QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY REGARDING EXPERIENCES OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH

ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Jeffrey Dana Ward

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Liberty University

2023

A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY REGARDING EXPERIENCES OF FREEDOM OF

SPEECH ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES

by Jeffrey Dana Ward

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

2023

APPROVED BY:

Dr. David Vacchi, Ph.D., Committee Chair

Dr. Mark Hogue, Ph.D., Committee Member

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine how suppression of free speech on college and university campuses in Southtown, USA affects student self-efficacy. The theory guiding my study is Bandura's social cognitive theory as it will evaluate the interplay between the system and environment sources of influence at Secular university Christian university in Southtown, USA. How has freedom of speech on college and university campuses affected the self-efficacy of college students in faith-based organizations? Interviews and focus groups were utilized to collect data for this central research question. Thematic analysis and coding was utilized to analyze the data collected. The result of my study is that Christian University students do not have as many freedoms as Secular University students when it comes to freedom of speech on their campuses and what is the effect of self-efficacy.

Keywords: freedom of speech, hate speech, speech codes, safe zones, 1st Amendment, bias response teams, bullying, self-efficacy

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to God. He has never let me down!

To my wife, Teresa, who has encouraged and stood by me every step of the way in earning this degree.

To my children, Eliana Hope and Mikayla Faith, may you pursue knowledge throughout your lives.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank my committee chair, Dr. Vacchi for giving me great feedback during the dissertation phase and for pushing me to do my best. Thanks also to Dr. Mark Hogue for his encouragement during my classwork and for being a Committee Member for my dissertation. I am thankful for the many friends who have encouraged me to pursue this degree. I am grateful for the influence of Dr. Malcolm McDow, Dr. Joe Brown, and Dr. Jerry Sutton.

Table of Contents

A List of Tables

List of Figures

N/A

List of Abbreviations

Foundation for Individual Rights (FIRE)

Baptist Student Ministry (BSM)

Fellowship of Christian Athletes (FCA)

American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Campus Crusade for Christ (CRU)

Episcopal and Lutheran (ELCA)

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

Chapter One discusses the background, situation to self, problem statement, purpose statement, significance of the study, research questions, and important definitions related to my study. The case study is the approach to this qualitative research. The purpose of this study is to examine how free speech on college and university campuses in Southtown, USA affects student self-efficacy. Gray (2019) states that a 2018 report published by FIRE found that 89.7 percent of American colleges have policies that restrict the freedom of expression of their students and faculty. Therefore, I examined a real-life system (college campuses) in the United States to see how the right to have free speech may have been discouraged on college and university campuses.

Background

This section provides notes on the historical background of free speech. In addition, this section looks at the social and theoretical aspects of the research on freedom of speech on college campuses in the United States. In addition, historical and theoretical aspects of the research are examined.

Historical Context

The debate on college campuses regarding free speech and religious liberty is an important debate to discuss. For example, Burleigh (2016) shares how more than half of America's colleges and universities now have restrictive speech codes. In addition, Burleigh (2016) notes that according to a censorship watchdog group, 217 American colleges and universities have speech codes that unambiguously impinge upon free speech.

Feldman (2019) noted how free speech on college and university campuses has generated controversies for decades. However, in recent years, several such controversies have attracted widespread and sustained media attention. It has been a discussion for several years. However, the attention to free speech on college campuses has heightened in recent years. Gruden (2010) noted because of hate speech codes, sometimes students have been penalized for expressing belief in Jesus and sharing their faith with others. In addition, Grudem (2010) noted how numerous organizations have had remarkable success in challenging these policies. The argument is these policies are unconstitutional. The thought is the 1st Amendment guarantees freedom of speech.

According to Gray (2019), universities are meant to be environments that perpetuate growth and discovery. This means being exposed to ideas they have never been exposed to. This mentality helps students learn new ideologies and philosophies that help them stay informed and grow.

The 1st Amendment of the United States says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances (U.S. Const. amend. I)." Allegheny (2021) surmised that the 1st Amendment protects what is commonly known as The Five Freedoms: freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of petition. Therefore, the amendment is part of ten amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights, which was adopted in 1791. The 1st Amendment gives people the right to express themselves, prevents the government from establishing a state religion, and from favoring one

religion over others. In addition, The 1st Amendment protects citizens of the United States and their rights to gather in groups for social, economic, political, or religious purposes.

Social Context

Conservative thinking has come under attack on many college and university campuses. For example, Feldman (2019) shares how several such controversies have attracted widespread and sustained media attention. In one instance, progressive students attempted to prevent conservative theorist Charles Murray, notorious for ostensibly linking intelligence to race, from speaking at Middlebury College in Vermont. In a similar incident, progressive students at the University of California Berkeley interfered with a speech by former Breitbart editor and right-wing provocateur Milo Yiannopoulos. Bauer-Wolf (2019) said lawmakers, mainly Republicans, from states all over the country have consequently intervened in matters of free speech in academe by proposing and helping to pass legislation that makes it clear students cannot interfere with the speech of their peers or visitors on campus.

Restrictions on freedom of speech are not just limited to conservative ideas. Hillsdale College and Baylor University are private Christian universities. Hirshauer (2021) compared the two schools to see how comfortable more liberal students felt regarding expressing their ideas. Hirshauer (2021) reported an overwhelming majority of Hillsdale students believe the administration is committed to protecting freedom of speech. However, at Baylor University, students did not feel the administration was committed to protecting freedom of speech for students with less conservative ideas.

Theoretical Context

Several theories of freedom of speech have developed over the years. Some of these include Mill's marketplace of ideas theory, Meiklejohn's democracy theory, Baker's liberty model, and Milton's freedom of speech theory.

John Stuart Mill dreams of a society in which people exchange ideas freely in his seminal book, *On Liberty* (Gordon, 1997). In addition, John Milton wrote a book entitled, *Areopagitica* expressing the need for the free expression of ideas. Gordon (1997) surmised human philosophies need freedom of expression to serve Mill's critical culmination. If they are not allowed to be freely expressed, human progress is impeded. Hence, human progress is achieved by the intermediate end of the self-development of each individual. Therefore, this end is served only if independent thought is allowed to flourish among all in society. Mill's marketplace of ideas is an expression of the idea of free expression in society.

Baker (1989) rejects the idea that the First Amendment was primarily designed to protect political speech. Therefore, Baker believes that in his Liberty model speech or other self-expressive demeanor is protected not as a means to achieve a collective good but because of its value to the individual (Baker, 1989). Consequently, Baker's model embraces the idea that the 1st Amendment protects a broad realm of nonviolent, noncoercive, expressive activity.

Baker (2011) shared how Meiklejohn wishes only to as thing worth saying, if relevant for democratic government can be said. Bates (2020) concludes for Meiklejohn, the fundamental meaning of the First Amendment is the freedom of ideas shall not be abridged. Calvert (2018) stated, "For Meiklejohn, as Columbia University President Lee Bollinger explains, 'the principle of free speech plays a practical role for a self-governing society, protecting discussion among citizens so that they can best decide what to do about the issues brought before them (p. 130).'"

Later, he elaborated in a law journal article that, "[s]elf- the government can exist only insofar as the voters acquire the intelligence . . . that, in theory, casting a ballot is assumed to express. (Calvert, p. 130)."

Problem Statement

The problem is free speech on college and university campuses in the United States is being threatened. La Noue (2019) shared how many campuses have adopted speech codes and have created Bias Response Teams to enforce them. Most of these teams are focused on remarks made by students to other students. For example, The University of Michigan had a Bias Response Team that investigated 150 incidents since 2017 (La Noue, 2019). Students who violate the policy might be disciplined by required training sessions or even suspension or expulsion. La Noue (2019) said, "But a new organization, Speech First, composed of students, their families, and alumni, disagreed and brought a federal lawsuit alleging that the UM student code and the Bias Response Team threatened 1st Amendment-protected speech (p. 557)." Snyder (2016) shared how there is growing suspicion regarding the importance of free expression.

Therefore, Downs & Surprenant (2018) contend freedom of speech has been a historically volatile issue in higher education. In recent years, however, there has been a surge of progressive censorship on college and university campuses. This rise of suppression has been characterized by the explosive growth of such policies as "trigger warnings" for course materials, "safe spaces" where students are protected from speech they consider harmful or distressing, "micro-aggression" policies that often strongly discourage the use of words that might offend sensitive individuals, new "bias-reporting" programs that consist of different degrees of campus surveillance, and the "dis-invitation" of a growing list of speakers in college and university campuses (Downs & Surprenant, 2018). All of this is creating tremendous tension on college and

university campuses in the United States regarding freedom of speech.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to examine how suppression of free speech on college and university campuses in Southtown, USA affects student self-efficacy. Suppression of free speech will be generally defined as the idea of a college or university derailing a student's right to freedom of speech due to the 1st Amendment of the United States. The theory guiding this study is Bandura's social cognitive theory as it relates to college and university students' perceptions regarding freedom of speech.

Significance of the Study

This case study provides information that examines the perceptions of students from Christian University and Secular University regarding freedom of speech. The practical aspect of this study is that it serves as a facilitator to promote freedom of speech on college and university campuses. The present study promotes the prevailing mass of theoretical and empirical knowledge and offers practical implications for colleges and universities regarding freedom of speech.

Theoretical

There are many interpretations of what freedom of speech means. For example, is free speech protected on college campuses? And what is not protected by the 1st Amendment? Chamlee-Wright (2018) stated, "Debates about campus speech tend to toggle between full-throated endorsements of 1st Amendment rights and calls for administrative prohibitions against speech that is false and/or works against the effort to create an inclusive learning environment (p. 392)." Over the past few years, on college campuses around the country, student protests against controversial speakers have become increasingly problematic. Many of these incidents have

stopped controversial speakers from engaging on campuses like the University of California, Berkeley, and Middlebury (Knight Foundation, 2020). According to a survey published by the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education 60% of students point have not felt the freedom to express their opinions. The survey consisted of 19, 969 undergraduate students from 55 colleges and universities (Anderson, 2020).

Empirical

The significance of this study is helpful given the analysis of freedom of speech restrictions on Christian and Secular university campuses. Peterson (2020) notes there is a growing concern about the steady attrition of free speech on college and university campuses. In addition, Carrasco (2022) reports a growing majority of college students believe their college or university stifles free expression.

Practical

These new hate speech regulations attempt to restrict speech that may offend someone. Feldman (2019) writes a quantitative article on the subject of free speech in America. The basic premise of the article says a shift has taken place from a Republican Democracy to a Pluralistic Democracy. This shift took place in the twentieth century. There is a difference between freedom of speech and hate speech. Freedom of speech is a right every American has as a result of the 1st Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The 1st Amendment and 14th Amendment work together to preserve individual liberty from government oppression. These Amendments work together to protect human rights in the United States. Carlton (2021) shared how the 1st Amendment restricts the government from arresting or fining people for protected speech or activities. Conversely, the government cannot make laws disturbing someone's free speech rights. Hence, the 1st Amendment does not restrict what private businesses, individuals, or even

most colleges can do. The 14th Amendment, ratified on July 9, 1868, was intended to do away with racial discrimination in the United States. Based upon the words of the Amendment, there can be no preferences or exclusions based on racial differences (Grudem, 2010). This could be broadly interpreted to include differences of opinion that inevitably arise on college and university campuses.

Research Questions

My study has a Central Research Question, Sub-Question One, Sub-Question Two, and Sub-Question Three. These questions guided my research on Secular University and Christian University.

Central Research Question

How has freedom of speech on college and university campuses affected the self-efficacy of college students in faith-based organizations?

Sub-Question One

What positive effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?

Sub-Question Two

What negative effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?

Sub-Question Three

What are the perceptions of administrators and educators regarding how campus freedom of speech affects student self-efficacy?

Definitions

1. Freedom of Speech – Freedom of speech is the right to express information, ideas, and opinions free of government restrictions based on content and subject only to reasonable limitations (such as the power of the government to avoid a clear and present danger) especially as guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution (Lakier, 2021).

2. 1st Amendment - The First Amendment of the United States Constitution states, that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances (U.S. Const. amend. 1). Lakier (2021) said, "The Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment has for decades now served as one of the most powerful mechanisms of individual rights protection in the Federal Constitution. It has been interpreted to apply to a dizzying variety of kinds of speech and expressive conduct (pp. 2300-2301)."

3. 14th Amendment - The Fourteenth Amendment shares how all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws (U.S. Const. amend. 14).

4. Speech Codes – Speech codes are any campus regulation that punishes, forbids, heavily regulates, or restricts a substantial amount of protected speech (What are speech codes? n.d.).

5. Bullying – Bullying happens when harm is caused to someone physically, verbally, socially, or through cyber avenues (Blincoe & Perry, 2015).

Summary

The problem is free speech on college and university campuses in the United States is being threatened. The purpose of this Case Study research is to discover the perceptions, experiences, beliefs, and opinions of students regarding free speech on college and university campuses in the United States.

The claim that America's campuses are in the midst of a free speech crisis has been made so often and so emphatically that it has widely become accepted as fact. Franks (2019) shared the assertion that conservative thinking is being aggressively inhibited in college and university campuses is as untrue today as it was in the 1970s. Subsequently, there have been a handful of occurrences involving conservative speakers, but the vast majority of colleges and universities have not experienced these problems regarding freedom of speech (Franks, 2019).

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

A systematic review of the literature was conducted to explore the problems related to free speech on college and university campuses. This chapter presents a review of the current literature related to my topic of study. In the first section, the theoretical framework relevant to freedom of speech on college and university campuses is addressed. This is followed by a synthesis of recent literature regarding freedom of speech on college and university campuses. Lastly, the literature surrounding the factors that lead to the development of freedom of speech on college and university campuses is conveyed. In the end, a gap in the literature is identified, presenting a viable need for my study.

Theoretical Framework

The main theory guiding my study is Bandura's social cognitive theory as it will evaluate the interplay between the system and environment sources of influence at Secular university Christian university in Southtown, USA. This self-system developed by Bandura provides reference mechanisms and a set of subfunctions for perceiving, regulating, and evaluating behavior. Learning is about interacting with the environment. Therefore, we learn from interacting with others in our environments. Environmental and behavioral determinants make up the social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). The evaluation will be between Secular University and Christian University

Artino (2012) defines self-efficacy as a personal belief in one's capability to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. It is often described as task-specific self-confidence, self-efficacy has been a key component in theories of motivation and learning in varied contexts (Artino, 2012). According to Bandura's social

cognitive theory, individuals possess a self-system that enables them to exercise a measure of

control over their thoughts, feelings, motivation, and actions (Pajares, n.d.). Whatever other

factors serve as guides and motivators; they are rooted in the belief that one can produce effects

by one's actions (Bandura, 2017).

Bandura (2017) asserts unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their

actions they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Therefore,

according to Bandura (2012), self-efficacy is embedded in a broader social cognitive theory.

Social cognitive theory subscribes to a casual structure grounded in triadic reciprocal causation

(Bandura, 1986). This human functioning is a product of the interplay of intrapersonal

influences, the behavior individuals engage in, and the environmental forces that impinge upon

them. Consequently, according to Bandura (2012), self-efficacy beliefs affect the condition of

human operation through cognitive, motivational, affective, and decisional processes. Expressly,

people's beliefs in their efficacy shape whether they think pessimistically or optimistically, in

self-enabling or self-debilitating ways. Thus, efficacy beliefs influence how well people motivate

themselves and persevere in the face of difficulties through the goals they set for themselves,

their outcome expectations, and causal attributions for their successes and failures (Bandura,

2012). People's beliefs in their coping capabilities play a pivotal role in their self-regulation of

emotional states. This affects the quality of their emotional life and their vulnerability to stress

and depression.

Horsburgh & Ippolito (2018) share how Bandura's theory of social learning provides a

useful framework to consider how students ascertain through observational learning and

modeling. They correlate how learning takes place in a social setting via observation, but it also

involves cognitive processes. For example, learners internalize and make sense of what they see

to reproduce the behavior themselves (Horsburgh & Ippolito, 2018). Consequently, this research will explore the positive and negative impact of freedom of speech on college and university campuses. Pajares & Schunk (2001) stated that a strong sense of efficacy enhances human well-being. For instance, self-efficacy beliefs influence the amount of stress and anxiety that people experience as they engage in an activity (Pajares & Schunk, 2001). Self-efficacy also predicts course satisfaction in traditional face-to-face classrooms (Bandura, 1997).

According to Bandura (1971), four specific steps occur at the cognitive and behavioral levels to ensure learning is successful. First, the learner must pay attention to the model's attitudes and behaviors. Second, the learner must remember what was observed. Through the observational process, the behaviors and thoughts of the social model become encrypted and stored in the learner's memory. Third, the observer engages in the behaviors and adopts the attitudes and mannerisms of the social model. The final step is the learner must have the motivation to replicate the behaviors and attitudes. This motivation derives from the rewards or punishments the person receives due to their behaviors and attitudes. Hence, if the person is rewarded for their behaviors, the person will be more likely to reproduce such behaviors.

An infringement upon one's freedom of speech may impede a student's self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is part of the self-system. It is made up of a person's attitudes, abilities, and cognitive skills (Cherry, 2020). This self-system is a large contributor to how people recognize conditions. Cherry (2020) affirms this self-system involves how people behave and react to different conditions. Therefore, self-efficacy plays a large role in how people perceive what is happening to them. Regarding freedom of speech, college students react to real and perceived obstructions to their freedom of speech.

Self-efficacy impacts how one thinks feels, and how they are motivated. Hsu & Wilde (2019) sustain that a person's beliefs surrounding their levels of self-efficacy will generate an effect on how they feel, think, and motivate themselves. Subsequently, this can lead to substantial contrasts in behavior between individuals with differing levels of self-efficacy. If a person has low self-efficacy it can cause people to avoid difficult or threatening situations. If a person feels their freedom of expression is being hampered, this could cause them to react negatively. Therefore, an individual's current general self-efficacy can shape behaviors. Hence, this may influence how people interpret and perceive information.

Self-efficacy theories yield diverse effects through four major processes. According to Bandura, these include cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes (Bandura, 1997). People who doubt their capabilities will regress from tasks. As it relates to freedom of speech on college campuses, if students feel they cannot voice their opinions they fall back from speaking on topics that are controversial in society.

Related Literature

An analysis of the literature reveals various opinions regarding freedom of speech on college and university campuses. The literature provides these varying opinions in the United States but may exist outside the United States as well. Colleges and universities have a task to educate their students and provide an opportunity for a well-rounded education. This responsibility involves a balance between academic freedom and the freedom to be exposed to new, and sometimes opposing ideas that may, at times, be offensive to the student. Therefore, colleges and universities have a responsibility to entertain freedom of speech in concert with academic freedom.

History of Freedom of Speech on College and University Campuses

The freedom of speech discussion on college campuses is not just a recent topic. The debate around freedom of speech has been around for a long time. The establishment of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915 came into existence because of bullying against university faculty for articulating unpopular views (Ramlo, 2020). Chemerinsky & Gillman (2017) asserted after World War 1 and before World War 2, anti-communist and anti-socialist movements created subjugation of freedom of speech on college and university campuses in the United States. Consequently, in the 1950s and 1960s, the civil rights movement brought speech tensions to university campuses in the United States. Additional campus protests against the Vietnam War started in the late 1960s accompanied by civil rights protests on university campuses in the United States (Ramlo, 2020). The current mentality on college and university campuses is similar to campus free-speech activities with those of the 1960s.

Subsequently, freedom of speech for college students is being infringed upon in today's culture. It has garnered a lot of attention. Interestingly, The Knight Foundation Report (2020) indicates that 68% of college students rate citizens' free speech rights as being extremely important to our democracy. The next most popular response of college students reports they are very important. In addition, The Knight Foundation Report (2020) reported that 65% of college students who believe freedom of the press is secure is down 16 percentage points from 2016 but is slightly higher than it was in 2017 (60%). College and university students are seeing confidence in freedom of expression waning. This is a concerning phenomenon among college and university students.

College and University Campuses at the Forefront of Freedom of Speech

College and University campuses have always been at the forefront of political and social debates in the United States. These debates have included, but are not limited to civil rights, resistance against wars, peace, racial issues, climate, environmental issues, and LGBTQ rights (Dahlum & Wig, 2021). Freedom of speech in colleges and universities is a fundamental right of students in the United States. Therefore, Novak (2020) asserts protection of the 1st Amendment is extended to state governments and public university campuses by the 14th Amendment.

Dannels & Rudick (2018) assert the dominant understanding of freedom of speech, and the idea upon which most U.S. jurisprudence in the twentieth century is based, in the notion that freedom means unrestricted or unchecked. However, a close examination of freedom of speech should seek to discover if it is building up or tearing down. This is a difficult task for educators to ascertain.

Academic Research Versus Debating Different Ideas

Consequently, there is a debate on whether colleges and universities should be a place of purely academic research or a place where ideas are introduced and debated (Thompson, 2021). This has caused tension in the academic setting. For example, Simpson (2020) conveyed how the university is a setting for explicitly academic communicative activities, related to teaching and research. These activities are to be protected by academic freedom. In addition, there are other expansive events, including commencement addresses, public lectures and debates, student society meetings, protests, political advocacy, and student journalism (Binder & Kidder, 2021). Therefore, these open activities should be embraced, accommodated, and protected against content-based limitations under the umbrella of free speech.

Standards of Free Speech

There are strong philosophical and educational grounds from which to argue untrue views provoking bullying and violence, and that deny basic humanity. Even so, there needs to be a discussion regarding these views to ascertain the flawed nature of the views. For example, White and Black Supremacy should be discussed to understand the moral flaws of both. Chemerinsky & Gillman (2017b) assert, that by law, campuses must allow all views and ideas to be expressed, no matter how offensive. In addition, the First Amendment means that the government cannot prevent or punish speech based on the viewpoint expressed. This also is a crucial aspect of academic freedom. In addition, Stephen & Williams (2018) contend students have rights as well as responsibilities, as does the leadership on their campuses. For example, members of a campus community should have the justification to request appearances by promoters of a given perspective, and others should have the right to present opposing opinions.

However, though freedom of speech should be applauded, there need to be standards in place at colleges and universities regarding freedom of speech. There needs to be an evident identification of academic freedom, including the idea of ideals at colleges and universities. This is why the United States has standards in place to guarantee freedom of speech (Dayton & Tarhan, 2021). In a democratic culture, like the United States, certain democratic standards and ideologies prevail. This is a substantial part of a democracy. In addition, there are some key values and principles one can look for direction in a disputatious sociopolitical climate. One example is found in the "Three Rs," delineated by Moses (2021). They include Relationship, Reciprocity, and Reasonableness. These three Rs provide principled considerations for campus leaders, to help them evaluate controversial views and justify their decisions.

Stifling freedom of speech could lead to lessened self-efficacy. Interestingly, mood also affects people's judgments of their efficacy. A positive mood enhances perceived self-efficacy, despondent mood diminishes it (Bandura, 1994). Significant dynamics emerge, which stimulate learning by modeling. Burke & Eargle (2018) contend significant dynamics are stimulating whether learning by modeling is successful. This includes but is not limited to people who are in a position of authority, people who are admirable or have a higher social status, and when imitating the behavior brings rewards.

Recent theories of free speech take a broader view, relating free speech to a more general constitutional theme of toleration reflected elsewhere in constitutional doctrine. For example, this theme is in the religious clauses of the 1st Amendment. In this article, Richards (2018) examines Frederick Shauer and Lee Bollinger. Shauer (2020) believes talk of an absolute 1st Amendment, however, is just, "talk." Shauer determines that freedom of speech has never been absolute. It was not absolute in the past. It is not absolute in the present. And, it will not be absolute in the future. Protections of freedom of speech are subject to be overridden by other considerations if they can be proven with sufficient evidence. An example of this was what happened in Charlottesville, Virginia in 2017.

Chong & Levy (2018) notice witnesses across the political gamut lament what they regard as a failure of the educational system to promote understanding and appreciation of the importance of free speech in a democratic society. The argument is the higher education system has failed to teach students what free speech involves. Because of this lack of education, students in colleges and universities do not have the correct perspective regarding free speech. This is why Cohen (2017) argues it is a mistake to deny the existence of psychological harms or that

such harms may justify limiting certain sorts of speech acts in certain sorts of circumstances, but that such circumstances are not part of the paradigmatic college environment.

Theories of Freedom of Speech

In addition to standards of freedom of speech, there are many theories of freedom of speech in the United States. A theory of freedom of speech is an interpretation of the constitutional value of free speech and how it relates to a context. Richards (1988) shares how Schauer and Bollinger are in critical search of a better theory of freedom of speech. However, one may argue both of their approaches are inadequate. Shauer is a Law Professor at The University of Virginia. He has written extensively on freedom of speech. Bollinger is the President of Columba University. He is one of the nation's foremost 1st Amendment scholars. Schauer's argument believes constitutional protection of speech cannot be justified, especially based on the 1st Amendment (Shauer, 2020). He believes freedom of speech is not absolute according to the 1st Amendment. For example, freedom of speech is allowed in most states unless states can show the speech may produce harm.

Bollinger agrees with Schauer regarding grounds for skepticism about how the state makes and enforces judgments of harm with its restricting speech. However, unlike Schauer, Bollinger recognizes that the same worries apply to state judgment restricting conduct (Richards, 1988). Therefore, speech and action are examined and concluded to be equally harmful when taken to the extreme. However, Bollinger believes the surest evidence of censorship or the suppression of ideas on college campuses is the disinvitation of controversial speakers (Bollinger, 2019).

The Marketplace of Ideas Theory of Freedom of Speech

One of the most popular rationalizations for defending free speech is that it helps promote the marketplace of ideas (Moses, 2021). This theory began with the writings of John Stuart Mill and John Milton. This theory commands that the free diffusion of viewpoints fashions a community progression where truth contends and eventually wins out over falsehood. Rosenthal (2017) stated, in the words of Supreme Court Justice William Brennan Jr., that America serves as a marketplace of ideas. Therefore, instead of formulating guidelines and systems aimed at silencing certain ideas, colleges, and universities ought to once again provide a forum for the marketplace of ideas to flourish. Truth, consequently, arises from interactive competition between ideas.

John Stuart Mill was one of the most important liberal political philosophers of the 19th Century. Cohen-Almagor (2017) stated, "By his own account, On Liberty (1859) was John Stuart Mill's most salient text (p. 566)." On Liberty is a book designed to celebrate individuality and freedom. Mill claims that no society is free that does not respect the absolute freedom of opinion and attitude of all people. Therefore, tolerance is an important aspect of this theory. This freedom includes practical, abstract, systematic, principled, or theological. In addition, this includes the freedom to express and publish these opinions (Cohen-Almagor, 2017).

Democratic Theory of Freedom of Speech

Alexander Meiklejohn argued that the 1st Amendment's primary purpose is to ensure that voters are free to engage in uninhibited debate and discussion to make informed choices about their self-government (Davis, 2020). This is the reason for the Constitution. The people have set this up for themselves. His theories were influential in his time and are still widely discussed

today. Baker (2011) asserts Meiklejohn wishes only to ensure that everything worth saying, if relevant to democratic government, can be said.

Hence, Meiklejohn contended anything worth saying if it is relevant to the democratic process can be said. Therefore, any speech related to self-government is acceptable (Bates, 2021). Consequently, the 1st Amendment is absolute. Thus, we are governed by ourselves because that is the way the government is set up in the United States. We are self-governed due to the nature of our government. Subsequently, all speech is healthy for the life of democracy in the United States.

Religious Theory of Freedom of Speech

Patton (2017) asserted all individuals should enjoy an unadulterated, or near-absolute, liberty of religious belief. But the difficult question is how far a defensible principle of religious liberty also includes the liberty of worship and observance. One must then decide to what degree, and under what circumstances religious liberty implies that individuals should be free to conduct themselves in ways that are guided by their religious beliefs.

Religion in the United States has become increasingly diverse. Dingle, et al. (2020) found, according to the Pew Research Center, from 2007 to 2014, the number of people who identified as Christian declined, while the number of people who identified as unaffiliated or non-Christian (e.g. Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu) increased. This change has altered the landscape of the religious and political landscape of the United States.

Freedom of religion, therefore, should be recognized as a human right. It is closely related to other forms of freedom (political, speech, etc.). Eko (2020) affirms this as he shares how the Supreme Court has interpreted the "establishment of religion" clause to mean the government may not establish an official religion or restrict Americans from exercising the right

of freedom of worship as they see fit. Further, it is noted an essential attribute of the United States is its 1st Amendment anti-establishmentarian system. This system impedes Congress from establishing an official religion akin to the Church of England. Moreover, the "establishment clause" of the 1st Amendment sets forth the anti-establishment mentality of the United States. Therefore, it states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people to peaceably assemble, and petition the Government for a redress of grievances (U.S. Const. amend. I.)."

Additionally, the government may neither promote nor restrain the free exercise of religion. This is a foundational principle in the United States. However, the question of religion's place in the college and university setting is the source of debate. Blum (2018) asserted for practical, theoretical, and ethical reasons, a recommendation for the category of "religious speech" be discarded. Further, religious discourse should be regarded no differently from any other kind of speech. Under this line of thinking, the right of religious people to voice their positions in explicitly religious terms is regarded as nothing more or less than the exercise of the general right to freedom of speech. This is an important foundation for the Biblical view of freedom of speech.

There are several Biblical views of free speech. Grudem (2010) stated, "Government power tends to corrupt people (1 Sam. 8:11–17; 2 Sam. 11:1–27; see pp. 86–87, 125)." Moreover, if a culture preserves freedom of speech, that tends to restrain government officials, because it makes them more accountable to the people. Therefore, freedom of speech allows people to speak out and criticize the government when they think it is doing something wrong.

Stott (2008) alleged most disputes are due to a misunderstanding. This misunderstanding is due to our malfunction in affirming the other person's point of view. Therefore, Stott concludes Christians should show love and not hate when it relates to freedom of speech. Philippians 2:3-4 (NIV) says, [3] Do nothing out of selfish ambition or vain conceit. Rather, in humility value others above yourselves, [4] not looking to your interests but each of you to the interests of the others.

Hate Speech and Bullying on College and University Campuses

Determining what delineates hate speech can be difficult. Therefore, Carlson (2020) quantified how hate speech is more than just an expression used to defame people based on their fixed identity characteristics. Furthermore, hate speech is a resource positioned by those with various forms of power to maintain their social, political, or economic dominance. Consequently, hate speech puts its victims in a subservient position (Carlson, 2020). This makes impartiality nearly unachievable. It is important to reconsider the near-absolute protection afforded to hate speech under the 1st Amendment.

Hate Speech on College and University Campuses

Jeremy Waldron has written about hate speech on college and university campuses. He teaches at the School of Law at New York University. Seglow (2016) engaged with the recent dignity-based argument against hate speech proposed by Jeremy Waldron. It is claimed while Waldron conceptualizes dignity less as an inherent property and more as speech undermines, his argument is nonetheless subject to the problem that there are many sources of citizens' dignitary status behind the speech of those whom they attack. Seglow (2016), therefore, suggests part of the harm of hate speech is it assaults our self-respect. Hence, the motives to esteem are honorable

motives, which can be shared with others. In addition, people have honorable motives to esteem themselves for their group and their privileges.

Subsequently, it is difficult, at times to delineate what is free speech and what is hate speech in today's culture. A close examination of what is deemed as hate speech is necessary, however, in today's culture. Whittington (2019) surmised it has been a customary acquiring in the public prose, going back decades, Americans articulate high levels of support for the freedom of speech hypothetically. However, when asked about the exact usages of provocative speech, that espousal begins to melt away. Subsequently, there are many variations of what is determined as hate speech. Howard (2019) asserts it does not simply denote speech exacting hatred. It is fully proper to articulate hatred at atrocious injustice. This is what makes it complicated for colleges and universities. Therefore, freedom of speech is a tenant of the United States, but the interpretation of what freedom of speech means is up for debate on many campuses in the United States.

Smith (2020) states that the free speech clause of the 1st Amendment, like the rest of the amendment and the other parts of the Bill of Rights, was extended to state governments and their public institutions through the Fourteenth Amendment. Further, the 14th Amendment's "equal protection" clause assures that there is no prejudice against speakers based on race or gender (Smith, 2020). However, the problem is that what might be one person's hate speech, maybe another person's protected viewpoint speech.

Consequently, it is easy to see why the true threat and viewpoint standards present college and university administrators in an arduous predicament. Furthermore, college and university administrators must protect all speech not regulated by time, place, and content-neutral restraints, unless it can be shown that the speech is treasonous, defamatory, presents a

true threat, or is not a protected viewpoint (Peterson, 2020). Because of the various viewpoints on hate speech, college administrators have a very difficult time delineating what hate speech truly is on their respective campuses. Conversely, Peterson (2020 shares how hateful speech is indefinable and subjective. No two people can agree on what constitutes hate speech. Furthermore, there is an arbitrary notion that hate speech and free speech are two different subject matters. In addition, Ceci & Williams (2018) share how the U.S. Supreme Court considers hate speech insufficient to allow government actors, which includes most colleges, to ban it. Instead, banned speech on state-supported campuses must be not only hateful but also imminently dangerous.

Dealing with Hate Speech on College and University Campuses

Therefore, a question arises regarding how to handle harmful speech. This is something that has to be addressed. Consequently, Etzioni (2019) implores that speech should not be regarded as forbidden unless there is substantiation that the speech candidly initiates substantial harm. This approach should command all groups. It should not just apply to protected groups. History references how in 2017 Justice Alito cited an opposing opinion by Justice Holmes from 1929. This opinion read, "Speech that demeans based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, age, disability, or any other similar ground is hateful; but the proudest boast of our free speech jurisprudence is that we protect the freedom to express 'the thought that we hate (Etzioni, 2019, p. 321).'" Therefore, the suggestion was the same measure should be employed to hate speech bans as to other speech. This is because they thwart speech rather than spotlight speech.

Hence, there is much debate regarding what is considered hate speech. Countries around the world have different views on what is considered acceptable speech. Howard (2019) cites the United Kingdom, where it is a criminal offense to incite racial or religious hatred. In addition,

while details differ, legislation of this sort exists in the preponderance of developed democracies, including Australia, Denmark, France, Germany, India, South Africa, Sweden, and New Zealand. In the United States, the United States Supreme Court has held uncompromising laws perpetuating discrimination based on viewpoint, especially those that suppress the expression of certain moral and political divisions, violate the 1st Amendment. This is even when the rationale for the suppression is to prevent any criminal violence that hateful speech might inspire. Howard (2019) cites Brandenburg v. Ohio 395 US 444 [1969] as an example.

Bullying on College and University Campuses

Although bullying has been widely recognized as a serious issue in elementary and secondary school and the workplace, little is known about the prevalence of bullying in postsecondary education. A comprehensive search of the peer-reviewed literature found 14 studies that reported the prevalence of bullying perpetration, victimization, or both in college and university students (Lund, et al., 2017). Nevertheless, a close examination reveals bullying is still a large issue in colleges and universities. For example, bullying may take several forms. Many times, bullying is exhibited by physical aggression (e.g., hitting, kicking, or punching), verbal aggression, (e.g., insulting someone), relational aggression (e.g., malicious gossip and deliberate social exclusion), or cyber aggression (e.g., verbal or relational aggression that takes place via the Internet, texting, or other electronic means) (Lund, et al., 2017). Hollis (2018) reported various research and workshops on workplace bullying in higher education led to an invitation for a four-day visit to Alamo Colleges, a network of multi-campus community colleges in San Antonio, Texas. This visit was the culmination of their year-long process to develop an anti-bullying policy, vet the policy, and then present the policy campus-wide.

Alternatively, Wilson (2019) shares how antibullying policies, as a kind of universal harassment rule, undercut the primary goal of provocation in preventing discrimination. Antibullying policies are so broad that they might become the tool of choice for repression. When this happens, it does not promote or encourage freedom of speech. However, Brick, et al. (2018) contend University anti-bullying policies should clearly outline resources available to students who are victims and perpetrators of bullying and seek to reduce bullying by peers and university instructors. The use of peer support programs and peer-based interventions may be instrumental in anti-bullying efforts across college campuses.

Cyberbullying on College and University Campuses

Cyberbullying is another issue colleges and universities are having to navigate. With the addition of social media, in recent years, students and faculty may succumb to a barrage of attacks on various platforms. Souza, et al. (2018) talked about cyberbullying, which is impacting colleges and universities. Sadly, cyberbullying is a serious and growing problem among university students and has a negative influence on victims' psychological development (Souza, et al., 2018). Additionally, Cyberbullying may be defined as individuals' repeated acts of aggression towards others to harm them with the use of different technological resources. The influence of university contextual variables (e.g., newcomer adjustment and feelings of well-being) on cyberbullying remains an understudied field, as research on the psychosocial predictors of cyberbullying still appears to be limited. University life can be stressful and cyberbullying contributes to this stress. Collen & Onan (2021) posit some researchers have theorized that cyberbullying has more destructive effects on a victim compared to conventional bullying. Therefore, cyberbullying is something to be seriously watched and studied.

Free Speech Codes, Safe Zones, and Safe Places on College and University Campuses

Even though the United States has standards and theories relating to freedom of speech, colleges, and universities have differing opinions regarding how to handle these standards. In response, colleges and universities, at times, seek to cocoon students due to the controversial aspect of many topics in the United States. This has led to the creation of free speech codes, safe zones, and safe places on college and university campuses. Verrecchia & Witherup (2020) share how these are a new phenomenon on college and university campuses.

FIRE (Foundation for Individual Rights) is an organization with a mission to defend and sustain the individual rights of students and faculty members at American colleges and universities. This includes the right to freedom of speech. Chong & Levy (2018) portioned how FIRE catalogs institutions corresponding to the level they institute and operate policies that restrict free speech. The vast majority of colleges and universities presently employ speech policies restricting substantial groupings of speech or those contravening speech in more limited ways. However, fewer than 5 percent of institutions are without any restrictive speech policies. Yet, Franks (2019) shares how the storyline of pervasive liberal prejudice and inhibition of conservative outlooks on college campuses is not true. The narrative continues with politicians, civil libertarians, university administrators, media outlets, and scholars. Hence, everyone does not feel their views are being suppressed. Although many groups would suggest their views are being suppressed.

Consequently, because of the differing opinions regarding what free speech entails free speech codes, safe zones, and safe places have been utilized on college and university campuses. For example, Herbeck (2018) noted by the mid-1990s, more than 350 colleges or universities responded to abusive or hateful speech on their campuses by adopting rules and regulations that

punish the use of derogatory names, an expression that stigmatizes or victimizes individuals, or singles out a person, group, or class of persons based on race, religion, gender, handicap, ethnicity, national origin, or sexual orientation.

Speech Codes on College and University Campuses

Speech codes are university regulations prohibiting expression that would be constitutionally protected in society at large. Combs (2018) contends constant restriction chills speech, deters the exchange of ideas, and potentially incentivizes threats. Therefore, colleges and universities should look for alternative means to neutralize the threat of violence due to the presence of controversial speakers on campuses. These speech codes restrict speech on college campuses. Speech codes began gaining attractiveness with college administrators in the 1980s and 1990s (Hudson, 2018). The debate is whether speech codes are unconstitutional and whether speech codes violate the 1st Amendment rights of students. Colleges and universities have historically been treated as sanctuaries for free speech. Thus, they have been researching laboratories of deliberation where various beliefs and philosophies can be considered and deliberated. This contributed to the search for truth and knowledge.

Chemerinsky & Gillman (2017) noted several of the more intense speech codes were contested in the courts. For example, judges ruled against procedures embraced by the University of Michigan (Doe v. Michigan, 1989), the University of Wisconsin (UWM Post v. Board of Regents, 1991), and Stanford University (Corry v. Stanford, 1995). Summarizing the judicial decisions of this era, Chemerinsky & Gillman (2017) concluded every court that scrutinized university speech codes found the codes unconstitutional because they violated the freedom of speech guaranteed by the 1st Amendment. There is, of course, a meaningful distinction between

structured endeavors by students to quiet speakers and guidelines espoused by colleges and universities to safeguard students.

The Argument for Safe Zones and Safe Places

The implementation of safe zones and safe places on college and university campuses has been something administrations have developed to help protect and nurture students. The term safe spaces first appeared during the women's rights movement, where it meant physical spaces on campus where women's issues could be discussed (Campbell & Manning, 2018). Supporters of safe zones and safe spaces on campuses hold that ensuring it helps support and frame students. This is done while they labor through cerebral or sensitive challenges. Because of this, students learn how to responsibly enter into difficult engagements and discussions. Proponents of safe zones and safe places provide students with the needed accommodations where they can go when they feel pressured or uncomfortable (Verrecchia & Witherup, 2020). These environments provide the needed innocuous environment to process the emotions they may be experiencing. Supporters believe this is essential for the welfare of students on college and university campuses.

Generating and sustaining an affirmative academic environment is of utmost importance for student welfare. Consequently, support of safe zones and safe places is paramount to student welfare. McKeachie (1974) asserted anyone who can take discouraged, dispirited teachers, mental health aides, or prison officials and revive their hope and vigor has done a great deal. Therefore, a teacher's enthusiasm and energy are very important. Hence, it can be argued it is the responsibility of the administration at colleges and universities to educate teachers and students regarding freedom of speech. However, it can be debated whether safe zones and safe spaces are a solution to the struggle many students are facing.

Therefore, the question arises whether safe zones and safe spaces are seeking to accommodate or educate. Muldoon (2017) expressed the apparent tension between the community role and intellectual role of colleges can be resolved or at least mitigated if we make a clearer distinction between speech and community endorsement of speech. In this essay, it is argued the apparent tension between the community role and intellectual role of colleges can be resolved or at least mitigated if we make a clearer distinction between speech and community endorsement of speech (Muldoon, 2017).

The Argument Against Safe Zones and Safe Spaces

Opponents argue such interventions overprotect students, impede free expression, and weaken rigorous critical thinking. For example, Schroeder (2018) asserts obsessive management of speech has led to friction between the rights of minorities to fair and equal education, environment, and opportunity and the rights of citizens of the United States to exercise freedom of speech, even when that speech is demeaning to others. This, as opponents argue, is done in the name of emotional support. Therefore, it could be argued student comfort takes priority over difficulty or challenge. Promoting growth and discovery are important aspects of the learning experience for college and university students. Some would argue safe zones and safe places infringe upon this purpose. For example, Gray (2019) notes he is of the attitude colleges and universities should have the purpose of growth and discovery. They should be a place where students can learn about ideas and beliefs that have never been revealed. The ability to learn about new ideologies and philosophies in a conducive environment helps everyone. It helps students increase their knowledge and become more educated. In 2018, a report published by FIRE found that 89.7 percent of American colleges have policies that restrict the freedom of

expression of their students and faculty. This is something that needs to be addressed by higher education administrators because, ultimately, the solution is not restricting free speech.

An argument by Welshon (2020) asserts because of the 1st Amendment, universities are legitimately posited to accept even mean-spirited intolerance in campus public forums even if not in the classroom. He then recommends three responses to weaponized intolerance on campus that are consistent with the 1st Amendment: (a) denunciation and protest (b) provision of safe space, and (c) an affirmation of academic values, norms, and standards. In addition, Welshon (2020) rejects three frequently encountered responses to mean-spirited intolerance as inconsistent with the 1st Amendment: (a) heckler's vetoes, (b) student speech codes, and (c) speaker bans. He argues one response, disruptive protest, that falls short of a heckler's veto is legally permissible for students and faculty members but is ruled out for faculty members by academic norms and professional standards.

Pujols (2016) shared how in 2015, discourses linked to freedom of expression have amplified in some American Universities, such as the University of Chicago, Missouri, Northwestern University, Columbia, Colorado, Yale, Princeton, and Harvard. Many students at these universities are requiring safe spaces without provocative speech that could hurt the feelings of anyone. Many of these students are demanding what they term hate speech be prohibited. Jackson (2021) says this is injecting in students what John Dewey called habituation or passive acquiescence. Hence, democratic societies require active citizens and not passive citizens. Therefore, many people are not in agreement with safe zones, or spaces, on college and university campuses. Many feel this is hindering the advancement of knowledge for students.

Conversely, Etzioni (2019) agrees with those who suggest homes, and dorm rooms might be such spaces. However, it should not be acceptable to demand professors or speakers avoid

topics because some in the audience might find them troubling. As a result, it is contended the right kind of trigger warning and safe zones and safe spaces do not prevent speech but allow some people not to be exposed to challenging ideas. So, it seems a reasonable accommodation to those who feel assaulted by some speech to have safe zones and safe spaces.

In addition, many people surmise safe zones are detrimental to the pursuit of knowledge in the academic arena. It is argued the protection provided by safe zones hinders a student's ability to be presented with opposing viewpoints. Etzioni (2019) shares how The University of Chicago's Dean of Students wrote a powerful, often-cited letter to the incoming 2020 Class, which opposed trigger warnings and safe space measures not so much because they limit speech but because they stand in the way of the university's mission to expose students to new and challenging ideas. However, the question remains whether trigger warnings and safe zones truly prevent such exposure.

Bias on College and University Campuses

In addition to free speech codes, safe zones, and safe places, bias reporting systems are in place at many college and university campuses. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education Bias Response Team Report (2017) defines a bias reporting system as any system identified as such, or that provides a formal or explicit process for or solicitation of reports from students, faculty, staff, or the community, and concerning offensive conduct or speech that is protected by the 1st Amendment or principles of expressive or academic freedom. In addition, this report shared that during 2016, at least 231 Bias Response Teams were publicized on American university or college campuses. Included in these teams are 143 from public institutions and 88 are at private institutions. The report, also noted, that there are at least 2.84 million students enrolled in these schools.

Higher education administrators incur many reports regarding outrageous conduct on their campuses. Over the last 3 years, the advocacy organization Speech First has filed six lawsuits challenging the constitutionality of bias response teams because they violate free speech (Ambriz, et al., 2022). It can be argued there needs to be prompt, fair, and impartial discipline for instances of physical misconduct, true threats, and harassment while fostering an environment in which offensive speech would be answered with more speech. Conversely, Yockey (2019) shares how colleges and universities with Bias Response Teams have chosen to go further, often deploying administrators to investigate the incidents and, if the respondent is found guilty, they are summoned for a hearing or an educational discussion, which may more closely resemble a reprimand than an enlightening exchange of views.

Bias Response Teams

Chappell-Williams (2011) shares Cornell's Bias Response Program was implemented in 2001 to help create an inclusive educational and work environment. This is one of the first Bias Response Teams in the country. Since then, Bias Response Teams have been created on many college and university campuses to combat outrageous conduct. Conversely, Goldstein & Lukianoff (2021) cite Bias Response Teams began to emerge toward the end of the first great age of campus speech codes, roughly 1985 through 1995. Hence, LaPeau et al. (2018) observed, that on the mercurial side of the situation, hundreds of colleges and universities have embraced bias response teams.

Therefore, Bias Response Teams may serve as locations fostering partnerships among student affairs professionals, faculty, and campus administrators. The goal is to respond to issues of power and privilege on a college campus in ways that are not punitive or judicial. Further, most Bias Response Teams are designed as voluntary or collateral committees for campus

educators resulting in a lack of formalized power and resources for this work. Speech First is an organization that has been formed to combat the abuse of Bias Response Teams on college campuses. It specializes in lawsuits challenging Bias Response Teams. Speech First has filed suit against bias response policies maintained by the University of Michigan, the University of Texas, the University of Illinois, Iowa State University, and the University of Central Florida (Goldstein & Lukianoff, 2021)

The Impact of Bias on College and University Campuses

Analysis has detailed the existence and effects of bias in higher education institutions. Students and faculty experience upshots of bias in university settings (Lincoln & Stanley, 2021). This impacts the environment of colleges and universities. A common form of bias reported on college campuses is known as microaggressions (Miller, et al., 2018). Therefore, Miller, et al. (2018) assert microaggressions are short, daily exchanges of sending demeaning messages to [oppressed groups] because they belong to [an oppressed group]. Consequently, compared to more blatant forms of bias, microaggressions are subtle and insidious, often leaving the victim confused, distressed, and frustrated and the perpetrator oblivious of the offense they have caused.

Enigmatically, Boysen & Vogel (2009) showed how 38% of professors reported explicit and implicit bias in the classroom. In addition, stereotypes were the largest type of bias reported, making up 47% of all the cases. The most frequently reported forms of bias were related to sexual orientation (20%) and race (19%). Therefore, it is concluded the results of this study showed that 38% of professors noticed student bias in their classrooms in the last year. In addition, explicit (27%) and implicit bias (30%) occurred with similar frequency (Boysen & Vogel, 2009).

It is important to note that many students, faculty members, and groups outside of higher education promote freedom of speech. These groups loathe any response from college and university administrators. Further, some deprecate what they view as impermissible hate speech and insist colleges and universities respond visibly (Ferguson, et al. (2017). This confuses college and university campuses and needs to be clarified by higher education administrators.

In many of the bias incidents found in higher education at colleges and universities, the role of the 1stAmendment protections signifies a crossroads of disparity among various communities in how some students, faculty members, and groups external to higher education argue for absolutely free speech and detest any response from college administrators; others deplore what they view as impermissible hate speech and insist that institutions respond visibly (Miller, et al., 2017). Subsequently, Miller, et al. (2017), in their article, sought to review several types of bias and bias incidents in higher education, followed by a consideration of student affairs administrators' attempts to protect free speech and promote diverse and inclusive campus environments. In addition, a recent formation of bias response teams on campuses was reviewed. In addition to peer-reviewed sources, news articles are cited, given the rapidly changing landscape on this topic and the lack of published scholarship examining bias response teams.

Notes on 1st Amendment

The final, approved, version of the 1st Amendment states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances (1st Amendment, n.d.)." The 1st Amendment ensures the right to articulate viewpoints and knowledge. The 1st Amendment, also, ensures

freedoms concerning religion, expression, assembly, and the right to petition. It forbids Congress from endorsing one religion over others and constricting an individual's religious traditions.

Traditionally, colleges and universities have been a place where the marketplace of ideas has been allowed to exist (Blocher, 2008). However, there is a trend on college and university campuses to limit the rights of students to live out the right to freedom of speech. Historical advancements have impacted the course of 1st Amendment practice. The issue of safeguarded speech at public schools has also been directly impacted by values and societal happenings in United States history. For example, the late 1960s were a tumultuous time and led to an increase in political activism among the younger population (Walsh, 2010).

The Foundation of American beliefs on Freedom of Speech

The 1st Amendment is the foundation for American beliefs regarding freedom of speech. Geegan, et al. (2020) noted, that the 1st Amendment is many times labeled as the foundation of American beliefs because of the constitutional safeguards included in the 1st Amendment. The 1st Amendment allows the area of viewpoints and perspectives to provide equal protection under the law of the land. This is an objective James Madison articulated in The Federalist Papers No. 10. Madison stated, "Liberty is to faction, what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be a less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, which is essential to animal life because it imparts to fire its destructive agency (Madison, 1787, para. 5)."

Therefore, according to Geegan, et al. (2020), it is not surprising the United States in 2015 ranked first, across the board, in a 38-country Pew Research Center survey measuring the percentage of citizens who believe that free speech, a free press, and uncensored use of the Internet is important. More than 30 years of research into Americans' professed democratic

values point to an overarching conclusion that Americans support the principles of the 1st Amendment nearly universally when considered abstractly but support them significantly less when applied to specific situations (Kuklinski et al., 1991). Herein lies a large problem when it comes to interpreting the 1st Amendment and rite of passage to freedom of speech in the United States and college and university campuses.

After a century of dramatic Supreme Court jurisprudence on the issue, speech enjoys greater protection in the United States than ever before. Bohannan (2020) says that 50 years ago, the Tinker case confirmed the free speech rights of students. In addition, it identified the classroom as the marketplace of ideas. It was affirmed by upholding the students' right to dispute the Vietnam War. Tinker was one of many Supreme Court decisions to establish the 1st Amendment as a supporter of movements for freedom, justice, and equality (Bohannan, 2020).

Human Liberty and the 1st Amendment

Arguably, the most forceful spokesperson for construing the 1st Amendment to include a right to speak on equal terms was Thurgood Marshall (Adelman, 2020). Marshall was a champion of free speech. The key to the 1st Amendment, according to Marshall, was not formal equality, but expressive equality. Sadly, according to Adelman (2020), the court became increasingly conservative and less interested in promoting open public expression and debate.

Grudem (2010) shares how the 1st Amendment is important because it guards against disproportionate power in the federal government. Therefore, one of the principal ambitions of the builders of the Constitution was seeking to thwart the kind of exploitation of government power they had experienced from Great Britain. The 1st Amendment was also a significant part of protecting human liberty. For example, the preface of the Constitution said that one of the

purposes of the government and the Constitution was to secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity (Grudem, 2020).

This is why Feldman (2019), in his article, explores the ramifications of the historical inter-relationship between free expression and democracy for campus no-platforming disputes. Starting in the late 1930s, the U.S. Supreme Court dramatically invigorated the protection of expression in reaction to a paradigm change in democracy, going from a republican to a pluralist democracy (Feldman, 2019). Consequently, one cannot hypothesize pluralist democracy without accounting for the political community that belongs and participates.

Today, by contrast, according to Bohannan (2020), free speech has become an incantation for alt-right groups. Frequently, these groups array vile ideas on college campuses (Bohannan, 2020). Although hate speech is harmful, eradicating it is difficult under current 1st Amendment law, and many question whether efforts to limit hate speech could harm the very marginalized groups they are intended to protect. The challenge is determining what is hate speech without doing away with freedom of speech.

Constitutional Law in America Regarding Freedom of Speech

The Supreme Court has been consistent in upholding the right to freedom of speech over the years. Gordon (2020) shared how, broadly, since the 1960s, the Supreme Court has been consistent in upholding freedom of speech as a central constitutional value. What remains questioned and vague is the scope of academic freedom. This is something universities, not the courts, are responsible for defining. In this article, Gordon (2020) examines how on September 19, 1969, the Board of Regents of the University of California fired Angela Yvonne Davis and the ramifications of this on free speech. Davis was fired because of her Communist Party

membership. The courts ruled her firing illegal and then she was later fired again because of her use of subversive language.

There are vast differences between advocates for free speech and those against freedom of speech. Chamlee-Wright (2018) contends free speech advocates counsel against any effort to regulate speech. Free speech advocates argue, that even in defamatory cases of wrong or belligerent speech, the dangers of speech regulation outweigh the perceived benefits. This is particularly true in a university setting. Therefore, the exchange of ideas is essential to the mission of higher education according to the proponents of free speech. On the other hand, opponents of free speech argue the university setting is the wrong place to hold a hardline free speech position Additionally, instead of promoting learning, opponents of free speech argue free speech inhibits learning (Chamlee-Wright, 2018).

Although freedom of speech is something that has, historically, been a freedom in the United States, Kenyon (2014) examines assumptions within negative approaches to free speech and finds little reason to support the idea that free speech exists primarily when the state is not directly limiting speech. In this analysis, arguments about free speech should be reframed. Content plays a large part in whether arguments exist regarding freedom of speech. Therefore, Chong & Levy (2018) concluded their analysis confirms a general penchant for tolerance continues to make liberals more tolerant than conservatives of controversial speech on both the left and the right. It also shows how rapidly these alignments can change when people's attitudes toward tolerance become more sensitive to their attitudes toward the content of the speech they are judging. This conclusion decries different groups have different views depending on the content of what is being said on college and university campuses.

Winning the Battle for Freedom of Speech on College and University Campuses

Jackson & Oleksiyenko (2021) share how today's higher education scholars, leaders, practitioners, and policymakers are seeking to grasp, and address, campus problems to help strive to understand and address campus issues helping fortify institutions and institutional effectiveness. In addition, the goal is to improve their ability to serve students and communities. Therefore, to understand and win the battle for free speech in the United States, one must understand the historical groundwork of the concept. Even though freedom of speech is explained, imparted, and bestowed as a cornerstone of American democracy there are limitations. In addition, as freedom of speech is an essential human right, there are also limitations to the effectiveness of this right. Hence, a critical investigation of this important precept of American democracy through a historical lens reveals that freedom of speech has restrictions (Commodore & Wheatle, 2019).

According to Moore (2021), the U.S. Constitution forms the theoretical and legal foundation for the republic. The core political ideals of American democracy, of popular sovereignty, limited government, judicial review, separation of powers, checks and balances, and federalism are enshrined in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights (Moore, 2021). Therefore, it is vital freedom of speech on college and university campuses is not deterred. Winning the battle for freedom of speech will impact everyone, regardless of their point of view, political persuasion, or religious affiliation. The freedom in the United States to share one's opinions and points of view is inherently unique to the United States. Without freedom of expression, democracy is a pipedream and autocratic systems begin to materialize. This is not sustainable in a nation committed to natural rights, not granted by the government, but protected by Constitutional law. Disagreements over the reach of the 1st Amendment, as well as comparting

visions of truth, indicate a healthy democracy. Consequently, in this type of environment disagreement, dispute, and open-mindedness are encouraged.

Franks (2019) claims that America's campuses are in the midst of a free speech crisis has been made so often and so emphatically that it has widely become accepted as fact. The claim conservative viewpoints are being sadistically inhibited on college campuses is as untrue today as it was in the 1970s. While there have been a handful of violent incidents involving conservative speakers, the vast majority of universities have experienced no such controversies (Franks, 2019).

However, there are certain traits among students in colleges and universities that may impede freedom of speech. Russomanno (2019) suggests the traits of the current generation of students are at the core of understanding any decline in campus speech freedom. This is not only in the observable manifestations of the erosion but also in the underlying appreciation of free speech values. Colleges and universities may move toward more speech-friendly campuses by analyzing historical, legal, and social science literature. Laurence Tribe calls this a "connect-the-dots approach," which was originally associated with principle and social, political, or cultural developments (Russomanno, 2019).

Charlie Kirk has asserted if conservative ideas were truly that bad and unpopular, then why does the left try to censor them? Why do activists shout down speakers? If no one liked our ideas, no one would follow us, attend our speeches, or engage with us. It is posited it happens because the left is scared conservatives might be winning (Kirk, 2018). In Kirk's book, he examines how the left has pulled this off and how conservatives can resurrect the heart and soul of colleges and universities as safe places for the teaching and expression of all ideas, not just those endorsed by the liberal agenda.

Consequently, this applies to liberal scholars and ideas as well. For freedom of speech to be truly on display, liberal ideas, and philosophies must be allowed as well. Moore (2021) pointed out the American pragmatist John Dewey deemed these conversations as fundamental. He shared these conversations are fundamental for several justifications. First, John Dewey maintained in a relentlessly transforming context, fixed truths or rigid theories are detrimental to people. However, dynamic, flexible thinking and fresh insight can help people work through complex social and political challenges. This is essential to a healthy society. In addition, Dewey believed dialog across different social groups is important for groups to see the opposing argument and be challenged to see a different point of view. Moreover, it cultivates a sense of commonality, according to Dewey (Moore, 2021). Therefore, the goal of freedom of speech is to create an environment where people do not feel isolated. This helps students cultivate a well-rounded point of view on the issue being debated.

Summary

This research paper describes what is known about the right of free speech being hindered on many college and university campuses in the United States. Many colleges and universities have enacted policies restricting freedom of speech. There is an ongoing debate in the United States regarding what delineates free speech. This debate has landed on college and university campuses. This writer believes what has, historically, been considered free speech is now considered hate speech. The debate about hate speech is causing tremendous controversy on college and university campuses.

It is important to understand there is a difference between freedom of speech and hate speech. Freedom of speech is a right every American has as a result of the 1st Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The 1st Amendment and 14th Amendment work together to

preserve individual liberty from government oppression. These Amendments work together to protect human rights in the United States.

Whittington (2019) implored that if colleges and universities are going to be able to seek the truth, students need to have situations where they can ponder complicated questions and seek the answers they need wherever they might be found. Therefore, colleges and universities should be in a position for ideas that may be experimental and independent of the orthodox. Many of those ideas will turn out to be wrong. But it will be the process of searching, and critical inquiry that will over time expose the weaknesses and the strengths of ideas both inside and outside the mainstream. This is why Whittington (2019) concludes it is the freedom to reconnoiter concepts on college and university campuses that makes them indispensable as mediums for enlightening the comprehension of the natural and social world. It is, therefore, society ultimately reaping the value of having these accepted beliefs tested by argument and evidence.

Goldberg (2018) contends as a standardizing theme, colleges, and universities are the prototypical place for conflicting philosophies. Hence, one could reason safeguarding this space, where views cannot only be expressed but also challenged, takes on special importance. This is especially important because surrounding communities are polarized and many people are reluctant to engage with someone with a different viewpoint.

Conservative thinking on college and university campuses has come under fire in recent years. When the "hot topics" of LGBTQ, gender, Biblical Marriage, and abortion are addressed, it is perceived as hate. Students have the right to free speech, even if they disagree with the person who may be speaking. Religious liberty is a cornerstone of the United States. The First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution are integral to freedom of speech in the United States. Feldman (2019) opines one cannot understand free expression in America without

accounting for a twentieth-century transition from a republican to a pluralist democracy. Hence, it is extremely obvious there has been a shift in the way free expression is viewed.

A review of the literature shows a need for more well-rounded voices in the arena for promoting freedom of speech on college and university campuses. What is free speech? This question has been an issue recently. Therefore, this writer believes more research needs to be conducted to set forth a more fair and balanced approach to free speech in today's cultural climate on college and university campuses. There needs to be a way for conservative and liberal voices to have the stage for honest dialog to take place on college and university campuses. One voice should not shut down the other voice. There is room for honest conversations. This was the goal of the 1st Amendment of the United States. All people should have the right to share their views regarding situations. This means that many of the viewpoints may not be popular. However, unpopular, no one should be silenced. The literature proves, however, that these views should not illicit hate or harm to the opposing viewpoints on college and university campuses.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

This case study explores how free speech on college and university campuses in Southtown, USA affects student self-efficacy. This chapter delineates the explanation of the research design, the research questions, and my research position regarding interpretive framework, and philosophical, epistemological, and axiological assumptions. The procedures for the study will be presented, along with the recruitment plan. Further, data collection utilizing interviews and focus groups will be discussed. Credibility, dependability, conformability, and transferability are discussed as aspects of trustworthiness at the end of the chapter.

Research Design

A qualitative study is appropriate for my study because human perception and understanding was examined (Stake, 2010). I conducted a deliberate inquiry into whether freedom of speech has been affected on Christian and secular campuses in recent years. Looking at students from a real-world perspective is an asset to my qualitative study. Qualitative research gives me freedom and comprises reviewing the meaning of people's lives, as experienced under real-world conditions (Yin, 2018).

I used case study for my research design. The case study offers an in-depth look at the topic of freedom of speech on college campuses and allows me to do research in a real-life setting. Yin, Merriam, and Stake are the three commonly cited authors who provide procedures to follow when conducting case study research.

Flyvbjerg (2011) contends case study research has been around as long as recorded history. Stake's work has been significant in defining the case study approach to scientific inquiry. He offers three types of studies. These types include intrinsic, instrumental, and

collective (Stake, 1995). My case study ascertains if there is a specific issue, problem, and concern over freedom of speech on college and university campuses. This is called an instrumental case, according to Stake (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Therefore, I conducted an instrumental case study between Secular University and Christian University in Southtown, USA. I explored how freedom of speech, or lack thereof, affects students at secular and Christian colleges and universities.

Research Questions

Central Research Question

How has freedom of speech on college and university campuses affected the self-efficacy of college students in faith-based organizations?

Sub-Question One

What positive effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?

Sub-Question Two

What negative effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?

Sub-Question Three

What are the perceptions of administrators and educators regarding how campus freedom of speech affects student self-efficacy?

Setting and Participants

Spiritual life clubs at Secular University and Christian University in Southtown, USA are the setting for this study. The leaders of the spiritual life clubs were interviewed. In addition to

students, I interviewed faculty and staff sponsors of the various clubs on each campus. The Southtown metropolitan area is a large and diverse city in the United States.

Site

Founded in 1927 Secular university is the leading public research university in Southtown, USA. Secular University awards baccalaureate, master's, professional, and doctoral degrees. Classified as a Tier One institution by its Highest Research Activity ranking by the Carnegie Foundation, Secular University is also one of only 300 institutions nationwide to receive the Foundation's highest designation as a community-engaged university.

Christian University has approximately 3,000 students with a 16:1 student-faculty ratio. It has 77 majors offered with an average class size of 25. In addition, 95% of classes are led by faculty, not teaching assistants.

Participants

The intent was to interview 10 spiritual club leaders from each campus. In addition, the intent was to form focus groups on both campuses. Subsequently, I sought to interview staff from both campuses.

<div align="center">

Researcher Positionality

</div>

The interpretive framework I will use for this study will be social constructivism. Constructivism necessitates that people extract meaning from their encounters to actively construct their knowledge. This section also includes my philosophical assumptions as a qualitative scholar.

Interpretive Framework

Social constructivism is a theory of knowledge in sociology and communication theory that examines the knowledge and understanding of the world that are developed jointly by

individuals (Amineh & Asi, 2015). The most important elements of social constructivism include the assumption that human beings rationalize their experience by creating a model of the social world and the way that it functions, and the belief in language as the most essential system through which humans construct reality (Leeds-Hurwitz, 2009). Therefore, this study was conducted with leaders of spiritual life clubs on secular and Christian college campuses in Southtown, USA to determine the behavioral and environmental detriments to freedom of speech on the 2 campuses.

Philosophical Assumptions

In any kind of study, certain beliefs are brought into the study. Ontological, epistemological, and axiological assumptions comprise the makeup of philosophical assumptions. Explaining these philosophical assumptions provides a basic explanation of my core beliefs. Reflection on these philosophical assumptions will give a greater explanation of my worldview and how it influences my research.

Ontological Assumption

As a Christian, pastor, and professor in a Christian Theological School, the way I define the nature of reality is from a Biblical ontological position. My position is that God is real, and the Scriptures are absolute truth. Therefore, if God is as He is described in Scripture, He must exist. God expects us to treat others with respect. My decision to do a case study on freedom of speech stems from my ontological assumption God expects us to treat everyone with respect.

Epistemological Assumption

Admittedly, I am post-positivist. Consequently, my beliefs and values will influence what I am observing in the study. My conservative beliefs will impact the study. Therefore, bias is unavoidable. However, my goal was to come as close to the truth as I could when it relates to

freedom of speech on college and university campuses. Post-positivists strive to disrupt the predictability that can occur in traditional interviews. Knowledge, therefore, is socially constructed. Hence, knowledge is gained through understanding the people being researched lived realities and experiences (Kankam, 2019).

Axiological Assumption

I hold to the axiological assumption that values and beliefs are social constructs as I bring my values and biases into the research. I am a conservative Christian. In addition, I am a pastor and professor at a Christian university. Furthermore, I am a believer in the right to freedom of speech based on the 1st Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The analysis of the findings and identification of themes are shaped by my values, biases, and individual experiences, but I have sought to honor the testimony of my participants.

Researcher's Role

I chose these two universities because I live in the Southtown, USA area. In addition, I have connections at Christian University and have researched the secular university in previous Doctoral seminars. There is a sense of connectedness to both of these universities because of my connection to Southtown for several years. However, I did not know the majority of the participants who were involved in the interviews and focus groups.

The primary goal of an instrumental case study is to better understand a theoretical question or problem (Algozzine & Hancock, 2016). I facilitated a discussion via interviews and the use of focus groups. My goal was to discuss the topic of freedom of speech. I am aware that my personal and professional background experiences may influence the study. However, I will not influence the people being interviewed or the focus groups with my bias regarding freedom of speech. Real-world situations will be analyzed in this qualitative case study.

Procedures

Necessary site permissions and approval from the Liberty University Institutional Review Board (IRB) were necessary to begin the research. I recruited spiritual leaders for interviews and focus groups at Christian University and Secular University. The data was examined after the interviews and focus groups were completed.

Permissions

Approval from the IRB was sought from Liberty University. I waited to proceed with the research until approval was gained from the IRB. This included permission from the administration at Secular University and Christian University.

Recruitment Plan

I obtained the contact information for the leaders of the various spiritual life clubs at Secular University and Christian University from various avenues on each campus. Baptist Student Ministry (BSM), Campus Outreach (Southtown, USA), Fellowship of Christian Athletes, The Navigators, and Young Life are the spiritual life groups on the campus of the Christian university. Baptist Student Ministry (BSM), Bridges International (non-denominational), Campus Outreach (Presbyterian), Catholic Newman Association, Chi Alpha Fellowship, Christian Science Organization, Church of Christ, CRU (Campus Crusade for Christ), ELCA (Episcopal and Lutheran), Hillel (Jewish), Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, Salt and Light (Lutheran), Mission 24 (non-denominational), Reformed University Fellowship (Presbyterian), United Campus Ministry of Greater Southtown, USA (Presbyterian), and Wesley Foundation (Methodist) are spiritual organizations at the secular university.

Once approval was given from the IRB and the two sites, I emailed various leaders on the campuses of Secular University and Christian University in Southtown, USA. Only those who

had completed an informed consent form and agreed to participate participated in the interviews and focus groups. In addition to students, I interviewed faculty and staff on each campus.

After the interviews and focus groups were conducted, analyzation of the data was done, and I developed themes based on the results of these data. Therefore, I functioned as an observer of the research information being collected. Yin (2009) shared how case study evidence may come from six sources: documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts.

Once the interviews and focus groups were completed I contrasted students' perceptions of freedom of speech on their respective campuses. I am the only person who has seen the transcriptions from the interviews.

Data Collection Plan

Data collection involved interviews and focus groups. In addition, data collection involved interviews that will follow up with open-ended interview questions. Subsequently, focus groups will be utilized to collect data.

Interviews

Open-ended questions were utilized during the interviews with spiritual leaders on the secular and Christian campuses. Interviews are one of the most important sources of case study information (Yin, 2009). In addition, Yin (2009) construed interviews should be conversations that are funneled rather than controlled questions. Chadwick (2008) emphasized that there are three fundamental types of research interviews: structured, semi-structured, and unstructured. Structured interviews include in-person dispensed questionnaires, in which a list of prearranged questions are asked.

Practically speaking, I used semi-structured interviews for collecting data. This is the most common form of data collection in qualitative research. I formally adopted the role of an interviewer during this process (Yin, 2016). My goal was to be organized and structured, yet open and adaptive when interviewing and analyzing the data (Stake, 2010). Unique information held by the person being interviewed was sought. I utilized Microsoft Teams for the interviews. The interviews were around thirty minutes long. The interviews were crucial to finding out the difference between Secular and Christian universities regarding freedom of speech on their respective campuses.

Individual Interview Questions

1. You have heard the expression, "being able to roll with the punches." Describe a time when you had to do that. CRQ

2. Please describe the degree you are working on and what you would like to do when you graduate. CRQ

3. Describe the state of freedom of speech on your campus. CRQ, SQ1, SQ2

4. What would you change regarding freedom of speech at your campus? SQ1, SQ2

5. Describe any challenges you have faced with freedom of speech on your campus. SQ1

6. Describe what has impacted your view of freedom of speech. SQ2

7. Before coming to campus, what has shaped your thoughts regarding freedom of speech on your campus? SQ2

8. Describe any challenges you have encountered with faculty and staff on your campus. SQ2

9. Describe any training you have received from the campus regarding freedom of speech. SQ2

10. Describe how you handle the controversial speakers and subjects on your campus. SQ3

11. What has been your experience with safe zones on your campus? SQ3

12. What else would you like to add to your experiences regarding freedom of speech that we have not discussed? SQ1

Good questions do not necessarily produce good research, but poorly conceived or constructed questions will likely create problems that affect all subsequent stages of a study (Agee, 2019). I sought to find out how freedom of speech on college and university campuses has influenced self-efficacy among students. The questions were intended to be non-threatening to participants.

Questions two through five dealt with the students' attitudes and behavior regarding freedom of speech. Questions six through nine sought to determine what students have observed regarding freedom of speech. Questions ten through eleven sought to determine how the students have handled the stresses that come with the freedom of speech on their campuses.

In addition, the intent was to find out how freedom of speech on their respective campuses has been impacted positively or negatively. According to most qualitative researchers, the reality perceived is impacted by social, cultural, historical, and individual contexts. Therefore, it was important to seek an array of people to describe, explore, or explain phenomena in real-world contexts (Kortsjens & Moser, 2017). Hence, understanding the context was important for this study.

Subsequently, it is important to decipher the participant's worldview. Gutierrez & Park (2017) contend worldviews comprise a class of beliefs that together constitute a philosophy of life. This philosophy of life forms an individual's prescriptive and proscriptive beliefs (i.e., values), his or her existential or metaphysical beliefs (i.e., the basic construction and purpose of

reality), and his or her evaluative beliefs and appraisals of reality. College students are just beginning the process of further development of their worldview. This is critical to the future of freedom of speech.

Individual Interviews Data Analysis Plan

Notes are likely to be the most common component of a database (Yin, 2009). While doing research these notes may take various forms. The form of the notes may include handwritten, typed, on audiotapes, or in word-processing or other electronic files, and they may be assembled in the form of a diary, on index cards, or in some less organized fashion (Yin, 2009). To codify is to arrange things in a systematic order, to make something part of a system or classification, or to categorize (Saldana, 2013).

Yin (2016) identifies five steps for data analysis. These include compiling data, disassembling, reassembling, interpreting, and concluding. Therefore, I began by using the information collected from the individual interviews (compiled data) to begin the process of data analysis. Then, I disassembled the data collected from the interviews. I assigned labels or codes to the fragments of information (Yin, 2016). From this point, I reassembled the information into lists and other tabular forms. This led to interpreting the reassembled data from the interviews. This led to making conclusions regarding the impact of freedom of speech on college and university campus students.

As a part of the data analysis, I employed thematic analysis. This complemented the five steps for data analysis (Yin, 2016). Thematic analysis is an appropriate and powerful method to use when seeking to understand a set of experiences, thoughts, or behaviors across a data set (Braun & Clarke, 2012). I conducted a deductive approach to the research. Hence, deductive

approaches use a pre-existing theory, framework, or other researcher-driven focus to identify themes of interest (Braun & Clarke, 2012).

Focus Groups

Current research in the area of focus groups has been limited, and counseling researchers who have implemented focus groups as part of their methodology have, in general, not yet seemed to realize their full potential as a research process (Goodrich, 2019). There are few guidelines, however, surrounding how focus groups are to be utilized.

Upon the conclusion of the individual interviews, participants were informed of the date and time of the focus group. The focus group enabled me to generate participants' perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes about their experiences.

Focus Group Questions

1. What is the first thing that comes to your mind when you think of freedom of speech? CRQ

2. What topics do you believe are off-limits when it comes to freedom of speech on your campus? SQ1

3. How does freedom of speech affect your experiences as a student on campus? SQ1

4. Describe one change that would improve freedom of speech on your campus. SQ1

5. How involved are the administration and faculty regarding freedom of speech? SQ1

6. What do you think of when you hear the term "hate speech.?" SQ2

7. Describe your experiences with hate speech. SQ2

8. Describe how you have processed controversial topics that may be perceived as hate speech. SQ3

9. What else would you like to add regarding freedom of speech on your campus? SQ3

Focus Group Analysis Plan

Specifically, the analytical techniques that lend themselves to focus group data are constant comparison analysis, classical content analysis, keywords in context, and discourse analysis (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2008). I used constant comparison analysis for analyzing focus groups. Three major stages characterize the constant comparison analysis, which includes open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Dickinson, et. al., 2009). However, I focused more on coding when analyzing the findings of the focus groups. I used these findings to understand how faculty and staff at Secular and Christian University recognize the meaning of self-efficacy and how other inputs impacted their self-efficacy.

At the very least, I drew together and compared discussions of similar themes. In addition, I examined how these relate to the variables within the sample population. Immediately after the focus group, I compiled notes regarding my thoughts and ideas about the focus group. This assisted with data analysis and, if appropriate, any further data collection.

Faculty and Staff Focus Group

I sought to conduct a focus group with faculty and staff at Secular University and Christian University. Open-ended questions were utilized during the focus groups with faculty and staff. In addition, I wanted the freedom to add questions spontaneously during the interviews.

Faculty and Staff Focus Group Questions

1. What do you believe the greatest need is in higher education today? SQ1

2. In a perfect world, how should freedom of speech be handled on college and university campuses? CRQ

3. How does the topic of freedom of speech on college and university campuses make you feel? SQ1

4. Describe how you view the state of freedom of speech on your campus today. SQ1

5. What influences your perspective regarding freedom of speech on college and university campuses? SQ2

6. How do decisions from upper-level administrators affect freedom of speech on your campus? SQ2

7. What changes do you believe are needed on your campus regarding freedom of speech? SQ2

8. Do you believe any topics should be off-limits when it comes to freedom of speech on college and university campuses? SQ2

9. Over the past few years have you seen any positive/negative changes regarding freedom of speech in higher education? SQ3

10. How should requests for controversial speakers on college and university campuses be handled by administrators? SQ3

11. What is your opinion about safe zones on college and university campuses? SQ3

12. Is there anything you feel is important regarding freedom of speech on college and university campuses that we have missed in this discussion? SQ3

Faculty and Staff Focus Group Analysis Plan

I used the same format for analysis with faculty and staff that I used with the student focus group. Three major stages characterize the constant comparison analysis, which includes open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Dickinson, et. al., 2009). I used these findings to

understand how adjunct faculty at Secular University and Christian University recognize the meaning of self-efficacy and how other inputs impacted their self-efficacy.

Subsequently, I drew together and compared discussions of similar themes. In addition, I examined how these relate to the variables within the sample population. Immediately after the focus group, I compiled notes regarding my thoughts and ideas about the focus group. This assisted with data analysis and, if appropriate, any further data collection.

Data Synthesis

Stake (2010) contends we do much of data synthesis intuitively, by using common sense by following certain routines, triangulating, and following the patterns of other researchers, As this happens patterns and themes will emerge. Sometimes we invent new ways to analyze and synthesize the data.

I sought to create various points of similarity and difference between Secular University and Christian University regarding freedom of speech perceptions on the respective campuses. The holistic analysis makes comparisons and asks questions. I sought to comprehend the, perceived, problem of free speech on college and university campuses. This involved discovering the causal factors that may have caused the problem with free speech. This process allowed me to focus on the core phenomenon of free speech and create the consequences and situational factors that have impacted free speech on college and university campuses. This was accomplished by interviewing spiritual leaders, conducting focus groups with spiritual leaders, and conducting focus groups with faculty and staff. The same protocol of data analysis was used for spiritual leaders and focus groups.

In addition, I used some form of coding for the information obtained. Coding is the process of ascertaining data as belonging to or representing, some type of phenomenon. This

phenomenon may be a concept, belief, action, theme, cultural practice, or relationship (Tracy, 2013). Therefore, the process of coding is central to qualitative research. It involves making sense of the text collected from interviews, observations, and documents. Coding involves amassing data into small categories of information. Beginning researchers tend to develop elaborate lists of codes. Lean coding was used.

Content analysis were used to determine the relationship between Secular University and Christian University as it relates to freedom of speech. Values coding were, also, used. According to Saldana values coding consists of three elements, value, attitude, and belief to examine a participant's perspectives or worldviews (Onwuegbuzie, p. 134).

<div align="center">**Trustworthiness**</div>

Trustworthiness addresses several key components. Credibility, dependability confirmability, and transferability are discussed in this section.

Credibility

If research is credible, people are confident in using the data and results in making decisions. Korstjens & Moser (2018) define credibility as the confidence that can be placed in the truth of the research findings. Hence, credibility establishes whether research findings represent believable material derived from the data and is a correct interpretation of the participants' original views.

Member checks were used in this research. The credibility of research is incredibly important for qualitative research. This is the reason member checks were implemented. This process increases the reliability of this case study because colleges and universities will be examined to validate the information regarding free speech on their campuses.

Consensual validation seeks the opinion of others. I examined the different opinions regarding free speech at Secular University and Christian University in Southtown, USA. Seeking consensual validation is important in a case study on free speech because all sides need to be presented for validity to take place.

Transferability

The transferability of qualitative research refers to the external validity and utility of findings or research in other contexts (Yin, 2018). Transferability ensures that other scholars can utilize the work for further research. By explaining in detail, the data analysis techniques and processes, other researchers should be able to perform the same study under similar circumstances. Anyone can compare Christian universities versus secular universities regarding freedom of speech via spiritual clubs on campus. However, it is not assured transferability will take place in other environments.

Dependability

Interviews and focus groups can be repeated in future case studies. My procedures offer a reasonable assurance of dependability because I am using traditional methods. A thorough and detailed description must be provided regarding the procedures involved in completing the said study (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The description of my participant selection, data collection methods, and data analysis and synthesis are thorough enough that they may be replicated with the same population and procedures.

Confirmability

Korstjens & Moser (2018) share that confirmability is the measure of the findings of the study that can be confirmed by other researchers. Hence, the data and interpretations of the findings will be derived from the data that is collected through the interviews of Christian leaders

of the spiritual clubs and focus groups. Therefore, I utilized triangulation to help confirm the data

collected from interviews and focus groups. Evidence that has been triangulated is more credible

(Stake, 2010).

The research questions kept my biases from influencing my research. In addition, more

than one source of information was being utilized. Triangulation was the main aspect keeping

my biases from influencing the study.

Ethical Considerations

There is the potential for controversy because of the climate in today's culture regarding

free speech. I weighed everything against the 1st Amendment of the United States. I presented

the perceptions of the participants related to free speech on college and university campuses. I

kept in confidence information from the questionnaire and interviews. I utilized informed

consent. In addition, I used pseudonyms. The data was well organized and only available to me. I

kept the information after the study.

I obtained permission from the IRB to conduct the interviews. I informed participants

from Secular University and Christian University of the nature of my study. They were informed

other students would be interviewed from their campus.

<div align="center">

Summary

</div>

The goal of this chapter was to outline the research method used to answer the research

questions. A discussion of the procedure, study participants, data collection, and interview

questions outlined the specifics of how the study was conducted and who participated in the

study. A case study design was used to analyze members of spiritual life clubs on the campuses

of Secular University and Christian University in Southtown, USA. I used the five steps of data

analysis (Yin, 2016). In addition, I utilized coding as a way of organizing the data received from

the interviews and focus groups.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

The purpose of this case study is to examine how free speech on college and university campuses in Southtown, USA affects student self-efficacy. The purpose of this section is to present the results of the data analysis. Results of the study and a summary will be included.

Participants

At Christian University I was able to interview 7 students for the interview process. At Secular University I was able to interview 7 students. For the student focus group, I had 4 participants at Christian University. For the student focus group at Secular University, I had 4 students. At Christian University I had 5 faculty and staff participate in the focus group. At Secular University I had 4 faculty and staff participate in the focus group.

Circumstances prevented me from having the same people in my student interviews and student focus groups. Students were out for the summer. Therefore, I had to rally to get any students I could get to commit to interviews and focus groups. Thankfully, I was able to build trust with influential student leaders on each campus to help me to find people to conduct the student interviews and focus groups via Zoom.

Table 1

Interview Participants – Christian University

Name	Organization	Degree Path
Edward	United Minds/BSM	Psychology
John	Student Government/YL	Business Management
Don	Navigators/Campus Outreach	Biology
Ginger	Honors College/BSM	Medical Humanities
Ida	Student Government/BSM	Psychology
Karis	Greek Life Chaplain/BSM	Christianity
Doug	Student Government/BSM	Nursing

Table 2

Interview Participants – Secular University

Name	Organization	Degree Path
Kim	BSM	Human Development
Wyatt	Christians of Secular University	Mechanical Engineering
William	Canterbury of Secular University	Marketing
Bob	Muslim Student Association	Clinical Engineering
Deborah	BSM	Business Management
Mike	BSM	Psychology
Monica	Canterbury of Secular University	Communications

Table 3

Focus Group Participants – Christian University

Name	Organization	Degree Path
Edward	United Minds/BSM	Psychology
Ginger	Honors College/BSM	Medical Humanities
Nick	Worship Band/BSM	Engineering
Jennifer	BSM	Education

Table 4

Focus Group Participants – Secular University

Name	Organization	Degree Path
William	Canterbury of Secular University	Marketing
Wyatt	Christians of Secular University	Mechanical Engineering
Deborah	BSM	Business Management
Kim	BSM	Human Development

Table 5

Faculty Group Participants – Christian University

Name	Area
Chris	Law School Faculty
Sam	BSM Director
Bob	College of Arts/Humanities
John	Assistant Professor of Education
Lisa	Professor/School of Christian Thought

Table 6

Faculty Group Participants – Secular University

Name	Area
Sylvia	BSM Director
Jim	Associate Dean of Students
Sienna	Dean/School of Education
Abel	Director for the Religion Center

Results

This section includes the results of my data analysis. The results are categorized into themes. The data was triangulated through three data collection methods including student interviews, student focus groups, and faculty focus groups. Interviews were conducted with each

participant for approximately 30 minutes via Microsoft Teams. Interview questions were open-ended to allow participants to share all information they believed to be relevant to each question. The interview questions facilitated participants' viewpoints about how freedom of speech is impacted on their campuses. The student and faculty and staff focus groups were conducted via Microsoft Teams and lasted for an hour.

After the data was collected and coded from the interviews and focus groups, three themes and sub-themes began to surface. There is a need for more training regarding freedom of speech. There is a disconnect between faculty and students. In addition, there is a need for more openness with tough topics on both campuses.

Need for More Training about Freedom of Speech

The interviews with students, and focus groups with students and faculty, at both campuses revealed a need for more training to be conducted for students. Each student at Secular University and Christian University indicated they had not received training since coming to the campus from faculty and staff.

Silvia from Secular University shared how there is a need for a process for outside groups related to freedom of speech. Jim stated that there was no awareness of policies and that the administration needs to be more proactive than reactive. Sienna indicated that there is a desire to follow rules, but that the rules and processes need to be communicated. Abel responded that there needs to be a better definition of hate speech communicated to the students. He stated there is a tendency to want to hide behind policies that have not been communicated very well to the students. Therefore, there is a need to have these policies communicated to students, but it should not inhibit the ability of students to have honest conversations on campus regarding controversial topics. Sienna echoed the sentiment of Abel by asserting a topic should not be banned just

because it is a sensitive topic. One of the biggest needs at Secular University, according to Jim, is a need for procedures for outside groups to follow that are coming onto campus. In addition, Jim indicated that there are misperceptions regarding discipline that need to be cleared up with students.

Education Regarding 1st Amendment

Chris, a faculty member from Christian University, indicated a need for more funding related to freedom of speech. John, a faculty member from Christian University, stated there needs to be a process for inviting outside speakers and an education process teaching students the five protections under the 1st Amendment. In addition, Chris stated, "We're losing our freedom of speech in more and more ways indirectly." Further, minimal concerns about hate speech were discussed by Lisa from the faculty at Christian University.

John, from Christian University, stated the five protections of the 1st Amendment should create an atmosphere for people to freely express their opinions without retribution or penalty. Many of the students interviewed from both campuses did not grow up in the United States. Therefore, they did not have a very good understanding of the 1st Amendment. Wyatt, from Secular University is from China and indicated he would like some form of training regarding the 1st Amendment and how it relates to freedom of speech.

Education on How to Disagree, Agreeably

Nick, from Christian University, indicated that he felt tough topics were pushed to the side and not discussed. Ginger indicated she felt like tough topics were not discussed because Christian universities are typically more conservative and topics like immigration are not talked about. However, the vast majority of students from Christian University want to engage in talking with their peers about these topics. Kim, from Secular University, stated since they are

such a diverse community, it would be really good for people to be able to hear other people's life stories and thought patterns regarding controversial topics.

Deborah, from Secular University, indicated a desire and need for students to be able to share their viewpoints in a respectful manner. Wyatt, from Secular University, indicated he would like to have a system where someone would moderate different viewpoints to help people enter into discussions about controversial topics in a civilized manner. William, from Secular University, shared how he felt the freedom of speech helped people learn from each other in a better way. Consequently, freedom of speech is not a way for someone to go off on someone because they do not agree with them regarding a topic or stance that is taken.

Disconnect from Faculty and Students

Students from Secular University and Christian University indicated there was a disconnect between faculty and staff. While students at both universities indicated they would like to have open dialogue, the overwhelming majority of students felt there should be a place for open dialogue regarding tough topics. Although Secular University had more openness regarding controversial topics, the students still indicated a disconnect with faculty and staff.

Mike, from Secular University, indicated there was an openness, but that openness had consequences. The process for inviting outside groups was clouded for the students at Secular University as well as Christian University. Although protests happened at Secular University when people like Matt Walsh came to speak, the students still felt it was important for them to have the right to have someone like him come to speak on campus. William indicated there was a controversy about a movie entitled, "What is a Woman?" that was shown on Secular Campus last year.

Jennifer, from Christian University, indicated she felt, "When it comes to the higher-ups…they do not treat everybody equal." She went on to say that many topics are "swept under the rug." This would pertain to the LGBTQ+ community and anyone who does not hold to Christian principles. From the student's perspectives, they want to create conversations around controversial topics, but there is no support from the administration of the university. Jennifer, also, gave the example of trying to get a historically black fraternity on campus. Christian University now has a black fraternity, but it took a long time to get it approved. And she indicated no one knew why it took so long to get the fraternity on campus.

In addition, Nick indicated many things at Christian University are "taboo" to talk about. He stated it is obvious there are people on campus who adhere to different opinions of the university, and the administration "sweeps these opinions under the rug." Nick stated it would be shut down or not talked about if someone had a controversial topic to be discussed. Controversial topics mentioned by Christian University students included: pro-choice, Black Lives Matter, LGBTQ+, immigration, political opinions, race, and critical race theory. Interestingly, the students interviewed stated they did not adhere to many of the controversial topics, but wanted a forum to discuss these topics civilly. The consensus is that this approach would get shut down by the faculty and staff at Christian University.

Need for Professors to Model Freedom of Speech

Kim, from Secular University, indicated some professors are really good about listening to other people's opinions, even if they do not agree with them, but other professors can, "kind of give a cold shoulder maybe to a certain idea or opinion that they do not necessarily respect." Further, Kim, from Secular University, indicated that many of the professors at Secular University were closed-minded when it came to the expression of controversial ideas. Sadly,

Kim, from Secular University, went on to say in the Honors College, "If you do not agree with what the professor says about certain interpretations, they may invalidate your opinion." Deborah, from Secular University, indicated she felt faculty and staff do not get involved unless freedom of speech crosses the line or things get bad.

Interestingly, Jim, a staff member at Secular University, indicated the more experience or tenure a staff member has the more they may be able to get away with more regarding freedom of speech regarding controversial topics. Further, he indicated you always have the sense that you have to watch what you say, as a staff member because people can easily get offended. And as a person of color, he has to be even more careful what he says. Sadly, Abel said sometimes he gets the feeling that higher education is really hiding behind policies that they have created so they do not have to do anything.

Edward, from Christian University, shared how one of his professors stopped the class one day and allowed the class to talk about gun violence. Edward went on to say, "…some individuals were very passionate about their ideas and all we did was hear them out respectfully… and no one was uncomfortable." Ida, from Christian University, shared, "I had some professors who were definitely more vocal about how they felt about certain things…I had a professor who claimed that he was open to hearing all sides, but I don't know if he really meant that just because he was a little more critical of certain people who felt a certain way."

Private University Versus Public University

At Secular University the discussion revolved around actions around controversial topics and speakers. This issue was not various topics. The issue revolved around actions. Sienna, a faculty member at Secular University said she has found students feel very open to freely talk about their different points of view. In fact, Sienna went on to explain that the standards of the

campus specifically say that simply the fact that people disagree or will be upset is not enough to stop the conversation. The issue is if the discussion disrupts the flow of the students on campus. However, although there is a great deal of openness, Abel, from Secular University said public institutions are in a delicate situation right now where they have to allow for space for things to be said.

Chris, a faculty member at Christian University stated when asked if any topics were off-limits, "….as long as Dr. _____ is here at President we will continue to uphold the values of the university. So, there are certain topics that would go against those values. For example, I do not see us hopefully ever having an LGBTQ+ XYZ or whatever it is club because of that." Chris, another faculty member, stated, "And as a private institution we are able to do that." Therefore, Chris stated they would continue to uphold the 1st Amendment but also continue to uphold their moral values as a university and limit certain clubs and organizations. Sam indicated other organizations that are limited are other religions. Cultural clubs, but not other religious clubs are permitted at Christian University.

Need for More Openness with Tough Topics

Bob from Secular University acknowledged certain topics were not discussed. While a prevailing theme from students at Secular University was a need for more openness, all the students interviewed said they had experienced no problems, personally, when it pertained to freedom of speech. Sylvia, a faculty member from Secular University stated, "Sometimes the openness is shocking" when it comes to freedom of speech on the Secular University campus. As a faculty member at Secular University, Jim indicated he was not worried about topics being discussed. He was worried about actions. Sienna, a faculty member at Secular University, indicated that no topic was off limits and no topic should be banned from being discussed just

because it is a controversial topic. The question, therefore, according to Sienna is, "Does it interrupt the campus?"

Conversely, Jim, a faculty member at Secular University indicated there was a feeling amongst the faculty that they had to watch what they say, and faculty that are people of color need to be cautious. Abel alluded to the same thing. He stated people of color had to be cautious about what they say on campus. The discussion amongst the faculty and staff and Secular University had a consensus around them needing a process and coordinated procedures for outside groups to come in on the campus.

John, from Christian University, indicated the school was, "Open…but not open" when it came to freedom of speech on the campus. Ginger indicated there was a need for more freedom of speech on the Christian University campus. Doug went a step further by stating there was no outlet for openness at Christian University for controversial topics. Bob, a faculty member from Christian University, stated that two views always had to be presented, and "the position of the school will be pushed." Interestingly, Lisa, a faculty member from Christian University, stated there needed to be freedom to have disagreements without worrying about retribution. Sam commented that Christian University had cultural organizations. Further, Bob, from Christian University stated, "Topics are not out of bounds. Positions related to topics are out of bounds."

There is a Need to be Proactive and not Reactive

As a faculty member at Secular University, Jim stated the administration needed to be more proactive rather than reactive. Jim, from Secular University, stated that many times an outside group has been contracted to come in on campus before the administration knows anything about the event. Kim, from Secular University, stated that maybe during orientation, the administration could communicate how students need to respect other people and listen to

everyone's opinions. Monica, from Secular University, suggested developing a program for students to anonymously share their views at various times throughout the school year. This would give students an opportunity to share their views without retribution or pushback. Therefore, William, from Secular University, expressed it would be helpful to know ahead of time what the correct way to respond to someone who does not agree politically or on a controversial topic.

Karis, from Christian University, expressed a need to understand how to create conversations regarding controversial topics. She indicated that because there is not a clear process, she feels a need to be very careful what she says regarding controversial topics on campus. She used the term, "Old School _____ Thinking" to describe how she felt regarding this mentality. As a leader on campus, Ida, at Christian University stated it would help to have a clear and defined process explained regarding what is expected regarding freedom of speech. She stated, "We were never explicitly told that we couldn't say certain things, but it was always kind of expected that a leader remain impartial."

Forums for Intentional Discussion of Controversial Topics

Doug, from Christian University, stated there is not necessarily an outlet for freedom of speech on the campus. Further, he suggested having meetings and open forums as a proactive way to honor freedom of speech to give students an outlet for discussion. Immigration, student debt, religion, politics, pro-life, pro-choice, traditional marriage, LGBTQ+, Black Lives Matter, Critical Race Theory, transgender, and the border crisis were topics that were mentioned on both campuses that were wanting to be discussed. Because of the diversity of the campus, Wyatt, from Secular University, stated it would be helpful to have productive discussions regarding controversial topics. These conversations could be mediated, and students could be taught a

healthy respect for other's opinions. Kim, from Secular University, said, "Since we're such a diverse university, like people from many different ethnicities, it would be really cool to be able to hear other people's life stories."

At Christian University, Nick indicated the taboo nature of talking about topics like LGBTQ+. He said there is a huge need to talk about it because it is happening all around the world around us. Ginger interjected that the campus at Christian University has a Pro-Life Club, but topics like race, LGBTQ+, and pro-choice are not talked about. In addition, Ginger stated she would like a conversation on immigration because it is such a hot topic right now. Ginger went on to say she felt if there were an environment where they were allowed to have a faculty or staff person to help guide the discussion regarding controversial topics it would be helpful. It would be great having a planned and designated place where conversations like this could happen.

Research Question Responses

Central Research Question

How has freedom of speech on college and university campuses affected the self-efficacy of college students in faith-based organizations? Self-efficacy is made up of a person's attitudes, abilities, and cognitive skills (Cherry, 2020). This is why self-efficacy plays such a large role in how people perceive what is happening to them. Hence, people react to real and perceived obstructions to their freedom of speech.

At Secular University self-efficacy has not been adversely impacted with students. Kim said, "Since we are such a diverse university, like people from many different ethnicities will come to Secular University, it is just cool to be able to hear other people's stories." Deborah stated that the state of freedom of speech on campus was, "really good." She stated that she had not experienced any challenges to freedom of speech. Again, Mike stated that he has had no

issues regarding freedom of speech. Kim said, "….the overall attitude towards freedom of speech is you can say whatever you want, but if you disagree with them, they may think poorly of you and not treat you well." Therefore, there is freedom. It has ramifications but does not impact self-efficacy at Secular University.

At Christian University self-efficacy has been affected in a more negative way. In response to the question, "Do you believe controversial topics are off-limits at Secular University," Edward said, "Yes." Jennifer said, "There's not really conversations about controversial topics and there are definitely people on our campus that do not feel accepted." Jennifer went on to say sometimes controversial topics get "swept under the rug." Nick continued by saying, "Basically, it is kind of a taboo thing to really talk about controversial topics (LGBTQ+, transgender, etc.). When they are brought up it is obvious people on campus want to push them to the side." Nick went on to say, "I think with the limiting factor on campus, it is sometimes kind of hard to hear other people's opinions because it is not talked about."

Sub-Question One

What positive effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus? At Secular University there are many positive effects regarding the nature of freedom of speech on their campus. Students at Christian University shared many positive aspects regarding the nature of freedom on their campus as well.

Kim indicated that freedom of speech is great because you learn more. This is very important to her. Wyatt stated Secular University is very fair when it comes to freedom of speech. The students felt there was freedom to share different opinions on campus. Deborah stated she felt like being able to share differing opinions in a respectful manner is something that is happening at Secular University.

Ginger, from Christian University, stated, "I think that the freedom of speech on our campus, at least for me personally, is great. I think a lot of Christians on campus think it is great, but for other populations, it is not open." Therefore, there is a positivity for Christians to share their beliefs and opinions, but not for other groups. Don stated that he had experienced no problems at Christian University. Ida stated certain kinds of speech are more acceptable than other kinds. She stated, "We were never explicitly told that we could not say certain things, but it was always kind of expected of you as a leader to remain impartial."

Sub-Question Two

What negative effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus? The negative effects for students at Secular University revolve around the process of introducing controversial topics and speakers on campus. At Christian University the students have a desire to discuss controversial topics but do not have the avenues to do this.

Sub-Question Three

What are the perceptions of administrators and educators regarding how campus freedom of speech affects student self-efficacy? The overarching perception from administrators at Secular University is they are reactive rather than proactive when it comes to students and freedom of speech. The overarching perception of administrators at Christian University is that there is nothing that is impeding the freedom of speech granted by the 1st Amendment.

<div align="center">

Summary

</div>

This chapter discussed the results of the data analysis from Secular University and Christian University in Southtown, USA. I have outlined the process of interviewing 7 students from each campus, conducting focus groups with 4 students from each university, and 5 faculty and staff from Christian University, and 4 faculty and staff from Secular University. This process

allowed for an in-depth look at both campuses and their views on freedom of speech. A description of all participants is provided.

I utilized coding to develop 3 themes that came out of the interviews and focus groups with students, faculty, and staff. I triangulated the data to develop the three recurring themes. I have referenced the interview and protocol structure for the interviews and focus groups via Microsoft Teams. From the coding process, 3 themes emerged: Need for more training about freedom of speech, Disconnect from faculty and students, and Need for more openness with tough topics.

The development of the themes relied upon thematic analysis. The participant's experiences formed the outcome of the study. The results of the study showed that Christian University has more limited freedom of speech than Secular University.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine how suppression of free speech on college and university campuses in Southtown, USA affected student self-efficacy. In this chapter, I will provide a summary of the findings, a discussion of the findings and the implications in light of the relevant literature and theory, an implications section, and an outline of the study's delimitations and limitations. Further, I will provide recommendations for future research.

Discussion

In this section, I demonstrate how the results of the qualitative case study were interpreted by discussing the themes that emerged during my data collection. Bandura's (1997) theory of self-efficacy served as the theoretical framework of this study. I will talk about how the results should be interpreted, what they mean for policy and practice, and what they mean for both theory and practice. The discussion will end with the study's limitations and delimitations.

Summary of Thematic Findings

After data was collected from student interviews, student focus groups, and faculty and staff focus groups from Secular University and Christian University three themes developed from the analysis. Consequently, there is a need for more training regarding freedom of speech. There is a disconnect between faculty and students. In addition, there is a need for more openness with tough topics on both campuses.

Interpretation of Findings

I conducted interviews with 7 students at Secular University and Christian University. In addition, I conducted a focus group with 4 students from Secular University and 4 students from Christian University. Five faculty and staff participated in the faculty focus group at Christian

University and 4 faculty and staff participated in the focus group at Secular University. From the interviews and focus groups data was collected, analyzed, and interpreted.

Students Want Freedom of Speech

Students from Secular University and Christian University have the privilege of freedom of speech. Self-efficacy is impacted more on Christian University than Secular University. Ida, from Christian University, shared that she wanted more dialogue on controversial topics. Doug, from Christian University, said there is "pushback" over "hot" topics. Moses (2021) shared how one of the most popular realizations for defending freedom of speech is the marketplace of ideas, which began with the writings of John Stuart Mill and John Milton. The idea is that truth arises from interactive competition between ideas.

Although certain topics are not discussed, openly, at Christian University students did not feel their freedom of religion was impeded. Nor did the students at Secular University. The students had very open discussions about religion, even with those who did not agree with their perspective. This was true even with the Muslim and more liberal spiritual life leaders at Secular University. All of the students interviewed interjected that Christians should show love, even when their belief is not accepted by everyone.

The Central Research Question guiding my study was, "How has freedom of speech on college and university campuses affected the self-efficacy of college students in faith-based organizations?" The results of the interviews and focus groups indicate self-efficacy is affected more on the Christian University campus than on the Secular University campus. The openness for controversial topics is more prevalent at Secular University. The majority of students at Secular University indicated they felt no restrictions regarding freedom of speech on their campus.

Based on the responses from the student interviews and focus groups conducted at Christian University and Secular University, self-efficacy is negatively more at the Christian University campus. The overwhelming majority of students at Secular University indicated they felt no restrictions regarding freedom of speech. Conversely, at Christian University more restraints were imposed upon students regarding freedom of speech. Doug, at Christian University, stated there was no outlet for openness. Edward, from Christian University, specified a desire for more freedom of speech. At Christian University, Ida said she would like to have more dialogue. Ginger stated there was not openness to outside opinions. Doug, at Christian University, went on to say there was no openness for other beliefs. And, Karis, at Christian University stated there was not an openness to opposing views.

Further, in the focus group at Christian University, Jennifer indicated a desire for peaceful conversations. Nick, from Christian University, said he would like more openness for students to discuss tough topics. For example, he stated that LGBTQ+ discussions were off-limits for students to discuss on campus. Ginger stated she would like tough topics like immigration to be discussed in an open forum and indicated a desire for planned conversations with mediators on these tough topics. Edward, from Christian University, indicated there was an openness in friend groups but not in public forums for tough topics. Further, Edward indicated a desire for more openness by administrators at the campus. Edward went on to say there was an awkwardness with the administration regarding controversial topics. Ginger, at Christian University, indicated this desire as well for more openness by administrators.

Self-efficacy was not impacted as much on Secular University. Kim indicated she experiences an openness to discuss controversial topics on campus. Bob, from Secular University, indicated the problem he has experienced has been with outside groups. However,

even though there have been some problems with outside groups, there was no indication Bob's freedom of speech rights had been impacted. Wyatt, from Secular University, stated he believed Secular University was fair when it came to freedom of speech. His perspective is from someone who grew up in a Communist country and did not experience the freedoms that he has experienced at Secular University. Interestingly, Mike noted that Secular University had openness, but with consequences. He was appreciative of the freedom of speech, but said that freedom comes with people disagreeing, at times, and protesting. However, even though there are consequences to expressing his beliefs, he believed the university was fair.

Several students at Secular University indicated their biggest concern was hate speech. Wyatt, from Secular University, stated the need for more conversations and less hate speech. And he indicated there were misinterpretations of hate speech. Daniella, from Secular University, also indicated misinterpretations of hate speech. Because freedom of speech is so prevalent, there was a consensus on the need for discussions of what is appropriate. For example, there is a concern amongst students interviewed at Secular University not to make students feel ostracized. For example, Deborah indicated when discussing politics, there is a need to make sure both sides are presented.

Hate Speech and Bullying were not Prevalent at Christian University or Secular University

The topics of hate speech and bullying were not as prevalent as I thought they would be based on the research. This may be because of the difficulty, at times, in delineating what is free speech and what is hate speech in today's culture. For example, Bob, at Secular University cited the time an outside group came on campus with a demonstration. While they were on campus they were shouting, "Muslims are going to hell." Although Bob shared this story with me, he did not promote this as hate speech toward his religion. This is why Howard (2019) asserted freedom

of speech is a tenant of the United States, but the interpretation of what freedom of speech means is up for debate on many campuses in the United States.

Sub-Question One asked, "What positive effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?" Wyatt stated he has had no problems with staff. William corroborated that there are no restrictions to freedom of speech at Secular University. Kim, from Secular University, shared how freedom of speech is great because it causes students to learn more. Freedom of speech, according to Kim, is a positive aspect at Secular University because it causes students to learn about other points of view.

Wyatt said Secular University is very fair when it comes to Freedom of Speech. William was encouraged because Secular University is welcoming to the LGBTQ+ community. Kim is encouraged by the state of freedom of speech at Secular University because there is an environment to create positive conversations between opposing points of view. Kim stated, "Since we are such a diverse community, it is great hearing other people's life stories." Wyatt shared that everyone has a right to share their thoughts and backgrounds at Secular University. Deborah stated she appreciated the atmosphere of Secular University that championed freedom of speech. She stated that having grown up in Rwanda, the freedom of speech she has experienced at Secular University was very well received.

John at Christian University referenced the George Floyd incident several years ago. He said there was a large gathering at Christian University and people spoke about this and other issues going on at the time. It was very well received. Don felt like he could talk about just about anything he wanted to talk about on campus. Further, Don shared an experience he had talking with some students at Christian University about abortion. He is pro-life and felt like he was

well-received by the people on campus who did not agree with him regarding his views on abortion.

There is a pro-life club at Christian University. Ginger shared how, every year, they do a cemetery for the unborn on campus. The club puts a bunch of crosses in their open fields in the middle of campus representing the thousands of lives that have been lost due to abortion. This practice is not challenged. However, Ginger did indicate if a pro-choice group wanted to stage a presentation similar to the pro-life club, it would be frowned upon.

At Secular University there were many positive effects regarding the nature of freedom of speech. Students indicated they did not feel any restrictions regarding freedom of speech at Secular University. The students indicated they felt they could discuss any controversial topic on campus as long as respect was shown.

At Christian University, students felt their freedom of speech was more limited. The consensus amongst students and faculty is there is freedom of speech regarding values adopted by the university. Therefore, the values of the university must be presented if a controversial subject is being discussed. However, controversial subjects are not discussed as widely in Christian University as they are in Secular University. The students indicated they would like more open, public, conversations surrounding controversial subjects but do not feel there is freedom to do this. A discussion ensued in the focus group with students at Christian University around having mediated discussions on campus regarding controversial subjects.

In addition, no one at Secular University or Christian University has heard of "safe zones." Further, there were no instances of bullying mentioned during the interviews and focus groups. This may be because the universities are in the South. Accordingly, there was no

mention of speech codes at either campus. In addition, there was no mention of bias reporting systems on either campus. Nor was there any mention of bias response teams.

There is More Openness to Freedom of Speech at Secular University

Sylvia, a faculty member from Secular University, stated all topics have been discussed on the campus. She stated that it is sometimes shocking how open the university is to certain topics being discussed on campus. Several students at Christian University stated there is no openness to other beliefs. Ginger and Doug stated there is not an openness to other beliefs. This was confirmed when Bob, a faculty member at Christian University stated that topics are not out of bounds. Positions related to topics are out of bounds.

Student self-efficacy was impacted more by Christian University than Secular University. According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, individuals possess a self-system that enables them to exercise a measure of control over their thoughts, feelings, motivation, and actions (Pajares, n.d.). Consequently, other factors serve as guides and motivators. Hence, they are rooted in the belief that one can produce effects by one's actions (Bandura, 2017). Further, an infringement upon a person's freedom of speech can impede a student's self-efficacy. As it concerns freedom of speech on college and university campuses, if students feel they cannot voice their opinions they fall back from speaking on topics that are controversial in society. This is what is happening at Christian University. This is why Karis, from Christian University, stated, "You have to be careful what you say."

Sub-Question Two asked, "What negative effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?" Interestingly, Kim, at Secular University stated one-sided politics should not be allowed on the campus. She stated, "Politics should maybe be kept off campus. Anything that promotes any politician or anyone that is known to lean one way

politically." Deborah agreed with Kim stating one-sided politics should not be allowed. Both sides of the political spectrum should be presented. Deborah went on to say anything that causes people to be ostracized should be off-limits. Kim stated from her personal experience it seemed as if people have a certain stereotype of what Christians are saying. Therefore, this could have a negative effect on freedom of speech.

Another negative aspect of freedom of speech on Secular University can come from the misunderstanding regarding hate speech. For example, Deborah said she has to make sure whatever her view is on a controversial topic she needs to be respectful. Deborah went on to say students need to make room to understand the other group's opinion regarding the controversial issue that is being discussed. Several of the students at Secular University mentioned the event where Matt Walsh, a conservative, came to speak on campus. Although there were protests, Mr. Walsh was still able to speak. Bob, from Secular University, stated there were plenty of policemen and security that prevented the event from getting out of hand.

William compared his experience at Secular University to growing up in a Communist country. He has a difficult time understanding why students become so angry, at times, when their point of view is being challenged or critiqued. William said he appreciated the freedom of speech that Secular University allows, but did not understand why people get so angry when issues are discussed and presented. An example given was when a group came to Secular University and showed the movie, "What Makes a Woman a Woman?" Although Secular University encourages the right to freedom of speech, protests developed on the night the movie was shown. Additionally, Bob stated that he experienced awkwardness when an outside group of fundamentalist Christians came to Secular University and yelled with megaphones, "Muslims are going to hell." Although this group had the right to be on campus, it made him uncomfortable as

a Muslim at Secular University. Further, Deborah indicated the group she is a part of held a "48 Hours of Prayer on Campus." Some people tried to run them off and comments were made she felt were unnecessary. However, despite this, she was appreciative of Secular University for allowing them to have the "48 Hours of Prayer" event.

Edward, at Christian University, stated the "right" wing point of view is more accepted than the "left" point of view on campus. For example, Edward alluded to a discussion regarding gun violence that stopped a class he was in. Although John at Christian University stated the openness regarding the George Floyd incident, he stated the school, overall, is not open. He said, "Whenever something big does happen, it is like we kind of just look the other way."

Ginger, from Christian University, shared how she knew people who may feel like they have limited freedom of speech because they think differently than a lot of the students at the university. Ida stated certain kinds of speech are more acceptable at Christian University than others. She attributes this to it being a Christian university. Therefore, it is easier to speak on topics that promote Christian principles rather than a wide range of topics. There is an expectation, according to Ida, for students to be impartial. For example, an LGBTQ+ club could not be formed because of what the Christian University handbook says about this type of lifestyle. On the other hand, Ida mentioned a time when Turning Point, USA tried to form a chapter on campus, and it was turned down. She said this was one of the most divisive decisions she has seen at Christian University.

Karis, from Christian University, indicated she felt she had to be cautious about what she said regarding certain topics. For her, as a woman who is training to be a minister, she had an instance where someone walked out of the classroom in protest. Doug, from Christian University, shared that he felt like he did not have an outlet for freedom of speech where people

could say whatever they wanted. Jennifer stated there are LGBTQ+ people on the Christian University campus who do not feel accepted, nor do they feel loved. She expressed a need for there to be open conversations about the subject. Nick feels like this topic is "swept under the rug" at Christian University.

Ginger indicated racial conversations and immigration conversations are, also, pushed to the side and not allowed to be discussed. Jennifer added there is the freedom to talk about controversial subjects to friend groups, but to a larger group at Christian University, freedom of speech is limited for students. Ginger went on to say she felt her freedom of speech was limited by the administration at Christian University. Several of the students at Christian University shared how they would love to have a place where planned conversations could take place on controversial topics with a mediator to help them better understand other points of view in society. Edward said, "It's a good and bad thing where it's like you stand by your beliefs, but it's a bad thing because you're not considering other people's opinions."

Kim, at Secular University, stated she felt as if Christians were stereotyped on the campus. In addition, there is a misunderstanding with students and faculty regarding how hate speech is defined. William, from Secular University, struggled to understand why people get so upset when another point of view is discussed. He could not understand why people would want to run off controversial speakers at Secular University.

At Christian University, the general feeling was that the Christian or conservative point of view is what is accepted. Ida, from Christian University, stated certain kinds of speech were more acceptable than others. This is attributed to the fact that they are a Christian University. At Christian University there is a feeling of cautiousness regarding discussing controversial topics on campus. There is a desire, from the students at Christian University for open and planned

conversations around topics like race, immigration, LGBTQ+, transgender issues, and immigration. Presently, there is not an outlet for these topics to be discussed.

There Needs to Be a Training Process for Students Regarding Freedom of Speech

Sub-Question Three asked, "What are the perceptions of administrators and educators regarding how campus freedom of speech affects student self-efficacy?" Abel, from Secular University, explained how students come to the campus with lived experiences. Those lived experiences, according to Abel, inform their day-to-day lives and thought processes. When society does not meet their expectations then they need an avenue to express their feelings. Therefore, according to all the administrators I talked to, no topic is off-limits for the campus to discuss. Jim pointed out that some students may say harassment or discipline is involved when it comes to their expression of freedom of speech. However, Jim said, "It is not the topic. It is the action that causes pause, at times." Subsequently, all topics are open to be discussed, but the action that takes place when the topic is discussed may be called into question.

Sienna, from Secular University, pointed out that many times people will disagree or become upset with one another when discussing controversial topics. Therefore, the administration must make sure nothing is going to disrupt the flow of students or overflow a building. Sienna said, "Just because it is a sensitive topic is not a reason to ban the speech." Sylvia interjected in the 7 years she has been at Secular University; she has seen almost every kind of group speak on campus. And they are not always welcome. But there is freedom. There are some parameters but there is freedom. Sienna, from Secular University, attributes this environment to the emphasis at the university on critical thinking.

At Christian University the administrators felt they were promoting freedom of speech at their campus. However, the general feeling was that there was a disconnect between the

administration and students at Christian University. The faculty promoted freedom of speech, but with limitations. For example, when asked about the first thing that comes to mind regarding freedom of speech, Lisa stated, "Probably that you would be able to disagree with people without retribution." Bob said, "That's pretty much what I was going to say." Chris talked about the 5 protections under the 1st Amendment. Chris said, "Sadly, what comes to mind nowadays is that we're losing our freedom of speech and more ways, indirectly." Bob referred to "cancel culture."

Chris, at Christian University, affirmed they are a pro-life and Christ-centered organization. He went on to say, "I don't see us ever having an LGBTQ+ on campus." Further, Chris said, "And as a private institution we are able to do that." As stated earlier, students can have "cultural" clubs but no religious clubs other than Christian clubs. Bob stated, "There are no topics that are out of bounds to be discussed. There are just positions concerning those topics that are out of bounds." The positions on these topics are encouraged to be discussed in the classroom and not campus-wide. Bob went on to say, "We encourage discussion about these cultural issues in the classroom and try to bring Christian wisdom to bear on the moral and spiritual dimensions of those problems so as to give our student body a basis on which to think them through." Interestingly, Chris mentioned that Christian University has a Law and Liberty Center that has been established to highlight their strong belief in the 1st Amendment.

Faculty and staff from Secular University felt they were reactive when it came to situations on the campus regarding freedom of speech regarding controversial topics. However, there was a consensus regarding the openness that exists to discuss a wide range of controversial topics. This issue is not openness, the issue is how this openness is controlled by the administration. Consequently, if there was a clearly defined process the administration would be better equipped to handle the outcomes of controversial speakers that come onto campus.

Conversely, Christian University faculty and staff noted they promote freedom of speech, but with limitations. There was not an openness for controversial topics to be discussed by someone who had a different stance than the university as a whole. The faculty encourages discussions about controversial topics to be held in the classrooms, but not campus-wide.

The lack of training and process for outside groups has led to a disconnect between the students and the faculty and staff. This interpretation agrees with Chong & Levy (2018) as they have noticed a failure of the educational system to promote understanding and appreciation of the importance of free speech in a democratic society. Jim, from Secular University, stated there is a need to be more proactive than reactive to controversial topics wanting to be discussed on campus. Edward, a student at Christian University said there is an awkwardness with staff on campus. John, from Christian University, said there needs to be a training process for inviting outside speakers.

Faculty at Secular University and Christian University assume students understand what freedom of speech involves. Therefore, there needs to be some form of training for students on both campuses regarding freedom of speech. This will help students have a proper understanding and perspective regarding free speech.

Implications for Policy or Practice

From the analysis of the interviews and focus groups emerges some implications for policy and practice. Based upon the analysis from the student interviews and focus groups, along with the faculty focus groups there are some recommendations encouraged to be considered.

Implications for Policy

While it is clear at Secular and Christian Universities, there is a need for training and processes to be implemented, it may also be the case for colleges and universities around the

country. Having a clearly defined policy for clubs to follow would help greatly when clubs and organizations organize rallies and host speakers on controversial topics.

Implications for Practice

Secular and Christian University need training regarding what freedom of speech involves on their campuses. It may be effective to start a program at Christian University where students can discuss controversial topics. Many students at Christian University indicated they would like to have a forum to discuss these topics with a mediator present from the university.

Secular University may need to develop and communicate a process for clubs to invite speakers and groups on campus to discuss controversial topics. While there is more openness on Secular University, there appears to be no consistent process for outside groups to follow. In the faculty and staff focus group at Secular Univesity, the prevailing thought was a need to be more proactive than reactive. Jim, at Secular University, communicated there was not an awareness of policies and many times the university finds out about events after they have been planned and organized.

Empirical and Theoretical Implications

The following implications describe the three themes derived from the interviews and focus groups with students, faculty, and staff at Secular University and Christian University. Three themes developed during the interviews and focus groups conducted. In this section, I will compare and contrast these themes with Bandura's social cognitive theory as it relates to self-efficacy among college and university students.

Previous Research Examined

Cherry (2020) indicated self-efficacy is made up of a person's attitudes, abilities, and cognitive skills. Therefore, college students react to real and perceived obstructions to their

freedom of speech. If a person has low self-efficacy it can cause people to avoid difficult or threatening situations. The faculty and staff at Christian University and Secular University would affirm freedom of expression is a foundational right of students in the United States.

The initial research indicated freedom of speech for college students was being infringed upon in today's culture. While this may be the case on many college and university campuses around the United States, this was entirely true at Christian University and Secular University in Southtown, USA. While Christian University has perceived limitations to freedom of speech, the prevailing observation was that this did not impede the students in their quest to share their opinions. The impact was on the public aspect at Christian University and for outside groups coming in to speak about their controversial stance on many "hot" topics such as LGBTQ+, transgender, immigration, and abortion.

Contribution to the Field

The biggest contribution to the field of study would be the importance of training regarding freedom of speech and the process needed for outside groups to come in and speak. Dannels & Rudick (2018) assert the dominant understanding of freedom of speech, and the idea upon which most U.S. jurisprudence in the twentieth century is based is the notion that freedom means unrestricted or unchecked. This is a difficult task for educators to ascertain.

Faculty and staff would benefit from the example given by Moses (2021). Moses (2021) identifies the "Three Rs." They include Relationship, Reciprocity, and Reasonableness. Subsequently, these Three Rs provide principled considerations for campus leaders. They help them evaluate controversial views and justify their decisions. Sadly, because of the lack of education, students in colleges and universities do not have the correct perspective regarding freedom of speech.

Other Implications of Method Used for Further Research

This case study would be interesting to utilize in an area that is culturally different from the Southern United States. It would be interesting to compare a Christian University and Secular University on the West Coast or in the Northeast portion of the United States. For example, The Knight Foundation Report (2020) reported college and university students are seeing confidence in freedom of expression waning. However, this was not the conclusion from the interviews and focus groups at Secular University and Christian University in Southtown, USA. While the analysis concluded Christian University was not as open as Secular University, the faculty and staff at Christian University still promoted themselves as having freedom of speech. However, the students did not see it this way.

Theory Related to Freedom of Speech

The theory that guided this study was Bandura's social cognitive theory. According to Bandura (1971), four specific steps occur at the cognitive and behavioral levels to ensure learning is successful. First, the learner must pay attention to the mode's attitudes and behaviors. Second, the learner must remember what was observed. Third, the observer engages in the behaviors and adopts the attitudes and mannerisms of the social model. Fourth, the learner must have the motivation to replicate the behaviors and attitudes. Self-efficacy is part of the self-system. It is a way in which people recognize conditions. According to Cherry (2020), the self-system is a large contributor to how people behave and react to different conditions. This is why self-efficacy plays such a large role in how people perceive what is happening to them. When it comes to freedom of speech on college and university campuses, students react to real and perceived obstructions to their freedom of speech.

Having a strong sense of efficacy enhances human well-being (Pajares & Schunk, 2001). Therefore, when a student does not feel they have the freedom to express their feelings on controversial topics, it impacts the student's self-efficacy. This, adversely, impacts their well-being. Because self-efficacy impacts how someone thinks, feels, and how they are motivated this makes a tremendous impact on a student if they do not feel they have the freedom to discuss these topics. This was the perception of the students at Christian University. Students at Secular University had better self-efficacy than their counterparts at Christian University.

Empirical Implications

All of the participants had a desire for freedom of expression. Christian University students have a desire to discuss controversial topics but do not feel the freedom to do so on a public level. The environment at Christian University towards freedom of speech impacts student's self-efficacy. Students want to have healthy conversations surrounding controversial topics but do not feel the freedom to do this on campus. The students have a deep desire to engage in these conversations. Karis indicated there is a feeling on campus at Christian University that you have to be careful what you say. John said, "The campus is open…but not open." Ginger indicated there is limited freedom and there is a great need for more freedom to discuss controversial topics.

Secular University's environment regarding freedom of speech did not impact student self-efficacy. There is a tremendous amount of openness at Secular University to discuss controversial topics. Sylvia, a faculty member at Secular University indicated it is shocking how much openness is at the university to discuss controversial topics. There is an openness to having outside organizations discussing controversial subjects.

Theoretical Implications

Bandura (2017) asserts unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Self-efficacy centered around freedom of speech is impacted at Christian University. Therefore, an infringement upon one's freedom of speech may impede a student's self-efficacy. Artino (2012) defines self-efficacy as a personal belief in one's capability to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. My study corroborates Hsu & Wilde (2019) as they share how a person's beliefs surrounding their levels of self-efficacy will generate an effect on how they feel, think, and motivate themselves.

The desire and want to have more freedom of speech at Christian University was evident during the interviews and focus groups. Nick stated the university pushed tough topics to the side. Therefore, there is a desire for more openness to discuss more. While Christian University has limitations to freedom of speech there is a desire for more freedom of expression. While the university would say there is freedom of speech, the freedom of speech is filtered through the lens of the values of the university. Therefore, learning is limited because of the desire for more interaction with the environment regarding controversial topics.

At Secular University the students do not feel their freedom of speech is limited. Interestingly, however, Mike from Secular University indicated there was openness with consequences. This, however, was not a prevailing theme. While there was no training involved regarding freedom of speech the students at Secular University indicated there were no challenges that would impede their abilities to express themselves.

This study added to Bandura's (1971) self-efficacy theory by providing an understanding of how student's experiences regarding freedom of speech at a Secular University and Christian

University have impacted their self-efficacy. The study extends the theory by providing implications regarding the process of freedom of expression in each environment.

Limitations and Delimitations

This section will indicate potential weaknesses of the study that could not be controlled. In addition, I will discuss certain, purposeful decisions that were made to define the boundaries of the study. Further, the rationale behind the decisions made to limit and define the scope and focus of the study will be discussed.

Limitations

Interviews and focus groups were limited to Microsoft Teams due to summer schedules. This impacted students and faculty and staff. Therefore, Microsoft Teams was the best option to use for these formats. The inaccessibility of students and faculty during the summer was a challenge to getting research accomplished.

The original plan was to have 7 students from Christian University, and 7 students from Secular University participate in individual interviews and focus groups. In addition, the intent was to have 7 faculty and staff from Christian University and Secular University involved in the focus group. However, the result was as follows:

1. 7 students for individual interviews at Secular University

2. 7 students for individual interviews at Christian University

3. 4 students for student focus group at Secular University

4. 4 students for student focus group at Christian University

5. 4 faculty and staff for faculty focus group at Secular University

6. 5 faculty and staff for faculty focus group at Christian University

I was not able to have 7 students and 7 faculty for the focus groups. A limitation beyond my control was the timeframe for the data to be collected. The data was collected during the summer utilizing Microsoft Teams. A better response may have been reached if the data collection was during the spring or fall semesters. Getting commitments from students and faculty during the summer was very difficult. Another limitation that could be perceived as a potential weakness is that the data analysis only involved students from spiritual life clubs at Secular University and Christian University.

Another limitation was data was not able to be analyzed because students at Christian University and Secular University did not understand safe zones and safe spaces. Neither campus had safe zones or safe spaces. Further, neither campus had speech codes. In addition, many of the students did not have a good understanding of hate speech. Also, bullying was not a factor at either campus as it relates to freedom of speech. Interestingly, students did not mention any issues with cyberbullying.

Delimitations

Due to my location, I intentionally chose to explore two colleges in Southtown, USA. Christian University and Secular University also had contacts that helped get me in front of students and faculty and staff for the data collection. This contributed to the decision to go with the Christian University and Secular University in Southtown, USA.

I chose to limit the individual interviews to 25 - 30 minutes and the focus groups to 1.5 hours. Further, the interviews and focus groups were limited to taking place via Microsoft Teams. This was done intentionally due to the time of year data analysis from campuses was being collected.

Delimitations of this study include the topic analyzed, student and faculty prerequisites, the qualitative design, and the method for data analysis. I chose to limit my research to the discussion of freedom of speech on college and university campuses in Southtown, USA. This topic was purposefully chosen because I felt it needed to be discussed due to previous research on the subject of freedom of speech on college and university campuses.

Recommendations for Future Research

In consideration of my study's findings, limitations, and delimitations, multiple recommendations and directions are provided for future research. My recommendations for future research include:

1. Include more than 2 universities in the data collection.

2. Conduct research in a place other than the southern United States

3. Conduct a quantitative study.

4. Ask more questions about the 1st Amendment.

5. Conduct in-person focus groups and student interviews.

6. Do not limit the study to only spiritual life leaders.

7. Allow for more time in the student interviews.

8. Ask better questions.

9. Have more people involved in the focus groups.

10. Attempt to get a perspective from Executive staff on the campuses.

11. Conduct individual interviews with faculty and staff.

Conclusion

This qualitative case study examined freedom of speech on college campuses in Southtown, USA. While the assumption was freedom of speech was being suppressed, and

affecting student self-efficacy, this was not entirely the case. As the data from student interviews and focus groups with students, faculty, and staff was analyzed, themes began to appear that led me to believe suppression was not the biggest problem.

Students want freedom of speech. They want to be able to have conversations about controversial topics. This is a greater openness to this in Secular University. Interestingly, bullying and hate speech were not topics that came up in discussions with faculty and staff. The only time this was discussed was when I asked questions about hate speech.

There is a tremendous need for training and coaching regarding freedom of speech. Further, there needs to be a process in place for outside groups and individuals that was to come onto either campus to talk about controversial subjects.

Interestingly, Secular University's stance on freedom of speech did not affect student self-efficacy. Christian University's student self-efficacy was affected more because controversial topics were not as easily discussed on campus.

REFERENCES

Adelman, L. (2020). The Roberts court v. the First Amendment. New Brunswick, 39(3), pp. 1-14, 62). https://www.proquest.com/docview/2365267142?pq-origsite=summon&accountid=12085.

Agee, J. (2009) Developing qualitative research questions: a reflective process, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 22(4), 431-447, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09518390902736512?needAccess=true.

Algozzine, B. & Hancock, D. R. (2016). Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning readers. Teachers College Press.

Allegheny, J. (2021). The First Amendment, censorship, and private companies: What does "free speech" really mean? Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. https://www.carnegielibrary.org/the-first-amendment-and-censorship/.

Ambriz, E., Garces, L.M., & Pedota, J. (2022). Challenges to bias response teams on college campuses. Educational Researcher. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0013189X221088307.

Amdt1.2.1 Freedom of Speech: Historical Background. (n.d.) Congress.gov. https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/amdt1-2-1/ALDE_00000393/.

Anderson, G. (2020). A perception problem about free speech. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/09/29/fire-report-students-are-censoring-their-opinions.

Artino, A.R. (2012). Academic self-efficacy: from educational theory to instructional practice. Perspectives on Medical Education, 1(2), pp. 76-85.

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3540350/pdf/40037_2012_Article_12.pdf.

Baker, C.E. (1989). Human liberty: Freedom of speech. New York: Oxford University Press.

Baker, C.E. (2011). Is democracy a sound basis for a free speech principle? Virginia Law
Review. 97(3). pp. 515 – 529. httpdds://www-jstor-
org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/stable/pdf/41261518.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A533ec7df8c5cef
acb5c83e63db081b84.

Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. Journal of
Management, 38(1). pp. 9-44.
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0149206311410606.

Bandura, A. (1971). Psychological modeling. New York: Lieber-Antheron.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy in changing societies. Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (2017). Toward a psychology of human agency: Pathways and reflections.
Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13(2). pp. 130-136. https://journals-sagepub-
com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/pdf/10.1177/1745691617699280.

Bates, S. (2021) Meiklejohn, Hocking, and self-government theory. Communication Law and
Policy. 26(3), pp. 265-311.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10811680.2021.1937003.

Bates, S. (2020). What Alexander Meiklejohn had to say about cancel culture. Lawfare.
https://www.lawfareblog.com/what-alexander-meiklejohn-had-say-about-cancel-culture.

Bauer-Wolf, J. (2019). Free Speech Laws Mushroom in Wake of Campus Protests. Inside

      Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/09/16/states-passing-laws-

      protect-college-students-free-speech.

Bauer-Wolf, J. (2017a, October 6). Free speech advocate silenced. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved

      from https://www .insidehighered.com/news/2017/10/06/william-mary- students-who-

      shut-down-aclu-event-broke-conduct- code.

Bauer-Wolf, J. (2017b). Speakers stress university pocket- books. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved

      from https://www .insidehighered.com/news/2017/10/13/colleges-search- answer-high-

      spending-controversial-speakers.

Binder, A.J. & Kidder, J.L (2021). The politics of speech on campus. Sociological Forum, 36(2),

      pp. 338-358. https://onlinelibrary-wiley-

      com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/full/10.1111/socf.12681.

Blincoe, S. & Perry, A. (2015). Bullies and victims in higher education. Journal of Bullying and

      Aggression. 1(1). http://sites.tamuc.edu/bullyingjournal/article/bullies-and-victims-in-

      higher-education/.

Blum, J.N. (2018). Public discourse and the myth of religious speech, Journal of Contemporary

      Religion. 33(1), pp. 1-16. https://www-tandfonline-

      com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/13537903.2018.1408259?needAccess=true.

Bohannan, C. (2020). On the 50th anniversary of Tinker v. De Moines: Toward a positive view

      of free speech on college campuses. Iona Law Review, 105(5). https://bi-gale-

      com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/global/article/GALE%7CA634680434?u=vic_liberty&sid=sum

      mon.

Bollinger, L. (1983). Free speech and intellectual values, 92(3). Yale Law Journal, pp. 438-473.

    https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/ylj/vol92/iss3/3/.

Bollinger, L. (2019, June 12). Free speech on campus is doing just fine, thank you. The Atlantic.

    https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/06/free-speech-crisis-campus-isnt-

    real/591394/?utm_source=twitter&utm_campaign=the-atlantic&utm_term=2019-06-

    12T10:00:47&utm_medium=social&utm_content=edit-promo&cid=db.

Boyson, G.A. & Vogel, D.L. (2009). Bias in the classroom: Types, frequencies, and responses.

    Teaching Psychology, 36(1), pp. 12-17.

    https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1080/00986280802529038

Braun V, Clarke V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In: Cooper H, editor. APA handbook of research

    methods in psychology. Vol. 2, research designs. Washington (DC): American

    Psychological Association.

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269930410_Thematic_analysis.

Brick, L.A.D., Marraccini, M.E., & Weyandt, L.L. (2018). Instructor and peer bullying in college

    students: Distinct typologies based on latent class analysis. Journal of American College

    Health, 66(1), pp. 1-37.

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323951458_Instructor_and_peer_bullying_in_colleg

    e_students_Distinct_typologies_based_on_Latent_Class_Analysis.

Burke, J.L. & Eargle, L.A. (2018). Student perceptions concerning political speech's association with

    violence. Race, Gender, and Class. 25(3/4), pp. 85-104.

    https://www.proquest.com/docview/2298707946?accountid=12085.

Burleigh, N. (2016). The battle against 'hate speech' on college campuses gives rise to a

    generation that hates speech. Newsweek.

https://www.newsweek.com/2016/06/03/college-campus-free-speech-thought-police-463536.html.

Calvert, C., McNeff, S., Vining, A., & Zarate, S. (2018). Fake news and the first amendment: Reconciling disconnect between theory and doctrine. University of Cincinnati Law Review, 86(1), 99-138. https://heinonline-org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/HOL/Page?lname=&public=false&collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/ucinlr86&men_hide=false&men_tab=toc&kind=&page=99.

Campbell, B., & Manning, J. (2018). The Rise of Victimhood Culture: Microaggressions, Safe Spaces, and the New Culture Wars. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70329-9.

Carlson, C.R. (2020). Hate speech as a structural phenomenon, First Amendment Studies, 54(2), 217-224. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/21689725.2020.1837649.

Carlton, G. (2021). College students' guide to free speech and the First Amendment. The Best Schools. https://thebestschools.org/resources/free-speech-first-amendment/.

Carrasco, M. (2022). Fewer students see freedom of speech as secure. Inside Higher Education. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/01/26/fewer-students-see-freedom-speech-secure#.

Ceci, S.J. & Williams, W.M. (2018). Who decides what is acceptable speech on campus? Why restricting free speech is not the answer. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13(3). pp. 299-323. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1745691618767324.

Chadwick, B., Gill, P., Stewart, K., & Treasure, E. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups. British Dental Journal. 204(6), pp. 291-295. https://www.nature.com/articles/bdj.2008.192.pdf.

Chamlee-Wright, E. (2018). Governing campus speech: a bottom-up approach. Society. 55(5),

  pp. 392-402. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6182638/.

Chappell-Williams, L. (2011, February 17). March forums seek feedback on bias response

  program. Cornell Chronicle. https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2011/02/forums-addressing-

  bias-response-be-held.

Chemerinsky, E. & Gillman, H. (2017a). Free Speech on Campus. Yale University Press.

Chemerinsky, E., & Gillman, H. (2017b). Milo Yiannopoulos and the lessons of free speech. The

  Conversation. https://theconversation.com/berkeley-milo- yiannopoulos-and-the-lessons-

  of-free-speech-72651.

Cherry, K. (2020). Self-efficacy and why believing in yourself matters. Very Well Mind.

  https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-self-efficacy-2795954.

Chong, D. and Levy, M. (2018). Competing norms of free expression and political tolerance.

  Johns Hopkins University Press, 85(1), 197-227. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/692750.

Cohen-Almagar, R. (2017). J.S. Mill's boundaries of freedom of expression, Philosophy, 92(4),

  pp. 565-596. https://www.proquest.com/docview/1951927870?pq-

  origsite=summon&accountid=12085.

Cohen, J.C. (2017). Psychological harm and free speech on campus, Society, 54(4), 320-325.

  https://philpapers.org/rec/COHPHA-4.

Collen, H.O. & Onan, N. (2021). Cyberbullying and well-being among university students: The

  role of resilience. International Journal of Caring Sciences, 14(1). P. 632.

  http://www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org/docs/67_onan_original_14_1.pdf.

Combs, L. (2018). Chalk talks: The importance of free speech on public campuses and the

restriction of free speech on university campuses due to safety concerns. Journal of Law

and Education, 47(1), pp. 169-175.

https://www.proquest.com/docview/2036209278?parentSessionId=rsvh0iEXWDooSk9b

BD0ATWd7JVe0b9nEO%2Fe%2Fg1izlj0%3D&pq-

origsite=summon&accountid=12085.

Commodore, F. & Wheatle, K.I.E. (2019), Reaching back to move forward: The historic and

contemporary role of student activism in the development and implementation of higher

education policy, The Review of Higher Education, 42(5), pp. 5-35. https://muse-jhu-

edu.ezproxy.liberty.edu/article/724909.

Creswell, J. and Poth, C.. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design, SAGE Publications.

Dannels, D.P. & Rudick, C.K. (2018). Yes, and…: Continuing the scholarly conversation about

freedom of speech at colleges and universities. Communication Education, 67(2), pp.

265-268. https://www-tandfonline-

com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/03634523.2018.1431681?needAccess=true.

Dahlum, S. & Wig, T. (2021). Chaos on Campus: Universities and Mass Political Protest.

Comparative Political Studies, 54(1), pp. 3-32.

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0010414020919902.

Davis, C. (2020). Meiklejohn, Alexander, The First Amendment is an absolute, 1961 Sup. Ct.

Rev. 245. Communication Law and Policy, 25(4). pp. 460-463.

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10811680.2020.1805950?needAccess=tru.

Dayton, J. (2021) & Tarhan, B. (2021). The evolution of student free speech: Tinker and beyond.

Laws, 10(94). https://www.mdpi.com/journal/laws.

Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Zoran, A. G. (2009). A Qualitative

Framework for Collecting and Analyzing Data in Focus Group Research. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8(3), 1–21.

Dingle, K, Herbstrith, J.C., Kuperus, S., & Roth, Z. (2020). Religion in the public schools: An examination of school personnel knowledge of the law and attitudes toward religious expression. Research in Education, 106(1), pp. 77-97. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0034523718821705.

Downs, D.A.. & Surprenant, C.W. (2018). The Value and Limits of Academic Speech: Philosophical, Political, and Legal Perspectives. Routledge: New York.

Eko, L. (2020). Mimicking the sacred: Advertising parody, religion and freedom of expression in the United States and France, Communication and Law Policy, 25(2), pp. 145-187. https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/full/10.1080/10811680.2020.1735191.

Etzioni, A. (2019). Allow offensive speech – curb abusive speech? Society, 56(315), pp. 315-321. https://go-gale-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/ps/i.do?p=BIC&u=vic_liberty&id=GALE%7CA596491159&v=2.1&it=r&sid=summon.

Feldman, S. M. (2019). Broken Platforms, Broken Communities? Free Speech on Campus. The William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal, 27(4). https://search-proquest com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/docview/2234395817?accountid=12085.

Ferguson, K.S., Guida, T., Medina, E., Miller, R.A., & Smith, S. (2017). Free speech tensions: Responding to bias on college and university campuses. Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 55(1), 27-39. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19496591.2017.1363051.

First Amendment (n.d). Congress.gov. https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-1/.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case Study. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research. Sage. Thousand Oaks, pp. 301-316.

Foundation for Individual Rights in Education. (2017). Bias response team report, 2017. Retrieved from http://www.thefire.org/first-amendment-library /special-collections/fire-guides/bias-response-team-report-2017.

Foundation for Individual Rights in Education. (2015a). State of the law: Speech codes. Retrieved from https://www .thefire.org/in-court/state-of-the-law-speech-codes/.

Franks, M. A. (2019). The miseducation of free speech. Virginia Law Review, 105, 218-242. http://ezproxy.liberty.edu/login?qurl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.proquest.com%2Fscholarly-journals%2Fmiseducation-free-speech%2Fdocview%2F2471028619%2Fse-2%3Faccountid%3D12085.

Freedom of Speech (n.d.). In Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary.

Geegan, S., Goatley-Soan, S., Herrington, T., Hester, E., Ivanov, B., Martin, J., Parker, K.A., Riker, S., & Silberman, W. (2020). Defending democracy: Inoculation's efficacy in protecting First Amendment attitudes, Communication Studies, 71(1), pp. 22-39. https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/epub/10.1080/10510974.2019.1671889?needAccess=true.

Goldberg, S.B. (2018). Free expression on campus: Mitigating the costs of contentious speakers, Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, 41(1), pp. 163-186. https://bi-gale-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/global/article/GALE%7CA528615392?u=vic_liberty&sid=summon.

Goldstein, A. & Lukianoff, G. (2021). Catching up with "Coddling" part eleven: The special

    problem of "bias response teams," Foundation for Individual Rights in Education.

    Retrieved from https://www.thefire.org/catching-up-with-coddling-part-eleven-the-

    special-problem-of-bias-response-teams/.

Goodrich, K.M., Luke, M. (2019). Focus group research: An intentional strategy for applied

    group research? The Journal for Specialists in Group Work. (44)2, pp. 77-81.

    https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01933922.2019.1603741?needAccess=true

Gordon, D. (2020). The Firing of Angela Davis at UCLA, 1969–1970: Communism, Academic

    Freedom, and Freedom of Speech. Soc 57, 596–613.

    https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Firing-of-Angela-Davis-at-UCLA%2C-

    1969–1970%3A-and-Gordon/ffe08c4a0c1d2abd962ff200311f193c9c146a9d.

Gordon, J. (1997). John Stuart Mill and the "Marketplace of Ideas." Social Theory and Practice.

    23(2). pp. 235-249. https://www-jstor-

    org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/stable/pdf/23559183.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aa8faf39f63489a

    aac6cfa84f8948ddea.

Gray, E. (2019). Campus speech codes stifle free expression. The Spectrum.

    http://ndsuspectrum.com/campus-speech-codes-stifle-free-expression/.

Grudem, W. (2010). Politics According to the Bible: A Comprehensive Resource for

Understanding Modern Political Issues in Light of Scripture. Grand Rapids, Michigan:

Zondervan Publishing Company.

Gutierrez, I. & Park, C. (2015). Emerging Adulthood, Evolving Worldviews: How life events

    impact college students' developing belief systems. Society for the Study of Emerging

    Adulthood and SAGE Publications. 3(2), 85-97.

https://www.academia.edu/22315565/Emerging_Adulthood_Evolving_Worldviews_How
_Life_Events_Impact_College_Students_Developing_Belief_Systems.

Herbeck, D.A. (2018). Freedom of speech and the communication discipline: Defending the
value of low-value speech, Communication Education, 67(2), pp. 245-253. https://www-
tandfonline-
com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/03634523.2018.1428760?needAccess=true.

Hirschauer, J. (2021) Can free speech thrive at a Christian college? Real Clear Education,
https://www.realcleareducation.com/articles/2021/10/22/can_free_speech_thrive_at_a_ch
ristian_college_110655.html.

Hollis, L. (2018). Remember the Alamo: implementing a campus-wide anti-bullying policy,
Human Resource Management International Digest, 26(4), 28-30. https://www-emerald-
com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/insight/content/doi/10.1108/HRMID-03-2017-
0046/full/pdf?title=remember-the-alamo-implementing-a-campus-wide-anti-bullying-
policy.

Horsburgh, J. & Ippolito, K. (2018). A skill to be worked at: using social learning to explore the
process of learning from role models in clinical settings. BMC Medical Education, 18(1).
p. 156.
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6029173/pdf/12909_2018_Article_1251.
pdf.

Hsu, A. & Wilde, N. (2019). The influence of general self-efficacy on the interpretation of
vicarious experience information within online learning. International Journal of
Educational Technology in Higher Education. 16(26), 1-20.

https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/track/pdf/10.1186/s41239-019-0158-x.pdf.

Howard, J.W. (2019). Free speech and hate speech, The Annual Review of Political Science, 22(1), pp. 93-109. https://www-annualreviews-org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051517-012343.

Hudson, D.L. (2018). Hate speech and campus speech codes. Freedom Form Institute. https://www.freedomforuminstitute.org/first-amendment-center/topics/freedom-of-speech-2/free-speech-on-public-college-campuses-overview/hate-speech-campus-speech-codes/.

Jackson, L. & Oleksiyenko, A.V. (2021). Freedom of speech, freedom to teach, freedom to learn: The crisis of higher education in the post-truth era, Educational Philosophy and Theory, 53(11), pp. 1057-1062. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epub/10.1080/00131857.2020.1773800?needAccess=true.

Jackson, M. (2021). Unmasking the fragility of trigger warnings, safe spaces, and code-switching on campus. Educational Theory. 71(2). https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/epdf/10.1111/edth.12474.

Kankam, P.K. (2019). The use of paradigms in information research. Library and Information Science Research. 41(2), pp. 85-92. https://www-sciencedirect-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/science/article/pii/S0740818818303931?via%3Dihub.

Kenyon, A.T. (2014). Assuming Free Speech. Modern Law Review. 77(3), pp. 379-408. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1468-2230.12071.

Kirk, C. (2018). Campus Battlefield: How Conservatives can WIN the Battle on Campus and

Why it Matters. Post Hill Press.

Knight Foundation (2019). Free expression on college campuses: A college pulse study

    commissioned by the Knight Foundation. https://kf-site-

    production.s3.amazonaws.com/media_elements/files/000/000/351/original/Knight-CP-

    Report-FINAL.pdf.

Knight Foundation (2020) The First Amendment on campus 2021 report: College students'

    views of free expression, The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation and Gallup (pp.

    1-56). https://knightfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/First-Amendment-on-

    Campus-2020.pdf.

Korstjens, I. & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4:

    Trustworthiness and publishing. European Journal of General Practice. 24(1), pp. 120-

    124. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092.

Kuklinski, J. H., Riggle, E., Ottati, V., Schwarz, N., & Wyer, R. S., Jr. (1991). The cognitive and

    affective bases of political tolerance judgments. American Journal of Political Science,

    35, pp. 1–27. doi:10.2307/2111436.

Lakier, G. (2021). The non-First Amendment law of freedom of speech. Harvard Law Review.

    134(7). https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/134-Harv.-L.-Rev.-

    2299.pdf.

La Noue, G.R. (2019). The price of individual and institutional self – censorship. Society. 56(6).

    p. 557.

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337692114_The_Price_of_Individual_and_Insti

    tutional_Self-Censorship.

Leech N. L. & Onwuegbuzie A. J. (2008). Qualitative data analysis: A compendium of

techniques for school psychology research and beyond. School Psychology Quarterly, 23(4), pp. 587–604. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2008-17775-010.

Leeds-Hurwitz W. 2009. Social construction of reality. Encyclopedia of communication theory, 892-895. https://teddykw2.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/encyclopedia-of-communication-theory.pdf.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Stanley, C.A. (2021). The faces of institutionalized discrimination and systemic oppression in higher education: Uncovering the lived experience of bias and procedural inequity. Qualitative Inquiry, 27(10), pp. 233-245. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/10778004211026892.

Lukianoff, G. (2012). Unlearning Liberty: Campus Censorship and the End of American Debate. Encounter Books.

Lund, E.M., & Ross, S.W. (2017). Bullying perpetration, victimization, and demographic differences in college students: a review of the literature. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse 18(3). https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26638186.

Lund, E.M., & Ross, S.W. (2017). Freedom of expression and categories of expression, University of Pittsburgh Law Review.

Madison, J. (1787). The same subject continued: The Union as a safeguard against domestic faction and insurrection. New York Packet. Retrieved from https://www.congress.gov/resources/display/ content/The+Federalist+Papers.

McKeachie,W. J. (1974). The decline and fall of the laws of learning. Educational Researcher, 3(3) pp. 7-11. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0013189X003003007.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Freedom of speech. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/freedom%20of%20speech.

Miller, R.A., Guida, T., Smith, S., Ferguson, K. & Medina, E. (2018) Free speech tensions: Responding to bias on college and university campuses, Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 55(1), 27-39. https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/full/10.1080/19496591.2017.1363051.

Mondal, A.A. (2016). Articles of faith: Freedom of expression and religious freedom in contemporary multiculture, Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, 27(1), pp. 3-24. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09596410.2015.1114240?needAccess=true

Moore, J. (2021). Assaults on freedom of speech: Why social studies must defend the First Amendment, The Social Studies, pp. 1-20. https://www-tandfonline-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/epub/10.1080/00377996.2021.1949258?needAccess=true.

Moses, M.S. (2021). "Very fine people on both sides:" Diverse viewpoints, truth, and free speech on campus, Educational Studies, 57(4), pp. 365-377. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353969149_Very_Fine_People_on_Both_Sides_Diverse_Viewpoints_Truth_and_Free_Speech_on_Campus.

Muldoon, R. (2017). Free speech and learning the difference. Symposium: Free Speech in Academic Precincts, Soc 54, pp. 331-336. https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/article/10.1007/s12115-017-0147-4#citeas.

Novak, Whitney K. (2020). Free speech on college campuses: Considerations for Congress. Congressional Research Service. https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/LSB10438.pdf.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2016). Mapping Saldaňa's coding methods onto the literature review process. Journal of Educational Issues. 2(1), pp. 130-150. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1127478.pdf.

Pajares, F. (n.d.). Current directions in self – efficacy research. Dynaread.

https://www.dynaread.com/current-directions-in-self-efficacy-research.

Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-beliefs and school success: Self-efficacy. Self-

Perception, 2, p. 239.

Patton, K.A. (2017). Trumping the First Amendment: Student-driven calls for free speech

restrictions on public college campuses. 68(1), pp. 189-212.

https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a2h&AN=127811833&site=eho

st-live&scope=site. Acesso em:12out.2021.

Peterson, R. (2020). The state of free speech on college campuses. The Macksey Journal. 1(60).

https://www.mackseyjournal.org/publications/vol1/iss1/60.

Pujol, J. (2016). The United States safe space campus controversy and the paradox of freedom of

speech. Communication and Culture, 1(1). pp. 240-254.

https://www.proquest.com/docview/2278058158?pq-

origsite=summon&accountid=12085.

Ramlo, S. (2020). Free Speech on US university campuses: differentiating perspectives using Q

methodology. Studies in Higher Education. 45(7), pp. 1488-1506. https://www-

tandfonline-

com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/03075079.2018.1555700?needAccess=true.

Richards, D.A.J. (1988). Tolerance and free speech. Philosophy & Public Affairs. 17(4), pp.

323-336. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2265403.

Rosenthal, D. (2017). Another college's speech code is at odds with First Amendment values.

The Heritage Foundation: The Constitution. https://www.heritage.org/the-

constitution/commentary/another-colleges-speech-code-odds-first-amendment-values.

Russomanno, J. (2019) Tribalism on campus: Factions, iGen and the threat to free speech,

Communication Law and Policy, 24(4), 539-586. https://www-tandfonline-

com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/10811680.2019.1660554?needAccess=true.

Saldana, J. (2013). The coding manual for qualitative researchers. Sage Publications.

Seglow, J. (2016). Hate speech, dignity, and self-respect. Ethical Theory and Moral Practice.

19(5). pp. 1103-1116. https://www-jstor-

org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/stable/pdf/44955460.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A5868bb59a02b4

9a04635dd8a2943f0a6.

Shauer, F. (2020). Free speech overrides. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 2020(47). pp. 1-

24. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3606186.

Shauer, F. (2017). Free speech, the search for truth and the problem of collective knowledge.

SMU Law Review. 20. pp. 231-252.

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3080453.

Schroeder, N. (2017). Avoiding deliberation: Why the "safe space" campus cannot Comport with

deliberative democracy. Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal, 2017(2),

325-358.

https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1402&context=elj.

Simpson, R.M. (2020). The relation between academic freedom and free speech. Ethics, 130(3),

pp. 287-319. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/707211?af=R&.

Smith, C.R. (2020). Circumventing the "true threat" and "viewpoint" protection tests to deal with

persistent campus hate speech, First Amendment Studies, 54(1), pp. 93-109.

https://www-tandfonline-

com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/epub/10.1080/21689725.2020.1742759?needAccess=true.

Snyder, J.A. (2016). Free speech? Now, that's offensive! Inside Higher Ed.

https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/09/01/dangers-not-valuing-free-speech-

campuses-essay.

Souza, S.B., Veiga Simão, A.M., Ferreira, A.I., & Costa Ferreira, P. (2018) University students'

perceptions of campus climate, cyberbullying and cultural issues: implications for theory

and practice, Studies in Higher Education, 43(11), 2072-2087. https://www-tandfonline-

com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/doi/citedby/10.1080/03075079.2017.1307818?scroll=top&need

Access=true.

Stake, R. E. (2010). Qualitative research: Studying how things work. The Guilford Press.

Stake, R.E. (1995). The art of case study research (pp. 49-68). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stephen, C.J. & Williams, W.M. (2018). Who decides what is acceptable speech on campus?

Why restricting free speech is not the answer. Perspectives on Psychological Science,

13(3). pp. 299-323. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1745691618767324.

Stott, J. (2008). Basic Christianity, Intervarsity Press.

Thompson, C. (2021). Debating academic freedom. Educational philosophical premises and

problems. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 53(11). pp. 1086-1096).

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epub/10.1080/00131857.2020.1773796?needAccess=tr

ue.

Tracy, S. J. (2013). Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis,

communicating impact. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

U.S. Const. amend. I.

U.S. Const. amend. 14.

Verrecchia, P.J. & Witherup, K.L. (2020). Safe spaces on campus: An examination of student

and faculty perceptions. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 8(6). p. 42.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341621420_Safe_Spaces_on_Campus_An_Exa mination_of_Student_and_Faculty_Perceptions.

Walsh, K.T. (2010). The 1960s: A decade of promise and heartbreak. U.S. News and World

Report. https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/03/09/the-1960s-a-decade-of-promise-and-heartbreak.

Welshon, R. (2020). Hate Speech on Campus: What Public Universities Can and Should Do to

Counter Weaponized Intolerance. Res Publica, 26(1), 45-66.

http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/10.1007/s11158-019-09424-5.

What are speech codes? (n.d). https://www.thefire.org/resources/spotlight/what-are-speech-codes/.

Whittington, K.E. (2019). The value of pluralism in the academy, Society, 56(6).

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12115-019-00423-z.

Wilson, J.K. (2019). The dander of campus bans bullying. AAUP Journal of Academic

Freedom, vol. 10. https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Wilson_0.pdf.

Yin, R.K. (2009). Case study research: Design and methods. SAGE Publications.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (Sixth ed.). SAGE

Publications, Inc.

Yin, R.K. (2016). Qualitative research from start to finish. The Guilford Press. New York.

Yockey, J.W. (2019). Bias response on campus. Journal of Law and Education, 48(1), pp. 1-50.

https://www.proquest.com/docview/2178915837?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true.

Appendix A

IRB Approval

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY.
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

April 25, 2023

Jeffrey Ward
David Vacchi

Re: IRB Exemption – IRB-FY22-23-1263 QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY REGARDING EXPERIENCES OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES

Dear Jeffrey Ward, David Vacchi,

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your application in accordance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations and finds your study to be exempt from further IRB review. This means you may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved application, and no further IRB oversight is required.

Your study falls under the following exemption category, which identifies specific situations in which human participants research is exempt from the policy set forth in 45 CFR 46:104(d):

Category 2.(iii). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:
The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects can readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, and an IRB conducts a limited IRB review to make the determination required by §46.111(a)(7).

Your stamped consent form(s) and final versions of your study documents can be found under the Attachments tab within the Submission Details section of your study on Cayuse IRB. Your stamped consent form(s) should be copied and used to gain the consent of your research participants. If you plan to provide your consent information electronically, the contents of the attached consent document(s) should be made available without alteration.

Please note that this exemption only applies to your current research application, and any modifications to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty University IRB for verification of continued exemption status. You may report these changes by completing a modification submission through your Cayuse IRB account.

If you have any questions about this exemption or need assistance in determining whether possible modifications to your protocol would change your exemption status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,
G. Michele Baker, PhD, CIP
Administrative Chair
Research Ethics Office

Appendix B

Consent Form – Faculty and Staff

Consent

Title of the Project: QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY REGARDING EXPERIENCES OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES
Principal Investigator: Jeff Ward, Doctoral Candidate, School of Education, Liberty University

Invitation to be Part of a Research Study

You are invited to participate in a research study. To participate, you must be a faculty or staff member at Houston Christian University or The University of Houston in Houston, Texas. Taking part in this research project is voluntary.

Please take time to read this entire form and ask questions before deciding whether to take part in this research.

What is the study about and why is it being done?

The purpose of this study is to examine how suppression of free speech on college and university campuses in Houston, Texas affects student self-efficacy.

What will happen if you take part in this study?

If you agree to be in this study, I will ask you to do the following:
1. Participate in an audio-recorded focus group with other faculty/staff that will take 1-1.5 hours.

How could you or others benefit from this study?

Participants should not expect to receive a direct benefit from taking part in this study.

Benefits to society include a greater understanding of freedom of speech on college and university campuses.

What risks might you experience from being in this study?

The expected risks from participating in this study are minimal, which means they are equal to the risks you would encounter in everyday life.

How will personal information be protected?

The records of this study will be kept private. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the records.
- Participant responses will be kept confidential by replacing names with pseudonyms.
- Focus Groups will be conducted in a location where others will not easily overhear the conversation.
- Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed in focus group settings. While discouraged, other members of the focus group may share what was discussed with persons outside of the group.

Appendix C

Consent Form - Students

Consent

Title of the Project: QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY REGARDING EXPERIENCES OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES

Principal Investigator: Jeff Ward Doctoral Candidate, School of Education, Liberty University

Invitation to be Part of a Research Study

You are invited to participate in a research study. To participate, you must be spiritual life leaders that are students at Houston Christian University or The University of Houston in Houston, Texas. Taking part in this research project is voluntary.

Please take time to read this entire form and ask questions before deciding whether to take part in this research.

What is the study about and why is it being done?

The purpose of this study is to examine how suppression of free speech on college and university campuses in Houston, Texas affects student self-efficacy.

What will happen if you take part in this study?

If you agree to be in this study, I will ask you to do the following:
1. Participate in an in-person interview that will take 30-45 minutes.
2. All participants are invited to do an audio-recorded focus group that will take 1-1.5 hours.

How could you or others benefit from this study?

Participants should not expect to receive a direct benefit from taking part in this study.

Benefits to society include a greater understanding of freedom of speech on college and university campuses.

What risks might you experience from being in this study?

The expected risks from participating in this study are minimal, which means they are equal to the risks you would encounter in everyday life.

How will personal information be protected?

The records of this study will be kept private. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the records.

- Participant responses will be kept confidential by replacing names with pseudonyms.
- Interviews will be conducted in a location where others will not easily overhear the conversation.

Appendix D

Recruitment Email – Student Interviews and Focus Groups

Date: TBC

Recipient: TBD
██████████████
███████████

Dear _____

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a Ph.D. degree. The title of my research project is QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY REGARDING EXPERIENCES OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES and the purpose of my research is to examine how suppression of freedom of speech on college and university campuses in ████████ affects student self-efficacy.

I am writing to request your permission to utilize your spiritual life groups list to recruit participants for my research. I will also be contacting faculty/staff at this university (whose information is public).

Participants will be asked to schedule an audio-recorded interview with me and all students will be invited to participate in an audio-recorded focus group. Participants will have the opportunity to review their transcripts to ensure accuracy. Faculty/staff participants will be invited to do a focus group only. Participants will be presented with informed consent information prior to participating. Taking part in this study is completely voluntary, and participants are welcome to discontinue participation at any time.

Thank you for considering my request. If you choose to grant permission, please respond by email to jdward2@liberty.edu. A permission letter document is attached for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Jeff Ward,
Doctoral Candidate, School of Education, Liberty University

Appendix E

Follow Up Email – Student Interviews and Focus Groups

Dear _____,

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a Ph.D. degree. Last week an email was sent to you inviting you to participate in a research study. This follow-up email is being sent to remind you to respond if you would like to participate and have not already done so. The deadline for participation is _____.

Participants, if willing, will be asked to take part in an audio-recorded individual interview and are invited to participate in an audio-recorded a focus group. Participants will have the opportunity to review their transcripts to ensure accuracy. It should take approximately 30 to 45 minutes to complete the interview and 1 – ½ hours for the focus group. Names and other identifying information will be requested as part of this study, but the information will remain confidential.

To participate, please contact me at jdward2@liberty.edu for more information/to schedule an interview.

A consent document is attached to this email. The consent document contains additional information about my research. After you have read the consent form, if you choose to participate, please sign it and return it to me at the start of the interview.

Sincerely,

Jeff Ward
Doctoral Candidate, Liberty University School of Education

Appendix F

Recruitment Email – Faculty and Staff Focus Group

From: **Jeff Ward** vols1fan@comcast.net
Subject: Faculty Focus Group - ███████████
Date: May 22, 2023 at 1:42 PM
To: ██████████████████████
Bcc: Ward Jeff vols1fan@comcast.net

Good Afternoon -

I trust you are having a great beginning to your week. I wanted to see if you would be willing to participate in my faculty focus group at ████████████. I have decided to conduct the focus group via Microsoft Teams. I believe this will be more convenient for everyone. I need 7 faculty/staff for the focus group. Do you know any other faculty/staff that may be open to participating in the focus group? I am available next week to do the focus group.

Blessings

Jeff Ward, Ph.D. Candidate, Liberty University

Appendix G

Recruitment Email Follow-Up – Focus Groups – Faculty and Staff

Date: TBD

Recipient: TBD
Title: TBD
Secular or Christian University
Southtown, USA

Dear _____,

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a Ph.D. degree. Last week an email was sent to you inviting you to participate in a research study. This follow-up email is being sent to remind you to respond if you would like to participate and have not already done so. The deadline for participation is _____.

Participants, if willing, will be asked to take part in an audio-recorded focus group. Participants will have the opportunity to review their transcripts to ensure accuracy. It should take approximately 1 to 1.5 hours to complete the focus group. Names and other identifying information will be requested as part of this study, but the information will remain confidential.

To participate, please contact me at jdward2@liberty.edu for more information/to schedule a focus group.

A consent document is attached to this email. The consent document contains additional information about my research. After you have read the consent form, if you choose to participate, please sign it and return it to me at the start of the focus group.

Sincerely,

Jeff Ward
Doctoral Candidate, Liberty University School of Education

Appendix H

Request to Meet with Dean and Associate Dean of Students – Secular University

From: **Jeff Ward** vols1fan@comcast.net
Subject: PhD Research Request - Jeff Ward (friend of ▒▒▒▒▒▒▒)
Date: May 3, 2023 at 4:47 PM
To: ▒▒▒▒▒▒▒▒▒▒▒
Bcc: Ward Jeff vols1fan@comcast.net

Good Afternoon ▒▒▒▒ -

I am a friend of ▒▒▒▒▒▒. Troy shared with me he talked with you about my Ph.D. Dissertation Research. I am attaching some information that will help you in understanding what I am needing to do for my research. I need to complete my interviews and focus groups by the end of May. I am very flexible and can conduct the interviews and focus groups in person or via ZOOM or Microsoft Teams. In addition, I am attaching my resume (church) and resume (education) to help you get to know me, better.

Thank you **SO** much for your willingness to help me with this. I look forward to meeting with you next week! Please let me know if you need more information.

Blessings -

Jeff Ward
(281) 979-0271

SUMMARY:

(1) Principle Investigator: Jeff Ward - Doctoral Candidate for Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration Leadership from Liberty University

(2) Title of Dissertation: QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY REGARDING EXPERIENCES OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES

(3) Stamped Consent forms from IRB for students and faculty/staff:

Ward_1263Stam
pedCo...lty).pdf

Ward_1263Stam
pedCo...nt).pdf

(4) Official Request Letter for the University of Houston:

▒▒▒▒▒▒ –
Ward_1...al.docx

(5) Jeff Ward's Resume (CHURCH)

Appendix I

Interview Questions – Students

Central Research Question
How has freedom of speech on college and university campuses affected the self-efficacy of college students in faith-based organizations?
Sub-Question One
What positive effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?
Sub-Question Two
What negative effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?
Sub-Question Three
What are the perceptions of administrators and educators regarding how campus freedom of speech affects student self-efficacy?

Individual Interview Questions
1. You have heard the expression, "being able to roll with the punches." Describe a time when you had to do that. CRQ
2. Please describe the degree you are working on and what you would like to do when you graduate. CRQ
3. Describe the state of freedom of speech on your campus. CRQ, SQ1, SQ2
4. What would you change regarding freedom of speech at your campus? SQ1, SQ2
5. Describe any challenges you have faced with freedom of speech on your campus. SQ1
6. Describe what has impacted your view of freedom of speech. SQ2
7. Before coming to campus, what has shaped your thoughts regarding freedom of speech on your campus? SQ2
8. Describe any challenges you have encountered with faculty and staff on your campus. SQ2
9. Describe any training you have received from the campus regarding freedom of speech. SQ2
10. Describe how you handle the controversial speakers and subjects on your campus. SQ3
11. What has been your experience with safe zones on your campus? SQ3
12. What else would you like to add to your experiences regarding freedom of speech that we have not discussed? SQ1

Appendix J

Focus Group Questions – Students, Faculty, and Staff

Central Research Question

How has freedom of speech on college and university campuses affected the self-efficacy of college students in faith-based organizations?

Sub-Question One

What positive effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?

Sub-Question Two

What negative effects do students experience due to the nature of freedom of speech on their campus?

Sub-Question Three

What are the perceptions of administrators and educators regarding how campus freedom of speech affects student self-efficacy?

Focus Group Questions

1. What is the first thing that comes to your mind when you think of freedom of speech? CRQ
2. What topics do you believe are off-limits when it comes to freedom of speech on your campus? SQ1
3. How does freedom of speech affect your experiences as a student on campus? SQ1
4. Describe one change that would improve freedom of speech on your campus. SQ1
5. How involved are the administration and faculty regarding freedom of speech? SQ1
6. What do you think of when you hear the term "hate speech.?" SQ2
7. Describe your experiences with hate speech. SQ2
8. Describe how you have processed controversial topics that may be perceived as hate speech. SQ3
9. What else would you like to add regarding freedom of speech on your campus? SQ3

Appendix K

Coding – Student Interviews – Secular University

SECULAR UNIVERSITY   STUDENT INTERVIEWS

KIM	WYATT	WILLIAM	BOB	DEBORAH	MIKE	MONICA
SELECTIVE FREEDOM OF SPEECH	FAIRNESS	CONTROVERSIAL SPEAKERS - MOVIE EXAMPLE	LEADER	FREEDOM FOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH	LEADER	OPENNESS
CONTROVERSIAL SPEAKERS	CONTROVERSIAL SPEAKERS	NO RESTRICTIONS	CONTROVERSIAL SPEAKERS - MATT WALSH	NO CHALLENGES	JUDGEMENT	BACKLASH - PROTESTS
PROTEST - MATT WALSH	PROTESTS	NO TRAINING	OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS	CONTROVERSIES	CONTROVERSIES - OUTSIDE GROUPS	NO CHALLENGES
OPENNESS	HATE SPEECH - MATT WALSH	NO SAFE ZONES	PRESSURE ON CERTAIN TOPICS	GREW UP IN ANOTHER COUNTRY	OPENNESS BUT WITH CONSEQUENCES	NO TRAINING
CLOSED MINDED	NO PROBLEMS WITH STAFF	NO CHALLENGES	AVOIDANCE	NO TRAINING	NO TRAINING	PROCESSES
PARENTAL INFLUENCE	NO TRAINING	BASH HATE SPEECH (?)	CERTAIN TOPICS NOT DISCUSSED	NO SAFE ZONES	FAIRNESS	
NO TRAINING	PROCESS FOR SPEAKERS	LEADER	OUTSIDE GROUP PROBLEMS		PROCESSES	
NO SAFE ZONES	LEADER		NO CHALLENGES		NO SAFE ZONES	
			PROTESTS			
			OPENNESS			

Appendix L

Coding – Student Interviews – Christian University

KARIS	DOUG	JOHN	EDWARD	DON	IDA	GINGER
CAREFUL WHAT YOU SAY	LEADER	LEADER	LEADER	LEADER	LEADER	LIMITED FREEDOM
CAUTIOUS	NO OUTLET FOR OPENNESS	NOT OPEN…BUT OPEN	MORE FREEDOM OF SPEECH	OPENNESS	NOT OPEN TO OTHER BELIEFS	NEED FOR MORE FREEDOM`
CHANGE JUDGMENT	NO PROBLEMS	NO CHALLENGES	NO CHALLENGES	NO PROGLEMS	NO TRAINING	LEADER
LESS JUDGMENT	SOCIAL MEDIA	HISTORY OF AMERICA	OTHER COUNTRIES	NO CHALLENGES PERSONALLY	NO OPENNESS TO OUTSIDE GROUPS	NO CHALLENGES PERSONALLY
PATIENCE	INFLUENCED GROWING UP	1ST AMENDMENT	WORLD EVENTS	DIFFERENCES RECEIVED WELL	RESTRICTIVE	NO TRAINING ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH
CHALLENGED BY OTHERS	HEALTHCARE DISAGREEMENTS	SOCIETAL INFLUENCE	NO PROBLEMS WITH STAFF	AGAINS CENSORSHIP	WANT MORE DIALOGUE	VETTING PROCESS FOR SPEAKERS
PARENTAL INFLUENCE	PUSHBACK OVER HOT TOPICS	NO PROBLEMS WITH STAFF	AWAKWARDNESS WITH STAFF	FAMILY IMPACT ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH	NO PROBLEM WITH FACULTY	NO SAFE ZONES
NO PROBLEM WITH STAFF	NO TRAINING	NO SAFE ZONES	NO TRAINING	NO TOPICS OFF LIMITS		NOT OPEN TO OUTSIDE OPINIONS
NO TRAINING	NO OPENNESS FOR OTHER BELIEFS	NON CONTROVERSIAL FORM OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH	NOT OPEN TO OUTSIE SPEAKERS	VETTING PROCESS FOR SPEAKERS		
NOT OPEN TO OPPOSING VIEWS			NO SAFE ZONES	NO SAFE ZONES		
NO SAFE ZONES				NO TRAINING		
OLDER PEOPLE NOT OPEN						
LEADER						

Appendix M

Coding – Student Focus Group – Secular University

SECULAR UNIVERSITY   STUDENT FOCUS GROUP

WILLIAM	WYATT	DEBORAH	KIM
BACKGROUND INFLUENCE	POLITICAL GATHERINGS OFF LIMITS	RESPECT OPINIONS	WANT MORE OPENNESS
NO CONSPIRIACIES	RESPECT FOR OTHERS OPINIONS	OPENED EYES TO HOW IT IS IN AMERICA AS OPPOSED TO OTHER COUNTRIES	CONTROVERSIAL SPEAKERS - MATT WALSH - VERY DISRUPTIVE AND PEOPLE WERE MEAN
NEED FOR ORIENTATION REGARDING FREEDOM OF SPEECH	POLITICS	MORE FREEDOM OF SPEECH THAN OTHER COUNTRIES	POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ONOY ONE PARTY SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED
MORE FREEDOM OF SPEECH THAN OTHER COUNTRIES	SHOULD HAVE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH	WHEN DISCUSSING POLITICS MAKE SURE BOTH SIDES ARE PRESENTED	GROUPS ARE STEREOTYPED - THIS LIMITS FREEDOM OF SPEECH
NEED FOR MORE EDUCATION REGARDING WHAT IS ACCEPTABLE	FREEDOM OF SPEECH SHOULD BE MODERATED	NO ONE SIDED POLITICS	NEED FOR PROFESSORS TO MODEL FREEDOM OF SPEECH
NEED FOR SUPPORT GROUPS	GROUPS ARE STEREOTYPED - ESPECIALLY FOR RELIGIOUS CLUBS	NOTHING TO MAKE PEOPLE FEEL OSTERCIZED	NEED FOR LESS HATE SPEECH AND MORE CONVERSATIONS
NEED FOR PROFESSORS TO MODEL FREEDOM OF SPEECH	NEED FOR PROFESSORS TO MODEL FREEDOM OF SPEECH	NEED FOR MORE EDUCATION ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH	MISINTERPRETATIONS OF HATE SPEECH
NEED FOR LESS HATE SPEECH AND MORE CONVERSATIONS	NEED FOR LESS HATE SPEECH AND MORE CONVERSATIONS	NEED FOR PROFESSORS TO MODEL FREEDOM OF SPEECH	
MISINTERPRETATIONS OF HATE SPEECH	MISINTERPRETATIONS OF HATE SPEECH	MISINTERPRETATIONS OF HATE SPEECH	

Appendix N

Coding – Student Focus Group – Christian University

CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY   STUDENT FOCUS GROUP

EDWARD	GINGER	NICK	JENNIFER
OPPENNESS IN FRIEND GROUPS - NOT PUBLICALLY	BILL OF RIGHTS	FREEDOM TO THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX	RACISM
MORE OPENNESS BY ADMINISTRATORS	FREEDOM OF SPEECH IS LIMITED	PUSH TOUGH TOPICS TO THE SIDE	LGBTQ+ OFF LIMITS
POLITICS - OFF LIMITS	LIMITATIONS BY ADMINISTRATION	OPENNESS FOR STUDENTS TO DISCUSS MORE	DESIRE FOR PEACEFUL CONVERSATIONS
STUDENT DEBT OFF LIMITS	SAFE ENVIRONMENT	LGBTQ+ OFF LIMITS	
IMMIGRATION OFF LIMITS	STUDENT DEBT OFF LIMITS		
	SAFE ENVIRONMENT		
	BLM OFF LIMITS		
	IMMIGRATION OFF LIMITS - EXAMPLE		
	WOULD LIKE PLANNED CONVERSATIONS WITH MEDIATORS		
	PRO LIFE ACCEPTABLE		
	CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES		
	HATE SPEECH		
	DESIRE TO CREATE OPEN OPPORTUNIUTIES FOR STUDENTS		

Appendix O

Coding – Faculty and Staff Focus Group – Secular University

SECULAR UNIVERSITY   FACULTY FOCUS GROUP

SYLVIA	JIM	SIENNA	ABEL
CONSTITUTION/BILL OF RIGHTS	CONSTITUTION/BILL OF RIGHTS	CONSTITUTION/BILL OF RIGHTS	CONSTITUTION/BILL OF RIGHTS
IMPORTANCE OF EXPRESSING OPINIONS	NOT WORRIED ABOUT TOPICS	NO TOPCS OFF LIMITS	DIVERSITY IMPORTANT
ALL TOPICS HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED	WORRIED ABOUT ACTIONS	DOES IT INTERRUPT THE CAMPUS?	INDIVIDUALITY IMPORTANT
OPENNESS	MISPERCECPTIONS ABOUT "DISCIPLINE"	SHOULD NOT BE BANNED BECAUSE IT IS A SENSITIVE TOPIC	RESPONSE FROM UNIVERSITY IS IMPORTANT
"SOMETIMES THE OPENNESS IS SHOCKING"	FEELING AMONGST FACULTY YOU HAVE TO WATCH WHAT YOU SAY	EMPHASIS ON CRITICAL THINKING	PEOPLE OF COLOR HAVE TO WATCH WHAT THEY SAY
STATE CAMPUS REFERENCE	PEOPLE OF COLOR HAVE TO WATCH WHAT THEY SAY	FACULTY FREEDOM	HAVE TO BE CAUTIOUS AS A PERSON OF COLOR
OUTISE FUNDAMENTATLIST GROUPS	HAVE TO BE CAUTIOUS AS A PERSON OF COLOR	DESIRE TO FOLLOW RULES	NEED A BETTER DEFINITION OF HATE SPEECH
MORE EDUCATION ABOUT PROCESS	NOT AN AWARENESS OF POLICIES		MONITORING OF OUTSIDE SPEAKERS
	NEED TO BE PROACTIVE AND NOT REACTIVE		PROCESS FOR SPEAKERS
	NEED PROCEDURES FOR OUTSIDE GROUPS		RISK MANAGEMENT
	DEFINE HATE SPEECH		TEMPTATION TO HIDE BEHIND POLICIES
	STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS A PROBLEM		

Appendix P

Coding – Faculty and Staff Focus Group – Secular University

CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY   FACULTY FOCUS GROUP

CHRIS	SAM	BOB	JOHN	LISA
5 PROTECTIONS UNDER 1ST AMENDMENT	REFERENCE TO FREE SPEECH BALL (?)	NEED FREEDOM TO DISAGREE WITHOUT RETRUBUTION	5 PROTECTIONS UNDER 1ST AMENDMENT	NEED FREEDOM TO DISAGREE WITHOUT RETRIBUTION
RIGHTS AS A PRIVATE INSTITUTION	LIMITS TO OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS	REFERENCE TO CANCEL CULTURE	THERE NEEDS TO BE A PROCESS FOR INVITING OUTSIDE SPEAKERS	THRE IS A NEED TO CELEBRATE DIVERSITY
COMPARISON TO PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS ALLOWED	TOPICS ARE NOT OUT OF BOUNDS - POSITIONS RELATED TO TOPICS ARE OUT OF BOUNDS		CONCERNS ABOUT HATE SPEECH
RESPONSIBILITY TO UPHOLD MORAL VALUES		POSITION OF SCHOOL WILL BE PUSHED		
MORE FUNDING NEEDED		THERRE IS A NEED TO CELEBRATE DIVERSITY		
THERE IS A NEED TO CELEBRATE DIVERSITY		CONCERNS ABOUT HATE SPEECH		
		TRANSGENDER EXAMPLE		
		2 VIEWS ALWAYS HAVE TO BE PRESENTED		