

CIS496: Thesis  
Davidson College

My Fellow Wildcat and Watcher:  
The Relationship Between Surveillance and Community at Davidson College

Gwenyth Van Doren  
8 May 2023

## **Abstract**

Davidson College surveils its students, and as students not only are we surveilled, but we participate in surveillance as well. David Lyon, a prominent scholar in surveillance studies, defines surveillance as the “...focused, systematic, routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction.”<sup>1</sup> Using this definition, I have identified three surveillance practices at Davidson: CatCard tracking, the Honor Code, and Campus Police. Of these, the first is actually surveillance, the Honor Code encourages it, and Campus Police use it. Through interviews, I aim to uncover how Davidson students understand these practices in relation to the Davidson community and vice versa. My findings were that students' perception of the Davidson community and its benefits can affect their understanding of surveillance practices, and conversely, the consequences of Davidson surveillance practices can potentially affect how students view the Davidson community.

---

<sup>1</sup> David Lyon, *Surveillance Studies: An Overview* (Oxford: Polity Press, 2007), 14.

## **Introduction**

At Davidson College, during the academic year 2020-2021, the administration utilized CatCard locational data to surveil students and reprimanded them if the data revealed students' actions that did not align with current school guidelines.

The evidence for this is the email students received from Walter Snipes, Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Residence Life, if they attempted to swipe into a dorm they did not reside in with their CatCard. Prior to the academic year 2020-21, students had CatCard access to all dorms. However, this privilege was revoked due to the COVID Shared Responsibilities "No Guest/Visitation" policy, which was established in order to limit the spread of COVID-19. While Davidson has relaxed its COVID-specific guidelines, this privilege has not been restored for students and it remains today students only have access to the dorms they live in. So, this "failed swipe" was recorded in the CatCard database that listed the user's name, date and time, the building which they were attempting to swipe into (including the specific entrance), and a description of whether access was granted, declined, or not completed. Dean Snipes' email served as a "notification that you should cease from attempting to access other residence halls"—a reminder (or warning) of the COVID Shared Responsibilities policy. He continues:

Your swipes into unapproved residence halls can be seen as you attempting to possibly violate that policy. Any attempts to violate the COVID-19 policies may result in 1) your removal from the residence halls or 2) the ceasing of your access to campus.

The above situation serves as evidence that Davidson not only actively collects students' CatCard data but also analyzes that data. This process of CatCard tracking is just one method of surveillance used by Davidson. Other methods of surveillance practiced at Davidson include the

Davidson Honor Code and Campus Police. Evidence of these surveillance practices will be presented as I delve into each practice throughout my paper.

Davidson surveillance practices come into tension with the institution's portrayal of the community since surveillance can imply a lack of trust. This tension is a contradiction of the established trust of the community. The Honor Code embodies this as it is regarded as one of the cornerstones of Davidson's community while creating surveillance practices. The essence of the Honor Code is described as granting "...the college community confidence in the words and actions of others in a way that permeates every aspect of campus life"<sup>2</sup>. Despite the tradition's intentions to foster trust, it functions to have students not only surveil themselves but surveil and police fellow students as well. This paradox raises questions: Do students feel in community with one another when they are bound by the Honor Code to report one another if they violate it? Do students feel like they are part of the community when their activity is covertly tracked and warned of future punishment?

Given this, my research question is as follows, how do Davidson College students understand Davidson surveillance practices in relation to community and vice versa? I aim to uncover how students conceptualize (including their awareness of or lack thereof) surveillance, both in general and in particular to Davidson. Alongside this, I will also reveal how students perceive community at Davidson. I adopt the stance that there is community at Davidson and surveillance practices as well. My question lends itself to a wider theoretical question of how surveillance and community co-exist; in addition, my investigation will present an opportunity to critically view the relationship between the two concepts. What complicates my research is how we define surveillance and community. In order to address the paradox, there needs to be a basis to evaluate both concepts. Once this is established, it will lead to a clearer analysis of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Davidson College, "Student Handbook", retrieved May 11, 2021.

relationship between surveillance and community. The end goal of my research is to locate the places where surveillance and community intersect and intertwine with each other.

## **Background**

To provide context and solidify my argument, I will briefly describe each of the Davidson surveillance practices this paper focuses on. The first one will be the Honor Code, which was briefly mentioned in the introduction. The most notable Honor Code violations are cheating and stealing. Every student signs a pledge to abide by the Honor Code and students experience academic privileges such as take-home tests as a result of the Honor Code (and pledge). A lesser-known Honor Code violation is the failure to report an Honor Code violation that one has first-hand knowledge of. The Honor Code dictates that students surveil themselves and their peers by monitoring their behavior to protect (against stealing) and to influence, manage, and direct students (including oneself) into following the Honor Code. Additionally, through the Honor Code, Davidson faculty and staff can surveil students for similar purposes.

The next Davidson surveillance practice is CatCard tracking. First, this practice is possible through the collection of CatCard data that exist in databases with varying levels of accessibility. The introduction of this paper begins with an instance of CatCard tracking. The Davidson identification card used by all students has a multitude of features, but the aspect central to my research is how CatCards generate time-specific locational data. CatCard features such as building and dining access reveal where and when the cardholder uses their CatCard to either access a building, eat in a dining place, or use a vending machine. If a student were to swipe into a residence hall they did not live in, they would be denied entry and their swipe would be recorded in the database. There is a portal that presents the majority of a student's CatCard activity (meal plan swipes, Dining Dollars, declining balance), yet it does not allow students to see the building access locational data produced by one's CatCard usage.

Regarding CatCard tracking, the Student Handbook formally says that Campus Police can use the locational data in the investigation of a missing student and that “CatCards may not be given to anyone other than the assigned student”<sup>3</sup>. These policies fix CatCard tracking as a form of protection and influence (to not give out your card). However, as this paper’s introduction exemplifies, the existence of the CatCard database means tracking can happen outside what is listed in the Student Handbook. This is because the data is recorded, kept, and can be accessed depending on the authority of the person doing the tracking. The CatCard features, accessibility, and policies fix CatCard tracking as a form of management (awareness of dining card limit), direction (to not give out your card), influence (to not attempt to enter residences you do not live in), and protection (of students).

The last Davidson surveillance practice I will describe is Campus Police. It is more accurate to say the practice is policing while Campus Police is the entity. Nonetheless, policing is inherently a practice of surveillance, thus Campus Police is composed of staff who carry out surveillance. The job of the police – law enforcement and crime prevention – is to monitor their jurisdiction to not only protect members from crime but to deter members from committing crimes as a form of influence, management, and direction. At Davidson, Campus Police employ community-oriented policing, defined as a “...philosophy, a management style and an organizational design that promotes police-community partnerships and proactive problem-solving strategies”<sup>4</sup>. Employing the specified Davidson surveillance practices, my literature review directly pieces together the respective bodies of literature on community and surveillance to then draw underlying connections that inform my research.

---

<sup>3</sup> “Student Handbook.”

<sup>4</sup> “Campus Police,” Davidson College, <https://www.davidson.edu/offices-and-services/public-safety/campus-police>.

## **Literature Review**

This paper's literature review will present the literature on community and introduce surveillance as a concept to be studied alongside community with its respective literature review subsequently. I initially review community and surveillance separately because preliminary background research revealed that surveillance and community are not so explicitly discussed together as this paper aims to do. However, my research joins the implied scholarly conversation on the relationship between surveillance and community and one's understanding of them. Thus, I relate the two concepts to one another (as is the goal of my research) and their bodies of literature at the end of the literature review.

As stated previously, I will approach my research in two sections. The first section of my research is concerned with community. The discipline of psychology tells us humans are social creatures; we form communities – that is what we do. Suffice it to say, Davidson College is a community. In the interest of clarity, when discussing the Davidson community or Davidson in this paper, I will solely be referring to Davidson College rather than the town of Davidson unless otherwise specified.

The word community can be ambiguous, thus it necessitates a straightforward definition. My research focuses on students' relational communities rather than their locational community at Davidson. Community, as distinguished by American sociologist Joseph Gusfield, typically denotes a "...territorial and geographical notion of community – neighborhood, town, city" or is "...‘relational’, concerned with ‘quality of character of human relationship, without reference to location.’"<sup>5</sup> It is possible for both types of communities to overlap and be true, such as a "...layering of communities...."<sup>6</sup> This is illustrated at Davidson with how students find

---

<sup>5</sup> David W. McMillan and David M. Chavis, "Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory," 1986, 8.

<sup>6</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community", 19.



themselves in Davidson's locality by the nature of our acceptance and attendance. Then, we develop subsets of (i.e., relational) communities around what French sociologist Émile Durheim observed as "...interests and skills...."<sup>7</sup> If someone were to refer to a *singular* community at Davidson, this use of community could refer to both their community as formed by geographical space and one's hobbies.

Regardless of feeling and/or experience, Davidson students remain part of the Davidson community in the corporeal sense due to their continued presence on campus or in classes (unless they formally leave). While how people understand community through space is an engaging subject, I am more concerned with students' understanding of their relational communities, including this idea of a "greater Davidson", and surveillance practices at Davidson. I am intentional with this direction because I acknowledge there is more student agency in deciding these types of communities and more room to illuminate students' experiences.

Diving into the study of communities and the decades of work on it, my research explores understanding, more specifically Davidson students' understanding of their Davidson community. I use David McMillan and David Chavis' definition and theory of sense of community as a foundation. Sense of community is composed of four elements: membership, influence, integration, fulfillment of needs (reinforcement), and shared emotional connection.<sup>8</sup> Sense of community, defined as a feeling, is a "feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together"<sup>9</sup>. Through the four elements and sense of community feelings, I will link students' understanding of their communities with their

---

<sup>7</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community", 8.

<sup>8</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community" 9.

<sup>9</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community", 9.

understanding of Davidson surveillance practices. Before that, a brief introduction to surveillance is required in order to evaluate my arguments.

Similar to the word community, the use of the word surveillance can be ambiguous. David Lyon's definition of surveillance guides my usage of the term. Lyon, a Scottish sociologist and prominent scholar in surveillance studies, defines surveillance as the "...focused, systematic, routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction"<sup>10</sup>. Additionally, tracing the root of the word surveillance to the French word *surveiller*, to "watch over", Lyon explains that surveillance refers to "...processes in which special note is taken of certain human behaviours that go well beyond idle curiosity"<sup>11</sup>. When I refer to Davidson surveillance practices, I am referring to the practices of Honor Code, CatCard tracking, and Campus Police. These practices are accurately defined as surveillance because each of these methods and entities involve monitoring with the purposes listed by Lyon.

There is scholarly work that illustrates the relations of power in surveillance that is vital to my research. I highlight Michel Foucault, a French philosopher, and his work to acknowledge the unequal power dynamics embedded in Davidson's surveillance practices. Foucault's introduction to Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon and the Panopticon's effect to self-internalize surveillance, termed as technologies of the self, illustrates how the watcher, the one who is monitoring, gathers information on the subject being watched.<sup>12</sup> This subsequently empowers the watcher to potentially use this information as a form of control over or to discipline the subject. With CatCard tracking and Campus Police, the watchers are institutional authorities. These authoritative actors have power over students by nature of their position as well as through the

---

<sup>10</sup> David Lyon, *Surveillance Studies: An Overview* (Oxford: Polity Press, 2007), 14.

<sup>11</sup> Lyon, *Surveillance Studies*, 13.

<sup>12</sup> Michel Foucault, "Panopticism" in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. By Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 200.

information they collect through said practices. However, through Honor Code policies, students are transformed into both the watcher and the subject, thus engaging in the surveillance of their peers. Foucault's technologies of the self are relevant here because students' awareness of their peers' surveillance may cause students to alter themselves, including their behavior, without direct force.

Foucault states later that "it does not matter who exercises power" regarding the Panopticon, yet this could be misconstrued to ignore who typically exercises the power represented by the Panopticon. This power, which encompasses control, discipline, and surveillance, is wielded by those empowered by and who benefit from a white supremacist, capitalist, and hetero-patriarchal society. Additionally, I argue later that it does matter who exercises power, specifically if they are viewed as a community member, in methods of surveillance because this can influence whether the surveillance is embraced or rejected.

It is not only necessary to discuss who surveils but also who is being surveilled. Scholars like Simone Browne and John Fiske offer a way to examine this through the concept of racialized surveillance. In *Dark Matters*, Browne directly connects Blackness to surveillance practices, tracing the historical formation of surveillance to the transatlantic slave trade.<sup>13</sup> This link informs the ways that "...race continues to structure surveillance practices"<sup>14</sup>. Browne investigates this through the plan of the *Brooks* slave ship, the Panopticon, the *Book of Negroes* as a record of Black escape from New York in the late 1700s, branding of enslaved people, and lantern laws in eighteenth-century New York which required enslaved people to carry lit candles as they moved about the city after dark.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Simone Browne, *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2015), 50.

<sup>14</sup> Browne, *Dark Matters*, 11.

<sup>15</sup> Browne, *Dark Matters*, 11.

Fiske supports Browne's work in the article "Surveilling the City: Whiteness, the Black Man and Democratic Totalitarianism" and demonstrates how surveillance is a technology of whiteness. Surveillance is racialized, and thus cannot go ignored when discussing surveillance. Fiske examines surveillance through "...the contemporary white imagination that has made the Black man into the figure of the American racial crisis and much of what anxious whites fear is wrong with their society is embodied by them into this figure"<sup>16</sup>. Surveillance is not only fuelled by pleasure and fascination but the need to control and suppress as well. The continued use of surveillance is justified through "real social benefits"<sup>17</sup> or "efficiency"<sup>18</sup>. Both Brownie and Fiske guide my research and acknowledgment of the disproportionate focus and impact of surveillance on Black people, as well as marginalized groups. While all surveillance is racialized, the term racialized surveillance highlights how surveillance can be an extension of White supremacy.

When I use surveillance, I also examine the specifics of the surveillance discussed. Used by itself and without examination, the word has the ability to obscure the agents and factors engaging in surveillance and the consequences of such surveillance. Given this, in my discussion of Davidson surveillance practices, I use simple terms to differentiate between surveillance inside (*surveillance-inside*) versus surveillance outside (*surveillance-outside*). In surveillance literature, there are numerous terms to describe these processes, each of which are slightly different in their own aspect. However, I will employ these simple terms for clarity's sake as well as to illustrate surveillance as an action.

So, *surveillance-inside* corresponds to the surveillance of community members by fellow members and *surveillance-outside* corresponds to the surveillance of community members by

---

<sup>16</sup> John Fiske, "Surveilling the City: Whiteness, the Black Man and Democratic Totalitarianism," *Theory, Culture & Society* 15, no. 2 (1998): 67.

<sup>17</sup> Fiske, "Surveilling the City," 69.

<sup>18</sup> Fiske, "Surveilling the City," 69.

non-fellow members. I also use the term *surveillance-within* as an extension of *surveillance-inside* to refer to when a community member's awareness of surveillance causes said member to alter themselves and their behavior. Students' perceptions of these forces vary depending on how they define their community, which can change whether a surveillance practice constitutes *surveillance-inside* and/or *surveillance-outside*.

In "Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory", although McMillan and Chavis do not use the word surveillance, the elements of the sense of community can be achieved with surveillance.<sup>19</sup> Davidson surveillance practices may be a method for students to ensure who has membership to the Davidson community, contributing to a sense of community. These boundaries, a defined attribute of membership, protect a community against "threat"<sup>20</sup>. Continuing, surveillance practices such as the Honor Code and its implied pressure on students to conform can strengthen a student's sense of community through the element of influence. When viewed positively, Davidson surveillance practices can continually bond a community. McMillan and Chavis support this, "The more a community provides opportunities for validation of its members, the stronger community norms become."<sup>21</sup> The Honor Code is an opportunity that allows students to validate themselves and feel validated by their peers when abiding by it, thus it continuously enforces a sense of community.

Nonetheless, students' negative experiences with surveillance practices like Campus Police and CatCard tracking can lessen a sense of community by damaging elements such as integration and fulfillment of needs as well as shared emotional connection. As McMillan and Chavis state, a sense of community is "...not a static feeling"<sup>22</sup>. If Davidson surveillance

---

<sup>19</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community".

<sup>20</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community", 10.

<sup>21</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community", 15.

<sup>22</sup> McMillan and Chavis, "Sense of Community", 19.

practices are a method in which a sense of community is obtained, then students' personal experiences with Davidson surveillance practices directly impact a sense of community. These experiences shape students' understandings; surveillance consciousness is "...how people understand and experience surveillance."<sup>23</sup> Employing Matthew Zaia's categories of being *before*, *with*, and/or *against* surveillance, I will examine Davidson students' surveillance consciousness.

To explain, the category *before* surveillance describes people who disregard surveillance given its function.<sup>24</sup> This is distinct from the category *with* surveillance because people that are *with* surveillance candidly advocate for surveillance rather than simply disregarding it.<sup>25</sup> To note, it is not necessarily the surveillance practice itself that dictates which category their surveillance consciousness falls into. Instead, as Joy Ciofi demonstrates through the *ambivalent subject* in casinos, students' surveillance consciousness is shaped by its "perceived benefits"<sup>26</sup>. The *ambivalent subject* could be considered in a category between *before* and *against* surveillance because the subject both disagrees with surveillance and enjoys the benefits of surveillance.

Drawing on interviews, I argue students simultaneously experience community and surveillance at Davidson, thus the understanding of the two is typically shared. On one hand, students' understanding of Davidson surveillance practices is influenced by their experience of the community and its perceived benefits. On the other hand, students' understanding of the Davidson community is influenced by the outcomes of Davidson surveillance. Furthermore, participants' responses signified trends that even if a surveillance practice exists, that does not mean it is employed. Also, surveillance as a method can be used to exacerbate issues (like

---

<sup>23</sup> Matthew Zaia, "Exploring Consciousness: The Online Community's Understanding of Mobile Technology Surveillance," (*Surveillance & Society* 17(3/4), 2019), 534.

<sup>24</sup> Zaia, "Exploring Consciousness", 535.

<sup>25</sup> Zaia, "Exploring Consciousness", 535.

<sup>26</sup> Joy Ciofi, "The Ambivalent Subject: Reconciling Contradictory Subjective Experiences of Surveillance," (*Surveillance & Society* 18(1), 2020), 72.

racism) already present in communities. With this, if students associate surveillance with a primarily negative connotation, they will not directly link surveillance with community.

## **Methods**

The primary method I used to conduct my research is interviews. The purpose of interviews is to understand how students think of surveillance and community at Davidson. I thought about using surveys, and although surveys would recruit more participants, I ultimately decided against it because it is difficult to get the personal stories and experiences from students that I was aiming for in a survey. With interviews, I can gather students' subjective experiences, including their understanding of Davidson surveillance practices and community. I did interview a few faculty members but their interviews did not prove useful for answering my research question since my focus was on students' understandings and experiences. Therefore, all of the participant interviews I will analyze will be student participants. Additionally, I did receive approval from The Institutional Review Board at Davidson College for my research.

To be eligible, participants had to be 18 years or older and a student at Davidson College. I recruited students through a college-wide email that explained my research and asked if they would be interested in participating. In the email, I also implored students who have had experiences with surveillance to think about signing up to participate. Due to the nature of the recruitment process, including time constraints and limited sample size, I was unable to be intentional in recruiting, thus unable to ensure a diverse student demographic. Additionally, all participants are given aliases and no real names are used in the recording and presentation of my research.

My interview questions were categorized into three sections: biographical details, community at Davidson, and surveillance at Davidson. With the first section, I aimed to get a sense of their home community, looking for how they create or understand that community, and if the closest people in their life are people at Davidson. In the next two sections, I prompted the



participants to be descriptive in their thoughts on what they consider Davidson community. I also asked my participants hypothetical scenario questions that placed the participant in a situation where they would directly encounter one of the Davidson surveillance practices I was researching. There are some questions that may have reflected my bias such as, “I know there have been student articles about the increased police presence on campus. Have you heard about these or noticed the presence yourself?” My reference to the student articles may be interpreted as I am agreeing with the statement, but hopefully, by asking the participant about their own thoughts on Campus Police presence I avoided imposing any of my biases on my participants. My interview questions can be found after my citations.

I interviewed eight participants that did have some variety in demographics such as class year, race, gender, sexuality, region, and socioeconomic status. Post-interview I collected participants’ demographics through a survey, assuring participants that their demographics would not be attached to their real names, but the alias I had assigned them. All participants’ demographics are self-reported. At the end of this section, there is a table of my participants’ demographics. Although demographics were not a factor in my research question, I acknowledge they shape one’s experience in life and understanding of the world around them. Therefore, when presenting participants’ responses, I include the participant’s general demographics to give context.

As a Davidson student, it was not difficult to interview other students in terms of physical access. Despite this, I understand my demographics (White, straight-passing, cisgender woman) and whether or not I previously knew the participant could have affected how much participants revealed to me in their interviews. Given my proximity in age and status as a fellow student, I do not think this was a significant challenge if one at all.

Lastly, there are no serious ethical considerations in my research. I did not use deception and I assigned each participant an alias and used their specific alias when quoting their interview responses.

*Participant Demographics Breakdown*

Alias	Pronouns	Class	Race	Gender	Sexuality	Region	Socioeconomic status
<b>Sisi</b>	she/her	Senior	Black	Woman	Bisexual	Northeast U.S.	Lower middle-class
<b>Violet</b>	she/any	Senior	White	Genderqueer	Lesbian	Northeast U.S.	Middle-class
<b>Duke</b>	he/him	Senior	Asian	Man	Pansexual	West U.S.	Middle-class
<b>Victoria</b>	she/her	Junior	White	Woman	Straight	Southeast U.S.	Upper middle-class
<b>Trenton</b>	he/him	Sophomore	Black	Male	Straight	Southeast U.S.	Middle-class
<b>B</b>	he/him	Sophomore	White	Male	Straight	Southeast U.S.	Middle-class
<b>Leilah</b>	she/her	Freshman	Black	Female	Straight	Southeast U.S.	Lower middle-class
<b>Barbra</b>	he/any	Freshman	South Asian	Not sure	Gay	North India	Middle-class

## Findings

### *Simplified Findings Breakdown*

Alias	Understandings of surveillance			Understandings of Davidson community
	<i>Campus Police</i>	<i>CatCard Tracking</i>	<i>Honor Code</i>	
<b>Sisi</b>	Uncomfortable	Thinks more about it	Not real	No community
<b>Violet</b>	Not needed	Experience in Commons	Reassuring, believes in it less	Fragmented
<b>Duke</b>	Useless	Wouldn't be surprised	Restorative and punitive	Multiple communities
<b>Victoria</b>	Too much during "COVID" semesters	Was unaware	Loves it	Tight-knit, easy to know people
<b>Trenton</b>	No difference	Simple to get into buildings without access	Trusts it	Great culture, great family, close-knit
<b>B</b>	Caught off-guard by them in community spaces (e.g. Union)	Understands the reason for it	Community accountability	Not competitive, slightly judgemental
<b>Leilah</b>	For safety, not as reassuring	Recognizes as surveillance	Added level of security	No overall community, cliques
<b>Barbra</b>	Security purposes, not welcoming	Physical tracking experience	Reminder, not codification	Supportive

During my research, I found that students simultaneously experience community and surveillance at Davidson, thus the understandings of the two are typically shared. Separating the two from one another becomes even more complicated when surveillance practices are framed as community-oriented such as Campus Police's community policing approach. Nonetheless, I argue that students' experience of the Davidson community and its perceived benefits can influence their understanding of Davidson surveillance practices. In turn, the consequences of

Davidson surveillance have the potential to influence students' understanding of the Davidson community. To support this argument, first, I will analyze my participants' perceptions of community. Next, I will analyze my participants' perceptions of surveillance, and then illustrate the relationship between the two.

If you go to the Davidson College website, scroll down and you will see the heading "EXPERIENCE THE DAVIDSON COMMUNITY"<sup>27</sup>. The small student population (1,973) and the presence of the Honor Code are used to market Davidson as a tight-knit community. Davidson students do experience community, albeit in different ways and not always as a tight-knit community despite Davidson marketing.

My participants' understandings of the Davidson community range from feeling no sense of community to calling the community a family. Several participants described the Davidson community as a PWI or Predominantly White Institution. Davidson's status as a wealthy PWI is not an opinion but a fact given that 66.5% of the student population is White and the median family income of a Davidson student is \$213,900 with 70% of Davidson families coming from the top 20%. For some participants, this is what is considered the "greater" Davidson, as in what Davidson represents, and is in contrast to the subsection of community they feel part of at Davidson. Given these statistics, I do acknowledge my participants' demographics and affiliations and how that can shape their experience of the Davidson community.

When asked how he would describe the Davidson community, Duke, a senior Honor Council member, asked back, "Which community at Davidson?" Other participants also recognized the numerous relational communities present at Davidson. Violet, a White queer senior, described the Davidson community as "fragmented" and said that she felt different parts of the community. Sisi and Leilah, a Black senior and freshman respectively, discussed their

---

<sup>27</sup> Davidson College, <https://www.davidson.edu/>.

connection with the Black Davidson community. Both Sisi and Leilah told me there is no “overall community” at Davidson; Sisi cited the lack of student-body participation in athletic events as one example, which differed vastly from her high school experience.

Additionally, Leilah talked about cliques at Davidson and how everybody knows each other, but she “wouldn't necessarily say everyone is comfortable with each other.” Trenton, a Black sophomore athlete, agreed with Leilah about the presence of cliques and that it is easy to stay in certain cliques. However, Trenton also described Davidson as a “great culture with great family” and “close-knit.” Furthermore, Barbra, a freshman international student, stated the Davidson community was “supportive,” explaining how their friends offered emotional support when Barbra’s phone was stolen and when Barbra had to go to the hospital. Similar to Trenton, Victoria, a White junior, characterized Davidson as a “tight-knit” community and stated that it is “really easy to find things out about people.”

B, a White sophomore, echoed Victoria’s sentiment about being able to know people at Davidson. B described the community as not competitive but also said that there is “the tiniest hint of judgment.” When asked to elaborate, he replied:

People are pretty willing to make judgments about people’s character and habits and friends, even if they don’t really know them just by like, you know, knowing their friends and being around them and seeing what they do and who they are.

Although Davidson is a small community by nature of its student body population, there is a variety in how Davidson students experience the numerous communities existing at Davidson. The responses about cliques speak to the presence of relational communities. Going

further, Violet comments on how “Davidson’s campus very much self-segregates” when she was asked to describe Davidson to someone who does not know anything about it. Among my participants, there was a general awareness or conception of the “greater” Davidson as being White and wealthy which aligns with its status as a PWI. However, the greater Davidson community could also extend to staff and faculty as my participants described personal relationships with professors and administrators. In his response to the question about a time Davidson has not lived up to his expectations, B stated, “Davidson’s kind of built for me”, and as a White male, he is not wrong. My participants’ self-awareness of their race comes up again when asked questions about surveillance.

Lastly, it seems that participants who are upperclassmen reject the romanticization, so to speak, of the Davidson community. In turn, my underclassmen participants seemed more likely to describe the Davidson community as portrayed by the institution itself through marketing. I do not have enough participants to fully support this pattern, but I would make the claim that the length of time spent at Davidson as well as experiencing Davidson at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic (or not) could impact how participants described community at Davidson. This is explicitly demonstrated when Sisi tells me:

“I think why I’m so frustrated with the lack of community at Davidson is because I just never thought about how COVID would affect community cause I was still seeing people online and still texting people.”

While Sisi could not describe to me *how* exactly COVID affected community at Davidson, she believes COVID has affected community at Davidson despite her keeping in

contact with her peers during the time. Sisi's response speaks to the need to examine the effects of the (continuing) COVID-19 pandemic on community, which, unfortunately, is outside the scope of my research. Nonetheless, my participants' responses to questions about Davidson and the community are insightful and will be referred back to when I connect their perceptions of community and surveillance.

Now, I will present my participants' understanding of Davidson surveillance practices to put into context my participants' characterizations of the Davidson community. As a reminder, the Davidson surveillance practices I identify in my research are the Honor Code, CatCards, and Campus Police. Before this, I reveal my participants' understanding of surveillance in general. This is necessary because how my participants conceptualize surveillance directly impacts how they understand Davidson surveillance practices and if they even consider the practices I have identified as surveillance in the first place.

Several participants linked surveillance to the presence of cameras, which makes sense given that CCTV is a form of video surveillance. However, Davidson has relatively few cameras on campus. I did not find out how many cameras there actually are on campus, but I do know there is a camera in the library (indicated by a sign) and in the athletic center Baker (presumably around the basketball courts). In part due to there being few (visible) cameras on campus, some participants said they do not feel surveilled. B said "I don't feel surveilled..." and directly followed up that comment with, "...there are remarkably few cameras". As a follow-up, when asked if they think surveillance happens at Davidson, B responded, "There's nothing [surveillance] I'm aware of". Although they expressed hesitancy to make a generalizing statement, they surmised surveillance was not an issue because they "just have no evidence", that is what they understood surveillance as (cameras) was not present at Davidson.

Like B, Barbra does not feel like they are surveilled and comments on how they have not come across cameras, which they view positively because “you never feel comfortable on camera.” However, Barbra does acknowledge surveillance happens and that he has witnessed “incidents”, specifically citing Hall Counselors and Campus Police. This discrepancy between feelings of surveillance can be understood through Duke’s observation that surveillance is more heightened for certain students than others, specifying later that “there’s a lot of eyes on minority students.” This is illustrated in both Sisi and Leilah as Black women feeling that they are surveilled.

Sisi understands surveillance more as a power dynamic rather than just a technology. When asked if she feels like she is surveilled at Davidson, Sisi responded, “I mean, yeah. [...] I’m definitely aware of it. I think I was always aware of it. I just didn’t think it mattered that much because it’s college.” After being asked to elaborate, Sisi explained:

I didn’t think it would matter as in like, they were tracking exactly who’s going here and they would use it as evidence against you or something like that. I just never realized that. Or it never occurred to me just because I was like, Oh this is a college, they don’t care about the students as much. But it is a small college. So, I guess they kind of have the ability to do that. And especially after that incident [described later], it is definitely like always in the back of my mind.

Sisi goes on to say that there are also not that many cameras on campus, but the ones she does notice she describes as “hidden”, leading her to sometimes ask herself, “Where are the hidden cameras?” When asked if she would feel safer with cameras, Sisi disagreed, “I don’t think



it makes me feel safer. I think it just makes me feel watched.” So, Sisi does recognize cameras as a form of surveillance, but more clearly identifies surveillance as a “they” entity, Davidson in her case, who is tracking herself and the rest of the student body. Sisi’s mention of “evidence against you” indicates her awareness of the power dynamic between students and Davidson administration and faculty. Her thought process about why surveillance did not matter because “it’s college” surprised me and will be addressed later when I connect surveillance and community. Sisi’s last comment reveals how the incident (described later) left a lasting impact on her and her awareness of surveillance. Going back to my earlier literature review, this speaks to Foucault’s technologies of the self where Foucault would surmise that Sisi’s awareness of surveillance happening can lead to her own self-surveillance. However, to clarify, Sisi’s response does not indicate she surveils herself.

Similar to Sisi, Leilah says she feels like “I’m surveilled at all times.” Leilah views surveillance as levels, with more apparent levels being CatCards and Campus Police, and more “underlying” levels like cameras and the Wi-Fi networks. Since Leilah identified a myriad of surveillance technologies, I asked who she felt surveilled by. Her response was, “I don’t know. I’ve never thought about it. But obviously Campo [Campus Police] and security, and things like that. But maybe T&I [Technology & Innovation, Davidson’s IT] as well.” Even though Leilah admitted a lack of knowledge, her response points to her basic recognition of power dynamics in surveillance such that she is surveilled by someone, specifically people in positions of power on campus.

In part, Barbra also recognized this when telling me about instances of surveillance with students in authority as well as the police, such as Hall Counselors and Campus Police lingering nearby while a student was walking their dog . Additionally, Violet’s response that she thinks

surveillance happens but she probably does not experience it to the same extent as others because she is White indicates her awareness of racial power dynamics in surveillance. Acknowledging power dynamics in surveillance is necessary to understand the effects of surveillance and points back to my literature review on racialized surveillance. Furthermore, it raises the question of how students then recognize power dynamics in the college community, which will be explored in depth later but Trenton and Duke touch on this in their interviews.

What I did not expect to think about from Trenton and Duke's interviews was the concept of surveillance by one's community by virtue of their positions. Now, I clearly see how this can link to accountability but these interviews were especially intriguing in my research. Trenton, when asked if he feels like he is surveilled, replied:

I feel like I probably am. But I feel like there should be. But not me as an individual. Yeah, maybe outside of my professors just checking up on my progress in classes, but outside of the day, I don't think so. My coaches talk about it a lot though. In the sense of being a football player on campus and how we make up 10% of the male population on campus. Just representing Davidson in a way when people see you. If you walk in and you have Davidson football across your chest, and you acting out or you're super loud, you causing a lot of disruption, you draw the eye. So, I will say to that extent, but I feel like that's minor for this matter for sure.

After this, Trenton recognizes surveillance as cameras and says that surveillance at Davidson is on a smaller scale than other schools. When asked if he thought it was an issue, he

stated: “Probably not, not that I have heard of. I will say a lot of people have at least some sort of integrity to some extent.” Here Trenton reveals that surveillance is not necessarily an issue because of people’s integrity. Later, I expand on my participants’ understanding of people’s integrity as shaped by the Honor Code. Going back, similar to my conversation with Trenton, Duke also discusses surveillance as he experiences it as a Honor Council Member. Below is a snippet of our conversation:

**Gwen:** Do you feel like you are surveilled at Davidson?

**Duke:** By other students or admin?

**Gwen:** You can answer for both.

**Duke:** By other students, not really to be honest. Yeah, I don’t think that’s real.

**Gwen:** Do you feel surveilled by Davidson as an institution? Like by administration?

**Duke:** I mean yes. But also yes because of my role. [...] I show up to specific events that they’ve asked me to show up and I have to wear a suit or whatever. I can’t just be like me [...] I’m representing Davidson. It’s not like [they] told me you can’t say this or that, right. But it is something that is implied or understood that I am a representative of Davidson in certain aspects and what I do. [...] You just have to change certain aspects of yourself because you’re now in a position of power.

When both Trenton and Duke speak about surveillance, they discuss how their on-campus affiliations affect their feelings of being surveilled. As a representative of their respective organizations, they are aware they are being surveilled to represent their organization

in a positive manner, thus possibly leading to self-surveillance as Duke's comment about changing certain aspects of one's self indicates. As active community members, it is worthwhile to acknowledge how their understanding of surveillance is informed by their community commitments.

Lastly, for this section, two participants, Victoria and Duke, talked about their experiences of surveillance during COVID, or the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters. Victoria distinguished between surveillance during COVID-19 and surveillance now. She said she definitely felt surveilled during COVID, describing it as "really weird", and then saying, "Now, I don't feel like it as much." Victoria felt surveillance was an issue during COVID and that you were "always being watched and had to do the right thing." I address Victoria's experience with Campus Police during COVID in a later paragraph. And keeping up with her distinction, she also does not think surveillance is an issue now. Victoria states, "[...] people are pretty trusting with the Honor Code and stuff. I don't feel like people are breathing down my neck like they were [during COVID]." Duke also made a similar distinction, saying he felt hyper-surveilled during COVID compared to now when he does not. Duke described surveillance during COVID as COVID tests every other day and told me his experience when he got actually COVID:

I think for the COVID thing, I felt hyper surveilled. Then, as soon as I got COVID, they just forgot about me. [...] They literally just dropped me off in some side street off of Main Street. Forgot about me for 10 days. And then even coming back, I didn't have to test anymore after [for the rest of the semester].

Although my research is not on COVID and surveillance, it is arguable that COVID had an effect on surveillance and community both. Thus, why I found it important to include Victoria and Duke's remarks. Additionally, their understanding of surveillance changed due to COVID. When talking about COVID at Davidson, Victoria and Duke were certainly talking about public health surveillance measures taken by institutions around the world to curb the pandemic. Even though these measures have been mostly lifted, surveillance still exists. Surveillance studies scholar David Lyon even published the book *Pandemic Surveillance* (2021) discussing how the COVID-19 pandemic is normalizing surveillance. For the sake of staying on topic, it is worthwhile to acknowledge that surveillance at Davidson during the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters shaped students' understandings of surveillance (and community as mentioned earlier).

Alongside interpreting my participants' understanding of surveillance, I also was able to get a sense of my participants' position on surveillance, their surveillance consciousness, and whether they were *before*, *with*, or *against* surveillance. Usually, if they were against surveillance, it was a specific surveillance practice they were against rather than surveillance as a concept. To add, just because a student felt surveilled does not necessarily mean they were *against* surveillance or thought it was an issue. For example, despite Leilah saying she feels surveilled "at all times", she also thinks surveillance is "not particularly" an issue and that the "current level is fine". After, she says, "Especially because there's that added level of the Honor Code. But at the same time, they're [Davidson] not doing anything overtly to make me concerned about it." This signals that there is an accepted level of surveillance for some participants. The question then arises of how we define this accepted level and when surveillance

becomes too much or excessive. I offer my participants' understanding, including experiences, of Davidson surveillance practices below.

### *Campus Police*

The majority of my participants had a negative perception of Campus Police, influenced by their own experiences or beliefs. When discussing the increased police presence on campus, Sisi questioned it saying, "What was it doing? Other than just increasing surveillance on campus and just making everyone, especially marginalized students, just feel uncomfortable." Sisi told me of another time she saw someone break into her friend's car on campus, and when she first called Campus Police they hung up on her but her friend was able to file a report later. Outside of her experiences, Sisi fills me in on a story she heard about upperclassmen's experience with Campus Police:

That morning I was rushing to go the airport. Alvaro [an upperclassmen] was like yeah, I'm gonna drop you off. So, I'm waiting for him in front of Tommy [upperclassmen residence] and I'm like *Where is this man? I'm about to be so late.* They [Alvaro and his roommates] come very very last minute like we had to speed to the airport because of how late they came. I was like *Where were you guys?* They're talking about the police raided, just knocked on the door mad aggressive in the morning. And then came in and raided the apartment. [...] I think what happened was there was a noise complaint the night before. [...] They were all sleeping when the police came in.

Sisi tells me they did get in trouble for drug paraphernalia but I do want to note that the upperclassmen that lived there were all men of color. This story along with her own experiences clearly shows Sisi's understanding of Campus Police in a negative manner. Duke, while not as negative, understands Campus Police as "kind of useless, like they're just not that helpful." He tells me that if Campus Police were not on campus, he would not feel any less safe. Violet echoes Duke's sentiments, describing Campus Police as "not helpful at all" when her friend's book bag was stolen. She also adds that she has been "lucky to not have personal run-ins [with Campus Police]", which frames an interaction with Campus Police as a negative one.

In addition, Barbra tells me that he knows "the police are here for security", but that "One does feel intimidation when there's just a cop with a gun in holster just standing there while you're walking back [from F]. It's maybe not creating a very welcoming vibe." Along the same lines, Leilah tells me the police are just trying to protect us but she does feel they're not as "reassuring" as she thought they would be. Leilah goes on to say, "Sometimes they will just be walking through [her dorm] and I'm like *Oh no, something's about to happen.*" Again, even if Barbra and Leilah understand the "purpose" of Campus Police, they do not feel comfortable in Campus Police's presence.

A story I was not expecting was Victoria's experience of surveillance by Campus Police during COVID, which in turn influenced her understanding of surveillance as previously mentioned. When Victoria first arrived on campus, during one weekend, she was sitting at a table with four people at the student center Union. There was a sign stating that only three people were allowed at a table per Davidson's COVID measures but everyone at the table, over the three-person limit, was wearing a mask. Nonetheless, a Campus Police officer came up to the table and wrote everyone up for a COVID strike (if you received three strikes you were removed

from campus). Although Victoria did not receive enough strikes to be kicked off campus, she told me her friend was kicked off campus. Victoria described this situation to me in response to the question “Can you tell me about a time Davidson did not live up to your expectations?”

However, Victoria tells me of another instance where Campus Police recently helped her friend in a medical situation. Victoria has also had interactions with Campus Police during campus events, like Campus PoliceR training. She advocates for these events for Campus Police to “feel more part of the community, because during COVID time, it was like us [students] versus them [Campus Police].” Victoria’s responses demonstrate how Campus Police played a role in her understanding of surveillance during COVID. Yet, “after” COVID, Victoria recognizes the potential of Campus Police to be part of the community. I wonder if Victoria would still hold this belief if she had a negative experience with Campus Police now, like what she experienced when Davidson COVID measures were in place.

The only participant that seemed to differ in response was Trenton, who told me that the police presence “made no difference” to him. It is unclear if Campus Police fits into Trenton’s understanding of surveillance at Davidson. Despite this, it is clear some participants understand Campus Police as a form of surveillance at Davidson, or at least recognize Campus Police’s power to discipline through surveillance.

### *CatCards*

In order to get a sense of how my participants understood CatCards, specifically locational tracking, as a surveillance practice at Davidson, I asked a scenario question based on a real event. The question was, “Imagine you just received an email from RLO saying you have attempted to swipe into a dorm that is not your own and they have a record of your failed card



swipe. How would you react?” Some students who tried to swipe into dorms where they did not live did in fact receive this email during the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters. One of my participants was actually involved in one of these situations. Sisi explained what happened to me:

I was doing my friend’s hair once. She lived in New Dorm and it was me and my other friend doing the girl’s hair. We had ordered Chipotle. So I left New Dorm to get the Chipotle and I had accidentally taken my other friend’s card [who did not live in New Dorm] instead of mine. [...] She [Sisi’s other friend] received two separate emails because I was swiping a lot. I was like *Why’s not working?* [...] It wasn’t a nice email. It wasn’t like *Oh we know she did this, don’t do that*. It was like *If you do this again, something’s gonna happen*.

Although Sisi’s friend was not punished for attempting to swipe, the email served as a reminder that RLO knew and there would be consequences if it were to happen again. Sisi is aware of CatCard tracking but this is also in part to another experience she had:

That [CatCard tracking] was also how I stupidly got caught sophomore [year]. With the whole weed thing, I had swiped into the football field in order to open the gate, instead of like hopping or something.

Sisi was brought up on neither a Code of Responsibility nor Honor Code violation, in fact, no one officially from Davidson College had addressed her about the situation. She only

knows someone from Davidson knows because her parents had received a call from a Davidson administrator to say Sisi had been smoking weed. Sisi knows it was a Davidson administrator based on the number in her parents' phone.

I asked her if she knew Davidson checked it, as in the CatCard database. Sisi replied, "Honestly, no. I just assumed because like how else would they know it was me?" This led me to ask if this had changed Sisi's awareness of when and where she swipes her CatCard. She tells me, "I've definitely thought about that before but I don't think there's anywhere where I've been like, *Oh let me not use my card because I don't want them to know I'm here.*" Although Sisi does not know the specifics of how and when Davidson tracks student CatCard usage, she is aware of it and it factors into her understanding of surveillance, especially how it can be used to discipline students. Along the same lines, when asked the initial scenario question, Duke responded that he "wouldn't be surprised about it." This suggests Duke, like Sisi, has an underlying conception that Davidson can use CatCards to track students. In contrast, when I gave Victoria the same scenario, she was unaware that had ever happened despite being a student at Davidson during those semesters RLO sent those warning emails. From this, I concluded that Victoria did not perceive CatCards as a surveillance practice at Davidson.

Some participants were indifferent to or agreed with the CatCard tracking in my scenario question. B tells me:

In terms of them [Davidson] having a record of everywhere where you've swiped in, that doesn't bother me. [...] That is something that makes sense. I think it's just a transparency thing. And also, if I really needed to, I could get around it. Like there are lots of ways to get around swiping a CatCard, both in academic buildings and residential buildings. It's

not something I have a problem with and it seems like a fair thing for them to know. [...]

It seems helpful from an administrative standpoint, for both safety and for kind of punishment reasons, to be able to track people and say *Oh, they swiped into their dorm at this time, which means that they were safe and had access to the building.*

B's response illustrates that he understands CatCard tracking as a form of surveillance but it is a practice he understands and agrees with. Afterward, B tells me he is a "big fan of transparency", describing how he keeps track of his friends' locations in the location-sharing app Life360. This response places B, and his surveillance consciousness, as being *for* surveillance. However, it is also important to note how B acknowledges resistance to CatCard surveillance, such as "ways to get around it". While Trenton is not necessarily resisting CatCard surveillance, he tells me, "I don't mind the hassle of calling a friend and saying, *Hey come let me in*, or waiting on somebody to open the door." Trenton's response indicates one way to avoid CatCard surveillance. Unlike B, Trenton did not acknowledge the tracking aspect, but agreed with the access restriction policy because it made sense for "safety, because if you don't live there, what are you doing? Why are you trying to get into the building so bad?" It is not likely Trenton considers CatCard as a surveillance practice, but his response highlights the ways in which other students have skirted around policies that are surveillant in nature. In some cases, it cannot be considered as resistance since it is not a conscious act of resistance, but it does lead to the undermining of CatCard tracking.

The majority of the participants have discussed CatCard tracking in terms of Davidson as the institution tracking them, possibly in part due to the framing of my scenario question. However, even outside of my question, Leilah identified CatCards as a surveillance practice done

by Davidson administration, like Campus Police. In contrast to these responses, Barbra describes their experience of CatCard tracking that happened physically:

[...] One of them [a peer] just literally silently, on my heels, followed me all the way back to Belk. And when I took out my CatCard to like punch in, they heaved a sigh of relief and walked back to the group.

Instead of CatCard tracking digitally, Barbra's story reveals it serves as a physical demonstration of one's status as a student that can be verified when you see someone use it. Hence, students, not just the administration, can also engage in CatCard tracking. This is not unrealistic, since Violet supports it by telling me two stories of physical CatCard surveillance:

Anthony Foxx [first Black student body president at Davidson] talked at something I remember going to my freshman year and he told a story about being asked for Davidson student ID and being told he was not a Davidson student. [...] Being asked for his CatCard to prove he was a Davidson Student by the police I think.

Violet's other story comes from a situation her roommate told her about:

Last year, she [Violet's roommate] was walking into Union. She was walking a little bit behind a group of college-aged guys [Black men] who got into Union. There was this White girl behind her and got up to her and was like, *I don't think that they are Davidson*

*students. My roommate ended up saying back, Well, they swiped into Union so I guess they have a CatCard.*

With these stories, Violet exemplifies the physical tracking of CatCards to signify whether or not someone is a student, which in part determines whether or not they are part of the Davidson community. Additionally, Violet's story about Anthony Foxx highlights the impact of racialized surveillance by making him prove with his CatCard that he is a Davidson student despite him being the student body president.

Overall, my participants seem to vary in whether or not they regard CatCards as a surveillance practice at Davidson. With some participants, offering insight into their opinions about whether or not they agreed or saw reason in that practice. While digital CatCard tracking is solely done by Davidson administration, physical CatCard tracking shown through Barbra and Violet's responses demonstrate how this type of tracking, thus surveillance, can play into ideas of community membership. I mention this when I explicitly connect surveillance and community at the end of my findings.

### *Honor Code*

Although the Honor Code is regarded as the central pillar of the Davidson community, its origin at a college that only admitted White male students at the time and current practice creates a complex discussion on the Honor Code's purpose and function. In one of my initial interviews, Sisi revealed to me her candid thoughts on the Honor Code:

**Sisi:** They [Davidson] drilled that shit [Honor Code] in when I visited.

**Gwen:** Well, what was your reaction? Do you remember what the tour guide said or anything?

**Sisi:** I don't remember what the tour guide said. But I'm pretty sure my reaction was like, nobody actually paid [inaudible] [...]

**Gwen:** So, do you think students aren't following the Honor Code?

**Sisi:** Honestly, no. I mean, some maybe are. A lot of people always point when they talk about the Honor Code, like how they're able to leave their laptop anywhere. Um, I don't really think that's the Honor Code. I think that's because there's a lot of rich people here and what are they going to do stealing my 2015 laptop? Like, you're not going to do anything with that shit. And it's also a small community. So someone is bound to see something if something happens.

Prior to this exchange, when I asked Sisi what the Honor Code means to her, she replied, "Honestly? Like it doesn't mean nothing." To Sisi, it is clear the Honor Code does not foster a trusting community, instead, she points me to class dynamics at Davidson. She leaves her stuff like her 2015 laptop around not because she believes in the moral character of the Davidson community as a result of the Honor Code, but because she knows the general Davidson community is wealthy and has no need to steal her laptop. Technically, (non-academic) stealing is not covered by the Honor Code but rather the Code of Responsibility. So, Sisi is right to think that being able to leave your laptop is not necessarily a result of the Honor Code. However, students typically attribute this benefit of leaving one's belongings around to the Honor Code rather than the Code of Responsibility. At the end of Sisi's response, she also explains people do not steal because it is a small community, and by its nature, it is difficult to steal without

someone noticing. Sisi connects community accountability to the size of the community rather than the Honor Code.

While Sisi does not believe in the social benefits of the Honor Code, she has also not been able to experience the academic benefits of the Honor Code (such as take-home tests) due to COVID-19 when students had to take tests outside the classrooms, so essentially every test was take-home. In fact, Sisi admitted to cheating due to the stress of COVID-19 and online learning, and she also tells me that “people definitely cheated” during that time. After this, it was unsurprising that when I asked if Sisi would report someone for an Honor Code violation, she replied simply, “No.” When I flipped the question and asked what her reaction would be if someone were to report her, the first word she said was, “Snitch.”

Sisi’s perceptions of the Honor Code are certainly negative. She does not view it as a revered community tradition, instead, it can be something that diminishes community if strictly followed. This is evident in her use of the word snitch, which carries a negative connotation. Who would want to be in community with a “snitch”? Sisi’s understanding of the Honor Code is the most negative compared to the other participants, but some participants also share similar sentiments with Sisi.

For Violet, the Honor Code was “reassuring” at first because “we all trust each other.” However, it had become less reassuring because she heard of people getting their “stuff” stolen. For example, Violet heard from someone whose laptop was stolen from the top floor of Union where the laptop was in its protective case on a table and it was actually taken out of the case. Despite this, Violet told me that “knowing so many people” at Davidson made her feel “safe”. From this, I asked Violet if she saw someone committing an obvious Honor Code violation, would she report them? Like Sisi, Violet replied in the negative, explaining that “I don’t want to

be like I'm the neighborhood watchdog here." Afterwards, I then asked Violet if she knew it is an Honor Code violation to not report an Honor Code violation that you have knowledge of, and despite being a senior, Violet told me she did not know this.

Earlier in the interview, Violet described a time when she found herself in a situation where she did not know another one of the Honor Code stipulations. This specific situation happened during the first semester students were back on campus after the COVID-19 lockdown; it was right before Thanksgiving break when students would return home for the rest of the semester. Violet's incident can also be regarded as an instance of physical CatCard tracking.

Violet recalled how her friend allowed her to use his CatCard to swipe into Commons during Thanksgiving break because he was going home but Violet was staying on campus and did not have reliable food access. Violet told me:

I swiped and the person manning the swipe-in desk looked at the screen funnily and they were like, *Are you [her friend's name]?* I'm like, *No I'm not him. But he gave me his CatCard because I am trying to make it through the end of the semester.* And she was like, *Okay, you need to give me that [the CatCard].* I was like, *What?* And she said, *Yeah this is an Honor Code violation and you can't swipe in with somebody else's CatCard.*

Violet did have to give up her friend's CatCard and he had to pick it up from Dining Services when he returned to campus. In the end, Violet was not written up because she was unaware of the rule, but the whole situation left Violet thinking, "Do people get sent to the Honor Council for this?" Violet's direct encounter with the Honor Code, enforced by Davidson staff, prevented her from receiving community support from her friend. On a similar line to Sisi's



sentiments, Violet experienced a conflict between the Honor Code and her community, assuming Violet's friend is part of her Davidson community.

Violet's answers reflected a contradiction in the Honor Code. Initially, Violet discussed Honor Code in regard to trust, however, when asked a scenario question that gauged her commitment to the Honor Code, she went against the Honor Code. Her use of the term "neighborhood watchdog" hints that the specific Honor Code violation requires distrust of other students. The term "neighborhood watchdog" is similar to the concept of a neighborhood watch, which although its intentions may be positive to improve the community, the function of it entails a distrust of your community members to necessitate a neighborhood watch in the first place. With that in mind, how does Honor Code authentically build trust while asking students to report their fellow students? In Violet's case, it is not necessarily the trust established by the Honor Code that made her feel safe, instead, it was the size of the community because Violet felt that she knew a majority of the people at Davidson which is not difficult given the small population. The link between trust and the Honor Code, and whether or not it was genuine trust, came up in my other interviews as well.

When I asked B what the Honor Code means to him, he said, "I think trust is the biggest word associated with it. [...] It's just a general expectation that everyone trusts that everyone else knows what they're doing. [...] It's felt like just an extra level of trust." B's trust is reflected in his response to the scenario questions. When he told how he would feel if someone reported him committing an Honor Code violation, he ended his answer by saying, "I would be like yeah, you [whoever reported him] did the right thing. I messed up." For the second scenario, B told me, "I am not completely sure that I would report someone that I found cheating, especially if it didn't hurt me or it didn't seem like it would hurt anyone else." So, for B, his understanding of the

Honor Code is that it established trust at Davidson, which he believes in and practices, as seen in his reply to the second scenario.

On a similar note, Barbra told me his perception of the Honor Code:

I think I've come to view it less as a codification and more as a reminder. It just means less about actually not cheating but more about having that common feeling of trust. And while it's easier to build a community, it's less about, *Oh don't cheat in exams*, and more about you can trust these people because they have committed to be trusted.

Again, this is reflected in his response to a scenario question where Barbra would rather not report someone he saw cheating because he thinks "the Honor Code is more about restorative justice rather than punitive justice." When asked to elaborate, Barbra explained, "It's [the Honor Code] creating a system of incentives rather than disincentives." Barbra highlighted the benefit of take-home exams as an example. He distinguished this from rules in high school that were written like, "If you cheat, you will be put in detention. Here [Davidson] it's written as, if you don't cheat, you get take-home exams."

This understanding of the Honor Code contrasted the views of Sisi and Violet. However, even though Barbra told me the Honor Code does "actually have a huge impact", he felt that, "Having an Honor Code kind of defeats the purpose of having an Honor Code. You should be behaving like that regardless. It shouldn't be the rule." This line of thinking is what had made Barbra skeptical about the Honor Code before arriving at Davidson because they had thought, "Why would you have that rule? Isn't that just how you're supposed to be?" The points Barbra

made speak to the necessity of an Honor Code in the first place. Despite this, Barbra embraced the Honor Code when he came to recognize the privileges it offers students.

Barbra was also aware of the Honor Code violations though. When I discussed how the Honor Code essentially requires us to surveil other students, Barbra commented, “Yeah that’s definitely something I would be uncomfortable with.” Nonetheless, Barbra understood the Honor Code outside of these violations and focused more on its benefits such as take-home exams and the trust it instills in other community members. Other participants also viewed the Honor Code positively.

Both Victoria and Trenton remarked on how they liked the Honor Code. Victoria even said she loves the Honor Code and Trenton stated how he leaves his bag “pretty much everywhere” because he “trusts the Honor Code.” Similarly, Victoria and Trenton took advantage of the benefits of the Honor Code, such as Trenton leaving his belongings unattended and Victoria experiencing take-home exams. When asked what the Honor Code means to you, Trenton responded, “It builds integrity for the student body”, and Victoria reflected, “I think the Honor Code is something, like if it means something to you, then you’re more likely to uphold it.” Evidently, they both believe as well as trust in the Honor Code, yet they also told me they would not report someone if they found someone cheating. While Trenton knew this was an Honor Code violation, Victoria, even though she is a junior, was unaware of this rule. Alongside Barbra, Victoria and Trenton understood the Honor Code through the benefits they experienced as well as its impact on the community rather than the consequences of the Honor Code. Their positive experiences have assumingly shaped their positive understanding. The next participant I examine illustrates a shift in an understanding of the Honor Code once they came to Davidson.

As a freshman, Leilah told me that a reason she chose Davidson was because she liked the Honor Code. She dived into her initial perception of the Honor Code later when she said, “Davidson’s branded with the Honor Code. It’s like everyone cares about each other and you’re protecting each other’s stuff. Professors allowing them [students] to do whatever. And I feel like that is not how it actually is, kinda.” Continuing, when I asked Leilah what the Honor Code meant to her, she responded, “It’s having integrity for what you do here, the things you do, and the things that you are thinking about doing, like protecting people’s belongings, having respect for one another, and having integrity when it comes to academics. I think those are the main things that come to mind.” I followed up by asking Leilah if she had directly felt the Honor Code. She told me:

There’s some aspects that work and some that don’t. Most of the people on my floor they don’t lock their doors and I feel like it’s because we have that mutual trust that nobody’s going to take anything or go into someone’s room randomly. But at the same time, I have this rug in front of my room and every weekend someone takes it and puts it in front of the elevator. I have yet to find out who’s doing that. It doesn’t make any sense because like Honor Code, or even if someone has a problem with it I rather someone tell me than just take it. There’s different levels of honor here.

The idea of different levels of honor was thought-provoking, so I asked Leilah to expand on it:

[...] I thought Davidson would be like people go out of their way to take care of one another, well not take care of another, but like have integrity and have, I don’t know,

more of a community and more honesty with one another. [...] I remember in the beginning of the year everyone was getting their bike stolen and I feel like that's childish, because why are you stealing someone's bike? It's pretty obvious when you have a random bike. [...] That is where [the level] I thought Davidson would be and that's not really what it is.

Despite Leilah's disillusionment with Davidson and the Honor Code, she is still committed to the Honor Code. This is demonstrated when I asked her how she would feel if someone saw her committing an Honor Code violation and reported her. Leilah replied, "I feel like that would be my expectation if someone saw me. That's what you're supposed to do." Additionally, she told me she thinks she would report someone if she saw them violating the Honor Code. From her interview, it is apparent Leilah believed in the principle of the Honor Code, yet did not see it fully practiced at Davidson.

The participant interview I left for the conclusion of this section is Duke because of his role as an Honor Council member. For Duke, the Honor Code meant that "people will treat each other with a certain amount of respect and trust at Davidson that I think exists mostly." While Duke acknowledged not everyone does respect one another, he said that in general the Davidson community "does trust and respect me. [...] But they're not going to do the extra step for you to help you necessarily. You kind of have to fight for it." The specific "they" Duke referred to may be Davidson administration given that earlier in the interview Duke told me about how he had to fight for financial aid this school year. Additionally, he shared that he had most directly felt the Honor Code with his role on the Honor Council as well as not having to worry about leaving his belongings. However, he does not fully attribute people not "touching" his items to the Honor

Code. He told me, “When people see stuff on campus, they don’t go, I shouldn’t steal that because of the Honor Code. I just don’t think that’s a realistic understanding of how Davidson community works.” Duke did concede the Honor Code may be part of that benefit of leaving one’s belongings unattended, but to him the Honor Code is not fully responsible for that.

When asked if he had reported someone before, Duke replied, “I have never reported someone before. I actually hate that part of the Honor Code, as an Honor Council Member.” I asked him why and he equated the policy of reporting someone to “snitching”, the same word used by Sisi. Duke continued to elaborate, “Like the idea of people surveilling each other in that way, you can’t build trust in that community.” After this comment, Duke began to talk about different understandings of what the Honor Code is, with some people understanding the Honor Code as “punishing, then we’re all hyper-surveilling each other to basically cause each other harm.” Duke also offers the potential of a different view of the Honor Code when he said to me, “If we kind of change our understanding of the Honor Code to something that’s restorative, which is something I am trying to do [as an Honor Council member]. But it’s not something I can do in one or two semesters.” So, with the idea of the Honor Code as restorative, Duke reframed the policy of reporting someone in a hypothetical:

Let’s say you violated the Honor Code to cheat. But you have extenuating circumstances and you actually need help, right? You need support from the Davidson community So, reporting you for the violation isn’t about punishing you, it’s about helping you get the help you need. But that’s not really what that last end [the requirement to report someone] of the Honor Code really is.

Duke told me he believed there is a better way to phrase or write that part of the Honor Code differently, such as “changing it from not making it a violation to not report someone or something like that.” After this, Duke delved into his own understanding of the Honor Code and the changes that have been made to it:

I think it’s a middle ground [between restorative and punishing]. I know the process pretty intimately. I know that the process at the beginning might be restorative, but the sanctioning and outcomes part of it is almost not restorative at all. I’ve tried to change that a little. We’ve expanded the types of sanctions you can do; we’ve made it so you can do multiple sanctions. So, before it was that you can only do one sanction. So, basically the sanction is an outcome – you would get an F on this, receive no credit for that, and things like that. The reason why not having multiple sanctions was bad because council members were forced to either choose between suggestions like we require you [students] to meet the Writing Center two times to work on this essay and rewrite it or you receive credit on the assignment. We couldn’t suggest both.

With multiple sanctions, Duke told me how the Council is able to hold students accountable as well as help them, instead of just having students (potentially) fail classes with no efforts made toward fixing the root of the problem. Despite this, Duke remarked that the Honor Council is in a “weird place right now because we’re saying we’re becoming more restorative, but we’re also using a lot of the same language and structure that have been used for however long the Honor Code has been.” Duke’s interview was especially insightful because Duke was able to provide detailed information about the inner workings of the Honor Council.

Although it is an Honor Code violation to not report someone you see committing an Honor Code violation, Duke told me, “I can’t think of a time of another student reporting another student because I think most students would just, instead of reporting, not interact with that student in that kind of academic sense anymore if they ended up cheating or whatever.” This aligns with other participants who said they would not report someone who they saw cheating. Furthermore, Duke’s response explains why when I asked if he felt surveilled at Davidson, he replied, “By other students? Not really to be honest. I don’t think that’s real.” From his interview, Duke understood the Honor Code as both restorative and punitive. However, it is evident Duke has worked towards and hopes for the Honor Code to become a more restorative entity. Duke’s efforts have not necessarily been in vain as seen in Barbra’s, a freshman, understanding of the Honor Code as restorative, but it is unknown if Barbra’s outlook was shaped specifically by the changes made by Duke and the Honor Council or if that is how Barbra just naturally views the Honor Code.

The majority of the participants did not perceive the Honor Code as a surveillance practice. I considered only two participants (Sisi and Violet) as understanding the Honor Code as surveillance with the others as not sharing this perspective; Duke is not included because of his nuanced view on the Honor Code. This was not surprising when I found out half of the participants did not even know it was an Honor Code violation to not report someone you see committing a violation. I do not have any data to back up this claim, but generally, I assume this is a lesser-known aspect of the Honor Code based on my personal experience as a student. Additionally, Duke provided a viewpoint from an Honor Council member:



The [Honor Code] process is out there. It's in the handbook, you can go and read it, right. But people are just not interested in hearing the process. We wanted people to know the process. I think we made an Instagram account or something this semester. We held a get-to-know the Honor Council event, things like that, and maybe four people showed up at a school of how many students. [...] I don't know if people are really that interested in knowing the process. And I think also there's a taboo. I mean when you sent out that groupchat asking about the Honor Code, people were like what did you break or whatever. And so there's this weird culture thing of like if you want to know more about you're wrong.

What Duke is referring to about the group chat and myself is when I had asked the Davidson '23 GroupMe about the Honor Council as well as COVID-19 Shared Responsibilities. Someone had replied to my initial question saying, "Mighty suspicious question...what are you plotting miss ma'am [three emojis]". So, as supported by Duke's story, assuming that the Honor Code is not extensively known is not such an unrealistic assumption to make, but I do recognize that school-wide survey data would provide a more concrete claim. Regardless, it is notable, and also unsurprising because of its portrayed standing in the community, that several participants (5) had thought of the Honor Code as building trust and integrity in the Davidson community. There is no doubt that the Honor Code has an impact on the community, but it was thought-provoking how my participants interpreted this impact differently.

## Discussion

My findings demonstrate that a positive perception of community lends itself to a positive surveillance consciousness such as *with* surveillance, or at least *before* surveillance which is an indifference.<sup>28</sup> This is seen in Victoria's interview where she talked positively about the Davidson community as well as the Honor Code, which is arguably the Davidson surveillance practice most embedded in the community. Victoria also recognized efforts by Campus Police to interact with the community, suggesting that Campus Police is a part of her understanding of the Davidson community. This possibly influences her positive reception of Campus Police surveillance practices, except when she experienced them during the "COVID-19" semester. Continuing, Sisi also recognized Campus Police's effort to be part of the community, such as introducing themselves and talking more with students as well as eating in public spaces. However, Sisi still told me, "To be honest, I don't even understand why anyone would walk up to them. They have guns in their holster." To Sisi, it is difficult for Campus Police to be part of what she considers her Davidson community. Thus, it makes sense that Sisi has a negative perception of Campus Police since it is *surveillance-outside*.

However, Sisi's general negative understanding of Davidson community aligns with her negative understanding of Davidson surveillance practices. The fact that Sisi believed there to be no community at Davidson then explains her belief that the Honor Code does not exist since the Honor Code is a pillar of the Davidson community. It is clear the Honor Code as a surveillance practice shaped participants' understanding of the Davidson community. This was exemplified when participants mentioned community accountability.

B told me, "I feel held accountable in a lot of ways. Because, like, pretty much any public space I'm in I see people I know. I never feel anonymous. Which is great. Because then it's good

---

<sup>28</sup> Zaia, "Exploring Consciousness", 534.

to feel like I have an identity.” Of course, this accountability can be attributed to Davidson’s small student body. Nonetheless, this accountability and the inability to feel anonymous is a result of the Honor Code as a surveillance practice that encourages students to know their peers by watching. Several participants associated the Honor Code with the concept of trust, so it raises the question of how surveillance builds trust. Given the Honor Code is an example of *surveillance-inside*, students’ trust in their community members extends to their actions as well. B admitted to me, “I feel like if I was to walk up to someone who I’d never seen or met before, but was a student here, my base level of trust for them would be a little bit higher than it would be like for someone I’d met in high school.” This response reflects that the Honor Code is a surveillance practice that shapes B’s understanding of community, such as whether or not community members are trustworthy.

However, despite the Honor Code and the small student body, there were still comments on the indifference of Davidson students about fellow students. Interestingly, both of these comments are from seniors. Violet told me, “Another thing that I see on this campus a lot is like if it doesn’t affect you you’re not giving a shit about it.” While Duke echoed a similar sentiment, “No one will (*pause*) do you wrong but they’re not necessarily invested in your, your life specifically, and want to help you.” Both of these participants did not have extremely positive understandings of Davidson surveillance practices, so these statements raise questions about the effectiveness of surveillance, and whether it needs to be effective in order to have a corresponding influence on ideas of community.

Lastly, when investigating understandings of surveillance, it was important to understand how racialized surveillance shaped these understandings. With that, it appeared that students of color felt less of a sense of community and were more susceptible to surveillance. This is evident

in Sisi and Leilah's responses. Leilah had a more positive understanding of surveillance, or at least its necessity, than Sisi but still expressed doubts about Campus Police and the Honor Code. The exception to this trend would be Trenton, however, his positive understanding of community could be attributed to his membership as a student-athlete with athletes being a connected coalition that represents Davidson in sports.

Conversely, white students felt a greater sense of community and fewer concerns about surveillance. Victoria and B are clear examples of this trend. However, B does acknowledge how his identity as a white man has affected his sense of community, and his experiences of surveillance, as he told me that Davidson was "built" for him. Victoria, similar to Trenton, had a strongly positive view of the Davidson community as well as an acceptance of Davidson surveillance practices, including both *surveillance-inside* and *surveillance-outside* practices. The only time she understood Davidson surveillance practices as negative was when Campus Police wrote her up for a COVID-19 Shared Responsibilities violation. With this trend, my findings provide insight into how identity can play a factor in both one's experience and understanding of community and surveillance. It seems that the negative consequences of surveillance experienced by marginalized students serve to further isolate them from a community that has already forced them to the margins. Yet, whether these consequences of surveillance are negative or not is subjective to how one perceives their community, especially if they understand the one surveilling as a community member. While my findings were extensive, it is vital to recognize the limitations of my research that then affect the conclusions I have come to.

The greatest limitation of my research is my small participant sample, and by extension, the limited range in participant demographics. However, the analysis of my findings attempts to achieve depth over breadth to compensate for this limitation. Another limitation is reducing my

own biases in the research. When discussing my method, I briefly touched on how some interview questions may have been phrased with a bias. This bias can also be found in my interpretations of the results. To reduce bias as much as possible and be transparent with the reader, I attempted to ground my interpretations in my participants' responses, hence why I have included numerous direct quotes. Additionally, I am intentional in acknowledging my bias because it is difficult, if not impossible, to erase bias, so it must be recognized in an effort to be transparent. This limitation also extends to examining my positionality in relation to my research. I addressed my positionality and its potential effect on my participants in my methods section. In part, my positionality guided me towards this research but I also know it can and does influence research methods. Lastly, although it is not necessarily a limitation, the question of the legacy and applicability of my research guides the conversation on the implications of my research.

These implications are that my research adds to existing, and can create new, discussions on community and surveillance, both separately and together. Although my small participant sample prevents me from extrapolating, my research can still prompt reflection. Forming an awareness of Davidson surveillance practices such as CatCard tracking and Campus Police are useful when institutional powers are abused and need to be addressed. Additionally, Davidson should increase efforts of data transparency as data grows increasingly more powerful. To highlight this, I created a website “watching wildcats” that allows students to request their CatCard data from CatCard Services and then visualize this data on a map to allow students to think about the implications of their own data. This website can be found in the website I made to document my research, which is: <https://gwvandoren.github.io/thesis/>. Under “davidson surveillance practices”, I have listed the practices I research as well as links to projects that

rethink these practices in an attempt to generate productive discourse, including “watching wildcats”.

To continue, an understanding of the Honor Code as a surveillance practice can possibly help the Honor Code shift from punitive to restorative as Duke hoped for. Not just an understanding of Davidson surveillance practices is worthwhile, but an understanding of the Davidson community. There is conflict in every community and Davidson is no exception, but an understanding of Davidson’s community can aid in conflict resolution. As my research attempted to illustrate, students’ understandings of Davidson’s community shaped their understanding, and subsequent acceptance and rejection of, or indifference to surveillance practices. Furthermore, these understandings and general awareness can prepare students or help them think about community, surveillance, and data transparency outside of Davidson. If one is able to employ their understanding of the community and surveillance practices to create change at Davidson, it is certainly possible to do once one leaves Davidson.

The relationship between surveillance and community, and how they affect people’s experiences of both is complex. Through my research, I explored this relationship at Davidson College through students’ experiences and understandings. My findings were that students’ understandings of surveillance and community affect their understanding of the other. Additionally, students’ experiences with surveillance or community can affect their understanding of the other as well. To state explicitly, students’ understanding of Davidson surveillance practices can be influenced by their experience of the Davidson community and its benefits. Also, students’ understanding of the Davidson community can be potentially influenced by the consequences of Davidson surveillance. There was a general trend that students of color felt less of a sense of community and were more susceptible to surveillance while white students

felt a greater sense of community and fewer concerns about surveillance. This trend aligns with research that illustrates the disproportionate extent and impact of surveillance on people of color.

Looking towards the future and to give my findings more credibility, I would interview more students and be deliberate in recruiting participants from a variety of demographics. Furthermore, I would expand my research of Davidson's surveillance practices to examine Moodle, Davidson's learning management system, as a surveillance practice. I would also like to analyze the effectiveness of Campus Police as well as the effect of the (ongoing) COVID-19 pandemic on perceptions of surveillance and community. In terms of my website and reaching students with my work, I would like to create a "Choose Your Own Adventure" style Honor Code simulator that places the user in a situation where the Honor Code encourages surveillance to raise student awareness of this practice through a game. In general, I hope my research inspires more reflection on the linked relations between community and surveillance in myself, and hopefully others, for future endeavors.

### Works Cited

- Browne, Simone. *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2015.
- Ciofi, Joy. 2020. "The Ambivalent Subject: Reconciling Contradictory Subjective Experiences of Surveillance." *Surveillance & Society* 18(1): 61-73.
- Davidson College. "Campus Police." Retrieved January 20, 2023.  
<https://www.davidson.edu/offices-and-services/public-safety/campus-police>.
- Davidson College. "Student Handbook." Retrieved May 11, 2021.  
<https://www.davidson.edu/offices-and-services/dean-students/student-handbook>.
- Davidson College. Retrieved January 20, 2023. <https://www.davidson.edu/>.
- Fiske, John. "Surveilling the City: Whiteness, the Black Man and Democratic Totalitarianism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 15, no. 2 (1998): 67-88.
- Foucault, Michel. "Panopticism" in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, 195-228. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Lyon, David. 2007. *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- McMillan, David W., and David M. Chavis. 1986. "Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory." *Journal of Community Psychology* (14): 6-22.
- Zaia, Matthew. 2019. "Exploring Consciousness: The Online Community's Understanding of Mobile Technology Surveillance." *Surveillance & Society* 17(3/4): 533-549.



## Interview Questions to Participants

### *Biographical details*

1. Tell me about the community you grew up in.
2. Who are the people you are closest to?
3. Tell me the story of the first time you came to Davidson's campus.
  - What made you choose Davidson?
4. How would you describe your current situation?
  - Hobbies, what do you do for fun?

### *Community at Davidson*

5. How would you describe Davidson to someone that does not know anything about it?
16. How would you describe the community at Davidson?
6. Can you describe a moment when you felt like you were part of the Davidson community?
  - Or a moment when you felt like you were not part of the Davidson community?
  - Who or what is part of your Davidson community?
7. How and who do you spend your time with at Davidson?
8. Can you describe a moment when you knew COVID-19 was going to affect your Davidson experience, including your community?
9. Can you talk me through a time Davidson hasn't lived up to your expectations?
10. How would you describe the relationship between students and administration? With professors?
  - Relationships amongst students?

### *Surveillance at Davidson*

11. What does the Honor Code mean to you? How have you directly felt the Honor Code?
12. Describe to me how you would feel if someone saw you committing an Honor Code violation and reported you.
  - Have you reported someone before? Would you?
13. I know there have been student articles about the increased police presence on campus. Have you heard about these or noticed the presence yourself?
  - Tell me how the increased presence makes you feel.
14. Imagine you just received an email from RLO saying you have attempted to swipe into a dorm that is not your own and they have a record of your failed card swipe. How would you react?
15. Let's say you ended up cheating on a test through Moodle. Your professor says they have Moodle records of this. How would you respond?
16. Have you had an incident with the administration and/or another student before? What happened?
17. Do you feel like you are surveilled at Davidson?
  - Do you think it happens at Davidson?
18. Do you think surveillance is an issue at Davidson?