insight into her meaning-making. She said,

This is it; this is what I want to be doing. I want to be helping students manage conflict. And I want to be helping others manage conflict. Whether that's conflict between the code of conduct and their conduct, or conflict between two students individually, I think that's what I'm there to facilitate. I'm there to be able to give them the tools to communicate effectively, and to understand one another better.

It is the final sentence that shows how she relates to the new knowledge and is consistent with the Expert action logic that focuses on guiding and advising others. Typical of the

Expert action logic, Nicole's framing of the quote places herself the holder of knowledge and sees her role as transferring it to others.

Tess (Achiever + ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed in her knowledge of competent and effective practice in SCA was less complex (Achiever) than her estimated primary late-Achiever action logic. Tess seeks to remain knowledgeable about what is happening on-campus. She took a photo of a pile of student newspapers (Figure 17) that she reads regularly to stay informed about campus. She said,

I actually finished reading these, as I promised but it's something I enjoy, it's something I do typically everyday when I come into the office, if they have the student newspaper out front, I read it, I want to know about campus what's going on with students, they mention a lot of things about programs about faculty, about staff. And so, I hope it helps me be a more well-rounded person and professional.

Through this practice Tess broadens her understanding of what is happening at the institution and creates an awareness of how her responsibilities are situated within a larger context. Tess articulates an awareness of a broader context as driving her work to gain knowledge about the campus community. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person may focus on knowledge that is not directly related to their work, yet is very practical and rational, has value, and informs them as a professional.

Figure 17. Tess: Growth and development

Post-Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed in his knowledge of competent and effective practice in SCA was less complex (Achiever) than his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Mark discussed the practice of “ingesting knowledge” and by this he meant,

I really, really, just love connecting with other people. And I don't have to talk to them. I mean, I really don't have to talk and tell my entire side of the story, but just listening to their experience, it really does impact mine, because I really get to do, like, a little: Okay, let me check myself and see where I am on that perspective, and just learn something from others.

The quote privileges the accumulation of multiple perspectives and the importance he places on being curious and continued learning. There is also an emphasis on his own learning as opposed to expressing a mutuality in the connection that is being created. Although very likely coming from a place of respect for the knowledge of others, his own perspective is placed as secondary and limits the co-creative potential of the exchange. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person appreciates multiple perspectives and learning from different sources of knowledge.

Alex (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed in his knowledge of competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with his

estimated primary Redefining action logic. Alex perceives several different opportunities in his work for improving his knowledge base. He wants to continue to focus on learning about Title IX and the legal issues informing his work. He continues to be interested in learning about race and ethnic studies on the college campus. He sees all these knowledge areas of learning as “interwoven” in being both a student conduct officer and student affairs professional. To illustrate the integration of knowledge he took a photograph of several twigs (Figure 18) representing the different areas of learning stemming from the same foundation. Alex believes that a benefit of working in student conduct is that “although it's a specialist position rather than a general position, like housing is, there's still those elements of being able to do a lot of different things.” Alex’s orientation towards SCA is typical of someone using a Redefining action logic because of his focus on the integration or interweaving of multiple perspectives and knowledge.

Figure 18. Alex: Current focus on growth and development

Paul (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed in his knowledge of competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul discussed his continuing challenge of

taking time to reflect on the improvement of his conduct program. He is concerned about the pace of his work that he feels leaves little time to learn, plan, and improve. Although a function of the first interview, when asked about why he decided to participate in this study he said,

I think I had been thinking a lot about my conduct program, and ways that we could improve the -- really, the student learning aspect of the program. And I was intrigued by the focus on -- it felt like, to me, the focus on the learning that was taking place -- within the profession -- a special learning. So professional learning growth, I thought that was very interesting. So I thought let me hear a little more about this. And it turned out that you were very close, and so it was a twofer for me. I could meet a counterpart person who's doing the same -- working in the same area of student affairs

Paul hoped participation in this study would be an opportunity to actually take time to think about his student conduct program while providing a benefit to a colleague. This is consistent with the Redefining action logic in which a person focuses on non-habitual ways of learning (volunteer participation in a dissertation study), engagement in forms of mutuality, and weaving together personal and organizational objectives.

John (Redefining + ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed in his knowledge for competent and effective practice in SCA was less complex (Achiever) than his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. As the chief SCA at his institution John is responsible for the overall management of the student conduct process. He takes seriously his responsibility to create an educational process and contribute to a safe community. However, he also recognizes that he has to depend on many of his campus partners to be successful. As a result, he is very collaborative in how he addresses the difficult challenges of his work. An example of this intersection of responsibility and collaboration is evidenced in how he has managed the institution's response to the rollout of guidance from the federal government about campus sexual

assault over the past year and a half. He said, “one of the most significant challenges that I see facing student conduct administration is keeping up with, and then compliance with all of these newly created and/or ever-changing regulations.” He took a photo of his computer screen and training manuals (Figure 19) to represent all of the new skills and knowledge bases he is responsible for being aware of and communicating to his colleagues. John understands that the rollout of new guidelines for addressing Title IX incidents requires that he acquire new knowledge. Both his quote and photograph highlight the importance he is placing on compliance and advancing institutional understanding of the expectations. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person focuses on personal and organizational learning objectives that are responsible and fulfill his expected duties.

Figure 19. John: Current challenges

Carl (Transforming - ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed in his knowledge for competent and effective practice in SCA was less complex (Redefining) than his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. Although Carl certainly values many of the traditional forms of knowledge described by

other participants, Carl also understands difficult experiences as opportunities for feedback and new knowledge. He described an incident where he was meeting with two female students and several colleagues regarding enforcement of a new policy. He described the meeting as not going very well and the students left dissatisfied. Later the students submitted an article for the student newspaper accusing Carl of inappropriate touching and insensitive or derogatory comments during their meeting. For Carl, the accusations were baseless and they were not difficult to disprove. However, instead of writing the incident off and moving on he interpreted it as helpful feedback wrapped in unfamiliar packaging. He said, “so no matter how irrational it may be, or irreverent... If you don't take it personal, and if you can keep your feet on the ground and listen, everything means something.” With this particular situation Carl was able to take away a deeper understanding about shifting expectations for student boundaries and ways in which a certain turn-of-phrase can be interpreted. For Carl, opportunities for feedback are always present and probably the most important ones are hidden in difficult situations. Additionally, his meaning-making reflects an implicit understanding that interpersonal conflicts reflect aspects of larger systemic dynamics. This is consistent with the Redefining action logic in which a person expresses a capacity to question basic patterns of behavior and simultaneously reflect on the systemic meaning of an interpersonal exchange.

Summary: Knowledge

From analysis of their stories and/or photographs, I estimated action logics for each participants’ meaning-making of the knowledge necessary for effective SCA. Five of the participants made meaning of the theme of knowledge with an action logic

complexity less than the primary estimate I made. The other four expressed an action logic consistent with the primary action logic estimate. Among these participants, action logic expression related to knowledge was more likely to be less complex than the primary estimate.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics for these participants can also be seen in this discussion of the knowledge they used. Meaning-making about the knowledge utilized by these participants at the conventional action logics was characterized by a role that possesses and transfers knowledge to others; recognizes multiple ways to create knowledge; conscious of the form of communication; and values knowledge that is practical and rational. Meaning-making about the knowledge utilized by these participants at the post-conventional action logics (Redefining) was characterized by recognizing knowledge is interwoven or interdisciplinary; seeks feedback in unfamiliar packages; and questions their own basic assumptions and patterns of behavior.

Theme 3: Attributes or Disposition for Competent and Effective Practice in SCA

Participants shared stories and took photographs that illustrate the attributes or dispositions regarding competent and effective practice in SCA. Data was categorized based on attributes or dispositions and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants' primary action logic (as identified by the researcher) was consistent with their expressed action logic during the process in which they were making meaning of their attributes or disposition for competent and effective practice in SCA. The results are also displayed in Table 8.

Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was more complex (Redefining) than her estimated primary Expert action logic. Joy described spending a lot of time in her meetings with students developing a positive rapport. She pulls on her strengths of inclusion and empathy saying, “I strive to really understand them. I think I have a natural knack for reading people's feelings, understanding how they're feeling when they come into the room.” Typical of the Redefining action logic is the expression of curiosity, empathy, and deep connection that seeks to inhabit the other’s perspective.

The Redefining action logic also presents a shadow side for Joy that she expressed in discussing her level of stress or burnout at work. She described herself as being “in a constant state of burnout” and almost every year Joy wonders if this will be her last year in the field. Joy recognizes how this state of burnout jumps over into her personal life creating a cycle of stress. She described the experience as “no safe haven, at work or at home, to escape from the others. It's just always that pressure feeling.” Typical of the Redefining action logic, Joy reflects on a tension at the boundary between her work and personal life. The shadow side of the Redefining action logic is how she is able to deeply feel this tension and seems to have become paralyzed by it.

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Achiever action logic. Thomas believes that student conduct is essentially a relational process. He begins all his student meetings with efforts at building rapport and said about meeting with students,

It's a conversation. It's not a formalized thing. But it's a conversation about what the alleged violations are, and how we can move forward. And so that's how I was trained, and that's how I've really gone forward. And that's how I train other people, there's certain things you're going to have to get in there, about the process, that are -- sound a little more formal, but you want the discussion to be a conversation.

For Thomas, the conversational and rapport building approach recognizes that there are rules and processes being managed but there are also relationships being managed.

Typical of the Achiever action logic, Thomas tries to balance his goal orientation and interpersonal relationships.

Nicole (Achiever ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was more complex (Redefining) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Nicole reflected on an incident from the past where a student was on campus with a large amount of a controlled substance. She was given a clear direction from her dean and vice-provost that the sanction would need to be expulsion from the institution. Nicole wrestled with the decision and specifically the philosophy behind permanently expelling a student from an institution rather than suspending for a few years in order to allow for rehabilitation. To illustrate this internal tension, she took a photo of a freeway with multiple exits available (Figure 20). She said about the picture, “what I was really looking for was I wanted something that depicted somebody else taking responsibility.”

During the decision making process Nicole wanted someone else to be behind the wheel because she did not personally agree with the decision she was being asked to make. Nicole's second photo represented more of what she was looking for in the situation (Figure 21).

Figure 20. Nicole: Conflicted or Torn (1)

Figure 21. Nicole: Conflicted or Torn (2)

The two photos represent very different journeys. The first photo (Figure 20) provides a view of the road ahead and Nicole shared how she sees several options but she wants someone else to be behind the wheel. In the second photo (Figure 21) she described herself as driving the vehicle but only has a single option and a clear indication of when to stop and go. When further prompted about the relationship between these two photos and the sanction decision she was managing she said,

When it came to such a life-changing decision, although it was expected of me, and I wanted some more guidance -- I guess more open-ended guidance, I guess is what it is. 'Cause I was given guidance. But it was in one direction. I also, I guess, didn't feel comfortable being -- I actually just wasn't sold on it. And that's why I wanted it to be somebody else's responsibility. Or somebody else's say.

Nicole was experiencing incongruence between the direction she was being given and her own understanding of the best decision to make. This is consistent with the Redefining action logic in which a person reflects on a personal and systemic tension and the ideological limitation of the system.

Tess (Achiever + ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was more complex (Redefining) than her estimated primary late-Achiever action logic. Tess described seeking to remain centered in her work in SCA. She described a process by which she attends to the quality of her disposition through faith and prayer. Tess's prayer life has a special role in her work from the moment she walks in the office door. She said,

I take a moment to pray for myself, and pray for everybody that walks through the door, actually. Sometimes I have to protect them coming into the office. Protect them from any sleep I might not have gotten the night before. I'm very serious about it. I've prayed my way through difficult situations. I attend church every other Sunday, where I go in and pray --literally pray over the office. Really pray for compassion. I pray for wisdom, I pray for experience, I pray for kindness. Fun, sometimes, you know. We need to pray for that kindness. And so I pray for protection against those who may have done something wrong, but will use every avenue they have to make others suffer because of that, including myself. But, yeah, it finds its way in here every single day that I walk in.

In her prayer she expresses an awareness of personal shadows that function to undermine relationships. Typical of the Redefining action logic is a capacity for presence to the self within a system and the multiple influences on our thoughts and behavior.

Post-Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was more consistent with his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Mark described that informing his disposition in SCA is an appreciation that “at the end of the day, nothing is black and white” and as a result he has learned to operate in a “world of grey.” He provided an example of a difficult decision made by his supervisor that he disagreed with and said,

The bottom line is that I've made peace with the fact that I work here. I signed on to this institution. And even if there's some decisions I don't like, I have to, at the end of the day, support those decisions and embrace them.

Immediately this statement appears to reflect a conventional action logic through its inherent commitment to the system boundaries. However, Mark went on to reflect that there are likely areas of grey in the decision making process that he is unaware of and he may not have the full picture. Therefore, he needs to “give grace to whoever's made those decisions, to say: Okay; perhaps they're seeing it from a completely different perspective.” In this particular situation Mark’s capacity to hold multiple perspectives is operating as opposed to just being agreeable. However, the limitation in meaning-making is that the grace he provides to others functions to give him peace and allow him

to remain committed to the institution and his colleagues. It does not function to influence the system. This is consistent with his estimated early Redefining action logic. Typical of the early-Redefining action logic is a capacity to see the “grey” areas but the interpretation he draws only informs his own navigation of the institution and not his influence of the institution. This is a subtle developmental transition that would invite additional complexity as Mark accesses a more stable Redefining action logic.

Alex (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Alex suggested that the increased expectations placed upon student conduct officers create a risk for burn out and this is something he tries to be aware of. He said, “I think we're burning ourselves out because we have so many expectations, being torn different ways. It's how do you still protect yourself against that burnout without adding too much onto our own plate.” He took a photograph of a candle with a burnt wick (Figure 22) to represent this challenge. His own way of managing this challenge is the way he sets boundaries around when and where he works. However, he is also aware of a boundary that informs his internal relationship to his work when he said,

The other thing is, for me personally, separating myself from the work, to a certain extent. Going back to what happens when your own personal opinion of who you are, being yourself in the role. I think that's important. You just have to keep that separation, too. Because if you get too personally in the work, it's going to -- it'll tire you out.

Alex suggests a capacity to get distance and perspective on work without being consumed by it. Although informed by the Achiever action logic through the goal of being effective for oneself and the institution, typical of the Redefining action logic is a

capacity to separate role from sense of self while understanding that they inform one another.

Figure 22. Alex: Promote own development

Paul (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul shared a story about managing an incident where a veteran student had become disruptive in two different offices resulting in staff calling the police out of concern for their safety. Paul shared that there was pressure placed upon him to remove the student permanently but he decided to take another approach that sought to better understand what the student was trying to accomplish. He called in another senior administrator who oversaw the offices in question and the two campus police officers who had escorted the student off campus for a meeting with the student. He said,

So we had a sit-down with him, and he was just sure -- so sure that he was about to be kicked out of school. And we said you know what? We're not kicking you out of school. We don't think that you're trying to harm anybody, we don't think that you're trying to hurt anybody, we don't even think you're trying to disrupt people. We just don't know what you're trying to do. So could you help us understand?... Let's start with us. We'll sit here and we're going to listen to what

you have to say, and hear your side of it. And the other dean and I and the two police officers just folded our hands in our laps and just let him talk.

There are a few notable characteristics about Paul's disposition and approach to this student meeting. First, it is collaborative and intentionally involves key stakeholders who can support the student. Second, his introduction of the meeting acknowledges the likely perspective of the student and his own assumptions about the motivations of the students. Third, he frames the meeting with an inquiry that seeks to understand more about what is happening for the student. Finally, he focuses on how he and his colleagues listen to the student. Typical of the Redefining action logic is being intentionally collaborative, acknowledging and inviting multiple perspectives, and authentic inquiry.

John (Redefining + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was consistent with his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. John provided an illustration of his disposition as a SCA with a photo of a bridge (Figure 23) that he travels everyday. Although he admitted to getting "a little dramatic" with Photoshop, he saw the metaphor of a bridge as significant to his own growth and development. He said,

Along our development we're going to travel many a mile, and encounter many a bridge, and there's a lot there and a lot to figure out. How do you utilize the bridge in terms of getting from one place to the next? And how do you see that bridge? Does it reinforce what you're doing, or is it taking you to a new place altogether? Is it going to be a one-way bridge for you, or whatever?

In his photo and quote John acknowledges the uncertainty about where he is heading developmentally and what function it will serve. He views his current task as trying to embrace the beauty of this period of time and acknowledge the more dramatic moments. He said,

It's part of that overall embracing the fact that the path is always surrounded by -- oftentimes nice and beautiful sights, and sometimes not so much. But here's an example of an inviting but yet potentially dramatic view of the skyline and life in general.

John is expressing optimism in the uncertainty of not knowing what lies ahead. He is able to be optimistic because he has also come to understand that he has some control over his own experience and how he experiences reality. Much like the ability to edit a photo, he can determine the shading of his experience. He said,

I know that I have the ability to control what I determine to be a good thing or a bad thing. And even if it feels bad I have to find a way to make it good. Otherwise, if I see it as bad and I treat it as bad, then that's all it's going to be.

Figure 23. John: Focus of growth and development

John's photo (Figure 23) and quotes express how he understands and relates to both the beauty and shadow of experience. He is seeking to hold both in his meaning-making and recognizes that one cannot exist without the other. Typical of the late-Redefining action logic, John has discovered a capacity to travel into the unknown but may not yet be aware of how to listen into the unknown. This means that although there is a willingness to experience the unknown, there is an indication that it is because he

knows he can shape or influence what is unknown. This is opposed to more fully embracing the paradoxes and counter-constructions of experience.

Carl (Transforming - ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed in the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA was less complex than his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. Carl's disposition as a SCA is represented in an experience where a female student was working off-campus as a stripper and engaged with alcohol and drug use. In addition to the individual behavior he was managing significant community impact because the student would flaunt stacks of one-dollar bills and dancing outfits in a first-year residence hall of a private Christian university. In addressing the behavior, he collaborated with a female resident director to discuss with the student and the choices she was making. Carl said, "I wanted to stay aware of just kind of my own role in this situation, being male, and wanting to make sure that I didn't make anybody uncomfortable." In this way he was navigating the challenge of his obligation to address this situation while also remaining aware of what his own identity might represent in the situation. While holding an awareness of his own identity he was able to work with his female RD to unpack the identity development of the student. Additionally, he had to be aware of and manage individual concerns from other students in the residence hall. He said,

It was hard because it was this fine line to walk of her being really disruptive in the hall, and scaring some people and doing some stuff that was causing harm to herself -- and at the same time seeing her potential. We were working harder than she was.

The student eventually began to turn the corner to salvage the rest of her academic semester. He said, "that's why we don't have a formulaic response to what we do, because we were able to uphold the integrity of the process, but it had some significant

variance to it, so that we could converse with her.” Typical of the late-Redefining action logic late-Redefining action logic is simultaneously maintaining individual and interpersonal awareness while navigating a challenging situation and being mindful of the student’s complexity and the underlying interpersonal dynamics.

Summary: Attributes or Disposition

From analysis of their stories and/or photographs, I estimated each participant’s expressed action logic regarding their meaning-making of the attributes or dispositions for competent and effective practice in SCA. Three participants made meaning at an action logic more complex than their primary estimate, while seven of the eight participants made meaning of the attributes or dispositions necessary for effective SCA at a post-conventional action logic. Examining this in relation to the estimates in theme one (skills) and two (knowledge) of the chapter, the data suggests that participants understand a post-conventional temperament in SCA but may lack a capacity to transfer this understanding to their skills and knowledge in SCA. In other words, participant meaning-making of attributes and dispositions in SCA expresses a more aspirational action logic than what is evident in their meaning-making of skills and knowledge.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics for these participants can also be seen in this discussion of the attributes and disposition for competence and effective practice of SCA. Meaning-making about the attributes and disposition utilized by participants at the conventional action logics is characterized by building rapport and engaging in conversations; mutuality bounded by role; and balancing goal orientation with interpersonal relationships. Meaning-making about the attributes and disposition utilized by participants at the post-conventional action

logics is characterized by consciousness of incongruence and presence to the self in the system; deep connection, curiosity, and empathy; separating role from self but recognizing how they inform one another; capable of recognizing light and shadow (Redefining) or embracing a co-existence of light and shadow (Transforming); reflecting on internal tensions and navigating ideological limitations of the system (Redefining) or learning to influence systemic ideology (Transforming).

Discussion

This chapter analyzed participant meaning-making in the area of three themes (skills, knowledge, and attributes or dispositions) that were reflected in the review of the literature of student affairs and SCA practice (ACPA/NASPA, 2010). Participant interview and photography data were analyzed in a way that separated *how* they thought from *what* they thought about the various themes. Recognizing there are numerous skills, sources of knowledge, and dispositions participants could represent from the field, *what* participants are doing or know is not as important as *how* they think about and relate to what they are doing or know. This study's sample of participants were separated by conventional action logics (Expert and Achiever) and post-conventional action logics (Redefining and Transforming). Additionally, the previous analysis showed that some participants utilized a range of action logics in their meaning-making of the themes. However, when employing a conventional or post-conventional action logic there was a noticeable contrast in the participants' meaning-making.

The analysis of the range of action logics expressed by participants that is displayed in Table 8 suggests that participants are developmentally aspirational in their meaning-making of the attributes and dispositions in SCA. Minimally, participants

expressed meaning-making that is consistent with their overall action logic estimate. On the other hand, meaning-making of skills and knowledge were more likely to be less complex than the overall action logic estimate. This suggests that meaning-making of the attributes and dispositions of these participants is more complex than their meaning-making of their skills and knowledge. This action logic pattern is not necessarily problematic but may create implications for how conduct officer training and program design that utilize the skills, knowledge, and attributes consistent with the post-conventional action logics. This implication for practice will be discussed more in chapter eight.

My own hypothesis and the GLP instrument assessed the majority of the participants at the Achiever (conventional) and Redefining (post-conventional) action logics. Although this result was not foreseen in the design of the study, it creates an interesting opportunity to understand the transitional space between conventional and post-conventional action logics for these participants. When examined through the lens of action logic theory, meaning-making of participants displays a noticeable contrast in each of the three themes explored in this chapter. Table 9 displays the characteristics of meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional levels of development for the skills, knowledge, and attributes necessary for effective SCA practice.

The developmental shift to a post-conventional action logic in the three themes can be characterized in a few ways. The key ingredient for a shift from conventional to post-conventional may be an increasing capacity for inquiry. There is a noticeable shift to a stance of inquiry when participants expressed a post-conventional action logic. These participants inquired into themselves, others, and the broader system as indicated

by the comments of Nicole, Tess, Mark, Alex, and Carl. This capacity for inquiry may help them notice more incremental changes, seek information and feedback from new and non-habitual sources, invite collaboration and co-creators, and influence broader change and transformation. The data analysis now transitions to understanding how participant action logics influence their meaning-making at three different dimensions of awareness including individual/personal, team/interpersonal, and organizational/systemic.

Table 9

Characteristics of meaning-making of the skills, knowledge, and attributes

Conventional Action Logics	Post-Conventional Action Logics
Skills	
Control and certainty of knowing and acting Acting and communicating conscientiously Aware and adaptive to context	Increased movement into collaboration and towards a co-creative process Valuing purposeful, incremental change and recognizing the limits of unilateral power
Knowledge	
Focus on a role that possesses and transfers knowledge to others Recognizing multiple ways to create knowledge Conscious of the form of communication Valuing knowledge that is practical and rational	Recognizing knowledge is interwoven or interdisciplinary Seeks feedback in unfamiliar packages Questions own basic assumption and patterns of behavior
Attributes or Disposition	
Building rapport and engaging in conversations Mutuality bounded by role Balancing goal orientation with interpersonal relationships	Consciousness of incongruence and presence to the self in the system Deep connection, curiosity, and empathy Separating role from the self but recognizing how they inform one another Recognizing existence of light and shadow (Redefining) or embracing a co-existence of light and shadow (Transforming) Reflecting on internal tensions and navigating ideological limitations of a system (Redefining) or learning to influence systemic ideology (Transforming)

CHAPTER SEVEN

MEANING-MAKING AT THREE DIMENSIONS OF AWARENESS

Participant narratives were analyzed for their meaning-making at three dimensions of awareness including 1) Individual or Personal, 2) Interpersonal or Team, and 3) Organizational or Systemic. This section will provide representational data for the action logic estimate of these dimensions. The purpose of this analysis is to illustrate the ways in which participants expressed action logics outside of their primary or assessed action logic. Table 10 displays each participant's estimated action logic. A symbol is then used to indicate for each theme whether the participant's meaning-making represented an action logic of consistent, more, or less complexity than the primary action logic.

Table 10

Analysis of action logic based on meaning-making of dimensions of awareness

	Conventional				Post-Conventional				
	Joy	Thomas	Nicole	Tess	Mark	Alex	Paul	John	Carl
Researcher's Action Logic Estimate	E	A	A	A (+)	R (-)	R	R	R (+)	T (-)
<i>Dimension 1: Individual or Personal</i>	↑	Ø	↓	↑	↓	↓	Ø	Ø	Ø
<i>Dimension 2: Interpersonal or Team</i>	↑	Ø	↓	Ø	↓	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
<i>Dimension 3: Organizational or Systemic</i>	Ø	Ø	↑	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø

E = Expert

A = Achiever

R = Redefining/ Individualist

T = Transforming/ Strategist

(-) = Early Stage

(+) = Late Stage

↑ = More complex meaning-making than the AL est.

↓ = Less complex meaning-making than the AL est.

Ø = Meaning-making complexity consistent w/ AL est.

Dimension 1: Individual or Personal

Participants shared stories and took photographs that illustrated how they understand or relate to the individual or personal dimension of their experiences in SCA. Data was categorized based on the themes and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants' active action logic (as identified by the researcher) is consistent with their estimated action logic during meaning-making of the individual or personal dimension of awareness. The results are also displayed in Table 10.

Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was more complex (Achiever and Redefining) than her estimated primary Expert action logic. Joy is personally challenged because the recent changes in the legal landscape do not emphasize an area of strength. She said, "my hand is forced to do something in a certain way, where I would usually use it more as a counseling session. So I think that part, I'm having a lot of problems with, right now." Joy is describing a tension between her developmental approach to SCA and the expectations for compliance and timeliness of her process. She said,

That's not an option at all anymore. And missing an investigative closure deadline or notification to students of final outcome deadline, they seem to be placing a lot of emphasis on that. And I just feel like my weaknesses are starting to just kind of be magnified, whereas they weren't before.

This is consistent with the Redefining action logic is a capacity to notice how the personal and systemic are in tension. However, Joy is responding to what creates and maintains her current context and condition. Typical of the Achiever action logic, Joy is not responding to the growth opportunity that is challenging her in a different way. This is a notable conflation of the action logics and may either suggest that the categories do not sufficiently describe Joy's experience or that a fluidity between multiple action logics is present.

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary Achiever action logic. An orientating characteristic in Thomas' meaning-making is integrity between the values and ethical principles he holds in his personal life and his professional life. He said,

You have to do it different ways with different students. But I really try to take what I value personally and put it into what I do as -- professionally, so I don't have to turn on the switch. It's not like I come into the office and go: okay, well, I've got to make sure I'm fair, because I try to work that out in my life, in who I am and how I am, you know. And take those things that I experienced when I was younger, that I readily talk about, and the mistakes I've made, the things I've learned, and then be able to impart that to others.

Thomas describes a capacity to observe his learning and values over time and integrate them into multiple dimensions of his life. Notice the estimated Achiever action logic at work on his repetitive use of the word "I" that focuses on the self and then "imparts" his understanding outward onto others. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person expresses a commitment to personal values, principles, and standards.

Nicole (Achiever ▼). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was less complex

(Diplomat and Achiever) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Nicole has high expectations of herself to be an effective conduct administrator. One area she has identified for improvement is having more confidence in her voice and decision-making. She shared an experience when she felt like she was acting as the lone voice for a student during a difficult staff meeting. Ultimately a decision was made that she was not in agreement with and she had to communicate it to a student. She took a photo of a single bench in an open field (Figure 24) to illustrate her experience of being a lone advocate. In thinking about her team meeting she said,

I felt shut down, a little bit. And I had a hard time... I find myself not to be as -- confrontational, I guess is the word that I would use -- as some of the others on staff. So when they start feeling very strongly about something, I kind of disengage.

Nicole has clearly gained some insight into her personal behavior and is aware that she is being influenced by other opinions. The polarity of options (confrontational or disengagement) she is aware of are also striking. Typical of the Diplomat action logic is concern for other's opinions while typical of the Achiever action logic is a desire to meet personal standards. This is a notable conflation of the action logics and may either suggest that the categories do not sufficiently describe Nicole's experience or that a fluidity between multiple action logics is present.

Figure 24. Nicole: Made a stand

Tess (Achiever + ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was more complex (Redefining) than her primary late-Achiever action logic. Tess took two photos that illustrate an experience of scheduling a student dismissal meeting and new student welcome orientation, one right after one another (Figure 25). One photo is the university's honor chord that the dismissed student would no longer be able to receive and the other is the orientation handbook (photo distorted to protect confidentiality) that new students receive when they arrive on campus. Tess reflected upon the quick shift in her responsibilities when she said,

I didn't have a lot of time to process it at the time, but it wasn't until later that I realized that within an hour, I was removing someone from the institution, no honor cord no nothing... none of that for you. But then I was opening up the welcome, "welcome to this institution" and it was just very sad. It was very sad, and so you are removing somebody, without that honor, without that degree, and then trying to shift gears really quickly and put a smile on your face and say "hello, this is a wonderful place to be and hopefully you will make it to graduation" and I felt really conflicted.

At the time Tess was unable to notice and process the difficulty of this way of switching gears. She would go on to reflect, "I was just like a machine out there, 'welcome, welcome, welcome,' but really feeling on the inside, like, yeah and, 'please don't cheat here, welcome, please don't cheat.'" Typical of the Redefining action logic is using reflection to see the self within the system and becoming aware of the tension between our behavior and internal experience.

Figure 25. Tess: Conflicted or torn

What limits this data to the Redefining action logic is how the quote appears to paralyze Tess in the tension rather than enhance her action as a result of the tension. This action logic may have influenced Tess to take photographs that represent two ends of the journey. A later action logic might understand the journey not as a linear process suggested by the rectangular shape of the guidebook but an entangled one represented by the graduation chord. What Tess unconsciously offers in her photos is an expression of how the student conduct process is part of that entangled journey for the student. Although her role as a “guide” for this student may end, the journey to graduation does not necessarily end for the student. This form of meaning-making may represent a developmental edge for Tess as she promotes her use of the post-conventional action logics.

Post-Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally

characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was less complex (Achiever) than his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Mark shared several stories of finding support and validation externally (supervisor, colleagues, institution, and professional association). For example, Mark discussed the experience of receiving a compliment from his dean of students regarding his level of empathy. He took a photograph of her office window (Figure 26) to illustrate where the compliment came from. He found it powerful and affirming that she thought he could bring something to the team that was both needed and important to him as a conduct administrator. He went on to describe how important it has been for him to be in a place where he experiences “fit.” Mark said, “I think it's a testament to once you are somewhere, and you feel appreciated, I think so many positive aspects of your personality come out.” Mark appreciates having found a place to work where he can show up with his imperfections, flaws, and successes and have them embraced and complimented by the institution. Typical of the Achiever action logic is seeking an image of the self that is aligned with the institution.

Figure 26. Mark: Success or delight

Another way to understand the photo of the Dean's office (Figure 26) is that it represents a role and boundary that are part of the system's structure. Much like the partially transparent glass wall in the photo, he is developing a capacity to see the influence of this system but still relies on elements of the system for his sense of self. Additionally, there is a meaning-making theme in Mark's data about only being able to identify growth in environments of support as opposed to environments of challenge.

Alex (Redefining ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was less complex (late-Achiever) than his primary Redefining action logic. Alex sees himself as a "work in progress" and that there are areas in which he can develop and grow. He said, "it is always understanding that you're always able to build off of what you have, to continue to grow." He represents this with a photo on his wall at home of the Eiffel Tower being built over time (Figure 27). For Alex, this represented a "work in progress" and that you ultimately build upon a foundation. He said, "I'm continuing to grow and I'm continuing to learn that I don't quite know what my final outcome is going to be. But I know I'll get there eventually." He notes that the photograph of the tower never erases what was at the foundation. He said, "the foundation needs to have its space."

Figure 27. Current focus of growth and development

The perspective Alex is expressing values learning and growth but appreciates that any growth is based upon a foundation. What is also striking about this quote and photograph is that they suggest an implicit “final outcome” or completion. Typical of a late-Achiever action logic is an appreciation for incremental growth and the process of becoming, while remaining connected to a foundation and aspiring to a completed state.

Paul (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul was unable to complete the photography exercise but the process of completing only some of it helped him reflect on his own experience of his current work in SCA. He described the challenge of finding the time to reflect on what photos he wanted to take was difficult to find. He said,

I was -- just recognizing that it was so hard to take these pictures was, like: something's not right here. There should be time for more reflection in this position, in this job, in this work. And trying to link that to my values, to say: I really value reflection; I really value -- that's part of my identity as a student affairs professional, as somebody who reflects, and thinks about the work, and does that in response to values. And so for me to be doing student conduct work without that reflection, then that's -- it's more mechanical. So it touched a nerve for me.

Although this experience was a function of the interview, typical of the Redefining action logic is a capacity for personal reflection that can identify the gap between his espoused values and his values in action as well as linking this insight to the broader system.

John (Redefining + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was consistent with his primary late-Redefining action logic. John shared that he believes he is in a very contemplative place in his own individual development. He finds himself wondering more about what he is called to become in the next phase of his professional career. He took a photograph of the beach near his home (Figure 28) to remind him of how he is developing. He said, “I see it as home. It resonates as being home to me.” He ties together his personal and professional lives and recognizes that they are connected and to be good in one you have to be good in the other. Although large gaps of time can exist between his beach visits, John believes he “naturally responds to the beach... its just having that comfort of knowing that the beach is there.” The beach functions to support John’s sense of balance and connection with himself. He said,

And so I find that I've also used that several times throughout my life as the place where I'll just go to reconnect, and to find balance and center within myself. So I see it, in terms of helping with my overall development, as a place for me to always know that a lot of things originate there for me. And being able to find that place, to remind myself of why it is I do things.

John’s photo of an empty beach with fog on the horizon represents an aspect of how he sees his individual development. He said,

It's not a clear path for me. There is some fog -- the fogginess and haziness and uncertainty. But there's the possibility of anything. And it's wide open, it's out there, it's in front of me. And so I'll just kind of see where it goes.

John is acknowledging that his own developmental trajectory is foggy and unclear. This speaks to the questions he currently carries about his career path and whether or not it will keep him in the field of student conduct administration. Typical of the late-Redefining action logic is an expression of contemplation, curiosity, and awareness of intrapersonal sensations while also experiencing confusion about direction and role.

Figure 28. John: Promote own development

Carl (Transforming - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed for the individual or personal dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. Carl described the importance of recognizing his role and sense of self in the system. When he first started as Dean of Students he knew that others knew that he lacked experience in residential life and student conduct. Carl felt that this gave him the freedom to ask questions and wonder about why things were done in a certain way. He said,

I had set, in many ways, kind of a really low expectation. People didn't expect me to act normal. And I did have a lot of street cred, coming from what I had done. And so I realized: oh, I can cash in on this. And not for very long. I kind of realized I've got a year, probably, where I can do this.

Carl knew that this was a distinct time and role that he was in and he used it with a purpose. He asked simple questions such as why a conduct process needed to last 16

weeks. This served to challenge the norms in the systems that had been taken for granted. Carl used his awareness of role and sense of self in the system to frame questions with a broader purpose for transforming the student conduct process.

There are three dimensions to Carl's awareness that are expressed. The first is his awareness of the system. This includes understanding the disparities and inconsistencies between mission, strategies, and implementation. The second dimension is awareness of his role and how the system mobilizes his role and the resources (i.e. staff, time, money) it can influence. The third dimension is his own sense of self or his internal experience. This involves an awareness of his own energy and sense of purpose. Typical of the early-Transforming action logic is an awareness that can inform action and strategy in a way that combines inquiry and advocacy in order to challenge norms and frame key questions.

Summary: Individual or Personal

I made action logic estimates for participant meaning-making of the individual or personal dimension of awareness. Four out of nine participants made meaning of their awareness of the individual dimension in a way that was consistent with their estimated action logic. Among the other participants, two were beyond their estimated action logic and three made meaning at an action logic below their overall estimate. Of the three dimensions analyzed, the individual or personal dimension expresses the largest action logic range. One interpretation would be to recognize that individuals are complex and so is their individual awareness.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics can also be seen in the individual or personal dimension of awareness expressed by participants. Meaning-making at the conventional action logics for the

individual or personal is characterized by a greater concern for other's opinions; capable of reflection and noticing tensions between the personal and systemic; clarified personal values and principles; and may rely on elements of the system for sense of self (Institutional Mind). Meaning-making at the post-conventional action logics for the individual or personal dimension of awareness is characterized by seeing the self in the system; links personal insight to the broader system; reflection can extend to questioning what maintains tensions between the personal and the systemic; and combines inquiry and advocacy to frame questions and challenge norms.

Dimension 2: Interpersonal or Team

Participants shared stories and took photographs that illustrate how they understand or relate to the interpersonal or team dimension of their experiences in SCA. Data was categorized based on the themes and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants' active action logic (as identified by the researcher) is consistent with their estimated action logic during meaning-making of the individual or personal dimension of awareness. The results are also displayed in Table 10.

Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was more complex (Redefining) than her

estimated primary Expert action logic. Joy believes that some of the best meetings are when students “really just are able to open up, maybe, to some of the deeper reasons, the underlying issues that cause them to behave in the way that brought them to my office.” She took a photo of a teardrop (Figure 29) to illustrate the experience of students being able to let go and get beyond the surface level of an issue. She described this as, “when you open up and kind of get past the surface level, and your body realizes, or your heart and soul realizes you have a second chance, it's part of that whole purging process.” Typical of the Redefining action logic is concern for root causes and deeper reflection that engages a more somatic heart and soul level of knowing.

Figure 29. Joy: Success or delight

The Redefining action logic is available during what might be one of Joy’s better moments, however, she returns to the Expert action logic in times of conflict and stress.

Joy described being in conflict with a student and how she mentally prepares for what she expects to be more difficult discussion. She said,

I'm in the boss role, and I kind of have to get into that role. So that's the first thought process that's coming, is changing that. And I'm always wondering, like - when I go into that, I'm a little bit uncomfortable -- am I going to stutter through those words? That comes to mind a lot.

Despite this return to an earlier Expert action logic, Joy is expressing an awareness of what she is doing while being both reflective and intentional. Therefore, in this instance, she may not engage from the Redefining action logic but it drives the identification of an alternative action logic. This is a notable conflation of the action logics and may either suggest that the categories do not sufficiently describe Joy's experience or that a fluidity between multiple action logics is present.

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary Achiever action logic. Thomas took a photo of two of his staff members (not displayed to protect confidentiality) in the office to represent this area of growth. He said,

What you see in there is the two of them conversing with each other. But in a way I think that has been set up by how I've worked with them, that we have a free flow of discussion. But it's just a focus for me, this year especially in going forward, of really spending more time as a mentor and as a supervisor than just me as the director getting things done.

Working with the development of his staff is an important way in which he focuses on his own growth. There is a mutuality between him and his staff that he is seeking to create and he takes pleasure in helping to foster these relationships. There are signs here of the Redefining action logic because of the focus on influence and mutuality. However, typical of the Achiever action logic is a focus on personal agency in creating the experience. This is another notable conflation of the action logics and may either suggest that the categories do not sufficiently describe Thomas' experience or that a fluidity between multiple action logics is present.

Nicole (Achiever ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was less complex (Expert) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. Nicole shared that she is currently working on how she presents cases to colleagues and displaying increased certainty in her communication with her team. She said,

If I'm questioning it, then why are we even going to be doing this? If I am more absolute about something, or I'm more confident in the way that I present my information, they're going to be more confident in the decision that I am presenting. And I'm going to appear -- hopefully, I will be -- more competent and more -- it may appear that I have thought it through, and have reached a decision, rather than I'm still wobbling back and forth.

Nicole is not expressing concern about the substance of her ideas but about the way she communicates. She wants to ensure ideas are presented in a way that gives the impression of certainty and, therefore, does not invite questions or critique. Although her Achiever action logic is helping her reflect on personal patterns of her behavior, is typical of the Expert action logic, which focuses on appearing confident or certain while engaging others.

Tess (Achiever + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was consistent with her estimated primary late-Achiever action logic. Tess places value on establishing a positive relationship with students and community members who interact with the student conduct office. She is not interested in small talk but rather having good conversations that can serve the purpose of a current or future meeting. This is especially true for her conduct meeting with students. Tess sees her conversations with students as a way in which she can remember them in the future. She said,

When they're telling me about mom, or their brother, or twin sister, these are things that I'm trying to pay attention to. When they're telling me where they're from, and we'll talk about culture and I'll ask what are two things that you miss from home, and two things that you could do without, it's because for me, we're going to talk again, potentially; we're going to meet again, and what's going to stand out to me in [you].

Typical of the late-Achiever action logic is a focus on being functional and balancing the goal of the meeting while cultivating an interpersonal relationship.

Post-Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - ↓). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was less complex than his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Mark is responsible for working with the entry-level staff in residence life who work with the student conduct process. He reflected on the nature of his partnership with residential life as an area of growth. He commented that there is often friction between how resident directors want to address student conduct and how his office expects them to address student conduct. He described that the resident directors sometimes want to “push an agenda to influence change” and he responds for his office with “no, we're running the student conduct process.” Mark believes that the resident directors do not understand the conduct process and can become entitled in their views and expectations for change.

Mark is capable of noticing differences in perspective and he is beginning to recognize that he may not always respond in an effective manner. In these moments where his power and competency are in jeopardy, Mark might respond in a manner that either subtly avoids the conflict or seeks to firmly express his perspective towards others. He struggles with a more fluent capacity to inquire about other perspectives and co-create resolution in the moments when the stakes are high. Typical of the Achiever action logic is managing multiple perspectives and a recognition that a more unilateral exercise of power may not be most effective. This suggests an Achiever action logic that is less complex than his estimated early-Redefining action logic.

Alex (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Alex uses the metaphor of a panda bear to describe his role in groups and teams as a SCA. He provided a photograph of a panda (Figure 30) to illustrate his clam demeanor but also his capacity to become more passionate and visible at times. He connected the metaphor of a panda with his own disposition saying,

You're surprised and shocked when they erupt or do something. 'Cause for the most part they have this calm demeanor, and you're just: oh, they're chill; they're doing their own thing. But then they get riled up by something and then they become more awake or more alive.

An aspect of this may be about having a more introverted personality but Alex prefers to stand back and observe what is happening around him. During these times he is able to better notice the environment, group patterns and priorities. He also sees himself as able to better select opportunities to intervene. Alex is not seeking to become a large presence in the group for very long. He said,

For the most part I don't jump in, I don't -- I'm not that person who's always barking down people's throats along the way. But when I choose to speak up I'll choose to speak up. And I find the appropriate time to do so. And that is aligned with, I guess, what a panda does. They're not always in your face; they do their own thing. So they find the appropriate time to do something.

Alex's hope is to help the group progress through timely interventions and feels that his inclination to stand back and observe makes him available for insights that are useful to the group. Without necessarily focusing on Alex's disposition, typical of the Redefining action logic is being able to observe and notice patterns while providing timely interventions that can help the group progress.

Figure 30. Alex: Made a stand

Paul (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul spends a lot of time in the student center where students gather to study and socialize. He views this as an opportunity to be proactive and address possible conduct issues before they happen. He took a photo of the student center (Figure 31) with numerous students sitting at different tables engaging in their own

interests. Paul described approaching a small group of students to talk about how they were being loud and disruptive. He said,

They're coming in and they're in their world, doing their thing, and not even noticing all the things that are going on around them. So I spend a lot of time having that conversation with people, to say: could you take a look at all the people here; see that guy right there? -- he's trying to study for a test; see those two people there? -- they look like they're holding hands, they're trying to have a quiet conversation; see those guys right there? -- they're having some kind of a meeting.

He goes on to share that he invites students to be more aware of how they are impacting others and what being part of a community means.

Figure 31. Paul: Philosophy or approach to SCA

Paul is using this interpersonal experience with students to try and draw their attention to something they do not seem to be aware of. The intervention used a tolerant but persuasive approach to seeking behavior change. The interpersonal approach can potentially allow students examine the conditions and determine for themselves how to proceed. Typical of the Redefining action logic is an awareness of personal, community, and organizational objectives combined with a capacity for creatively influencing the gaps between the objectives.

John (Redefining + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. John discussed a current interpersonal challenge of responding to the financial wealth that some college students possess and leads to a more privileged and entitled student population. John took a picture of a row of student cars parked on campus (Figure 32) noting how expensive they are. He said,

I took this shot and then posted it on my social media site. So just had the caption of -- I don't even remember for -- whatever I put, but basically, the life of a student at [Institution Name], or student cars versus staff cars.

He also locates his own car in the photo as the fifth car down the row and notes that the “cost of some student cars could not be purchased by most staff members in their lifetime.” He goes on to share that the expensive vehicles are owned by international students and represent an institutional objective to admit students who are capable of paying full-tuition.

Figure 32. John: Current challenge

John went on to reflect on his experience of international students in the conduct process. He recognizes that they sometimes bring with them different experiences and cultural norms that manifest in behaviors that violate university policy such as tobacco use and academic honesty. He said,

The international students come to the States with different experiences and expectations, and rules and regulations, all the way down to personal habits... And so it becomes challenging in certain conduct situations, to try to fully communicate with these students, to get them to understand the policies.

John is acknowledging the diversity of individual identity and the challenges it presents in SCA. He sees it as his responsibility to adjust and help others understand. His quotes and photo (Figure 32) express both his awareness of differences and what they suggest about the broader system. Although there is some cynicism about the cost of some student vehicles, typical of the late-Redefining action logic is expressing a desire to create space for individual identity.

Carl (Transforming- Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed for the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. During the interview Carl reflected on how much has changed over the past several years. He illustrated this with a photo taken during a two-day service trip in Mexico that new staff attended (Figure 33). A primary goal of this experience was Carl's desire to create connection among the staff and to have the experience of doing difficult work while remaining connected to a sense of meaning and purpose. The first is a staff group photo that represented for Carl a lot of what his desired state was when he started as dean seven years ago. He said,

Mixed into the group photo -- it's hard to tell -- are all of my resident directors. These lines are blurred... And so I think the idea that we've come together in that way, that's a whole level, for me, of working with that team of resident directors and their commitment to these young people. That if anything's missing it's that level of how I pour into them, as they pour into these students. But in some ways I like the ideas that are represented by that big mass of people.

Typical of the early-Transforming action logic is a focus on noticing the blending of different types of power between students and the professional staff and the need to foster a shared vision across sources of power in order to create transformation.

Figure 33. Carl: Philosophy or approach to student conduct

Summary: Interpersonal or Team

Action logic estimates were made for participants' meaning-making of the interpersonal or team dimension of awareness. The majority (six) of participants made meaning of their interpersonal awareness in a way that was consistent with their estimated primary action logic. Five out of the nine participants expressed a conventional, and primarily Achiever, action logic. What is interesting to note is that three of the four post-conventional participants (Paul, John, and Carl) who expressed a consistent post-conventional interpersonal awareness hold chief student conduct officer positions. This suggests that a senior organizational role may allow participants to operate in ways that mid-level positions cannot.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics can also be seen in the interpersonal or team dimension. Meaning-making for participants in this theme at the conventional action logics is characterized by a firmness and certainty of knowing; agency that is directed at or for the Other; and

focusing on a functional balance of both goals and interpersonal relationships. Meaning-making for participants in this theme at the post-conventional action logics is characterized by a more intuitive or heart-centered form of knowing; concern for root causes; consciously drawing upon the functional use of previous action logics; observing patterns; combining inquiry and advocacy; expressing an awareness of individual differences and links to systemic implications; engaging in mutual forms of power and shared visions.

Dimension 3: Organizational or Systemic

Participants shared stories and took photographs that illustrate how they understand or relate to the organizational or systemic dimension of their experiences in SCA. Data was categorized based on the themes and then coded for action logics being expressed. This section uses emblematic data to illustrate if the participants' active action logic (as identified by the researcher) is consistent with their estimated action logic during meaning-making of the individual or personal dimension of awareness. The results are also displayed in Table 10.

Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the conventional action logics were Joy (Expert), Thomas (Achiever), Nicole (Achiever), and Tess (Achiever +) because conventional action logics are generally characterized by adherence to the established system norms, conventions, and efficiencies.

Joy (Expert Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Joy expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with her estimated primary Expert action logic. Discussion of the organizational or systemic awareness in

the data was very limited. Joy rarely shared stories about her experience from a systemic perspective but she did sometimes indirectly discuss her relationship to the system. For instance, Joy discussed the increasing expectations placed upon her by the organization for timeliness and closure of case referrals. She said,

Anytime I feel I'm about to bump into a deadline or some kind of pressure that way, I don't want to make a decision that I haven't thought all the way through. So sometimes I just kind of need to sit back and to do that, and consider all the different scenarios or outcomes

Joy experiences the pressure as coming from the organization and her response is to become more of a knowledgeable authority on the topic. This is consistent with the Expert action logic in which a person is operating under pressure and a short time frame.

Thomas (Achiever Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Thomas expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with his primary Achiever action logic. Thomas has worked hard over the past few years to change the campus' perception of his office which recently changed physical locations to a more prominent place on campus. He said,

We moved suites recently, and I think this just shows the maturation of where we've come from -- from just an afterthought to where you might find the place, to now we have a bright sign on our door saying who we are and how you can get ahold of us.

For Thomas, this represents "in many ways" that the office has "arrived." This is important to Thomas because he believes that the student conduct office is "part of the overall student safety net, and the overall problem-solving network for student issues." He described how the "greater your credibility is, especially with your key constituents, the more business you get and the more confidence people have in your ability to help out with everything." Thomas is now looking towards the next evolution of the office in

becoming a stronger part of that student safety net. This is consistent with the Achiever action logic in which a person is focused on delivery of longer-term goals, working across organizational boundaries, and the office's perceived status and use of symbols.

Nicole (Achiever ↑). I estimated that the action logic complexity Nicole expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was more complex (Redefining) than her estimated primary Achiever action logic. A number of times throughout the interviews and photographs Nicole demonstrated a capacity to question organizational and institutional ideology. Her questions sometimes invited the field of SCA to be better than it currently exists. One instance was when she took a photograph of a clock (Figure 34) and said “there’s just not enough time.” She wants more time to spend with students but feels she “is constantly being pulled in other directions.” She asked the question,

Do we just shuffle them [students] through so that we can get our numbers and show our relevancy and how busy we are -- or do we even have the opportunity to take the time to do the quality work that would really benefit the students and the campus?

Nicole is questioning current organizational values and ethics by exploring the gap between what the institution espouses and what it practices. She will later discuss in the interview her own uncertainty about her personal fit in the organization and the broader field of SCA. Typical of the Redefining action logic is a capacity for reflecting on and questioning fundamental values and assumptions about the organization.

Figure 34. Nicole: Current challenge

Tess (Achiever + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Tess expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with her estimated primary late-Achiever action logic. Tess discuss her perspective on the current challenges facing SCA around sexual violence and Title IX compliance. A striking moment was when she discussed the how institutions build trust with the public and federal government. She said,

When people see fifty schools [referring to list of schools being investigated by the Office of Civil Rights], when they see school so-and-so, they start to connect that with you, with this school. Well, I know so-and-so did this. It's a ripple effect... It actually affects all of us; every student conduct office, right? And so that's how we build trust. We go, we do the right things, and we educate ourselves. And we do things for the right reason. Not because the president so-and-so said we must do it, or supervisor so-and-so says we must do it. If it's wrong, at the end of the day it's going to come back on you.

Typical of the late-Achiever action logic is a focus on personal and organizational standards that guide responsible behavior. Additionally, the start of a transition out of a conventional action logic is available in her capacity to see systems and “ripple effects” (post-conventional) but recommends a strategy that works within the current system (conventional) to create change.

Post-Conventional

Participants who were estimated to operate from the post-conventional action logics were Mark (Redefining -), Alex (Redefining), Paul (Redefining), John (Redefining +), and Carl (Transforming -) because post-conventional action logics are generally characterized by a capacity for reexamination of previously accepted system norms, a focus on the complexity and interdependence of problems, and an interest in individual and systemic transformation.

Mark (Redefining - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Mark expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary early-Redefining action logic. Mark provided an example of how he has begun to notice, understand, and navigate the multiple priorities, forces, and dynamics at an institution. He took a photo of an art piece on campus (Figure 35) that was given to the university by a donor. To Mark, this is an “incredibly hideous” piece of art and represents the experience of being conflicted or torn in his work. He went on to recall the experience of being asked in his interview by the director of development about how he would prioritize returning a phone call to a donor over other tasks. At first, Mark’s student affairs and student centered perspective found the question “incredibly, incredibly wrong.” For Mark the decision would be based on fairness and equity on who called first. About a year later he started to rethink this approach and developed an appreciation for how donors bring an important value to the university. He said, sometimes in student affairs “you do have to make very political decisions.” The donor of this particular art piece has also donated the funds for a new student center on campus. Mark said that he now appreciates the larger picture and institutional priorities that need

to be integrated into his decision-making. Typical of the early-Redefining action logic is a capacity to notice and be curious about the larger system and respond to competing priorities that exist. This capacity might allow him to navigate the system more effectively and employ a form of contextual relativism.

Figure 35. Mark: Conflicted or torn

Alex (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Alex expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Alex understands that as a SCA he represents the university and that others are likely to perceive him this way. He shared difficult stories that recognized these moments and made conscious decisions to act in ways that may have been inconsistent with his personal preference. Alex discussed a campus climate challenge that had occurred the previous semester when a group of students put on a video using “blackface.” This is a form of entertainment that often promotes stereotypes of black individuals. Alex said,

To the students, I had no opinion about that. I couldn't have an opinion about it. As much as I tried to get people to get it -- to understand what the history of it is, and to understand that element of it, I couldn't really say, “But I think that was personally offensive.”

Alex went on to recognize that he represents a specific role and office on campus and feels that he needs to “scale back” his own opinions and perspectives during these types of incidents in order to promote the offices identity as objective and dispassionate in case an incident is referred for student conduct allegations. He said,

I felt like I had to give the sense to the students that I was going to be fair with the process. Or that you're going to be objective... I just felt because I was representing student affairs, and student affairs had a certain perspective of that issue, you have to scale back what your personal opinion of it was.

Alex clarified that his decision was his own “professional judgment” and that he was not told by the university to speak in a certain way. As someone who was fairly new to the campus at the time he decided to pursue some of the educational conversations in a one-on-one setting in order to remain mindful of the political setting. Ultimately, the central conflict for Alex was balancing his own authentic self while recognizing that he is in a role within a structure that has certain expectations. Typical of the Redefining action logic is recognizing the limits of role and when the personal and institutional objectives are in tension as well as a capacity to navigate these conflicting experiences.

Paul (Redefining Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Paul expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary Redefining action logic. Paul took a photo that adjusted the framing of a previous photo (Figure 31) that is depicted in the previous section for the dimension of group and team awareness. The photo (Figure 36) captures the student center where students spend time outside of class socializing, studying, and being involved in student organizations. However, for this photo he stepped back a few feet to capture a gate that is partially closed and regulates access to the cafeteria area. He discussed what the boundary represented to him when he said,

I think there was something about that that just struck me intuitively, that there were these kind of gates in place that didn't feel -- they didn't feel good. Like, are we in jail? It had that kind of jail feel to it. But they were there to create parameters. So all these great things that were happening here, these gates were there, around there, creating the parameters. And it made me feel like it's the role of the rules that we enforce, and the policies and the codes of conduct. And it felt like some of these gates that were there sometimes didn't feel great, but they created that framework in which some of the best things that we do can take place.

Paul is making sense of the photograph not as illustrating a contradiction but as necessary paradox. This is the initial felt experience of the gate and the function that it ultimately serves. Additionally, this experience of the gate is used as a metaphor for the experience of SCA. Typical of the Redefining action logic is Paul's awareness of an intuitive experience, working with paradoxical or contradicting thoughts and experiences, and the use of a metaphor to describe the experience. Any of these alone may not suggest a Redefining action logic but the use of all three powerfully express the estimated Redefining action logic at the systemic level.

Figure 36. Paul: Conflicted or torn

John (Redefining + Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity John expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary late-Redefining action logic. John reflected on an experience

where the university just reached the end of a law suit raised by a family whose son (also a student athlete) had gone through the student conduct process over two years ago.

What was important for John about this experience was noticing how the student at the center of the controversy was negatively and unnecessarily impacted as a result of his parent's obstruction of the conduct process. He took a photograph of a soccer field on campus (Figure 37) that was covered by fog and blocked by a fence to illustrate the layers of complexity in this situation. He said,

And it was one of those cases that has -- it just kept unfolding, and layer upon layer of what was really going on was being exposed. It was just one of those you just feel bad for how people evolved, and the fact that then the family started intervening, and really blowing it much more out of proportion than it needed to be.

John is noticing the complexity and subtle influences that exist in this type of issue.

Additionally, he expressing an awareness of patterns and empathizes with the experience of the student involved.

Figure 37. John: Conflicted or torn

John noticed that the student was struggling during this incident and in the aftermath. He felt a lot of the struggle was unnecessary and the result of his parent's involvement. He said,

It wasn't about the student anymore. The family inserted themselves and it became about them and their pride, or whatever. And then, of course, when that starts happening, and accusations start being flung around, and rumors are trying to be made into fact and -- it just gets bad.

John remarked that things just seemed to unravel and as parents intervened it required the university to take certain steps to protect its self. He said about the parents,

They kind of injected themselves into the whole situation... with a lot of these students and families, is that the child has always been successful and has always been the superstar; therefore, he could never do any wrong, and has probably never been held accountable.

Typical of the late-Redefining action logic, John is capable of noticing the presence of the layers of complexity in the incident and that barriers kept the conduct process from engaging the student in an educational and developmental way. He said,

We had this barrier in our process; that even if we're in a full-blown investigation and it's one of our high-level cases, we are still trying to be an educational developmental process that's supporting our students. Even if they're going to be found responsible and held accountable, by the nature of what we do we still are trying to support their success and their well-being and their development. But with this, the family's involved, and ultimately, the lawsuit. This fence, a barrier, kind of came into play.

The meaning-making made available through the quotes and photo shows that John is capable of noticing the underlying and competing dynamics. The data also suggests what John wanted from the experience was to be more collaborative with the student and parents while exploring differences in both perspective and values.

Carl (Transforming - Ø). I estimated that the action logic complexity Carl expressed for the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness was consistent with his estimated primary early-Transforming action logic. Over the past seven years Carl has incrementally challenged and transformed the student conduct process. When he arrived to his position there were two systems in place from the prior Dean that

represented what Carl sought to challenge about the process. He took one photo of the dean's annual report (not displayed to protect confidentiality) noting that it was volume two and hard bound like a dissertation. The second photo represents a file system that the dean had created to track information about every student enrolled (Figure 38). He reflected, "something that I've become aware of, in this exercise [the research study's photography exercise], is how much of my early years in this work were defined by trying to get the institution away from this kind of approach to student conduct." Carl described the how the mythology from the student experience "was the dean of students has a file on everybody." He briefly tried the system but concluded, "I love students, but this stuff is garbage." Carl elaborated by describing how bright students can be when you give them a chance and not try "to beat these people over the head." Typical of the early-Transforming action logic, Carl is grappling with the limits of maintaining unilateral power and he stands in stark contrast with how the previous system exercised this form of power. He also has grown to appreciate how major change occurs over a longer time horizon.

Figure 38. Carl: Conflicted or took a stand

Summary: Organizational or Systemic

Action logic estimates were made for participant meaning-making of the organizational or systemic dimension of awareness. Eight out of nine participants made meaning of their organizational or systemic awareness in a way that was consistent with their estimated primary action logic. The one exception was Nicole whose meaning making was a full action logic more complex than her primary estimate. This may suggest that one's meaning-making of their organizational or systemic awareness is a strong indication of the primary action logic.

Differences between meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics can also be seen in organizational or systemic theme. Meaning-making for participants in this theme at the conventional action logics was characterized by responding to the pressure from the system as opposed to responding to the system; working across boundaries to deliver increasingly longer term goals; clarifying personal and organizational standards to guide behavior; and working within the current system to create change. Meaning-making for participants in this theme at the post-conventional action logics was characterized by questioning organizational ideology; exploring the gaps between espoused and actual values; aware of personal capacity to revisit previous action logics and uses their awareness to navigate the system to create change; noticing the presence of layers of complexity and competing priorities not just as contradictions but as necessary paradoxes.

Discussion

This chapter analyzed participant meaning-making in the area of three dimensions of awareness (individual/personal, interpersonal/team, organizational/systemic).

Participant interview and photography data was analyzed in a way that separated *how* they thought from *what* they thought about the various dimensions. Recognizing there are numerous perspectives or observations participants could represent at these different dimensions, *what* participants observed or know is not as important as *how* they think about and relate to what they observe or know. This study's sample of participants were separated by conventional action logics (Expert and Achiever) and post-conventional action logics (Redefining and Transforming). Additionally, the previous analysis showed that some participants utilized a range of action logics in their meaning-making of the themes. However, when employing a conventional or post-conventional action logic there was a noticeable contrast in the participants' meaning-making.

The analysis of action logics expressed in the three dimensions of awareness displayed in Table 10 suggests that participants' awareness of the organizational and systemic dimension is the most consistent with their overall estimate. More variation from the overall estimate occurs among participants at the individual and interpersonal dimensions. This makes sense when you consider the strategies, practices, and current areas of focus for SCA learning and growth that participants reported. Participants overwhelmingly shared professional growth practices that were based on understanding what is happening in the broader field (Title IX, conflict resolution, policies, and regional and inter-campus collaborations). Additionally, the literature on student affairs practice suggests that as student affairs professionals move into more senior authority positions the organizational dimension of awareness becomes a more critical competency area. This has implications for SCA education and training and designing learning practices

and areas of growth that highlight the individual and interpersonal dimensions of awareness as well as closing any gap between the three dimensions.

My own hypothesis and GLP instrument assessed the majority of the participants at the Achiever and Redefining action logics. Although this result was not foreseen in the design of the study, it creates an interesting opportunity to understand the transitional space between conventional and post-conventional action logics. When examined through the action logic theory, meaning-making of participants displays a noticeable contrast in the three themes. Table 11 displays the characteristics of meaning-making for these participants at the conventional and post-conventional levels of development for the three dimensions of awareness.

The developmental shift to a post-conventional action logic in the three dimensions can be characterized in a few ways. A key ingredient explaining a shift from conventional to post-conventional may be an increased recognition and leveraging of mutuality. The awareness of participants when expressing a post-conventional action logic identifies and increasingly works with the interconnections of experience. They recognize not only multiple perspectives but multiple ways of knowing. Meaning-making at the post-conventional action logic for these participants tends to be aware of internal experiences, empathize with the experiences of others, and links the insights gained to the broader systemic environment. These participants demonstrate a pattern of inquiry that invites others to collaborate and even co-create new insights and change efforts.

Chapter seven concludes the data analysis of the study. Attention is now turned to a discussion of the findings, implications for future research and practice, and methodological consideration.

Table 11

Characteristics of meaning-making of dimensions of awareness

Conventional Action Logics	Post-Conventional Action Logics
Individual / Personal	
Greater concern for other's opinions Capable of reflection and noticing tensions between the personal and systemic Clarified personal values and principles and may rely on elements of the system for sense of self (Institutional Mind)	Combines inquiry and advocacy to frame questions and challenge norms Seeing the self in the system and links personal insight to the broader system Reflection can extend to questioning what maintains tensions between the personal and the systemic
Interpersonal / Team	
Firmness and certainty of knowing Personal agency that is directed at or for the Other Focusing on a functional balance of both goals and interpersonal relationships	A more intuitive or heart-centered form of knowing Engaging in mutual forms of power and shared visions Concern for root causes Consciously drawing upon the functional use of previous action logics Observing patterns and combining inquiry and advocacy Expressing an awareness of individual differences and linking to systemic implications
Organizational / Systemic	
Responding to the pressure from the system as opposed to responding to the system Working across boundaries to deliver increasingly longer term goals Clarifying personal and organizational standards to guide behavior Working within the current system to create change	Questioning organizational ideology and exploring the gaps between espoused and actual values Aware of personal capacity to revisit previous action logics and uses their awareness to navigate the system to create change Noticing the presence of layers of complexity and competing priorities not just as contradictions but as necessary paradoxes

CHAPTER EIGHT

FINDINGS

Chapter eight begins with an overview of the key findings related to the study's primary research questions. Focus then shifts to a discussion of the implications for constructive development theory and implications for practice in SCA. Then, a discussion of methodological considerations, researcher trustworthiness, limitations, and aspirations for future research are provided. Finally, the chapter concludes with my own aspirations for the field of student conduct administration.

Overview of Findings

The overarching question this study addressed is how SCA'S make meaning of their experiences and professional development, and how this meaning-making may be influenced by their stage of constructive-development. To answer this question, three specific research questions were formed:

1. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of their professional experiences as a student conduct officer?
2. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of the strategies and practices they utilize in order to promote their own development as a student conduct officer?
3. What (if any) relationship exists between the student conduct administrators' meaning-making and their assessed stage of constructive development?

A qualitative research design that drew from both narrative and visual inquiry was used to collect and analyze data. The study's primary hermeneutic lens was literature rooted in developmental psychology, specifically the theories of William Torbert (2004) and Robert Kegan (1982, 1994). Participant interviews and photography acted as the

primary source of data for nine SCAs as well as my own assessment of each participant's primary action logic. The addition of the participants' results from taking Global Leadership Profile (GLP), an instrument designed to assess an individual's developmental action logic, provided a second interpretation of the participants' primary action logic and is used to help generate insights into participant meaning-making.

Although other studies in SCA and (more broadly) the field of student affairs have researched the professional learning and growth of its members, this study is the first to use constructive-developmental theory to understand the meaning-making of these professionals. Other studies have focused on *what* skills, knowledge, and attributes an individual needs in order to be effective, however; this is the first study to focus on the internal process of organizing this information and experience (meaning-making) and its relationship to one's developmental action logic. The specific population of SCAs was selected because this functional area of Student Affairs is currently sitting at a complex nexus of legal, educational, demographic, and organizational challenges. I anticipated that this complex environment would provide fertile ground to explore participant meaning-making. As a result, the study's research questions are intentionally broad in order to explore this new terrain with as much flexibility as possible.

Research Questions #1 and 2

Research questions one and two are addressed together in this section due to the shared nature of their inquiry. Taken together the research question is: How do student conduct administrators make meaning of their *professional experiences and the strategies and practices they utilize in order to promote their own development* as a student conduct officer? To answer the first and second research questions, participant data was coded for

characteristics that influence meaning-making. I inquired about the data, what is influencing the participant's beliefs, decisions, and overall experience? Data was coded for meaning-making characteristics and then clustered into categories. A first-level analysis of narrative was then constructed to describe the characteristics and resulting structures of each participant's meaning-making. This analysis of narrative was reviewed for accuracy as part of the external audit that is discussed later in chapter eight. Chapters 4-7 described in detail the orientating characteristics and structures for each participant's meaning-making and the discussion at the end of chapters 5-7 illustrate through the use of tables the most frequent meaning-making characteristics present in this sample of participants.

Participants in this sample exhibited a number of meaning-making characteristics that influenced their meaning-making in SCA. These characteristics are discussed in chapters 5-7 according to whether they expressed a conventional or post-conventional action logic. What is important to note about the findings for research questions one and two is that participants demonstrated a capacity to express meaning-making that encompasses the range of complexity between both conventional and post-conventional action logics. Although each participant was assessed as expressing a primary action logic, this finding suggests a fluidity of meaning-making characteristics influencing participants that can allow the more complex action logics to be expressed. The implication of this finding is that this sample of participants potentially has a broader range of action logics available to them at any given time than previous research has acknowledged. Research that acknowledges the range of action logics available to

participants is an important contribution to the literature on human development and for improving our understanding what may be influencing individual meaning-making.

Research Question #3

To answer the third research question, participant data was coded for action logic expression and I hypothesized a primary action logic for each participant. This action logic hypothesis was reviewed for accuracy as part of the external audit discussed later in chapter eight. Additionally, participants completed the GLP instrument to assess their action logic stage. There was alignment between my action logic hypothesis and the GLP for only three out of nine participants. Possible reasons for the discrepancy between my hypothesis and the GLP are explored later in chapter eight but ultimately provided data to support the presence of a range of action logics.

To better understand the relationship between participant meaning-making and stage of constructive-development (action logic) an analyses of the data was completed in three domains reflected in chapters 5-7. The analysis suggested a finding that participants expressed a range of action logics both more and less complex than the primary assessment I made. Moreover, a range of action logic complexity appeared to be present for each participant. The implication of this finding is that even though a participant is assessed as a particular action logic there is a certain fluidity in their action logic expression. This fluidity suggests that these participants possess a capacity for experiencing flashes of other action logics and reaching into and expressing a later developmental capacity. In other words, nuances in these participants' meaning-making suggests that action logics are more of a profile than a state of being. The presence of a profile of action logics challenges what previous research has suggested where

participants make meaning from a single or fixed action logic. Indeed, what may be more important is not “developing” later action logics but accessing our personal potential for more complex action logics and discerning the functionality and effectiveness of their use.

This study is not able to conclusively account for the fluidity of meaning-making characteristics identified in this sample of participants. Later sections in this chapter will discuss possible factors identified in this study that contribute to the fluidity including organizational role and latent or unconscious developmental aspirations. There may certainly be other factors outside of the data collected for this study including social identity and personal history. Future research could further explore this fluidity of meaning-making characteristics and researchers may benefit from the design of the data analysis in chapters 5-7 that examines meaning-making and action logics based on themes from the research questions and literature.

Discussion of Implications for Constructive Development Theory

Using the findings discussed in the previous sections, this chapter now turns to a discussion of the implications for constructive-development theory. This includes a discussion of the availability of a range of action logics, discussion of two meaning-making characteristics for accessing more complex action logics, the proposition of a developmental taxonomy for action logic expression, and the influence of role on action logic expression.

Availability of a Range of Action Logics

The brief definition of “action logic” used in this study is “an overall strategy that thoroughly informs an individual’s reasoning and behavior” (McCauley et al., 2006, p.

643) or how one might “interpret their surroundings” (Rooke and Torbert, 2005, p. 67).

Torbert’s (2004) seven stage action logic model is used in my estimate of each participant’s action logic. The model posits that the more complex (or later) action logics offer more choice for how an individual can deploy their attention, more flexibility in their decision-making, more methods for seeking feedback, and a broader range for how power can be exercised. This has contributed to a somewhat latent debate or inconsistency in the literature about stage development or action logic theory that this study seeks to more squarely address. The debate being, does one simply inhabit a stage or does one express a capacity for drawing from multiple stages (even those beyond their primary action logic)? The literature has often categorized individuals as being a single action logic and suggesting that later action logics contribute to more effective leadership (Rooke & Torbert, 1998; Torbert, 2004; Rooke & Torbert, 2005; Jones, 2015). Some research has also explored how individuals can express developmental peaks or action logic regression under certain conditions (McCallum, 2008; Livesay, 2013). Livesay’s (2013) dissertation study on the perspectives of key thinkers and theorists in constructive development does suggest that contemporary research consider shifting away from understanding development as a fixed stage or action logic. Instead, Livesay suggests that developmental assessments indicate a range of development. However, there is an absence of empirical literature that explores the complexity and fluidity of an individual’s action logic from the perspective of one inhabiting and expressing multiple action logics or operating from a range of developmental action logics.

The analysis of participant meaning-making and action logics in this study found that there is more fluidity in the expression of action logics than previous research has

acknowledged. Rather than only hypothesizing that an individual is a single action logic, the analysis explores how individuals possess and express multiple action logics. There are at least two potential conclusions that can be drawn from recognizing that individuals have a capacity to express a range of action logics. First, the seven action logic categories are insufficient and do not adequately capture the nature of an individual's complexity that is embedded in a unique context. Although it is possible that the seven stage model is insufficient, there is considerable research to suggest that the model is helpful in understanding what influences an individual's understanding and relationship to their experience. Therefore, this research does not suggest that the model should be set aside but rather the model should be used to identify a foundational action logic whereby an individual's accessible and aspirational developmental range can be understood.

A second conclusion emerging from this research is that action logics are more of a profile than a state of being. Action logics represent a range of potential that can be accessed at any given moment depending on the individual's discernment of what is functional and effective. Data from this study suggest that while the action logic categories do apply to these participants, multiple action logics are needed in order to explain how these participants make-meaning of their experiences and professional growth in SCA.

Participants in this study expressed a primary action logic, however, as the analysis in chapter 5-7 showed they also expressed more and less complex action logics when making meaning of different themes. The availability of a range of action logics was not necessarily the result of a developmental peak or optimal experiences nor was it from developmentally regressive and fallback experiences as suggested in previous

research. Rather, participants simply inhabited multiple action logics and expressed them based on their best awareness of what was effective and functional. In other words, the action logic expressed is in response to and constructed in a context specific situation. A number of factors could contribute to this but this study's analysis suggested that action logic expression was influenced by the participant's organizational role and context – a significant factor that is discussed in a later section.

Developmental Ingredients: Inquiry and Mutuality

Several meaning-making characteristics were identified in the analysis in chapter 5-7. There are at least two characteristics that appeared most prominently throughout the participants' experiences and expressed a starkly different meaning at the conventional and post-conventional action logics: Inquiry and Mutuality. The following section will discuss these two characteristics and their implications for SCA.

Increased or expanding inquiry is a consistent theme in in participant meaning-making in the transition between conventional and post-conventional action logics. At the conventional action logics inquiry is confined to existing systems and works in a way that allows the individual to act as an agent of the existing system. Inquiry at the conventional action logics is likely to value differing opinions but may still work in habitual ways that are consistent with the norms of the broader system. Participant inquiry at the post-conventional action logics engage in a more strategic inquiry into future possibilities that consider one's own experience, the perspective of others, and a capacity to situate insights in service of transforming the broader system.

Table 12

Characteristics of inquiry in at the conventional and post-conventional action logics

Conventional Action Logics	Post-Conventional Action Logics
Philosophy and Approach to SCA	
Adherence to principle and objectives that are informed by well-considered values and assumptions	Creating opportunities for inquiring that may lead to deep connections and perspective taking
Strategies and Practices for Learning	
Curiosity and drive to keep learning	Valuing continuous feedback loops
Focus on craft knowledge that is seen as valid by authorities	Close listening to one's experiences
Current Focus of Growth and Development	
Creating rules, principles, and objectives to guide focus.	Inquiring into a broader system that is at work
Knowledge	
Recognizing multiple ways to create knowledge	Recognizing knowledge is interwoven or interdisciplinary
Valuing knowledge that is practical and rational	Seeks feedback in unfamiliar packages
Attributes or Disposition	
Balancing goal orientation with interpersonal relationships	Consciousness of incongruence and presence to the self in the system
	Reflecting on internal tensions and navigating ideological limitations of a system (Redefining) or learning to influence systemic ideology (Transforming)
Individual / Personal	
Greater concern for other's opinions	Combines inquiry and advocacy to frame questions and challenge norms
Capable of reflection and noticing tensions between the personal and systemic	Reflection can extend to questioning what maintains tensions between the personal and the systemic
Interpersonal / Team	
Firmness and certainty of knowing	A more intuitive or heart-centered form of knowing
	Concern for root causes
	Observing patterns and combining inquiry and advocacy
Organizational / Systemic	
Working within the current system to create change	Noticing the presence of layers of complexity and competing priorities not just as contradictions but as necessary paradoxes

Torbert et al., (2004) describes mutuality in contrast to the exercise of unilateral power and increases the likelihood of creating trust and honest communication. Mutuality involves a transparent inquiry into the use of power and the play of power between parties (i.e. a conduct officer and student). Once power dynamics are openly recognized, mutuality involves “creative actions to develop shared visions and strategies, increasingly collaborative ways of conversing, and jointly determined ways of learning the worth of what is created together” (2004, p. 7). Torbert goes on to suggest that mutuality does not neglect other forms of power but does subordinate them to rarer “mutual power that makes the person acting and the people and organizations he or she is relating to vulnerable to transformation” (2004, p. 8). In other words, greater mutuality involves a capacity to allow oneself to become vulnerable to learning and transformation as opposed to this growth and development being placed only upon the other. Participants in this study expressed varying degrees of mutuality in their meaning-making. Table 13 adapts the summary tables from chapter 5-7 and highlights the characteristics associated with mutuality in meaning-making at the conventional and post-conventional action logics.

Table 13

Characteristics of mutuality in at the conventional and post-conventional action logics

Conventional Action Logics	Post-Conventional Action Logics
Philosophy and Approach to SCA	
Reliance on positional authority and traditional knowledge and structures	Creating opportunities for inquiring that may lead to deep connections and perspective taking
Taking responsible and transparent actions	Seeking to envision more of who the student is and is becoming
Strategies and Practices for Learning	
Branding a legitimate professional identity	Creating immersive experiences
Current Focus of Growth and Development	
Enhancing current and traditional areas of skill and competence	Insight into self and sense of purpose
Skills	
Control and certainty of knowing and acting	Increased movement into collaboration and towards a co-creative process
Knowledge	
Focus on a role that possesses and transfers knowledge to others	Questions own basic assumption and patterns of behavior
Attributes or Disposition	
Building rapport and engaging in conversations	Deep connection, curiosity, and empathy
Mutuality bounded by role	Separating role from the self but recognizing how they inform one another
Individual / Personal	
Greater concern for other's opinions	Seeing the self in the system and links personal insight to the broader system
Interpersonal / Team	
Personal agency that is directed at or for the Other	Engaging in mutual forms of power and shared visions
Organizational / Systemic	
Clarifying personal and organizational standards to guide behavior	Questioning organizational ideology and exploring the gaps between espoused and actual values

As a sample group, participants expressed varying degrees of mutuality along the different dimensions of analysis in chapters 5-7. Although specific narratives related to

these characteristics can be revisited in the analysis chapters, it might be important to note that participants never advocated dismantling their formal roles in order to create a false sense of oneness with another party (i.e. a student, office, staff member, or supervisor). Rather, some participants expressed an interest in transcending their formal role in order to promote greater learning for all involved including themselves. As a practitioner, the transition between mutuality characteristics at the conventional and post-conventional action logics reflected a powerful tension in the field of SCA between the increasing legalisms and role of student education discussed in chapter one. The question it raises is how can SCAs expression of mutuality value their legal and role obligations while working to transcend them in service of a collective learning that can transform the field of SCA? This is a question that will be explored more in the implications for SCA practice but central to the question is openly and consistently placing oneself in the role of learner.

A Developmental Taxonomy

During the analysis it was observed that participants were expressing action logics outside of their primary action logic and I wanted to try and understand why this might be occurring from the perspective of individual development. The action logic taxonomy in SCA emerging from this study consists of four phases by which a participant might explore and more fully inhabit the more complex action logics. The developmental taxonomy appreciates why it might be developmentally functional for an individual to express a range of action logics. Additionally, I found that the photographs participants shared often expressed unconscious elements of meaning-making that the participant was unable to reflect upon in the interview. Unlike other approaches to action logic

assessments, for the purpose of developing the taxonomy I considered what participant photographs might be expressing about their unconscious aspirations for their own development. The expression of the more complex action logics is both something they demonstrated an ability to consciously access through their narrative but also demonstrated an unconscious potential for accessing through the photographs they made available.

The first phase is a fallback action logic that is less complex than the estimated action logic. The phase of the taxonomy recognizes that individuals operating from a less complex action logic have not necessarily regressed in their development, but that individuals often operate in this way in order to be functional. Livesay (2013) suggests that one role of fallback is to facilitate more complex action logic development. In other words, operating from a less complex action logic can become a staging ground for spring forward into the more complex stages of development.

The second phase is a primary or foundational action logic that I assessed the participant expressing most consistently. It is the action logic they most frequently express. In other words, their meaning-making operates in a way that more frequently triggers this action logic making it foundational to how they understand and relate to their experiences.

The third phase is an accessible action logic that may be $\frac{1}{2}$ to one full action logic more complex than their foundational action logic. The accessible action logic might be expressed through a reflective capacity where a participant can peer into a more complex action logic yet may struggle to translate their language and meaning-making into an action that is consistent with what they have become aware of.

The fourth phase is an aspirational action logic where the expression is fleeting and perhaps even unnoticed by the participant. This aspirational action logic often expressed itself through the photographs. For example, Joy took a photo of a magnifying glass (Figure 5) to represent her new investigation skills and expressed her foundational Expert action logic. However, the I noted that a magnifying glass implies more than one way of looking at things and can be a tool used to put things ablaze. There is another possible side of Joy's photograph that is aspirational in that the magnifying glass could be used to burn down certain ways of knowing that are comfortable and familiar. The magnifying glass may express her potential to be clear, sharp, knowledgeable, and an important tool or resource within the system. Through the photograph and this alternative interpretation, an aspirational Achiever action logic is expressed.

Figure 5. Joy: Promote own development

Another example of this unconscious aspiration is available from Tess using two photographs she took to represent an experience when she felt conflicted or torn. She used two photographs (Figure 25) to illustrate an experience of going from one meeting where she dismissed a student from the institution (graduation chord) to another meeting where she welcomed new students to the university (guidebook). Typical of her accessible Redefining action logic, Tess used reflection to see herself within the system and became aware of the tension between her behavior and internal experience. Another

interpretation of the two photos Tess paired together is that they represent a journey from orientation to graduation. The journey is not the linear process suggested by the rectangular shape of the guidebook but an entangled one represented by the graduation chord. What Tess unconsciously offers in her photos is an expression of how the student conduct process is part of that entangled journey for the student. Although her role as a “guide” for this student may end, the journey to graduation does not necessarily end for the student. Through the photograph and this alternative interpretation an aspirational Transforming action logic is represented by seeing and appreciating multiple systems, a longer time horizon, and the importance of becoming entangled in the journey.

Figure 25. Tess: Conflicted or torn

A third example of how an aspirational action logic was represented in participant photography was Nicole’s photograph of an open road (figure 21) that represented the internal conflict and systemic tension she was aware of from her accessible Redefining action logic. Typical of the Redefining action logic Nicole is focused on the competing and precarious aspects of the system and how paralysis can take hold. However, another interpretation of the photograph is that Nicole can indeed see the road ahead and has illustrated this in her photograph. Despite her focus on the immediate conflict and

direction, the photograph illustrates an unconscious aspirational knowing that expresses a Transforming action logic by seeing into the distance.

Figure 21: Nicole: Conflicted or torn (2)

The aspirational phase of this action logic taxonomy is subjective, interpretive, and very often left unnamed by the participants. I also recognize that it is difficult for individuals to access alternative interpretations on their own and suspect that identifying this phase of development will require good partners who are capable and willing to offer insight on the journey. What is important to note is that participants often expressed action logic capacities beyond their foundational action logic. The expression of these more complex action logics is both something they demonstrated an ability to consciously access through their narrative but also demonstrated an unconscious potential for accessing through interpretations of their photographs that are available. These more complex action logics may have been more elusive but they are present and with appropriate forms of inquiry, mutuality, and good partners for the journey participants may be able to nurture their access to them more fully.

Influence of Organizational Role

Individual meaning-making is always embedded in a unique context that inevitably influences action logic expression. Although not the focus of this study, a

participant's organizational role is one contextual factor that seemed to inform action logic expression. It is likely that conflation of participant role and responsibility influenced the range of action logics available to participants. The two deans of students (Paul and Carl) and three chief conduct officers (Joy, Thomas, John) had more consistency in expressing their primary action logic. This more consistent expression of action logics may be a function of experience but may also be a function of positional authority and what the institution permits from them. In other words, a more senior role permits them to be able to express what mid-level SCAs may perceive as less permissible – operating from their most natural action logic. The Dean and Chief role protects them and allows them to exercise their primary action logics. Whereas, the mid-level conduct officers expressed a broader range of action logics. One hypothesis might be that mid-level staff possess less role capacity to influence the system and are pulled toward different action logics required to be effective in their responsibilities. Other variables in the context and environment (i.e. public/private institution and size) were considered but the data in this study is not clear enough to draw a conclusion. Research that further explores the influence of context and environment on action logic expression would be a valuable contribution in the future.

Implications for Practice

This research suggests that the meaning-making of professional experiences and learning by SCAs in this study is influenced by a range of action logics. This research has several implications for practice including SCA education and training, practice, and supervision and mentoring.

Implications for SCA Education and Training

Training and education in student affairs and SCA, at least initially, rarely involves a focus on human development beyond what occurs in the college environment. This research suggests that a promising practice for early or new professionals in SCA could include theory related to constructive-development, meaning-making, and action logics. Even exposure to this knowledge base may help expand the possibilities for options available to new professionals who are in the midst of making meaning of their work. Theory can also be used to develop strategies and practices for training and education in SCA. Additionally, this theory base would help make them aware of some of the reasons why they may engage and interpret their student affairs experiences the way they do; thus, informing their development of the habits and patterns that will inform their work in the future.

The SCA field could also benefit from considering how the skills and knowledge they have identified for their work could transform when influenced by different experiences that may activate different action logics. For instance, a skill such as assessment could be understood from different action logics. A professional who engages with an Expert action logic might see assessment as benchmarking against similar programs and someone accessing an Achiever action logic might identify a desired outcome and systematically collect data to determine if the outcome is met. However, someone operating from a Redefining action logic might use data to identify gaps in performance and question elements of the existing system. Whereas, professionals operating from a Transforming action logic might engage in a more collaborative-inquiry with colleagues and thought partners in order to interpret data and

co-create new insights and directions. Examining SCA skills and knowledge through the lens of action logics adds a helpful dimension to thinking about what it means to continually develop a certain competency.

Finally, integrating opportunities for SCAs to practice reflection on their leadership would be a valuable endeavor. Reflective practices could involve opportunities to critically examine ones meaning-making and looking inward to wonder about one's history and experience from which our meaning-making characteristics emerge. Opportunities to practice this type of reflection outside of graduate school and in the company of other practitioners may be especially valuable. This could involve creating knowledge communities, program tracks, or emphasis areas into already existing conferences, professional literature, learning experiences.

Implications for SCA Practice

SCA is currently in the midst of complex challenges that require practitioners to become increasingly more thoughtful about their student conduct practice. Awareness and development of a range of action logics would assist practitioners in meeting these varied challenges. Additionally, a capacity for discerning which action logics to employ in a given challenge in order to increase effectiveness or perhaps even help transform an existing program is critical. An often ignored point in previous research is that each action logic has its strengths and limitations and could be helpful in different situations. A professional operating from an Expert action logic is likely able to appreciate the importance of the legal and policy landscape and how it informs the work of ensuring the institution is in compliance with any expectation, yet those operating from the Expert action logic may be limited in their ability to question or be critical of this landscape.

The individual operating from the Achiever action logic can help mobilize different campus constituents towards attaining certain goals and objectives, yet they may be limited in their ability to involve and resolve competing perspectives and priorities. The individual operating from the Transforming action logic can attend to broad overarching visions and approaches to the student conduct program, yet may not be able to have patience for the details required for its implementation. The extent to which practitioners can develop their range of action logics and be able to make thoughtful decisions about what is necessary, the more effective and transforming their leadership can become.

Implications for Supervision and Mentoring of SCAs

Supervisors and mentors who can listen to others with an understanding of meaning-making and action logics may be able to better support and challenge their staff. The ability to understand where others may be developmentally, while recognizing that development is not fixed, and understand what influences their meaning-making in that particular moment allows them to better support someone's development. For supervisors, it might be about understanding where a staff member finds meaning in their work or what challenges them and help them to make better choices about their assignments and deployment of attention. Additionally, a supervisor might think about the developmental diversity on a team and make hiring decisions that are at least informed by what might create a more holistic range of action logics available to the department.

Mentoring is a common practice in student affairs and SCA. Several participants commented on the role of their mentors helping them navigate difficult situations and decisions in their work. There is no standard format for mentoring but it often involves

providing advice and pointing out possible pitfalls along the professional journey. Certainly, mentors might benefit from the ability to attend to the action logics and meaning-making of their mentee in order to invite them into a more complex understanding of their experience. Mentors can use the action logic model to challenge mentees to make more complex decisions, exercise their personal authority, and work more collaboratively with others as they move forward. Additionally, expressing the Transforming action logic can even invite mentors to exercise their vulnerability to engage in their own learning during the mentoring experience.

Methodological Considerations

This section will consider two unexpected methodological elements of the data collection and data analysis processes that arose during the research. These include the role of the researcher as an instrument and the use of visual inquiry. I believe these are important considerations for any researcher studying human development and meaning-making. My hope is that expanding upon my experience in these areas will support future researcher's in their own analysis.

Researcher as Instrument

I spent considerable time during the analysis of each participant's data working to engage the data holistically. By this I mean, I sought to develop an intuitive sense of who the participant is and how they understand and relate to their experiences. I thought of this as a more holistic approach to analysis and believe it allowed for consideration of important nuances and meaning to be considered in the assessment. It also allowed me to form an early hypothesis that could be dis/confirmed during the traditional coding process. This holistic approach recognized my own role as an instrument for analysis.

There were things I could feel one-on-one with a participant or knew from the tone of their voice that became an important part of the analysis. For instance, meaning-making characteristics such as curiosity, inquiry, immersion, and passion were only partially made available through the transcript but could also be experienced by me as the researcher. The caveat (discussed again in the section on researcher bias and reactivity) being that the more subjective experiences also had to be tested and supportive or contradictory data was necessary. However, appreciating my own role as an instrument was especially helpful when differences existed between my own analysis, the GLP, and the external auditors. Having developed a trust and a willingness to apply a critique of my own interpretations allowed me to more effectively work with interpretations from other sources as opposed to simply engaging in a debate with these interpretations. The end result was an analysis that ultimately builds upon differences in order to contribute to the findings.

Visual Inquiry

When I first embarked on the design of this study I thought about the difficulty of assessing individual meaning-making and felt a traditional semi-conversational interview process would not be sufficient. I selected the methodology of visual inquiry and subsequently designed the photography exercise as an experiment to see if the process of taking and reflecting on photographs would help assess individual meaning-making. There are no other constructive-development instruments that I am aware of that utilize photography or art in this way. However, there are instruments that utilize sentence stems as a projective technique for accessing an individual's development. My hope with the use of photography was that it would act in a similar way. Essentially, participants

would be able to take a photograph and project their own meaning-making upon it in order to express the orientating traits and characteristics of their meaning-making.

Using participant photographs as a way of getting to data presented two particular challenges. The first challenge was during the data collection. Although I received photographs from participants in advance, I did not know what meaning the photographs might hold for the participants and found that during the interview I would need to be prepared to work in the moment and probe further about the participant's understanding of the photograph. This interviewer nimbleness and flexibility is a common challenge in conversational and semi-structured interviews but the challenge was compounded by the addition of another element (the actual photograph) to respond to. Essentially, as I worked through the interview process I was mindful of the participant's narrative data as well as visual data and probing both in such a way that their most complex meaning-making could potentially be expressed.

The second challenge was during the data analysis and using the photographs in a meaningful way as opposed to just relying on a participant's narrative about the photograph. The challenge of making meaningful use of the photographs is what ultimately lead to a unique analysis opportunity. I found that the photographs participants shared often expressed unconscious elements of meaning-making that the participant was unable to reflect upon in the interview. The aspirational action logic expression was already discussed briefly in the section on a developmental taxonomy of action logics. Traditional qualitative analysis might identify these interpretations as subjective associations that should be acknowledged but bracketed outside of the findings. However, I also began thinking about these interpretations as representing the

unconscious elements of meaning-making being made available by the participant. In other words, the photographs presented by the participant may mean more than they are immediately aware of and presented an opportunity for alternative interpretations. A caveat to this type of interpretation is that we cannot ever be conclusive about what a participant is unconsciously expressing but we can hypothesize and search for supportive and contradictory data.

An example of this unconscious process of meaning-making included an analysis of a photograph Joy shared of Jesus Christ and a women kneeling (figure 2). Joy's conscious and stated interpretation of the photo was around the role of repentance and forgiveness in her philosophy and approach to SCA. Another possible interpretation of this photo is that the woman kneeling is a self-representation of Joy's own appearance and the painting is an embodiment of her own faith journey. Therefore, it raises a question about unconscious self-projection in her work as a conduct officer and how she might be embodying and enacting her own dynamic in how she takes up her professional role.

Figure 2. Joy: Philosophy and approach to student conduct

Joy provides data to support a hypothesis of her self-projection into her role when in the very next photo she provides a secular representation of her philosophy of student conduct. She shared a photo of a quote (figure 39) that reads, “Sometimes life gives you a second chance because you weren’t ready the first time.” One hypothesis of these two photos (figure 2 and 39) taken together is that Joy reinforces and sanitizes an aspect of her identity to fit comfortably within the system.

Figure 39. Joy: Philosophy and approach to student conduct (2)

Another example of how photographs can express unconscious elements of meaning-making is Carl’s use of the image of artist Kesha (figure 4). Carl’s conscious and stated use of the image was to represent the need to create conduct processes that respond to who the students really are as opposed to who they put on display for us. What his conscious meaning-making possibly did not consider was the way in which he may also use a persona in his work with students. As a dean of students and former university minister, the image of Kesha and her party lifestyle stands in stark contrast to the self he presents to students. Of course, there is nothing wrong with this functional use of a persona. Indeed, it can be healthy to present a persona that is aligned with organizational role and expectations. However, meaning-making that can engage in the

vulnerability required to consider how one is capable of enacting the same persona or dynamics expressed by others is typical of a more complex Transforming action logic.

Figure 4. Carl: Challenge in student conduct administration

Using images to analyze data in this way is difficult to integrate into a more traditional approach to qualitative analysis that seeks to use clear claims and defensible data in order to create a logic sequence. I found that relying solely on more clear and defensible claims meant that some of the richness around the potential unconscious elements had to be sanitized in order to protect the logic sequence. In regards to this research, my concern is that the rich element of the unconscious processes that influence meaning-making may have been minimized. It allowed me, however, to draw conclusions based on data that could be pointed to as possible evidence. Future research might explore how a methodology can be developed in order to use images, photographs, and art as an analysis tool for exploring the unconscious elements of meaning-making and action logic expression while understanding this process would arguably require greater participant interaction.

Trustworthiness and Integrity

This study was an exploration of the relationship between SCAs meaning-making and their stage of constructive development. I believe it revealed several important considerations for both those working in the field of Student Affairs and those interested in research on the intersections of leadership and human development. As with any research, there is an element of researcher interpretation and subjectivity. Recognizing that the results of this study on developmental meaning-making would be filtered through my own developmental meaning-making, the study was particularly prone to threats of trustworthiness and integrity. Therefore, I have designed several steps in the research process to ensure trustworthiness and integrity of the results.

Researcher Bias

As noted in chapter three, I am a veteran student conduct officer with over a decade of professional experience working full-time in SCA and possess strong beliefs about the challenges and opportunities being faced by the field. I am also very familiar with theories of constructive development, both as they relate to the traditional college student population and the human lifespan. My shared professional identity with the participants and knowledge of constructive developmental theory form a particular lens or filter through which I might interpret data. This creates potential for both insight as well as blind spots. As a result, I needed to be aware of the potential for bias and ensure my own assumptions and beliefs did not inappropriately interpret data from my participants.

Despite the important steps discussed later in this section to remain objective or neutral, my subjectivity could never be completely removed from the analysis.

Therefore, I integrated my own action-inquiry (Torbert, 2004) steps to improve the management of researcher bias. First, I was transparent about this bias to both myself and my dissertation committee. My dissertation Chair was especially helpful in reviewing early drafts of the analysis and identifying interpretations where I may have unconsciously linked or mirrored my own beliefs to that of the participant. This critical feedback was helpful in providing an opportunity to go back to the original data and ensure accuracy or adjust the interpretation. For instance, I was able to reflect upon my own identification with two participants and a tendency to code certain meaning-making beliefs as an Achiever action logic when upon further evaluation they expressed a more complex Redefining action logic. Eventually, this feedback helped me identify my own unconscious patterns of interpretation and generate a better overall analysis. Second, in the data analysis chapters I sought to be clear about when data that was presented was directly from the participant or an interpretation from me as the researcher. This way the reader would be able to differentiate what was the participant's belief and what was my own. Finally, I monitored changes in my own beliefs and assumptions about SCA and human development. This study took place over the course of 18 months and, periodically, I would notice changes in my own professional SCA practice. Reflecting on the cause of these changes was important to managing researcher bias. For instance, in my own conduct conversations with students I might have found myself using the terminology, strategies, or overall approach of one of the study's participants. Additionally, half-way through the data analysis period I changed professional roles and made the decision to leave SCA and broaden my portfolio of experiences in Student Affairs. This professional transition allowed me to begin thinking about the broader

implications of this research in student affairs. Being explicit about when this was happening was helpful in monitoring my own bias, limiting the impact my bias had on the study, as well as promoting my own growth as a researcher and practitioner.

Reactivity

Participants were engaged in the study periodically over the course of six months. During the entire process of engaging participants in the study, I remained aware of the possibility that their behavior and meaning-making could be influenced by my presence and the fact that I was “studying” them. To manage my influence on participants I began with a deep appreciation for what they were making available to me in this study. I believe that the way one composes meaning in their life is deeply personal and exposing it to a researcher is an exercise in vulnerability. Although some participants may not have experienced the research focus in this way, I found that holding this perspective helped inform each encounter with a participant and to hold the data they offered with compassion and gratitude.

The belief manifested itself in the actual data collection process. I sought to provide clarity for participants at each stage of the process. This began with putting out a call for participants and allowing them to contact me about their interest. I then asked for a 10minute phone call to explain the data collection process and their time investment. This was, of course, both for their benefit as well as the study’s to help ensure a common understanding of what involvement would entail. Prior to each interview I sat alone seeking to be mindful of the potential for impacting participants and setting an intention to both create an environment where they felt comfortable expressing themselves and I was able to collect meaningful data for the study. I found this personal practice to place

me in a frame of mind that was inviting, adaptable, and curious. Finally, recognizing that the GLP instrument and photography exercise might create unnecessary anxiety in participants, I sought to explain each clearly and make myself available for questions or concerns.

My only regret from my encounter with participants was a six-month gap of time between the end of data collection and the time I provided them their results to the GLP instrument. The time gap was the result of a pause in the data analysis due to personal and professional transitions in my own life. Only two of the nine participants responded or acknowledged receiving the GLP results and this was a very different response than I was used to receiving from the group. Since this did not occur during the actual data collection process, I do not want to read too much into this but do want to acknowledge its occurrence. Overall, the steps I took to address participant reactivity was helpful and I believe it contributed to the trustworthiness of the study.

Descriptive Integrity

All research should seek to analyze accurate data and this research design is not an exception. In fact, I would argue that the accuracy of interview transcriptions is especially important because the study is concerned with the structure and order of what the participants is focused on. Therefore, concerns about deviation from verbatim wording were very present for me in this study. Although interviews were professionally transcribed, I reviewed each transcription against the audio multiple times to ensure accuracy. Photographs were linked to sections of an interview in which they were discussed. Additionally, each participant received their interview transcription with

embedded photographs to read through and provide any revisions or clarifications they wanted.

Member Checking

I provided participants an opportunity to review their data a few different times. First, I sent them a copy of their two interview transcripts. They were invited to read through the transcripts for accuracy or to clarify anything they did not feel they originally explained the way they would like. Most participants responded and provided helpful clarifications to the transcript. Second, participants were provided a copy of their narrative analysis presented in chapter four along with the emblematic photo I selected. Note this did not include the action logic estimate and rationale because I felt that the ability to provide constructive feedback on this required a more advanced understanding of the developmental theory informing my analysis. They were asked if the narrative was accurate and included what they felt was most important to understand about their personal and professional journey. I received no feedback on any participant narratives but several confirmations of receipt. Finally, participants were provided their results to the GLP instrument and they were invited to share any thoughts or questions they had about it. Only one participant replied back to me and expressed disagreement with the GLP results and a desire to discuss it further.

Memo Writing

Throughout the data collection and analytic processes, I engaged in memo writing. Memo's helped capture insights on participant data as well as my own personal experience of the data. Insights on the data helped establish themes and patterns from participants. As described in the section above on researcher bias and reactivity,

reflection on my personal experience helped manage inappropriate researcher influence on the data.

External Audit

The study included a formal external audit of the participant data and first level analysis of narrative. The audit was adapted from a dissertation study (Jones, 2015) of action logics in philanthropy that asked expert reviewers to read both raw data and the narrative and analysis of a narrative for dis/agreement. Four independent auditors with advanced knowledge of theories of constructive development and action logics were recruited to review data and my analysis. Each auditor reviewed these materials for two participants. The auditors have been colleagues of mine in my doctoral program and three are active researchers or consultants in the field of leadership and adult development. I purposefully selected six participants to have audited and two participants were audited twice (Carl and Joy). The reason I selected Carl and Joy to be audited twice was because they represented both the most and least complex action logic estimates. Additionally, in my memo writing I identified Carl and Joy as presenting a higher risk to researcher bias and I wanted to provide an extra layer of analysis to their data.

The audit process included two primary steps. First, the auditor was asked to review the two interview transcripts that included participant photographs as well as the participant narrative and analysis of narrative I had written. The participant narrative would eventually become the personal and professional background information provided in chapter four. The analysis of narrative was a first-level synthesis of a participant's meaning-making and estimated action logics. The full version of this first-level synthesis

is not included in the dissertation but many elements of this analysis comprise the analysis in chapters 5-7. Based on the auditors' review of these materials, they were asked to respond to two questions.

1. Does this description of the participant's background seem to be consistent with the story the participant tells about him/herself?
2. Do the meaning-making themes in research questions one and two reflect the participant's data? Are there dominant themes/traits inadvertently missed that indicate something important about how the participant makes meaning of their experience or speaks to their developmental action logic?

The goal of this first step was to ensure that I had condensed the participant's narrative appropriately and not inadvertently left out experiences that seemed important to the participant. The second goal was to ensure the characteristics and structure of participant meaning-making were accurate as these were used to hypothesize an action logic estimate for each participant.

The second step of the audit was to review the analysis of the participant's estimated action logic. Note that the auditors did not have access to the results of the GLP instrument. A condensed version of this analysis is included in chapter four following each participant's narrative and communicates my estimated action logic as well as any other action logics present in the participant's meaning-making. Auditors were asked to review the material and respond to the questions:

1. Based on the data presented in the transcripts and the analysis of research questions one and two, does the overall action logic assessment seem accurate?

2. If not, please identify why it is inaccurate and what other assessment should be considered. For example, were data available but not included, or, perhaps, was there not sufficient data available to make an assessment?

The results of the audit largely confirmed my own analysis of the six participants.

However, even those audits that were in agreement made helpful comments about the nuances of how participants expressed an action logic. Their comments on the nuances were helpful in supporting the study's findings related to participants possessing a range of action logics. The responses from each auditor is summarized in Table 14 and is followed by a summary of any written comments for each participant. Some auditors were more robust in their feedback than others even if it was ultimately confirming my own estimation. I am grateful for this as it often helped in later analysis that examined how participant's engaged in meaning-making from a range of action logics.

A final note about the audit process before summarizing the results is to emphasize that the auditor's analysis was not intended to replace or confirm my own analysis. The audit was another strategy for taking responsibility for my own analysis in order to improve the trustworthiness and integrity of the results. Although there was one instance where auditors identified data that I was not fully considering which led me to a significant change in the analysis, most of the audit feedback provided helpful insight and confirmation for the analysis I was conducting. Below is a summary of of feedback each participant put through the audit process.

Table 14

Audit results for six participants

Participants		Audit Questions		
		Does this description of the participant's background seem to be consistent with the story the participant tells about him/herself?	Do the meaning-making themes in research questions one and two reflect the participant's data?	Based on the data presented in the transcripts and the analysis of research questions one and two, does the overall action logic assessment seem accurate?
Joy	Audit #1	Yes	Yes - Noted that Joy can see the self-authoring space yet cannot occupy it yet in her SCA role.	No - Expert (<i>later changed from Diplomat to Expert by researcher</i>)
	Audit #2	Yes	Yes - Noted her discomfort with researcher's own interpretation of some photos (<i>this is addressed in the comment section below</i>)	No - Expert (<i>later changed from Diplomat to Expert by researcher</i>)
Thomas	Audit #1	Yes	Yes - added that Thomas often used colleagues as a source of emotional support	Yes - Achiever
Nicole	Audit #1	Yes	Yes - Noted more subtle themes of seeing systems implications and limits to her own ideology	No - Redefining w/ pull towards Achiever by context
Tess	Audit #1	Yes	Yes - Noted Tess' embeddedness in the institution yet capacity to see multiple systems	Yes - Late Achiever
Mark	Audit #1	Yes	General Agreement but noted several instances of theme nuance	Yes - Early Redefining
Carl	Audit #1	Yes	Yes - added helpful nuances to themes that are described in the comments	Yes – Early Transforming
	Audit #2	Yes	Yes	Hesitant to make an AL estimate based on data

Auditor Comments for Joy. Based on reflections in my memo writing about data collection with Joy, I decided to have her data and my first-level analysis audited twice. I noticed my memos expressed a deep compassion for Joy and the challenges she articulated. I could feel myself drawn into her story and, therefore, was concerned about my subjectivity. Additionally, Joy was the first participant of the nine that I analyzed and I felt an additional audit would help counter any changes in my action logic ratings that occurred during the course of later data analysis. Overall, this proved to be a helpful decision and led me to conclude that my original estimation was inaccurate and I subsequently revised my action logic estimate from Diplomat to Expert.

During the first-level of analysis I originally estimated Joy at the Diplomat action logic but feedback from the auditors convinced me that an estimation of an Expert action logic was more appropriate. Auditor #1 noted how Joy seems to perceive herself in role writing,

Joy's image in the mind of self, role, and institution seems to illustrate her experience of feeling alone as well as torn between the desire for whatever timeliness a restorative, socially just process would bear out (reflective of her personal/internal commitment) and the institutional timing required for investigation, decision, compliance, and closure (reflective of her institutional/external commitment).

Auditor #1 made the estimate of Expert action logic noting how Joy is able to help students see multiple perspectives in their own experience yet there is an incongruence with how she is challenged to do this in her own experiences. Auditor #1 wrote,

In many ways, Joy can see the self-authoring space though she cannot yet occupy it in this role. As is consistent with developmental growth, Joy is able to help students gain perspective to see how their behavior or reasoning is connected across contexts, though she has difficulty taking up this perspective for herself in a way that would lessen the charge of the personal tension she describes and perhaps allow for more self-confident agency.

Auditor #1 goes on to note both Diplomat and Achiever action logic tendencies in how Joy operates and makes-meaning of her work. Auditor feedback like this was critical in my own thinking about participants possessing a range of action logics as opposed to being a single action logic. Auditor #2 also estimated Joy at the emerging Expert action logic but did not include a rational in the audit. After revisiting the data and considering feedback from the auditors I decided to change my estimate from a Diplomat to an Expert action logic. My original Diplomat assessment was the result of her orientation to relationships; however, the auditor highlighted the data described above pointing out how she perceives herself in her role.

Auditor Comments for Thomas. The auditor recommended including additional emphasis on Thomas' relational preferences and the experiences of seeking out colleagues for emotional solace during difficult student conduct incidents. The auditor also commented on the nature of Thomas' photography writing,

I was struck how text-focused they were, and very literal in their interpretation. Only a couple had people in them. The others all seemed to involve words. The photos of written policies and web pages stuck me as being very concrete interpretations of what he was asked to portray graphically. I was surprised that almost none exhibited metaphorical, symbolic, or more abstract representations.

I agree with this observation and was initially struck by the same traits in his photography. This comment from the auditor helped me continue thinking about what function my own subjective interpretations of the photography could have in the analysis. It helped me ask the question, "what else might the photographs be expressing about a participant's meaning-making?" The results of this manifested in certain data analysis sections involving participant photography and is discussed more in this chapter in the section on visual inquiry.

New perspectives reinforced for me how difficult this type of analysis can be. Arguably, Thomas operated from the same action logic more consistently than any other participant. Despite this consistency, alternative perspectives can be made about his meaning-making and action logic. The action logic interpretation to some degree is influenced by the action logic of the researcher or external reviewer who brings their own meaning-making lens and experience to the analysis. What researchers must do, and what I believe was accomplished in this study, is take responsibility for their interpretations seek out both supportive and contradictory data.

Auditor Comments for Nicole. The auditor noted how Nicole was able to notice the limits of her own ideology and her frequent reference to systems implications in her own work, in her students' behavior, in the institution, and broader SCA field. This data was strong enough for the auditor to recommend a Redefining action logic with a “gravitational pull” towards Achiever due to the context in which she works. The auditor wrote,

My Redefining assessment was based on those things you identified and: her recognition of the limits of her own ideology and her desire to poke at them; her very clear awareness of the reverberations in systems and the power they exude in situations; her approach in her interactions with the students (focus on inquiry, noticing of multiple territories of experience at once), the way she has more recently presented cases to her colleagues, her sense of the broader challenges and opportunities (beyond the traditional, beyond structure, beyond culture) that are possible in her field. There's absolutely still the Achiever in Nicole, but I almost feel like this represents her trailing edge, rather than the leading edge that I feel Redefining is for her.

This comment was helpful in providing me an opportunity to wrestle with the fluidity of action logics created by the blending of self, role, and context. Ultimately, these influences cannot be completely disaggregated. This fluidity added to my findings that suggest a range or profile of action logics available to an individual in both their

meaning-making and behavior. This range can create an incongruence in how we make meaning and the action that is exercised. Ultimately, after revisiting the data, I decided to maintain my original estimate of the Achiever action logic.

Auditor Comments for Tess. The auditor noted how Tess seems to perceive herself in role writing,

Tess' image in the mind of self, role, and institution seems to illustrate her feelings of embeddedness within the organization and her team ("you're not really alone") and a general internalization of the institution and identification as being a representative of the office and the larger field of student conduct. In other words, the external commitments become internal commitments as she re-authors her own personal commitments to accommodate them, leading to less tension between them and more of a hand-holding relationship between them.

Despite Tess' embeddedness in the institution, the auditor went on to highlight Tess' capacity to see multiple systems writing,

Tess' experience of authoring her identity as a guide for all stakeholders through the institutional processes involved in student conduct issues, a guide as critical to the processes (from her perspective) as the guidebooks she identifies. Tess has experimented with an awareness of herself and her institution as holding a place and responsibility within the larger field of student conduct, connecting to previous systems (there and otherwise), parallel systems (represented at professional conferences), as well as imagining future systems (desire to incorporate a global perspective).

The auditor uses this interpretation as evidence of a late or transitioning action logic towards a more post-conventional logic. This supported my first-level analysis yet raised questions for me about how participants can make-meaning from post-conventional action logics but may not operate from this action logic.

Auditor Comments for Mark. The auditor agreed with the action logic estimate of early Redefining but commented on several patterns in his meaning-making that added nuance to the analysis. For instance, the auditor noticed a pattern of Mark only identifying growth coming from environments of support and not challenge. Another

pattern noticed by the auditor was how Mark directed his curiosity toward exploration of third person or expert resources. The auditor also agreed with my assessment that Mark expressed the less complex Expert and Achiever action logics and provided additional data points to support this assessment that were included in the analysis chapters. The auditor's feedback and agreement with the presence of multiple action logics being expressed by Mark helped in my consideration of participants using a range or profile of action logics that captured the fluidity of their identity.

Auditor Comments for Carl. Auditor #1 provided some helpful nuances to the meaning-making themes I identified in the first-level analysis for Carl. For example, Auditor #1 recommended changing the coding language from “challenging norms” to “Using and/or creating dissonance as an opening for transformation”. This auditor noted that the language of challenge suggests a more rebellious exercise. Rather, what Carl was doing created a dissonance that “reflects the parallel process, where the students experience dissonance and he serves as a mirror to them about the difference between their behavior and their goals, which they had lost touch with.” Auditor #1 also noted that Carl's focus on time and not having enough time to engage with the broader SCA field may be “a cover story, and perhaps unrecognized resistance to embracing an Alchemist action logic.”

Auditor #2 found it difficult to make an action logic estimate for Carl based on the data provided. The auditor wrote,

I really struggled as I read Carl's interviews to make an assessment. The conversation seemed to focus on content (which, clearly, was largely Strategist in nature). In my experience, the nature of the world of student affairs deals with issues in a way that can, on the surface, appear to be Strategist in nature. However, that does not necessarily mean that the student affairs staff member is actually acting as a Strategist. I think your assessment is likely correct; however,

there wasn't enough of a push beyond the content to the why or, as Kegan would say, "on behalf of what" underlying the content for me to feel comfortable making an assessment.

This particular auditor has advanced training in the Subject/Object Interview instrument (Lahey, Souvaine, Kegan, Goodman, & Felix, 1988) which relies on a different method of identifying a stage of constructive-development. Nevertheless, this is helpful feedback and reinforced something I had been reflecting on my memos. That is, is there a difference between acquiring post-conventional language and exercising post-conventional meaning-making? The nature of education and training in Student Affairs and SCA reinforces a language that is often aligned with a post-conventional action logic (i.e. social justice, pluralism, systems thinking, and global perspectives). This line of inquiry assisted me in thinking about a taxonomy of action logic development whereby one is capable of internal meaning-making and language associated with more complex action logics but may struggle to express actions that are congruent with this meaning-making.

Final Thoughts on External Audit. Overall, the external audit was an invaluable step in the analysis process. The feedback from auditors helped open lines of inquiry as well as confirm some of the insights into SCA development that I was having during the first-level of analysis. Specifically, the audit reinforced a need to structure the second level analysis in a way that illustrated how this group of participants were capable of operating from a range of action logics. This range was not simply the result of peak experiences or moments of developmental regression but is what the individual understood as functional given the external variables they were aware of.

I was surprised at the different ways that auditors approached the exercise. I originally estimated that conducting two audits would take approximately 4 hours but two of the auditors reported spending close to five hours on a single audit. They also acknowledged their own role in extending this time and diving into the data and writing a robust analysis. There was not a relationship between dis/agreement with the analysis and length of time the auditor spent on the exercise. Another difference in the way auditors completed the exercise was their frame of reference for analyzing stage of constructive development. One auditor was clearly using a Torbert/GLP style of analysis while another two used a Kegan/Subject-Object Interview style of analysis. The fourth auditor approached the analysis from a more holistic style that considered both context and individual understanding and relationship to the content. I was grateful for each of these approaches as they helped deepen the analysis. Ultimately, as the principal researcher, I used their insights along with my own experience of the data to determine how the audit should inform the final analysis.

I want to conclude this section by noting that each of these auditors received their education and training in adult development theory at the same institution. Although at least three of them have moved on to receive additional training at other institutions, our collective foundational training is very similar and may introduce a bias into the audit process. Jones (2015) also noted this challenge in the audit process my audit was adapted from. I found this to be an acceptable risk as the goal of the audit was not necessarily to dis/confirm my action logic estimate but to provide the data additional perspectives to help unearth the nuance of participant meaning-making and its relationship to an estimated action logic. The limit of this potential bias is that an auditor's agreement with

my action logic estimate cannot be used to disconfirm any difference with the assessment made by the GLP. Ultimately, although the auditors estimate of the participant's action logic was important, what was beneficial about the audit was the insight they provided about how participants understand and relate to their experiences and professional growth in SCA.

Global Leadership Profile

The primary purpose of the Global Leadership Profile (GLP) is that it was one way of triangulating participant data in order to facilitate inquiry and construct propositions about how SCAs make meaning of their experiences. At the conclusion of the first interview participants were provided instructions for completing and submitting the GLP, which uses a projective technique and consists of 30 incomplete sentence stems that the participant completes. A sentence completion technique is often used to understand the unconscious operations of the ego that help to organize our thoughts and make sense out of them and the world around us. Examples of these sentence stems include "When I am criticized...", "My time...", "A good leader...", and "Rules are...". The completed stems were used to determine the participant's primary action-logic. The primary action-logic is identified as one's most available and consistent way of making meaning of experience.

To score the GLP, completed instruments were submitted directly to Dr. Bill Torbert through his organization, Action-Inquiry Associates. By utilizing a memorandum of understanding (Appendix D), Dr. Torbert's organization analyzed the completed instruments and shared them with two trained raters in order to ensure inter-rater reliability. I did not review the scored instrument until all analysis steps in stage

one were completed. This guarded against the imposition of bias and provided me with a “veil of ignorance” (Rawls, 1999, p. 11). When stage one of the data analysis was complete I accessed the scored instruments and investigated any potential relationship between initial interpretations and the participant’s assessed stage of meaning making.

I reviewed five instruments in chapter two that could have been used for the purpose of triangulation. My decision to use the GLP was made because it is more oriented towards practicing leaders and there are more recently published reliability and validity statistics for the GLP (Torbert, 2013, 2014). The GLP established reliability of scorers on 805 measures using 13 possible levels (action-logics) of development for each measure. Results showed “a .96 Pearson correlation between the two scorers, with perfect agreement in 72% of the cases, with a 1/3 action-logic disagreement in 22% of the cases” (Torbert, 2014, p. 7). An added feature of the GLP is that any disagreement between scorers results in a negotiation prior to supplying feedback to the client. The limitation of these validity statistics is that they have not been independently verified. I believe that the lack of independent verification of the GLP is not problematic in this study because the instrument is only being used for triangulation purposes and is not the primary method for assessing participant action logics.

I was not concerned with consistency between the GLP and my own assessment of a participant’s action logic. Rather, I was seeking to gather additional evidence about participants in order to open up lines of inquiry and generate propositions about the relationship between participant meaning-making and stage of constructive-development. In three participants there was consistency between the GLP and my own estimate but in the other six there was a gap. Both the presence of consistency and discrepancy in the

assessment were treated as an opportunity to address the research questions and inform theory.

GLP Results. The results of the GLP and my own action logic estimate are presented in Table 13. There was an exact match for three of the nine participants (Thomas, Nicole, and Paul) while the remaining six participants had some inconsistency. The average difference between the GLP and my estimate was 0.9 action logics. Additionally, Table 13 indicates that when there was a difference which rating provided a more complex action logic assessment. The remainder of this section will discuss potential reasons for the discrepancies.

Table 13

Difference between results of GLP and interview estimate

Name	Interview Estimate	GLP Rating	Difference	More Complex
Joy	Expert	Redefining	2.0	GLP
Thomas	Achiever	Achiever	0.0	
Nicole	Achiever	Achiever	0.0	
Tess	Achiever (late)	Redefining	1.0	GLP
Mark	Redefining (early)	Redefining	0.5	GLP
Alex	Redefining	Achiever	1.0	Interview Est.
Paul	Redefining	Redefining	0.0	
John	Redefining (late)	Achiever	1.5	Interview Est.
Carl	Strategist (early)	Achiever	2.0	Interview Est.
Average Difference			0.9	

Reason #1: The structure of a participant's context or environment might contribute to discrepancies. The literature on constructive-development has acknowledged that the interior condition of individuals is complex and constantly evolving so that individuals inevitably express multiple stages of development in their lives. Not only is our interior condition complex but so are the environments we are

situated within. Individuals both act upon and are acted upon by their environment creating a sort of interplay between the two. Sewell (1992) suggests that a largely unconsidered element of structures (including rules and resources) is human agency or the internal schemas they possess. Individuals are social agents that engage their environments and as a result are influenced by their environment. Sewell goes on to suggest that individuals vary in their capacity for agency and that their agency varies from context-to-context depending on the particular structures that inform a context.

With interplay between structure and human agency in mind, I want to point out the contextual nature of each assessment. The assessment made based on two interviews and photographs was in regards to the professional context. In fact, for all but one interview (Nicole) the participants requested to be interviewed at their office location. However, the GLP was not only professionally based but directly invited reflection on other environments. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that a discrepancy would occur when an individual is reflecting on different structures and social environments. Jones (2015) suggested if we assume the environment does influence action logic expression then “discrepancies between the assessments would indicate that both instruments accurately reflected the participants’ thinking *in the particular moment it was administered*” (p. 288).

Although this reason for discrepancy between my own and the GLP rating was possible in each of the participants, it was a potentially a stronger influence in those with a rating gap of two action logics (Joy and Carl). Specific contextual influence that may be at work for Joy is managing a large student conduct program on her own as the only conduct officer. Working in what she referred to as a “stand alone shop” may apply

pressure to work very conventionally and effectively resulting in unconsciously reducing focus on complexity in her work in order to be functional. Carl's position as Dean of Students requires managing a broader portfolio of responsibilities and as a result may invite a more complex action logic. Additionally, his position provides protection for expressing a late action logic that can be seen as experimental or risk-taking.

Reason #2: Student Conduct Administration may be a profession that attracts meaning-making that is post-conventional but operates with an Achiever action logic.

Both forms of assessment primarily resulted in action logic estimates of Achiever and Redefining. There are only two exceptions that included the interview assessments made for Joy and Carl. A possible explanation for this might be that the education, training, and work experience of Student Affairs and specifically SCA prepares individuals to make meaning and use language that is reflective of the post-conventional action logics. A more robust discussion of the skills, knowledge, and attributes for effective SCA practice can be found in chapter two. However, the literature suggests that education and training beginning at the graduate level and entry-level emphasizes interpersonal and human relation skills that develop capabilities of engaging with diverse individuals and multiple perspectives. There is also a strong focus on continued growth and learning in order to be able to support the development of students and the institution. In order to progress into mid and senior levels of administration the literature suggests that individuals must focus on leadership that is collaborative and capable seeing and working across systems. These core traits of professional learning, at least on the surface, are consistent with development towards a post-conventional action logic. Therefore, post-

conventional meaning-making of professional experiences by some participants may be a function of professional training.

This particular reason for discrepancy between my own and the GLP would exist among participants who I hypothesized as post-conventional but the GLP rated as conventional (Alex, John, and Carl).

Reason #3: Bias was introduced to the interview by the level of rapport with the researcher. Although steps were taken to manage participant and researcher reactions to the interview and photography exercise, it may be that some participants were influenced by the study or the presence of a researcher. Specifically, the participants and the myself may have been influenced by the level of rapport that existed (or did not). I have known three of the participants as professional colleagues (Thomas, Alex, and Carl). Although they expressed genuine interest in participating in the study, it is reasonable to assume that the collegial relationship we had built had a role in them volunteering to the call for participants. For Alex and Carl, who there were discrepancies between the two assessments, it may be that they felt comfortable expressing their more complex meaning-making with me. On the other hand, those participants who only knew me from the research context may have withheld or censored the complexity of their meaning-making. Expression of individual meaning-making is an exercise in vulnerability and minimally requires a level of personal disclosure about the difficult and (sometimes) unpleasant challenges of their professional work.

The nature of rapport may not only influence the participants but may also influence me as a researcher including the probing question I may ask and the way I might analyze their statements. Although I tried to remain aware of my personal

experiences of each participant, interviews and analysis are still subject to elements of my personal lens and filter. This personal subjectivity includes my own developmental level. In preparation for this research I conducted an independent study where I completed the GLP and wrote a narrative of my own action logic development in order to make this potential bias more explicit. However, my own development is still a likely influence in the analysis of some participants. For instance, I was comfortable rating the participants with an Achiever and clear Redefining action logics but then struggled more with participant action logics that were late Redefining and Transforming. It may be that when expressed action logics became more complex they began to enter the developmental territory that I am still personally exploring and therefore limits what I can perceive from the data. Working through the data line-by-line and one photograph at a time while asking about the action logic being expressed as opposed to remaining caught up in the excitement of the larger story was a helpful approach to gaining perspective on the later action logics. Additionally, I would ask myself about how an action logic expression would change if it were another action logic in order to draw comparisons. For instance, if a participant discussed consulting with a colleague on a difficult sanctioning decision I would look for data that indicated the purpose behind the request. Was the purpose to validate a decision or make the correct decision (Expert), ensure educational consistency and compliance (Achiever), look for an alternative approach that was both programmatically consistent and individually tailored to the student (Redefining), or get feedback about their own potential subjectivity in the decision-making and wonder about sanctions that address both the individuality of the student and the communities they are situated within (Transforming)? Identifying data that pointed to

the level of complexity the participant's attention or focus was able to consider was an important strategy in coding for action logic expressions.

This particular reason for discrepancy between my own estimate and the GLP could have occurred with Joy, Alex, and Carl. My memos during the course of their interviews reflected strong rapport and potential presence for bias.

Reason #4: The photography exercise may have influenced the assessment. The photography exercise represented an experiment in this study. There are no other constructive-development instruments that I am aware of that utilize photography or art in this way. However, there are instruments that utilize sentence stems as a projective technique for accessing an individual's development. My hope with the use of photography was that it would act in a similar way. Essentially, participants would be able to take a photograph and project their own meaning-making upon it in order to express the orientating traits and characteristics of their meaning-making. In other words, the photography exercise was designed to dive deeper into their meaning-making during the course of two interviews. Obviously, the GLP assess action logics in a very different way. This is not necessarily a problem and it is difficult to know if participant meaning-making was influenced in any way by the photography exercise. Most participants expressed their enjoyment of the exercise and the opportunity to reflect on their work in this way. The majority of participants reported taking much longer than the intended time of 60 minutes to complete the exercise. Whereas, Thomas completed the exercise rather quickly and Paul was never able to fully complete the exercise. Minimally, the photography exercise provided participants a higher level of freedom to direct the second interview and speak to what was most important about their experience in SCA. At its

best, the photography exercise was an opportunity for creative self-expression of one's meaning-making and identity as a SCA.

This particular reason for discrepancy between my own estimate and the GLP could have occurred with any participant with a gap between the two ratings. My assumption is that the photography exercise did not necessarily invite a rating of more or less complex action logics, rather; the photography invited more nuance from which to draw an assessment.

Reason #5: Different action-logic assessments may be the function of a different frame of analysis used in the interviews and GLP. In addition to the photography exercise, I used a very different frame of analysis than the GLP during the interview and analysis processes. My frame of analysis was more clinical while the GLP is informed first by a psychometric approach. I structured the interview as a modified Subject/Object interview and prior to the data collection I completed a self-training of the interview procedure. The interview and photography exercise used similar prompts to that of the Subject/Object interview. This clinical approach to the interview may invite participants to engage in expression of their late action logics because there is an opportunity for follow-up prompts and discussion that is not provided in the GLP. It should not be surprising that two in-depth interviews provide additional opportunity for participants to express their most complex action logics than the GLP that utilizes sentence stems to capture a foundational action logic.

I have already noted that the GLP was never included in the research design to guard against researcher subjectivity and bias but to serve as another perspective on the participant's action logic development. Additionally, I have noted the lack of

independent verification of the instruments rating process despite having been built upon well-validated instruments. However, there may also be a bias in the analysis procedure used in the GLP. In her dissertation study of the action logics in philanthropy, Jones (2015) described this bias as “psychometric-first approach” (p. 298) that suggests when the GLP researchers rate each sentence stem they begin to form a bias about the participant that may not be questioned in the later analysis that involves a reviewing of all sentence stems for an overall profile or intuition-informed rating. If this bias exists, then it may influence the more clinical analysis that occurs after the psychometric approach. This clinical approach would allow for consideration of important nuances and meaning to be considered in the assessment of a participant’s action logic stage.

This particular reason for discrepancy between my own estimate and the GLP would most likely influence ratings for participants whose more complex rating was given by me (Alex, John, and Carl). Again, this would be the result of the clinical approach to the modified Subject/Object interview that probed and created opportunity for participants to express their more complex action logics.

Conclusion. I described five reasons that could possibly explain the discrepancies between the GLP instrument and my own interview analysis. Table 15 presents these reasons along with the participants whose analysis may have been influenced by the reason. Of course, connection between a particular reason and a participant is not conclusive but a hypothesis. Additionally, I have tried to present these reasons for discrepancy in a way that illustrates how the discrepancies helped create new propositions and lines of inquiry in the analysis of participant meaning-making and the assessment of action logics. This is opposed to using the discrepancies to suggest that

one way of assessing participant action logic is more or less valid or reliable. Rather, the discrepancies highlight the fluidity and complexity of how action logics operate in the experiences of these participants and the futility of confining an individual to a specific action logic expression.

Table 15

Possible reasons for discrepancies between GLP and interview

	Joy	Tess	Mark	Alex	John	Carl
<i>AL Difference between Interview and GLP</i>	2	1	0.5	1	1.5	2
Influence of context or environment	X					X
Function of SCA field				X	X	X
Rapport between researcher and participant	X			X		X
Influence of photography exercise	X	X	X	X	X	X
GLP and Interview represent different frames of analysis				X	X	X

Limitations

Limitations exist in any study. In anticipation of these limitations I implemented several strategies to manage their influence including acknowledging researcher bias, ensuring accurate data, member checking, memo writing, multiple forms of assessment, and a formal external audit of the data and first-level analysis. In this study the most important limitations involve the instruments used and the participant selection and sample size.

Instruments

I have discussed in several sections the limitations of the GLP instrument as well as the limitation of my own analysis of the interview data that was modified from the Subject/Object Interview. These limitations are somewhat mitigated, although not

dismissed, by the focus being on how the instruments make available different perspectives and propositions about the data rather than evaluating action logics consistently. Specifically, my interview assessment was susceptible to bias. The steps described in the section on trustworthiness and integrity provide several strategies for managing the influence of bias in my analysis. The most extensive step for managing researcher bias was including a formal external audit. Although the external audit admittedly had its own limitations, the audit helped verify the analysis and introduced several nuances into the analysis of participant meaning-making. Finally, it should be noted that I completed my analysis of the data without the use of a qualitative coding software. I found it to be more helpful to code by hand participant narratives and photographs for meaning-making characteristics and action logics. It is possible that if another researcher used a coding software they might come up with different results. However, to some extent differences in analysis occur even if researchers use the same software.

Participant Sample and Selection Criteria

The study's sample size of nine ($n=9$) participants cannot be generalized beyond this group of participants. However, as an initial study in the area of SCA meaning-making it represents a helpful heuristic tool for future research. Additionally, the participant selection criteria were purposefully limited to participants with five or more years of experience working in SCA and working at institutions in the state of California during the data collection stage. The only other demographics given consideration was attempting to balance participants by gender and public/private institution affiliation. This sample is by no means representative of the field of SCA and future studies might

seek a more representative sample based on race, ethnicity, region, gender expression, and sexual orientation. Additionally, this particular sample was not representative of all action logics or stages of adult constructive-development. Future studies could seek representation from stages of development not fully represented in this study.

Aspirations for Future Research

This study represents an initial inquiry into the meaning-making of SCAs and the developmental action logics that inform their experiences and strategies for professional growth. As such, it raises a number of questions to be considered in future research about the nature of human development and how it informs the practice of SCA and (more broadly) Student Affairs. This section will suggest four directions for future research.

This study was primarily populated by individuals who express a primary action logic of either Achiever or Redefining. Although participants demonstrated being capable of expressing more and less complex action logics, there is limited data to understand how the more and less complex action logics inform SCA. The first area of future research might explore are the less complex action logics (Diplomat and Expert) and more complex action logics (Transforming and Alchemist) in order to better understand what influence they might have in SCA. An understanding of how a broader range of action logic complexity is expressed in SCA would be a valuable resource to inform conduct officer training and mentoring.

This study captured a momentary glimpse of the meaning-making of SCAs. A second area of research would be a longitudinal study of how meaning-making changes during the course their career. Research could follow a cohort of graduate students through the first decade of their career periodically assessing their action and

interviewing for changes in meaning-making. This would be opposed to measuring the impact of a single practice or strategy of development since this form of development in adults can take several years (Kegan 1982, 194).

This study used a visual inquiry and arts-based process to understand SCA meaning-making. This approach to researching individual development holds promise as an inquiry strategy for understanding the less conscious and unconscious dimensions of one's identity while understanding that individual unconscious can never be fully known but only hypothesized. Exploring the unconscious elements of meaning-making is difficult to accomplish through traditional interviews and approaches to analysis. Furthermore, it has been suggested that visual inquiry and arts-based research be used to understand the meaning-making development of university students (Welkener and Magolda, 2014), but it may also prove helpful in research across the lifespan and of the professionals or educators that seek to promote the development of university students. It is clear to me through this research that photography and art can help capture a rich element of individual meaning-making. Future research might continue this exploration of how photography and art can be integrated into the analysis of meaning-making.

Finally, SCA is one functional area of the broader field of Student Affairs. Future research might extend this study to other areas of Student Affairs. This research could add a helpful dimension to our understanding of professional competencies and how varied professionals understand and relate to these competencies. Additionally, research could examine action logics based on organizational hierarchy including new, mid, and senior level professionals.

Aspirations for the Field

Student conduct administration has been some of the most rewarding and difficult work I have ever engaged. I believe that the perceived mistakes students make in their college experience can potentially release some of the most important learning they will receive in college and my role is to support that journey no matter where it leads. I value the partnership with colleagues who are interested in finding creative ways to promote student and community learning while wrestling with the complexities of organizational life. In this study, each of the participants expressed their own passion for work in SCA and I appreciate and admire what they shared.

I believe that SCA, and more broadly Student Affairs, is an area of work consisting of people who are passionate about student learning and development. In a way, this study turns the mirror inward to explore how we as professionals learn and develop. My hope is that this study helps to provide insight into how we as professionals can broaden our own understanding of professional development. My hope is that this study can help contribute to an ongoing dialogue in the field about how we can lean more fully into the educational mission of our work and what it might mean to let go of some of our ingrained assumptions and beliefs about SCA. I believe that our work would benefit from our collective capacity to express the range of action logics that allow us to work more mindfully and inhabit the potential that is clearly present.

Although I have eluded to it during this chapter, I want to end by more fully acknowledging that during the course of this research I left the field of student conduct administration. The reasons are both professional and personal but I am confident it was in response to a deep knowing that it was time to move in a new direction. During my

transition into another functional area in student affairs, I became more aware of the widening potential for the implications of this study. I mentioned this in the sections on future research and implications for practice; however, I want to emphasize that I believe all student affairs professionals would benefit from an increasing awareness of their own meaning-making and capacity for a range of action logics from which to operate.

Together with our colleagues in SCA, and other arenas in the academy, we can co-create future possibilities for learning and development in our communities.

REFERENCES

- American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (2010). *Professional competency areas for student affairs practitioners*. Washington DC: Author.
- Amey, M. J., & Reesor, L. M. (2002). *Beginning Your Journey: A Guide for New Professionals in Student Affairs*. Expanded and Revised.
- Armour, M. P., Bain, B., & Rubio, R. (2004). An evaluation study of diversity training for field instructors: A collaborative approach to enhancing cultural competence. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 40(1), 27-38.
- Bach, H. (2007). Composing a visual narrative inquiry. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry* (pp. 280–307). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Collier Macmillan. Bateman, T. S., & Snell, S. A. (1999). *Management: Building competitive advantage* (4th Ed.). Boston: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
- Bateman, T. S., Snell, S. A., Cevallos Almada, M. G., Lozano Hirschfeld, A., Franklin Fincowsky, E. B., Nevado de Zelaya, M. R., & Velazquez Garaña, F. J. (1999). *Administracion: una ventaja competitiva*.
- Beatty, D. L., & Stamatakis, L. C. (1990). Faculty and Administrator Perceptions of Knowledge, Skills and Competencies as Standards for Doctoral Preparation Programs in Student Affairs Administration. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31(3), 221-29.
- Bickel, R. D., & Lake, P. F. (1999). *The rights and responsibilities of the modern university: Who assumes the risks of college life?* Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Burkard, A., Cole, D. C., Ott, M., & Stoflet, T. (2005). Entry-Level Competencies of New Student Affairs Professionals: A Delphi Study. *NASPA Journal (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.)*, 42(3), 283-309.
- Chase, S. E. (2005). „Narrative Inquiry: Multiple Lenses”, *Approaches, Voices, w: Handbook of Qualitative Research*, red. NK Denzin, Y. Lincoln.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cook-Greuter, S. R. (1999). *Postautonomous ego development: A study of its nature and measurement*. [Ed.D. dissertation]. Dissertation Abstracts International, 60(06B), UMI No. 993312

- Cook-Greuter, S. R. (2004). Making the case for a developmental perspective. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 36(6/7), 275.
- Cook-Greuter, S. R., & Soulen, J. (2007). The developmental perspective in integral counseling. *Counseling and Values*, 51(3), 180-192.
- Dannells, M. D. (1997). *From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education*. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Dannells, M., & Lowery, J. W. (2004). Discipline and judicial affairs. In F. J. D. Mackinon & Associates (Eds.), *Student affairs practice and higher education* (3rd ed., pp. 178-217). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 651-680). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive biography*. Sage University Papers Series on Qualitative Research Methods, 17. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2004a). *Becoming adult learners: Principles and practices for effective development*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Drago-Severson, E. (2004b). *Helping teachers learn: Principal leadership for adult growth and development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Drath, W. H., & Palus, C. J. (1994). *Making common sense: Leadership as meaning-making in a community of practice*. Center for Creative Leadership.
- Fey, C. J., & Carpenter, D. S. (1996). Mid-level student affairs administrators: Management skills and professional development needs. *NASPA Journal*, 33, 218-231.
- Gehring, D. (2013). The history and founding of the association. In Waryold, D.M. & Lancaster, J.M. (Eds.), *The state of student conduct: Current forces and future challenges: Revisited*. ASCA.
- Geiger, R. L. (1999). The ten generations of higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumpert (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 38-69). Baltimore, MD: JMU Press.
- Goethals, G. R., & Sorenson, G. J. (Eds.). (2007). *The quest for a general theory of leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Gordon, S. E., Strode, C. B., & Mann, B. A. (1993). The mid-manager in student affairs: What are CSAOs looking for?. *NASPA journal*, 30(4), 290-297.
- Harper, D. (2005). What's new visually. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, (3rd ed., pp. 747-762). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers* (Vol. 465). Harvard University Press.
- Herdlein, R. J. (2004). Survey of chief student affairs officers regarding relevance of graduate preparation of new professionals. *NASPA Journal*, 42(1), 51-70.
- Jacobson, K. A. (2013). *Transforming hierarchical relationships in student conduct administration*. (Order No. 3588562, University of Northern Colorado). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 231. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1428371718?accountid=14742>. (1428371718).
- Kegan, R. (1980). Making Meaning: The Constructive-Developmental Approach to Persons and Practice. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 58(5), 373-380.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (1984). Adult leadership and adult development: A constructivist view. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 199-230). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock potential in yourself and your organization*. Harvard Business Press.
- Kholberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research*. New York, NY: Rand McNally.
- Komives, S. R. (1992). Getting things done: A gender comparison of resident assistant and hall director achieving styles. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 22(2), 30-38.
- Kretovics, M. (2002). Entry-level competencies: What student affairs administrators consider when screening candidates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(6), 912-920.

- Kruger, K. (2000). New alternatives for professional development. *The handbook of student affairs administration*, 2, 535-553.
- Lahey, L., Souvaine, E., Kegan, R., Goodman, R., & Felix, S. (1988). A guide to the subject-object interview: Its administration and analysis. *Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA*.
- Lake, P. F. (2009). *Beyond discipline: Managing the modern higher education environment*. Hierophant Enterprises, Incorporated.
- Lancaster, J.M. (Eds.), *The state of student conduct: Current forces and future challenges: Revisited* (pp. 1-5). ASCA.
- Livesay, V. T. (2013). Exploring the Paradoxical Role and Experience of Fallback in Developmental Theory (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego).
- Loevinger, J. (1966). The meaning and measurement of ego-development. *American Psychologist*, 21, 195-206.
- Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R. (1970). *Measuring ego development: Vol. 1. Construction and use of a sentence completion test*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Loevinger, J. (1979). Construct validity of the Sentence Completion Test of ego development. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 3, 281-311.
- Love, P., & Estanek, S. M. (2004). *Rethinking student affairs practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lovell, C.D., & Kosten, I. (2000). Skills, knowledge, and personal traits, for success as a student affairs administrator: A meta-analysis of thirty years of research. *NASPA Journal*, 37(4), 553-572.
- McCallum Jr, D. C. (2008). Exploring the implications of a hidden diversity in group relations conference learning: A developmental perspective (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University).
- McCauley, C. D., Drath, W. H., Palus, C. J., O'Connor, P. M., & Baker, B. A. (2006). The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 634-653. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.006
- Miller, T. K. (2003). *CAS, the book of professional standards for higher education 2003*. Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.

- Ospina, S., & Sorenson, G. (2007). A constructionist lens on leadership: Charting new territory. In G. R. Goethals & G. Sorenson (Eds.), *The quest for a general theory of leadership* (pp. 188-204). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
- Palus, C. J., & Drath, W. H. (1995). *Evolving leaders: A model for promoting leadership development in programs*. Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Patton, M. J. (1991). Qualitative research on college students: Philosophical and methodological comparisons with the quantitative approach. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 389-396.
- Perry, W. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in a child*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.), *Life history and narrative* (pp. 5-24). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 266-277.
- Reason, R. D. (2001). The use of narrative inquiry in student affairs research. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 20(2), 93-103.
- Renn, K. A., & Hodges, J. P. (2007). The first year on the job: Experiences of new professionals in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 44(2), 367-391.
- Rentz, A. L. (2004). Student affairs: An historical perspective. In F. J. D. Mackinnon & Associates (Eds.), *Rentz's student affairs practice in higher education* (3rd ed., pp. 27-57). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Riessman, C. K. (Ed.). (1993). *Narrative analysis* Sage University Papers Series on Qualitative Research Methods, 30. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rooke, D., & Torbert, W. R. (1998). Organizational transformation as a function of CEO's developmental stage. *Organization Development Journal*, 16(1), 11-28.
- Rooke, D., & Torbert, W. R. (2005). Seven transformations of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(4), 66-76.

- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (1999). The Doctorate in Student Affairs: Essential Skills and Competencies for Midmanagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(2), 185-91.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage
- Scott, R. A., & Bischoff, P. M. (2000). Preserving student affairs in times of fiscal constraint: A case history. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 38(1), 116-127.
- Senge, P. M. (1997). The fifth discipline. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 1(3), 46-51.
- Spigner-Littles, D. (1985). *Perceptions of skills and competencies necessary to become an effective chief student affairs officer* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma.).
- Stimpson, M., & Stimpson, R. (2008). Twenty-seven years of student conduct literature: Implications for practice, scholarship and ASJA. *Journal of Student Conduct Administration*, 1(1), 14-31.
- Stoner, E. N. II, & Cerminara, KL (1990). Harnessing the “spirit of insubordination”: A model student disciplinary code. *The Journal of College and University Law*, 17(2), 89-121.
- Strang, S., & Kuhnert, K. W. (2009). Personality and leadership developmental levels as predictors of leader performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 421.
- Thelin, J. R. (2011). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.
- Torbert, W. R., Cook-Greuter, S. R., Fisher, D., Foldy, E., Gauthier, A., Keeley, J., et al. (2004). *Action inquiry: The secret of timely and transformational leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Torbert, W. R. (2013). Listening into the Dark: An Essay Testing the Validity and Efficacy of Collaborative Developmental Action Inquiry for Describing and Encouraging Transformations of Self, Society, and Scientific Inquiry. *Integral Review: A Transdisciplinary & Transcultural Journal for New Thought, Research, & Praxis*, 9(2).

- Torbert, W.R. (2014). *Brief comparison of five developmental measures: The GLP, the MAP, the LDP, the SOI, and the WUSCT*. Retrieved from: <http://www.williamrtorbert.com/>
- Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 654-676.
- Waple, J. N. (2006). An Assessment of Skills and Competencies Necessary for Entry-Level Student Affairs Work. *NASPA Journal (National Association Of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc.)*, 43(1), 1-18.
- Waryold, D. M., & Lancaster, J. M. (2008). The professional philosophy of student conduct administration. In J. M. Lancaster & D. M. Waryold (Eds.), *Student conduct practice: The complete guide for student affairs professionals* (pp. 6-13). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Waryold, D.M. (2013). The student conduct administrator. In Waryold, D.M. & Lancaster, J.M. (Eds.), *The state of student conduct: Current forces and future challenges: Revisited* (pp. 1-5). ASCA.
- Welkener, M. M., & Magolda, M. B. B. (2014). Better Understanding Students' Self-Authorship via Self-Portraits. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55(6), 580-585.
- Wilber, K. (1997). An integral theory of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 4(1), 71-92.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1965). *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment*. New York, NY: International University Press.

APPENDIX A

First Interview Guide

Research Questions:

1. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of their professional experiences as a student conduct officer?
2. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of the strategies and practices they utilize in order to promote their own development as a student conduct officer?
3. What (if any) relationship exists between the student conduct administrators' meaning making and their assessed stage of constructive development?

Welcome:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. As you know, I am exploring the variety of ways that student conduct administrators make meaning of their work and promote their own development. I have several questions to ask and hope that we can talk openly about your experiences. If you want more information or clarification at any point, please do not hesitate to ask.

With your permission, I will digitally record the interview so that I can capture what you share without having to write extensive notes. The recording will remain confidential and after it is transcribed I will send you a copy so you can review it for accuracy.

At the end of the interview I will take a few minutes to describe what will be next. This includes instructions for taking the GLP assessment and preparing for the photograph exercise in our second interview.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Demographic Data:

Name/ Pseudonym:

Title:

Institution:

Years at Institution

Years in student conduct / student affairs:

Gender:

Introduction:

1. When you first got the invitation to participate in this study, what came to your mind?
2. Tell me about yourself.

Experience in Student Conduct Administration:

1. Describe the progression of your professional experiences and how you were led to your current position?

2. Can you tell me about your philosophy or approach to student conduct administration?
  - a. *What aspects of your past or identity find expression in your philosophy or approach to student conduct?*
  - b. *What is it that you do? That is, what is the essence of your work; what are you doing on the deepest level? How do you bring that essence into the conduct process?*
  - c. *What guiding principles, if any, inform your work in student conduct? How do you bring these into the student conduct process?*

Current Work in Student Conduct:

1. Describe the process of a typical student conduct meeting between you and a student.
2. Share with me an experience of a difficult decision or situation you have experienced in student conduct.
  - a. *What made it so difficult?*
  - b. *What were the critical first steps in your response?*
  - c. *How did you decide how to proceed or determine what to do?*
  - d. *What tools, models, or processes did you draw upon to proceed?*
  - e. *What are the ways in which you support yourself in these types of situations?*
  - f. *How might a colleague describe you during this difficult situation?*
  - g. *What are aspects about your institution or the field of student conduct administration do you find supportive during these difficult situations? ... aspects you do not find supportive?*
3. What does an ideal conduct process look like to you? What does success look like?
  - a. *How might students you've worked with describe your style?*
4. Share with me an experience in student conduct where you were at your best.
  - a. *What did it look like?*
  - b. *What did it feel like?*

Strategies/Practices for Development:

1. Describe your approach(es) to developing as a student conduct officer.
  - a. *What outcomes do you experience from these?*
  - b. *How do they support your work in student conduct?*
  - c. Describe a recent development experience that you found impactful.
  - d. *What makes this experience impactful for you?*
  - e. *How, if at all, did you change as a result of the experience?*
2. What is your growing or learning edge right now in your work?
  - a. *Can you share ways in which you are currently, or might in the future, address this learning edge?*
  - b. Generally, in your daily life, what do you find most helpful for supporting your learning and growth?

Student Conduct Field:

1. What do you see as the current challenges being faced in student conduct administration?
  - a. *What recommendations do you have about how these challenges can be addressed?*
2. What do you find most challenging about working in student conduct?
  - a. *What does this look like on a daily basis?*
  - b. *What thoughts or feelings come to mind when you are involved in this challenge in some way?*
3. If you could share three pieces of advice to tomorrow's leaders in Student Conduct Administration about how to be effective and/or develop in this field, what would you say?

Conclusion:

1. Is there anything I have not asked you that I should? Is there anything you would like to add?
2. Do you feel like you have been able to be open in our conversation?

APPENDIX B

Photography Exercise Guide

1. Please take at least three photographs that describe an experience or tells a story about your *philosophy or approach* to student conduct administration.
2. Please take at least two photographs that describe an experience or tells a story about when you *felt success or delight* in your work as a student conduct administrator.
3. Please take at least two photographs that describe an experience or tell a story about a time when you *felt conflicted or torn* in your work as a student conduct administrator.
4. Please take at least two photographs that describe an experience or tell a story about a time when you *made a stand or something was important to you* in your work as a student conduct administrator.
5. Please take at least three photographs that describe *how you promote your own development* as a student conduct administrator.
6. Please take at least three photographs that represent what you believe *your current focus of growth and development* is as a student conduct administrator.
7. Please take at least two photographs that represent what you believe are the *current challenges* being faced in student conduct administration.

APPENDIX C

Photography Interview Guide

Research Questions:

1. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of their professional experiences as a student conduct officer?
2. How do student conduct administrators make meaning of the strategies and practices they utilize in order to promote their own development as a student conduct officer?
3. What (if any) relationship exists between the student conduct administrators' meaning making and their assessed stage of constructive development?

Welcome:

(Prior to the scheduled interview, I will confirm with the participant that they were able to complete the photography exercise. If they were not able to complete it before the scheduled interview then we will reschedule)

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me again.

1. How have you been?
2. Were you able to complete and submit the GLP since our last meeting?

As a reminder, I am exploring the variety of ways that student conduct administrators make meaning of their work and promote their own development. In this meeting I look forward to discussing the photos you took and what they mean to you. With your permission, I will digitally record the interview so that I can capture what you share without having to write extensive notes. The recording will remain confidential and after it is transcribed I will send you a copy so you can review it for accuracy.

We can also discuss at the end of the interview any ethical considerations with any individuals that are pictured in the photos and how anonymity can be protected.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Interview:

1. Please choose a photo and tell me about it.
2. What does this photo mean to you?
3. Is there any symbolism in the photo? If so, can you explain it to me?
4. Why did you choose to take this photo?
5. What is the photo not saying?

APPENDIX D

Memorandum of Understanding Sean Horrigan William Torbert, Action Inquiry Associates

This memorandum of understanding outlines the responsibilities agreed upon between Sean Horrigan, principal researcher, and William Torbert, Global Leadership Profile Administrator, in Horrigan's 2014-2015 dissertation study: *Narratives of meaning-making in student conduct administration: A developmental perspective*

Responsibilities:

Mr. Horrigan will provide Dr. Torbert with a list of participants from which he may expect completed tests. He will provide participants with Dr. Torbert's email (bill.torbert@bc.edu) to which they may forward completed tests ready for scoring.

Dr. Torbert will provide Mr. Horrigan with a blank copy of the Global Leadership Profile (GLP) to be forwarded to participants. Dr. Torbert will receive the completed profiles directly from participants and will let Mr. Horrigan know when they have been received. Dr. Torbert and his staff at Action Inquiry Associates will score the profiles and forward the following information to Mr. Horrigan: participants' overall scores, participants' sentence stem completion responses, the score for each participants' individual sentence stems, and other comments as deemed necessary.

Confidentiality:

Dr. Torbert and his staff agree to maintain the confidentiality of study participants.

Remuneration:

Mr. Horrigan will compensate Dr. Torbert \$175 per completed GLP profile. Payment will be made upon delivery of the scored profiles.

Signatures:

Sean Horrigan
University of San Diego

William Torbert
Action Inquiry Associates

APPENDIX E

The Global Leadership Profile

© William R. Torbert & Elaine Herdman Barker
Action Inquiry Associates

Please complete the following information, which we pledge to hold in confidence:

Your name:

Age:

Gender:

Mother tongue:

Your organization and position:

Corporate or Research Sponsor for doing this work, if any:

E-mail(s) to which you wish the GLP results sent:

Telephone:

Date:

Next, please complete in your own way the following 30 sentence stems in one sitting of an hour or less. Please respond freely and honestly. There are no right or wrong answers, and this document will be treated confidentially.

After you have finished, save this document for yourself, and also send it as an attachment to johnsabbage@btinternet.com. You will receive a Self-Estimate document after you send in your sentence completions, and then a report detailing our analysis within 21 working days, at the most. Please complete the following sentences:

1. Education...
2. When a child will not join in group activities...
3. When I am criticized...
4. Being with other people...
5. The thing I like about myself is...
6. Raising a family...
7. When people are helpless...

8. A man's job...
9. What gets me into trouble is...
10. If my mother...
11. My time...
12. I just can't stand people who...
13. A girl has a right to...
14. When they avoided me...
15. A good leader...
16. I feel sorry...
17. A career is...
18. Rules are...
19. Sometimes I wish that...
20. When I get angry...
21. People who step out of line at work...
22. My father...
23. My conscience bothers me if...
24. Power...

25. At times others worry...

26. Crime and delinquency could be reduced if...

27. My friends...

28. My main problem is...

29. Dreams are...

30. I am...

APPENDIX F

Research Participant Invitation

Sean Horrigan is a Ph.D. Candidate in the Department of Leadership Studies at the University of San Diego, and is collecting data for his dissertation study. His study aims to explore how current student conduct administrators at varying stages of development make meaning of their experiences and how they promote their own development.

Participant criteria:

- Current student conduct officer or administrator
- At least 4 years of experience working in Student Affairs
- All position levels and institutional types are being sought

Participants will (approx. 4-5 hours):

- Complete two 60-90 minutes interviews over a period of 2-3 weeks.
- Complete a photography exercise where they take pictures representing different aspects of their work.
- Complete the Global Leadership Profile, an instrument designed to assess their stage of meaning-making.

Participant benefits:

- Personalized results for the Global Leadership Profile provided by Action-Inquiry Associates. (<http://www.williamrtorbert.com/global-leadership-profile/>)
- A copy of the book *Action-Inquiry: The secrets of timely and transforming leadership* (Torbert & Associates, 2004) to assist with understanding individual results of GLP instrument.
- Helping to enhance the general knowledge in the field of student conduct administration.

Please contact Sean Horrigan if you meet the aforementioned criteria and are interested in participating or learning more about the study, and/or forward this invitation along to individuals who may qualify to participate. His e-mail address is Horrigan@san Diego.edu or can be reached at (researcher phone #)

With Gratitude,

Sean Horrigan
Ph.D. Candidate, Leadership Studies
Director of Student Conduct & Graduate Student Life
University of San Diego

Institutional Review Board Project Action Summary

Action Date: June 25, 2014

Note: Approval expires one year after this date.

Type: ☐ New Full Review ☒ New Expedited Review ☐ Continuation Review ☐ Exempt Review
☐ Modification

Action: ☒ Approved ☐ Approved Pending Modification ☐ Not Approved

Project Number: 2014-06-286

Researcher(s): Sean Horrigan Doc SOLES

Dr. Zachary Green Fac SOLES

Project Title: Narratives of Meaning-Making in Student Conduct Administration: A Developmental Perspective

Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence with the student researcher.

Modifications Required or Reasons for Non-Approval

None

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited review at any time.

Dr. Thomas R. Herrinton
Administrator, Institutional Review Board
University of San Diego
herrinton@sandiego.edu
5998 Alcalá Park
San Diego, California 92110-2492

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Hughes Administration Center, Room 214
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4553 • Fax (619) 260-2210 • www.sandiego.edu