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

CIS496: Thesis
Davidson College

Gwenyth Van Doren
May 2023

<u>Introduction</u>

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 However, this privilege was revoked due to the COVID Shared Responsibitlies "No Guest/Visitation" policy, which was established in order to limit the spread of COVID-19 While Davidson has relaxed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 can analyze that data to produce some result. 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 community, since surveillance can imply a lack of trust. This tension is a contradiction of the established trust of community. The Honor Code embodies this as it is regarded as one of the cornerstones of Davidon'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" (Davidson College 2022). 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

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.

Methods

The primary method I will use to conduct my research is interviews. The purpose of the interviews is to understand how students think of surveillance and community at Davidson. With interviews, I am able to gather students' subjective experiences, including their understanding, of Davidson surveillance practices and community. All of my participants will be students because that is the group my research question focuses on. 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.

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 and thus ensuring a diverse student demographic.

Nonetheless, I interviewed 8 participants that did have some variety in demographics such as race/ethnicity, gender, class year, socioeconomic status, region, and sexual orientation. Demographics like socioeconomic status were not explicitly asked but revealed during interviews when asking general background questions. 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.

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 a code name and use this code name when quoting their interview responses.

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 specificed.

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" (McMillan and Chavis 1996:8). It is possible for both types of community to overlap and be true, such as a "...layering of communities…" (McMillan and Chavis 1996:19). This is illustrated at Davidson with how students find ourselves 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…" (McMillan and Chavis 1996:8). 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 (1996) as a foundation. Sense of community is composed of four elements: membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs (reinforcement), and shared emotional connection (McMillan and Chavis 1996). 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" (McMillan and Chavis 1996:9) Through the four elements and sense of community feelings, I will link students' understanding of their communities with their 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" (Lyon 2007:14). 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" (Lyon 2007:13). 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.

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 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*.

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 noted 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 access and dining card 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" (Davidson College 2022:63). 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 due to the fact that 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), 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" (Davidson College 2022). Employing the specified Davidson surveillance practices and previously stated definitions of community and surveillance, the following and final section of my literature review directly pieces together the respective bodies of literature and draw underlying connections to inform my research.

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 (1996). 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" (McMillan and Chavis 1996:10). 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" (1996:15)

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 fufillment of needs as well as shared emotional connection. As McMillan and Chavis state, sense of community is "...not a static feeling" (1996:19). If Davidson surveillance 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" (Zaia 2019:534). Employing Matthew Zaia's categories of being *before*, *with*, and/or *against* surveillance, I will examine Davidson students' surveillance consciousness (2019).

To explain, the category *before* surveillance describes people who disregard surveillance given its function (Zaia 2019). This is distinct from the category *with* surveillance because people that are *with* surveillance candidly advocate for surveillance rather than simply disregarding it (Zaia 2019). 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" (Ciofi 2020:72). 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 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 racism) already present in communities. With this, if students associate surveillance with a primarily negative connotation, they will not directly link surveillance with community.

Findings

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 has 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 (davidson.edu), scroll down and you will see the heading "EXPERIENCE THE DAVIDSON COMMUNITY". The small student population (1,973) and presence of the Honor Code is 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 describe 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. There is a substantial amount of research that demonstrates how one's identity can affect one's experience of community. Although my data cannot sufficiently argue this point, 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 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. ~~From what I just said [an incident described later when I discuss students' understanding of surveillance through CatCards].~~ 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 occured 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 them 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 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 her own self-surveillance. However, to clarify, Sisi's response does not indicate she surveills 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 police. 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 (CP), 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 CP 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 CP:

> That morning I was rushing to go the airport. Alex [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 [Alex 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 CP in a negative manner. Duke, while not as negative, understands CP as "kind of useless, like they're just not that helpful." He tells me that if CP were not on campus, he would not feel any less safe. Violet echoes Duke's sentiments, describing CP as "not helpful at all" when her friend's bookbag was stolen. She also adds that she has been

"lucky to not have personal run-ins [with CP]", which frames an interaction with CP 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 CP, they do not feel comfortable in CP's presence.

A story I was not expecting was Victoria's experience of surveillance by CP 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 table with four people at the student center Union. There was a sign that conveyed 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 CP 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 CP recently helped her friend in a medical situation. Victoria has also had interactions with CP during campus events, like CPR training. She advocates for these events for CP to "feel more part of the community, because

during COVID time, it was like us [students] versus them [CP]." Victoria's responses demonstrate how CP played a role in her understanding of surveillance during COVID. Yet, "after" COVID, Victoria recognizes the potential of CP to be part of the community. I wonder if Victoria would still hold this belief if she had a negative experience with CP 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 CP fit into Trenton's understanding of surveillance at Davidson. Despite this, it is clear some participants understand CP as a form of surveillance at Davidson, or at least recognize CP'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 off 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 Chiptole. So I left New Dorm to get the
> Chiptole 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 they had:

That [CatCard tracking] was also how I got 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.

I asked her if she know they 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 in to 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. Afterwards, 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" it. While Trenton is not necessarily resisting CatCard surveillance, he tells me, "I don't mind the hassle of calling of 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.

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 administration, can also engage in CatCard tracking. This is not

unrealistic, since Violet supports it with 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. 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 stuff around to the Honor Code rather than the Code of Responsbility. 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 unsuprising 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 has become less reassuring because she has 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 tells me that "knowing so many people" at Davidson makes her feel "safe". From this, I asked Violet that 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 ask Violet if she knew it is a Honor Code violation to not report a Honor Code violation that you have knowledge of, and despite being a senior, Violet tells me she did not know this.

Earlier in the interview, Violet describes 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 and it was right before Thanksgiving break when students would return home for the rest of the semester. Violet's incident can also constitute as an instance of physical CatCard tracking.

Violet recalls 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 tells 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?"

Works Cited

Ciofi, Joy. 2020. "The Ambivalent Subject: Reconciling Contradictory Subjective Experiences of Surveillance." *Surveillance & Society* 18(1): 61-73.

Davidson College. 2022. "Campus Police." Retrieved January 20, 2023. https://www.davidson.edu/offices-and-services/public-safety/campus-police.

Davidson College. 2022. "Student Handbook." Retrieved May 11, 2021 (https://www.davidson.edu/offices-and-services/dean-students/student-handbook).

Lyon, David. 2007. *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Oxford: Polity Press.

McMillian, 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 Commmunity's Understanding of Mobile Technology Surveillance." *Surveillance & Society* 17(3/4): 533-549.