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Abstract

It is almost inevitable that some organizational members will fall short of meeting important organizational standards, and organizations often have explicit procedures for disciplining employees after such violations. However, we know very little about what happens after discipline occurs, and specifically, how employees become reintegrated back into organizations following violations. Research on the aftermath of punishment is scarce, and what does exist is problematic in three significant ways. First, the preponderance of research to date has treated punishment as an outcome; not only has this prompted research efforts to assume that punishment restores a system to a functioning state, but it has also prevented scholars from asking questions about the long-run effects of punishment on violators. Second, most of the limited research that has been done on reintegration in the aftermath of punishment focuses on the interpersonal dynamics of reintegration, discounting both the role that the violator and the organization play in reintegration. Third, the reintegration literature fails to consider the violators’ perspective in the reintegration process, causing scholars to have very little understanding of what makes violators feel more or less reintegrated, and what ultimately makes reintegration more or less effective. The present research addresses these shortcomings and significantly revises our understanding of reintegration. By conducting a longitudinal, inductive, qualitative field study of how violators become reintegrated back into a military service academy following violations of organizational standards, I show that violations generate ruptures in
violators’ sense of self-worth, support, and standing. Reintegration is the process by which violators repair their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. I show that reintegration does not simply return violators to a pre-violation state, as folk theory assumes; rather the process of reintegration creates a new “psychological contract” in the minds of the violators, specifying new expectations that the violators have of the organization. Some of these expectations are \textit{formal} – expectations that are explicitly “promised” by the organization – while others are \textit{self-generated} – expectations that are “filled in” by violators. I show that the extent to which violators feel reintegrated depends on the extent to which violators’ psychological contracts – comprising both formal and self-generated expectations – are fulfilled. When violators’ expectations are met and their psychological contracts are fulfilled, they feel repaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing, and more reintegrated over all. When violators’ expectations are not met and their psychological contracts are breached, violators feel unrepaid in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing, and they feel less reintegrated overall.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Failure, errors, and violations of organizational standards are ubiquitous in organizational life. Termination is often assumed to be a standard response to these types of employee violations. However, organizations often have very good reasons for wanting to retain employees despite violations: the employees may be very valuable organizational assets, or it may be costly to hire and fire employees. It is therefore not uncommon for organizations to discipline but retain employees in the aftermath of a violation. For example, television reporter Brian Ross was suspended for three weeks without pay after he reported a story without verifying its accuracy first (Wang, 2017). Police officers are often placed on temporary administrative leave while incidents involving force are investigated, after which they are often returned to their normal roles. And physicians can have their licenses suspended – and then reinstated – in the aftermath of negligence or misconduct.

A great deal of research has been focused on punishment and discipline in organizations (e.g., Arvey & Ivancevich, 1980; Wiltermuth & Flynn, 2013; Trevino, 1992). Most of this research appears to implicitly assume that punishment is an end that restores the organizational system to a functioning state (Adams & Mullen, 2014; Okimoto & Wenzel, 2009). However, by treating punishment as an end state, scholars have often overlooked questions regarding the long-run effects of punishment on violators. Understanding the aftermath of punishment is particularly important in cases when violators are retained at organizations despite violations.

When organizations discipline but retain employees after violations, they create the conditions for reintegration. Violations cause ruptures, and reintegration relates to the process of how those ruptures are repaired. Reintegration has been used to describe repair dynamics following both employee violations and violations by entire organizations (e.g., Pfarrer et al.,
For the purposes of this research, I focus on violations by individual employees. At the individual employee level, reintegration has typically been conceptualized as interpersonal reacceptance of a violator by victims or third parties. For example, Gromet and Okimoto (2014) defined reintegration as a “willingness of other organizational members to accept the violator and victim and bring them back into the organizational fold” (415).

The focus on interpersonal dynamics of reintegration has led scholars to study topics such as forgiveness (Gromet & Okimoto, 2014; Fehr & Gelfand, 2012; Barclay & Saldanha, 2016; Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006; Bies, Barclay, Tripp, & Aquino, 2015), victims’ willingness to reconcile (Palanski, 2011; Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001; Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006; Tomlinson et al., 2004), and observers’ perceptions of victim-violator dynamics (e.g., Gromet & Okimoto, 2014). Less attention has been paid to the experience of violators, and the research that has centered on violators tends to focus on apologies and making amends (e.g., ten Brinke & Adams, 2015; Kim et al., 2004; Ferrin et al., 2007; Bottom et al., 2002). However, apologies and amends are likely a small fraction of the experience of reintegration for violators.

Understanding the whole of violators’ experiences of reintegration is important, because violators’ perceptions and experiences of reintegration may differ from the perceptions and experiences of victims or third-party observers. As a result, violators may not feel fully reintegrated back into an organization, even if apologies have been made and victims or observers believe violators have been reintegrated. Research suggests that when employees feel disrespected or they do not have full standing in an organization, they are likely to feel disengaged (Sleebos, Ellemers, & de Gilder, 2006). Disengagement can lead to loss of productivity and potentially even turnover, both of which are costly to organizations (Kahn,
In order for reintegration efforts to be effective, it is necessary to understand what makes violators feel more or less reintegrated. Focusing on interpersonal aspects of reintegration does not provide insight into understanding violators’ reintegration experiences; therefore, it is vitally important for research to examine how violators experience reintegration.

This led me to ask the question: *What is a violator’s experience when he or she breaks a core organizational standard and attempts are made to reintegrate the member back into the organization?* To understand violators’ experiences of reintegration, I conducted a longitudinal, qualitative, inductive study of violators at a military service academy (“the Academy”) as they were reintegrated back into the organization. The Academy had a highly formalized reintegration program, making it an ideal setting to study this question. By systematically following violators as they completed this program, it allowed me to uncover how violators experienced reintegration, thereby understanding the process of reintegration from the violator’s perspective.

My data suggest that violations generated ruptures in violators’ sense of self-worth, support, and standing. When violators were retained at the Academy, they believed they were being given a second chance. As part of this second chance, violators knew that the organization had certain expectations of them, which they attempted to comply with. However, in doing so, violators also began to develop their own expectations about what they could expect from the organization and its members going forward. In short, violators began to perceive a psychological contract to exist between themselves and the organization.

My data suggest that the extent to which these psychological contracts were fulfilled or breached fundamentally influenced the extent to which violators felt reintegrated overall. When violators’ psychological contracts were fulfilled, they experienced repair in their self-worth, support, and standing, and felt highly reintegrated. When violators’ psychological contracts were
breached, their sense of self-worth, standing, and support went unmet, and they felt less reintegrated overall.

This dissertation is structured as follows. In Chapter 2 I provide some orienting literatures to provide context for the subsequent theorizing and discussion. In Chapter 3 I summarize the context and methodology that was used in this study. I then present my findings in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 articulates a more generalized model of the reintegration process, placing it in dialogue with existing theory and research. Chapter 6 concludes by highlighting the theoretical and practical contributions that this dissertation makes.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As will be seen in Chapters 4 and 5, my data suggest that violators experience reintegration as a process that begins with a violation and punishment, and continues on in the aftermath of punishment. To lay the groundwork for understanding this process, I review several literatures that are pertinent to different stages of this process. As foreshadowed above, the experience of violators during reintegration has been largely overlooked by scholars. I therefore begin by focusing on the limited literatures that do center on the effects of violations on violators. I review research regarding relational ruptures between violators and organizations – namely, the work on standing in the context of the group engagement model (Tyler & Blader, 2003), stigma, and social rejection. I will then review research on punishment in organizations, which often follows violations. Though very little work has explored the next stage – the aftermath of punishment in organizations, especially reintegration – I conclude by discussing the limited research that has been done in this area. For each literature, I provide an overview of the state of the research, and identify assumptions and gaps in the current understanding of the topic.

Effects of Violations of Violators: Standing, Stigma, and Social Rejection

A violation – because it involves a breach of standards or trust -- may affect a violator’s social interactions and standing in an organization. As such, I begin by reviewing research related to the group engagement model (Tyler & Blader, 2003). This literature provides hints about how organizational members may lose standing in an organization in the aftermath of violations. I then turn to research on stigma and social rejection to highlight what may happen when an organizational member’s standing becomes lowered.

Standing and the Group Engagement Model
People have a need to join and maintain membership in groups, and individuals are deeply affected by how they are viewed in those groups (Baumetister & Leary, 1995; Huo, Binning, & Molina, 2010; Tyler & Blader, 2003). Individuals want to be valued by other group or organizational members, and therefore they are deeply concerned about their status—also referred to as “standing” (Tyler & Blader, 2003) or “respect” (Huo, Binning & Molina, 2010)—within a group. Individuals infer their standing or respect in a group based in part on the quality of their interpersonal relationships with other group members (Tyler & Blader, 2003; Huo, Binning, & Molina, 2010; Fuller et al., 2009; Spears, Ellemers, Doosje, & Branscombe, 2006).[1] Rude treatment from group members signals that the individuals have low status, while positive interactions signal that the individuals have more standing (Tyler, 1989: 831). This is particularly true of authorities’ actions toward individuals, as authorities’ actions are assumed to reflect the collective opinions of the group (Huo, Binning, & Molina, 2010). When organizational members perceive themselves to have low standing, it has significant effects on their behavior. Sleebos, Ellemers, and de Guilder (2006) found that organizational members who are disrespected identify less with the group, though under some circumstances, they may continue to engage in and contribute to the group.

When an individual commits a violation, he or she may lose standing in the organization. If so, other organizational members may react to this lowered standing by stigmatizing and socially rejecting the violator—which can have significant impacts on the violator.

**Stigma**

Stigma was originally defined by Goffman (1963) as “an attribute that is deeply discrediting” that reduces a person “from a whole and usual person to a tainted, discounted one” (3). Goffman (1963) identified several sources of stigma: abominations of the body, such as
physical deformities or illness; tribal stigma, such as race and religion; and – most relevant for the current research -- “blemishes of character,” which are triggered by inappropriate behavior and are sometimes called “conduct stigma” (Goffman, 1963; Devers et al., 2009). Importantly, Goffman conceptualized stigma as a label that is placed on individuals, not necessarily a static, immutable trait that individuals possess. However, because much of the research on stigma has focused on race, ethnicity, or chronic illnesses, scholars often treat stigma as a permanent feature of an individual. Only recently has research begun to explore the concept of destigmatization, or the process by which previously stigmatized individuals’ worth and status improve (Clair, Daniel, & Lamont, 2016). While work on destigmatization is still in its infancy, scholars have identified several ways that stigma can be removed. Broadly speaking, these fall into two categories: either the stigmatizers can alter their perceptions of the individuals and/or the attribute (e.g., Link & Phelan, 2001; Cook et al., 2014; Corrigan & Kosyluk, 2013; Paluck & Green, 2009), or the stigmatizing attribute can be removed from the individuals, often through identity change (e.g., Bursell, 2012; Devers et al., 2009).

Groups and organizations may use stigma as a method of social control (Paetzold, Dipboye, & Elsbach, 2008). Affixing a stigmatized label on individuals leads others to make negative evaluations about the individuals (Paetzold, Dipboye, & Elsbach, 2008; Devers et al., 2009), thereby discrediting them. By discrediting individuals that possess a particular attribute, groups effectively signal what attributes are appropriate or desirable in the group. Thus, stigma becomes a way for groups to enforce their values and norms (Devers et al., 2009; Erickson, 1962).

Stigmatization has several significant (and negative) effects on the discredited individuals. Because stigma discredits individuals in the eyes of others, stigmatized individuals
lose their status (Link & Phelan, 2001), legitimacy, and reputations (Paetzold, Dipboye, & Elsbach, 2008). In short, they lose their standing in the group or organization. Furthermore, because stigmatized individuals are assumed to possess attributes that are counter to group values or norms, group members may disengage with and socially reject stigmatized individuals. A great deal of empirical research shows that when individuals deviate from group norms or when their actions reflect badly on the group, other group members dissociated from the individuals (Abrams, Marques, Bown, & Henson, 2000; Marques, Abrams, & Serôdio, 2001; Lewis & Sherman, 2003; Marques & Paez, 1994). This social rejection and ostracism likely occurs for both psychological and functional reasons (Robinson, O’Reilly, & Wang, 2013: 209; Gruter & Masters, 1986; Pickett & Brewer, 2005; Wesselmann, Wirth, Pryor, Reeder, & Williams, 2012). To better understand how individuals react when a group stigmatizes and socially rejects them – as may be the case in the aftermath of a violation – I review the literature on social rejection and ostracism.

**Social Rejection & Ostracism**

When a collective socially rejects a stigmatized group member, this rejection may take the form of ostracism (Smart Richman & Leary, 2006; Robinson, O’Reilly, Wang, 2013), isolation, marginalization, exclusion, or organizational shunning (Anderson, 2009: 36; Robinson, O’Reilly, & Wang, 2013: 205) against the stigmatized or rejected member. While the term “ostracism” has typically been defined as being ignored or excluded without explicit negative attention (Williams, 2007), for the purposes of this review, I use “ostracism” to refer to all types of social rejection by group members.

Ostracism can have affective, psychological, and behavioral effects on the rejected individuals. Ostracized individuals may experience a range of negative emotions, including
sadness, anger, distress, and “hurt feelings” (Leary et al., 1998; MacDonald & Leary, 2005; Blackhart et al., 2009). Under some circumstances, ostracism may also lower self-esteem (Ferris, Lian, Brown, & Morrison, 2015). These negative reactions are thought to arise from the awareness that others do not value the relationship as much as the ostracized individuals would like (Leary et al., 1998; MacDonald & Leary, 2005). According to sociometer theory (Leary & Baumeister, 2000), a threat to self-esteem signals to the individuals that they have been or at risk of being excluded from a group (Leary & Baumeister, 2000; Leary, 2005).

Ostracism has also been linked to rumination, anxiety, and distress (Robinson, O’Reilly, Wang, 2013: 208). Some scholars argue that because ostracism entails the absence of inclusive behaviors, it is often unclear if ostracism occurred at all, or if it is, whether it was intentional (Robinson, O’Reilly, Wang, 2013: 208; Wong & Weiner, 1981; Guastella & Moulds, 2007). Even if the ostracism is obvious, ostracized individuals may ruminate about why the rejection happened and what it means, which may lead to anxiety and distress (Robinson, O’Reilly, Wang, 2013: 208). Thus, ostracism is clearly an emotionally and psychologically aversive experience for the ostracized individual.

Smart Richman and Leary (2006) argue that behavioral responses are possible following ostracism: the ostracized individuals may attempt to regain acceptance, retaliate against the group that has rejected them, or withdraw from the group to avoid further rejection. If individuals are motivated to regain acceptance, they may engage in reparative or prosocial behaviors toward other group members (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Smart Richman & Leary, 2009; Williams & Sommer, 1997). On the other hand, if ostracized individuals respond with retaliation, they may behave more aggressively (Leary, Twenge, & Quinlivan, 2006; Twenge, Baumeister, Tice, & Stucke, 2001) or engage in other antisocial actions (Downey, Freitas,
Michaelis, & Khouri, 1998; Twenge et al., 2007). If ostracized individuals are instead motivated to avoid further rejection, they may withdraw from the group, either by physically distancing themselves, or by failing to contribute (Smart Richman & Leary, 2009; Kross & Ayduk, 2011). The behavioral response depends on how the ostracized individuals construe the rejection; for example, whether it was fair, whether the costs of the rejection are high, whether the individuals believe that repair is possible, etc. (Smart Richman & Leary, 2009).

**Assumptions, Gaps, and Limitations**

This review suggests that several things may happen in the aftermath of a violation. Violators may lose standing in organizations and become stigmatized. If this is the case, they may experience social rejection by other organizational members, which may have significant negative effects on violators.

However, although the literatures reviewed above have comprehensively investigated the constructs of standing, stigma, and social rejection, none of these literatures have deeply explored the *dynamic* aspects of these constructs. There is a dearth of research about how standing, stigma, and social rejection change over time, especially in response to workplace events like violations. Many unanswered questions remain, including: what happens when an individual loses their standing, but organizations give the individual chances to regain it? How does the violator attempt to regain standing? What increases the likelihood that an individual will regain standing? Can individuals ever truly recover and return to their previous level of standing, or will they always be “marked” in some way? What role does the organization and its members play in helping individuals regain standing?

Similar questions can be asked of stigma. Some very recent research has started to explore the idea of destigmatization (Clair, Daniel, & Lamon, 2016), but a great deal remains
unknown about this process. Very little is known about an individual’s experience as he or she becomes destigmatized. In particular, it is unclear whether the previously stigmatized individual ever achieves the same level of wellbeing and status that un-stigmatized individuals experience, or if the experience of being stigmatized leaves permanent marks on a person’s life. Do destigmatized individuals feel that they have been returned to full standing, or does some of the “spoiled identity” (Goffman, 1963) linger, even in their own eyes?

There are many unanswered questions about the experience of social rejection as well. Once an individual has been socially rejected, how does he or she regain social acceptance? Does being social rejected but then accepted return the individual to a “baseline” level of wellbeing, or will the individual never fully recover in the aftermath of rejection?

**The Aftermath of Violations: Punishment**

After a violation occurs and becomes known, it is likely that the organization will engage in some type of punishment or disciplinary action against the violator. Punishment has long been of interest to philosophers, criminal justice researchers, sociologists, and organizational behavior scholars. Although punishment appears to be a ubiquitous part of organizations and society, people may hold different views about the purpose of punishment.

One predominant view is that the purpose of punishment is retributive (Trevino & Weaver, 1998). Retributive theories of punishment hold that violations give violators unfair advantages, and therefore punishment is used to make up for previous bad behavior and restore the system to a fair state (Trevino & Weaver, 1998; Ellis, 1995). In other words, punishment is a form of “compensation” for violations (Goodstein & Butterfield, 2010: 455). These theories hint that once discipline has been administered, the system returns to a functioning state.
Theories of restorative justice take a different perspective. Restorative justice conceptualizes violations as ruptures in relationships between violators, victims, and other stakeholders (Goodstein & Butterfield, 2010; Okiomoto et al. 2009). Restorative justice focuses on returning victims to pre-violation states, reintegrating violators, and fostering healing (Bazemore, 1998; Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather, & Platow, 2008). In a restorative justice framework, discipline can be used to restore the violators’ standing in a community (Goodstein & Butterfield, 2010: 457). Implicit in this is the idea that punishment repairs relationships, such that victims and violators can interact at least as effectively as they did before the violation. Therefore, although restorative justice approaches are more repair-oriented, they – like retributive justice approaches – implicitly treat punishment as the “final stage” after violations. These perspectives assume that punishment restores the social system, enabling it to carry on as before.

Occasionally scholars have considered how discipline may have longer-lasting effects, continuing beyond the punishment episode. However, these scholars have focused almost exclusively on the perspective of the manager, and how the manager uses punishment to produce future consequences, such as generating more respect from the violators, or sending signals to other employees (e.g., Butterfield, Trevino, & Ball, 1996). Research has not considered how violators may continue to experience the effects of punishment, long after the immediate punishment episode has ended.

Assumptions, Gaps, & Limitations

As can be seen from this review, many of the prevailing theories about punishment and justice assume that punishment is the final stage in the aftermath of a violation. In short,
punishment restores the social system to a functional state, and therefore there is nothing else to consider.

However, it is possible that punishment may actually have longer-term effects on violators, beyond the punishment event. If violations are assumed to damage the relationships between violators and organizational members, then considering punishment through the lens of relationship repair may hint at longer-lasting process for violators. Relationships involve ongoing positive interactions (e.g., Dirks, Lewicki, & Zaheer, 2009), which often involve reciprocity. If punishment serves to restore a relationship, then it should re-start a cycle of positive exchange between violators and organizational members. But because positive exchange necessarily involves expectations of reciprocity, this suggests that punishment may actually prompt violators to generate new expectations of the organization and its members – thereby triggering new ongoing processes involving violators and organizations, beyond what previously existed. However, existing literature remains silent about whether violators feel that punishment is the “end” of the process, or if punishment prompts new longer-term processes involving new expectations of reciprocity.

The Aftermath of Punishment: Reintegration

Because research often assumes that punishment is the final stage following a violation, little attention has been paid to the aftermath of punishment in general, and to reintegration in particular. Although “reintegration” has been used to refer to a myriad of concepts, I use this

1 The term “reintegration” has been used to describe a variety of situations: how ex-criminals re-join communities and societies following incarceration or time in the criminal justice system (e.g. Braithwaite & Mugford, 1998; Maruna, 2011); how military service members transition following deployment (Doyle & Peterson, 2005) or how ex-combatants rejoin society (e.g. Anaya, 2007); how employees experience re-entry into organizations following illness, maternity leave, or time as an expat (e.g. Dunstan & MacEachen, 2013; 2014); how organizations regain legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders following corruption (e.g. Pfarrer et al., 2008; Gillespie, Dietz, & Lockey, 2014); or how employees who have committed a transgression are re-accepted by the organization and its members to become full, accepted, contributing members of the organization (e.g. Goodstein et al., 2014; Goodstein & Aquino, 2010).
term to describe the process by which individuals who have violated an organizational standard become re-accepted and regain standing in an organization (e.g. Goodstein et al., 2014; Goodstein & Aquino, 2010).

The limited empirical and theoretical work that exists on reintegration is often grounded in theories of restorative justice (e.g. Goodstein & Aquino, 2010; Goodstein et al., 2014, p. 322). Restorative justice tends to focus on situations in which interpersonal transgressions have occurred. As such, the focus of restorative justice is often on interpersonal repair between a violator and a victim (e.g., Bazemore, 1998: footnote 4; Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994; Johnstone, 1999). Restorative justice emphasizes collective healing, especially through restitution to victims and reintegration of offenders (Zehr, 1990; Braithwaite, 1999; Bazemore, 1998). As a result, a significant focus of much restorative justice work is on how offenders offer, and how victims accept, amends (e.g. Bazemore, 1998).

Because restorative justice – with its focus on interpersonal transgressions and amends – underpins much of the work on reintegration in organizations, organizational scholars have focused a great deal on the interpersonal dynamics of reintegration in organizations. This can be seen in the definitions of reintegration that organizational scholars have adopted. For example, in their review, Goodstein et al. (2014) state, “reintegration depends to a great extent on the perceptions and actions of third parties…..these parties ‘must want to work and interact with the offender and the victim for them to once again be truly include as members of the organization,’ (Gromet & Okimoto, 2014: 411).” They also define reintegration as, “offenders taking steps to make amends with those they have harmed in the community, regaining support, and ‘earning their way back into the trust of the community’ (Bazemore, 1998: 770).” Other scholars have also focused on the interpersonal aspects of reintegration by defining reintegration as the
“willingness of other organizational members to accept the offender and victim and bring them back into the organizational fold” (Gromet & Okimoto, 2014).

The focus on interpersonal reintegration goes beyond definition. Goodstein et al. (2014, p. 321) and Goodstein and Aquino (2010) both devote significant portions of their reviews to the interpersonal interactions involved in reintegration, including making amends, apologies, forgiveness, and acts of restitution between the offender and victim. Furthermore, a significant portion of the conceptual and empirical research on reintegration in organizations looks at interpersonal outcomes such as relationship repair (Okimoto & Wenzel, 2014) or third party acceptance of the victim or offender (Gromet & Okimoto, 2014). Because of this focus on interpersonal re-acceptance, scholars have been able to draw on the well-developed literatures of forgiveness, (e.g. Bies, Barclay, Tripp, & Aquino, 2015), trust repair (e.g. Kim, Dirks, & Cooper, 2009; Schweitzer, Hershey, & Bradlow, 2006), and relationship repair (e.g. Ren & Gray, 2009; Dirks, Lewicki, & Zaheer, 2009; Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2001; Aquino, Tripp, & Bies, 2006) in the study of reintegration.

A few attempts have been made to move beyond a focus on interpersonal re-acceptance in the study of reintegration. For example, Goodstein et al. (2014) in their review mention that reintegration may also have aspect of intrapsychic restoration, and they point to two intrapsychic processes that may be involved in reintegration: self-forgiveness (e.g. Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2012; 2013) and the development of redemptive narratives (Weeks & Pasupathi, 2011; Dunlop & Tracy, 2013). However, to date these intrapsychic processes – or any significant focus on the emotional or psychological experiences of violators – have been largely absent from most research on reintegration of violators in organizations.
In addition to its emphasis on interpersonal dynamics, research following the restorative justice tradition has also tended to conceptualize reintegration as a binary outcome -- it either happens or it does not (e.g., Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994; Okimoto & Wenzel, 2014; Gromet & Okimoto, 2014). Some attempts have been made to treat reintegration as a process (e.g., Goodstein & Butterfield, 2010), but most work is theoretical. To date, the vast majority of empirical work on reintegration in organizations conceptualizes reintegration as a binary outcome.

**Assumptions, Gaps, and Limitations**

Several observations can be drawn from a review of the reintegration literature. First, most research in this area has focused on the antecedents of restorative justice, and reintegration has been treated as one contributing factor (see, e.g., Goodstein & Aquino, 2010). Rarely has reintegration been studied in its own right, and as a result, far less theoretical or empirical research has focused on the process of reintegration.

Second, the vast majority of the literature focuses narrowly on the interpersonal dynamics involved in reintegration. The overemphasis on the interpersonal aspects of reintegration is problematic for several reasons. With a few exceptions, (e.g. Goodstein et al., 2014; Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2012; 2013) most of this literature ignores the higher and lower levels of analysis – it does not consider what the organization does with respect to the violator’s reintegration, nor does it attend to the experiences of the violators. In addition, it does not consider how the violator’s experience may respond to, or be shaped by, the actions of the organization, and vice versa. Failing to consider the experience of the violator is problematic, as violators may have very different perceptions about the extent of their reintegration, as compared to victims or third-party
observers. In other words, a third party may believe that a violator has been fully reintegrated, but the violator may not feel integrated at all.

Ignoring the experience of violators in reintegration also prevents us from developing rigorous theory about the process of reintegration. Despite organizational attempts at reintegration, violators may have different experiences of reintegration, ranging from feeling highly reintegrated to not reintegrated at all. Failing to consider the violators’ experiences prevents us from seeing these different types of reintegration experiences, let alone understanding the processes by which violators become more or less reintegrated. In order to fully understand reintegration in organizations, and to know how to make reintegration more effective, it is necessary to understand how violators experience the process of reintegration.

Focusing almost exclusively on the interpersonal dynamics of reintegration presents other problems as well. Both definitionally and empirically, research on reintegration of violators in organizations emphasizes dyadic interactions, including making amends, forgiveness, re-acceptance, and relationship repair. Implicit in this conceptualization is the idea that reintegration involves the repair of a single relationship between a violator and a victim (Ren & Gray, 2009; Schweitzer, Hershey, & Bradlow, 2006; Kim, Dirks, & Cooper, 2009; Aquino et al., 2003; Shapiro, 1991; Grover et al., 2014). This approach overlooks the fact that violations of organizational standards may rupture more than the relationship between a violator and victim. Rather, violations of standards may simultaneously rupture multiple types of relationships: violators’ relationship to the organization, to organizational representatives, and to their peers. Failing to examine these multiple types of relationship ruptures and repairs raises the question of whether all ruptured relationships need to be repaired for successful reintegration to occur, or whether some types of relationship repair matter more than others.
Lastly, conceptualizing and operationalizing reintegration as a binary outcome has prevented scholars from developing an empirically-based process theory of reintegration. As a result, much of the reintegration research tends to ignore the possibility that there may be a continuum of reintegration outcomes, from completely un-integrated to highly reintegrated. If reintegration was treated as a process, it may help organizational scholars better understand what accounts for differences in reintegration outcomes, and what factors make violators feel more or less reintegrated.

To understand reintegration from the violators’ perspective and develop an empirically-grounded process model of reintegration, I conducted a longitudinal, inductive, qualitative study of how violators become reintegrated back into an organization following violations. In the next chapter, I describe the organizational context of this study, and the methodology that I used.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

To explore the overarching question of “What is a violator’s experience when he or she breaks a core organizational standard and attempts are made to reintegrate the member back into the organization?” I conducted a longitudinal, inductive, qualitative study at a military service academy (“The Academy”). The Academy is an institution that trains future military officers (“Cadets”). In many ways, Cadets are similar to employees of other professions: they are strongly socialized during their training, they are given a formal qualification (commissioning as an officer) upon graduation, and they even receive a salary while at the Academy. The Academy has a very strong honor code, and honor violations are taken very seriously. If a Cadet is found to have committed an honor violation but is retained at the Academy, the Cadet is required to participate in a remediation program that is designed to bring the Cadet back into full standing at the Academy. The fact that the Academy has an unusually formalized reintegration process makes it an “extreme exemplar” (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Yin, 1994), and therefore an ideal setting to develop theory about what happens to violators as they navigate reintegration.

Context

“The Academy” is a military service academy located in the United States. The Academy has a strict honor code that forbids Cadets from lying, cheating, or stealing. It applies not just to academics, but to every aspect of Cadets’ personal and professional lives at the Academy. If a Cadet is suspected to have violated the honor code, a jury of the Cadet’s peers reviews evidence and determines whether the Cadet is guilty. If the Cadet is found guilty, the Superintendent, the highest-ranking military official at the Academy, determines the Cadet’s punishment, with input from the Cadet’s chain of command. Although Cadets could be permanently expelled from the Academy, lesser punishments are often given, including making
the Cadet graduate six or twelve months late. All Cadets who receive a delayed graduation also lose their rank and privileges. This means that they become the lowest-status members of the Academy, and they are not allowed to leave the Academy, participate in many Academy activities, or wear civilian clothes. In addition, these Cadets must wear a special pin that publically signals their reduced rank – a type of visible stigma.

Cadets who are given a delayed graduation punishment are also enrolled in a remediation program ("the remediation program", pseudonym). The remediation program is intended to be a developmental program that targets Cadets’ behavior and character, ultimately leading to the Cadet’s “restoration” (Academy Honor Handbook, 6-2). In this program, Cadets are paired with senior officers at the Academy (Mentors), who help the Cadets “identify habits that are dysfunctional or incongruent with [the Academy] values” and “examine and modify [their] own actions, thoughts, values, and beliefs” and (Academy Honor Handbook, 6-1). While in the remediation program, Cadets meet with their mentors weekly, write reflective journal entries about their violation, teach a class about honor to younger Cadets, and complete a culminating project that demonstrates their development.

After Cadets have finished all of the remediation program requirements, their work is reviewed by the Academy administration, including the Superintendent. If the Superintendent is satisfied with the work and believes the Cadet has been “remediated”, the Superintendent will formally restore the Cadet’s rank and privileges. This not only allows the Cadet to participate in all normal Academy activities, but it also signals that the Cadet has become a full member of the Academy again.
Informal member checks with former officers at the Academy revealed that the remediation program was intended to make Cadets “better” than they were before the violation, especially in terms of honor, commitment, and engagement with the Academy.

Data and Participants

Because I intended to build theory about violators’ processes of reintegration, I conducted a longitudinal, qualitative, inductive study of honor violators as they completed the remediation program and returned to full standing at the Academy. Ultimately 23 Cadets and 10 Mentors agreed to participate in this research. In my sample, roughly 60% of the violators were academically-related (plagiarism, academic cheating, insufficient citations, etc.). The rest involved some type of lying – lying to supervising officers to get special accommodations, access, or privileges; lying to other Cadets to get out of certain duties; misreporting information on official documents to avoid getting in trouble, etc.

I collected several types of qualitative data from participating Cadets and their officer Mentors\(^2\) at several points in time. When Cadets first begin the remediation program, they completed a survey that collected a range of data about the violation, their backgrounds, and how they feel at the Academy. I used this survey mainly to prepare for the first interview, so that I had some familiarity with the Cadets’ violations and their experiences at the Academy. I conducted hour-long, semi-structured interviews with each Cadet at up to five points in time (see Appendix I for interview protocol). These interviews were conducted at roughly the beginning, middle, and end of the remediation program, with the final interview occurring after the Cadet had received his or her rank back (and been returned to full status). The first interview focused

\(^2\) In accordance with Institutional Review Board policies, I am only able to collect data from Cadets and Mentors who volunteer to participate in this study. As such, my data will not include every Cadet or Mentor who completes HRP, but only those that agree to participate and give consent.
on the Cadet’s background, the violation, and their experiences as their case was adjudicated. The middle interview(s) focused on Cadets’ experiences during the course of the remediation program, while the final interview explored Cadets’ experiences returning to full standing at the Academy. For this study, Cadets also completed up to 3 “reflection exercises” during the course of the remediation program (see Appendix II). These reflection exercises were adapted from Kahneman et al.’s (2004) Day Reconstruction Method, and were designed to help Cadets re-create and reflect on the most recent meeting they had with their Mentor. I often used the reflection exercises to stimulate conversation during the interviews; I would read the reflection exercises prior to the interviews, and then ask Cadets questions about what they wrote, as a way to develop a richer insight into their experiences in the program. Some Cadets also provided copies of the journal entries they wrote as part of the remediation program.

I also conducted between one and three interviews with each Mentor, roughly at the beginning, middle, and end of the remediation program (see Appendix III). These interviews asked Mentors about their experiences with the remediation program, their perceptions of the Cadets they were working with, and how (if at all) they had seen the Cadets change over time. Mentors were also asked to complete “reflection exercises” about their meetings with Cadets.

To better understand the Academy and the lives of Cadets and Mentors, I also spent time on campus informally observing and participating in Academy events. These included athletic events, lunches and dinners, formal celebrations, officer get-togethers, promotion ceremonies, and graduation activities.

Ultimately I conducted over 107 interviews from participating Cadets and Mentors over the course of 20 months. I spent over 200 hours on-site at the Academy; that time included both conducting interviews, as well as doing things to develop an in-depth understanding of Academy
life, such as attending athletic events, going for runs, talking with officers and Academy employees, attending ceremonial events, etc.

**Analysis**

To analyze the data, I took an iterative approach informed by grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1965; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I also employed several strategies to examine longitudinal data (e.g., Langley, 1999). Following this grounded theory approach, I iterated between data and theory to understand my data and identify emerging themes. Specifically, I coded in several phases:

**Preliminary Analysis.** I began by constructing detailed narratives of each Cadet from the raw data. Langley (1999) argues that this can be an effective preliminary step, as it prepares a “chronology for subsequent analysis” (695). For each Cadet, I read all of the Cadets’ transcripts chronologically, then used the content of the transcript to infer how the Cadet felt about his or her overall experience at each point in time. This helped me develop a general sense of Cadets’ reintegration experiences over time, and identify the “high” and “low” points of their experiences. I visually mapped out these “high” and “low” points on timelines to get a sense of each Cadets’ trajectory, and to compare across Cadets. From this, I started to notice patterns in the reintegration pathways: some Cadets finished the program at “high points” and some Cadets finished the program at “low points”. I used the insights I gained from this exercise to pay attention to violator’s “highs” and “lows” in the subsequent interviews that I did. When I noticed a Cadet mention a high or low point, I asked follow-up questions about that point to better understand Cadet’s experiences at these exemplary points.

**Phase 1: Open Coding.** After I had collected about 2/3 of the interviews, I began to engage in open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Locke, 2001) of the interview transcripts. These codes
were close to the data, allowing me to stay open to themes and patterns that emerge (Thornberg & Charmaz, 2014). For example, some of these open codes included “getting back to previous place”, “fixing and improving self”, “feeling supported”, and “treated unfairly”. Due to the longitudinal nature of my data, I wanted to develop a sense of how these codes mapped on to the overall trajectories I had mapped out in the preliminary analysis phase. For each Cadet, I looked at the open codes that were generated in each interview, and examined these in light of what the nature of their trajectory was at each point. For example, Cadet 007 had a low point at the beginning of the reintegration program. I found that open codes at this point were also negative in nature: “officer thought worse of her”, “thought others would think she was a bad person”, “family difficulties”, “worried about failing”, “bad relationship with supervising officer”. This helped me begin to understand the specific factors and concepts that may have been contributing to the different parts of Cadets’ trajectories.

I engaged in memo writing, both as a I was coding and when I took particular temporal “cuts” of the data and the open codes. For example, I examined the open codes from each individual Cadet, across all interviews. I then looked at specific time periods (e.g., the final, post-remediation program interview) and compared the codes from all Cadets at each specific time period.

Consistent with a grounded theory approach, the insights that emerged from this open coding also prompted me to refine my interview protocol for the remaining interviews. For example, the open coding revealed that the concept of “fitting in”, “belonging” and “feeling like a part of the Corps” were significant parts of Cadets’ experiences. In the remaining interviews (roughly 1/3), I therefore asked Cadets explicitly about their experiences of how they felt in relation to the Corps and their peers.
Phase 2: Axial Coding. Once the initial open coding was complete, I attempted to group these codes into categories. I compared these categories against the data to ensure that the Cadets’ experiences were reflected in the categories, and modified the categories as necessary. I compared codes and began to reduce them to a smaller number of theoretical categories (e.g. Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I did this with an eye toward the temporal aspects of my data. For example, I compared codes within a single Cadet, across time; I also compared codes across Cadets at a single point in time.

For example, open codes of “friends offering support”, “feeling cared about”, “strong bonds”, “losing friendships”, and “friends no longer talk to Cadet”, “encouragement from close others” were grouped under the category of “sense of support”. I then mapped this “sense of support” – and whether it was high or low, positive or negative – for each Cadet throughout their time in the remediation program. In this way, I was able to determine how “sense of support” changed for each Cadet over time. I then compared “sense of support” across Cadets. This comparison indicated that Cadets had different experiences of “sense of support” at different points in time. For example, at the beginning of the remediation program, most Cadets had negative experiences of support; by the end of the remediation program, some Cadets had positive experiences of support, while others still had negative experiences of support.

This comparison and reduction of codes, with an eye toward process and temporal dynamics, helped me move to higher levels of abstraction. By moving to higher levels of abstraction, I attempted to decipher deeper structures that underlie the theoretical categories. I continued memoing during this phase as a way of identifying and recording themes and patterns.

Phase 3: Building Theory. In this phase, I configured my data into a coherent framework. I moved between data, themes, concepts, dimensions, and existing theory to develop a coherent
framework that ties the emergent themes and categories together, with an eye toward the longitudinal nature of the data. As I began to identify emerging themes, I used the other sources of data to corroborate, disprove, or modify these themes. For example, as I began to notice that “expectations” were an important part of the process, I read through the transcripts of the interviews with Mentors to understand whether and how they set Cadets’ expectations about the process. I used the reflection exercises and journal entries in a similar way. This ultimately led me to the findings and theory that I articulate in the next chapters.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

When considering the overall experience of violators over time, my data suggest that violators had different experiences of reintegration. Specifically, violators seemed to experience different pathways of reintegration, which led to different reintegration outcomes. As depicted in Figure 1, some violators seemed to experience consistently increasing recovery, leading violators to feel highly reintegrated by the end of the process. When violators became highly reintegrated, they felt like they were “better” at the end of the process than they were before the violation occurred, and they held highly positive views of the Academy.

Other violators seemed to experience repeated cycles of more recovery followed by less recovery. This up-and-down trajectory appeared to be related to a sense of partial reintegration at the end of the process. Partially reintegrated violators felt like they eventually returned to “normal” and were back to where they were before the violation occurred. Violators who became partially reintegrated also appeared to held tepid or ambivalent attitudes toward the Academy.

Another group of violators seemed to experience a great deal of recovery initially, but later experienced very little recovery – in short, a misleading sense of recovery. Such a trajectory appeared to be linked to violators feeling not reintegrated at all at the end of the process. These violators felt like they were “worse” than they were before the violation occurred, and like they were unlikely to get back to the pre-violation state. Violators who did not become reintegrated held highly negative or antagonistic attitudes toward the Academy. Quotes illustrating these three different trajectories of recovery and reintegration outcomes appear in Table 2 of Appendix IV.
In this chapter, I attempt to understand the process of reintegration from the violators’ perspective that account for each of these reintegration paths and outcomes. My data ruled out a number of explanations that potentially could have accounted for the range of outcomes. My data suggest that the different reintegration outcomes are unlikely to be driven by demographics (age, gender, race, tenure at the Academy, class year; coming from a military family; being an athlete); males and females, younger and older Cadets, minorities and non-minorities, athletes and non-
athletes all experienced each of the pathways and outcomes. The range of reintegration outcomes also does not seem to be influenced by aspects of the violation or punishment: the severity of the violation, the severity of the punishment, whether the Cadet believed that he or she actually did something wrong, whether the Cadet took responsibility for the violation immediately or not, whether the Cadet was deeply invested in the remediation program, or if they “checking the box”. Previous experiences at the Academy also did not seem to drive differences in reintegration outcomes (previous disciplinary record; how committed they were to the Academy prior to the violation; how involved they were at the Academy prior to the violation). Lastly, whether violators became highly reintegrated or not did not seem to be influenced by aspects of the mentor-Cadet relationship (e.g. whether the Cadet knew their mentor prior to the violation; the rank/status of the mentor).

Instead, my data suggest that the reintegration path and outcome that violators experience depends on the expectations they form, and how well their expectations are met. In this chapter, I present a descriptive model of the process of reintegration, highlighting the role that expectations play in it (Figure 2). Drawing on my data, I first show that violations generated ruptures in violators’ sense of self-worth, sense of support, and sense of standing. When violators were retained at the organization, they felt that they had been given a second chance. Violators became aware that in return for a second chance, the organization had certain expectations of violators, which the violators attempted to comply with.
Somewhat counterintuitively, my data suggest that in addition to complying with the organization’s expectations, violators themselves also formed expectations about what they would experience and how they would be treated in the future. Specifically, all violators seemed to form expectations regarding their future sense of self-worth, support, and standing. Some of these expectations were formally articulated and “promised” by the organization, while others were “self-generated” by the violators.

My data suggest that all violators appeared to have their formal, organizationally-promised expectations met. From the organization’s perspective, this means that reintegration should have been completed successfully – the organization delivered what it promised to violators.

However, the different reintegration paths and outcomes described above suggest that not all violators experienced full reintegration. This suggests that formal expectations were not the
only factors that mattered in violators’ reintegration experiences. Rather, my data suggested that the reintegration pathway that violators experience -- and how well reintegrated violators feel at the end of the process – appeared to be driven by how well violators’ self-generated expectations were met. When self-generated expectations were continuously met over time, violators experienced consistent recovery, ultimately leading them to feel highly reintegrated. When some self-generated expectations were unmet initially, but later were met – and when this cycle of unmet- and met-expectations occurred repeatedly over time – this generated an oscillating recovery process, leading violators to feel partially reintegrated. And when violators had their self-generated expectations met only initially and then unmet later, violators experienced misleading recovery, resulting in violators feeling not reintegrated at all.

Below I unpack and provide evidence for each part of this process. Quotes are followed by a parenthetical label of the form: (C0##, B/M/E, HR/PR/NR). C0## signifies the Cadet speaking; for example, C010 is Cadet 010. The second part of the parenthetical label indicates which interview the quote came from. B signals beginning interviews, M signals middle interviews, and E signals end or final interviews. If the letter is followed by a number – for example, B2 – this means that there were multiple beginning interviews conducted, and the quote came from the second of the beginning interviews. Lastly, the final signifier – HR/PR/NR – indicates the Cadet’s reintegration outcome. HR denotes “highly reintegrated”, PR denotes “partially reintegrated”, and NR denotes “not reintegrated”.

**Ruptures in Self-Worth, Support, and Standing**

When violators were found guilty of committing an honor violation, they experienced ruptures in their sense of self-worth, in their sense of support, and in their sense of standing.
Sense of Self-Worth: After being found guilty of a violation, all violators seemed to experience ruptures in their sense of self-worth. Ruptures in self-worth were apparent when violators questioned whether they were “good” people, or when they felt like they were not living up to their own standards. For example, Cadet 012 seemed to interpret the violation as an indication that she was a bad person. She said,

  after I did it, probably for about four months, I was just like, “oh my god, I’m a horrible person, who am I?” I was kind of lost, honestly [crying, choking up]. I didn’t really know who I was anymore…. whenever anyone would kind of ask about it, I would kind of respond by, “oh, I’m a shitty person.” And I kept doing that (C012, B1, PR)

C012’s confusion, her negative self-evaluation, and the fact that she shared this negative self-evaluation with others suggests that C012 experienced a rupture in her sense of self-worth following the violation.

Other Cadets had similar experiences. Cadet 008’s ruptures in his sense of self-worth were made visible when he indicated that the violation was shocking to him, because it was misaligned with his personal standards for himself. He recollected that when he was found guilty of the violation, “I was like, ‘why did I even do what I did? What drove me to do such a thing if I had never done such a thing before?’…at that moment I definitely was like, ‘I expected more of myself’”(C008, B1, HR). The confusion that C008 experienced, and his feeling that the violation was a breach of his own expectations of himself suggests C008 experienced ruptures in his sense of self-worth after the violation.

Other Cadets’ ruptures in self-worth were apparent when they felt like their organizationally-relevant identities were damaged because of the violation. C021 held high-profile leadership roles and was a star on an athletic team. When found guilty of a violation, he was no longer able to participate in either. Having these identities removed – even temporarily – appeared to trigger ruptures in self-worth. C021 explained,
That was just like, "All right, life is about to change as I know it."…. being [leadership role] and being on the [team], that was who I was….. my head coach always used to put pictures of me on the things that were sent up to the [Academy leadership], and whenever I [entered the stadium] it was always, "C021 of [HOMETOWN]"…. and there was definitely an audible response, my classmates cheering and stuff like that. The fact that it all kind of washed away, it was difficult (C021, B, NR)

C021 described his role and his team affiliation as “who he was”. When he felt like these identities were “washed away”, it appeared to negatively influence his sense of self-worth.

The stigma of having to wear the “PFC” pin that signaled a loss of rank also seemed to rupture violators’ sense of self-worth. For example, C005 – like many members of the Academy – had looked down upon other Cadets who wore the PFC pin. When he himself had to wear the pin, he described the experience as, “I never thought I would be ‘that cadet’ that would get an honor board …. I had always looked down on cadets with PFC rank, but now I am the ‘pitiful’ private first class” cadet” (C005, B-Journal Entry, NR). Calling himself “pitiful” and saying that he never thought he would be “that Cadet” suggests that C005 felt like he was no longer a good person, leading to a rupture in his sense of self-worth.

**Sense of Support**: Violators also seemed to experience ruptures in their sense of support following violations. Ruptures in support occurred when violators felt no longer cared for or included by close others. These close others could be friends, family members, romantic partners, officer they were close to, or any other individuals that they expected emotional support and encouragement from.

Some violators noticed the ruptures in support when their friends distanced themselves from the violator. For example, C012 felt that she lost friends – sources of support – after the violation. She explained,

when we got our ranks stripped it was kind of worse… everyone knows that you did something bad to get it, so every time I would see one of my friends, they’d be like, “oh,
what did you do? What happened?”…some of the friends that I thought I was relatively close with, kind of don’t talk to me anymore (C012, B1, PR, emphasis my own)

The fact that close others ostracized her after the violation made C012’s experience “worse”, suggesting that she experienced ruptures, likely in support. C018 had a similar experience. He described the rupture caused by ostracism, saying, “I felt like a leper walking around. I felt disowned by about everyone, including some of my closest friends” (C018, B, PR). C018’s feelings of being disowned by his closest friends suggests that he experienced a loss in support.

Other Cadets’ experienced ruptures in support not because others ostracized them, but because the violators themselves chose to distance themselves from close others. For example, C005 explained that the violation prompted him to isolate himself. He recalled, “I just wanted to stay in my house all break, and only leave to go to the gym to keep in shape for [summer training]. Emotionally I distanced myself from everything….my friends, family, and girlfriend” (C005, B – Journal Entry, NR). C005’s lack of interactions with close others made him feel “distanced” from close others, suggesting that he experienced a lack of support.

Other Cadets felt ruptures in support when they realized that the violation had broken trust between themselves and close others. C008’s violation involved copying his roommate’s paper without permission. When he was found guilty of plagiarism, he explained, “I realized I really messed up, I had broken that trust and our friendship, because we were roommates for like 3 years” (C008, B1, HR). C008 felt like he had damaged both the friendship and the trust between him and a close other – suggesting that he felt like he had lost a source of support.

Sense of Standing: Violators also reported experiencing ruptures in their sense of standing following violations. Violators experienced full standing when they felt that they were full members of the organization, in terms of participation, status, rank, esteem, and inclusion. Violators experienced ruptures in standing when they felt “lesser” than other organizational
members in some way. Feeling lesser could be influenced by the things that other organizational members explicitly said. For example, after her violation, Cadet 011 was explicitly told by her supervising officer that she was a bad Cadet – indicating to C011 that she was lower in standing than other Cadets. C011 described this interaction, saying

Next thing I know, I’m being called up to Major [NAME]’s office, who’s the executive officer, and he’s chewing me out. He said…..“You’re a poison to the company.” Just listing off reasons A through Z why I’m a terrible person (C011, B, HR)

Being told that she was a “poison” indicated to C011 that the supervising officer thought she was a “terrible person”, which likely made C011 realize that she had been lowered in standing.

Both C007 and C004 had similar experiences in which supervising officers explicitly told the Cadets that they were “lesser” in the officers’ eyes. C004 recalled that after his violation, “[officer] was blaming it all on me, blaming the entire thing on me, saying, ‘you just screwed over your partners, you have the decision-making skills of a child’ and all this stuff” (C004, B, NR). Being blamed and being called a “child” likely make C004 feel ruptured in his sense of standing, because the officer made it clear that he did not hold C004 in high regard. C007’s supervising officer also engaged in similar behavior, leading to a ruptured sense of support. She explained,

[supervising officer] explicitly said in the board, ‘Yeah, I thought [C007] was a really exemplary team leader, and she was what we wanted. Now that she's found on honor, I obviously will think less of her’…I didn't know what to think… I was just shocked (C007, B2, PR)

By saying that he “will think less of her” and that he thought that C007 was no longer “what we wanted” as an organization, the supervising officer signaled to C007 that she was “lesser” than other Cadets, and should not be a full member of the organization. The shock that C007 experienced is likely an indication of the rupture in standing she felt.
Other violators experienced ruptures in standing through less explicit means. Some violators experienced ruptures in standing when they felt disrespected or treated unfairly by other organizational members. For example, C021 noticed the disrespect from his fellow Cadets, saying, “some cadets, many of whom have shown their true colors, have shown me a lot of disrespect in the wake of this” (C021, M - reflecting on beginning, NR). C014 explained how this disrespect from other Cadets translated into feelings of ruptured standing, saying,

There's this hatred for people who are Privates. Anyone who has their rank taken from them. They're seen as beneath everyone else, almost. “Oh, that guy is a fuck up. You see that guy, he's a screw up.” They don't know anything about you. They just immediately think you're one of the worst people here, probably shouldn't be here (C014, E, PR)

C014’s statement shows how other Cadets’ disrespect of violators was linked to beliefs that the violators didn’t deserve to be at the Academy. Even if violators still believed that they deserved to be at the organization, knowing that others did not think so likely made violators feel “lesser” than other Cadets, and like they were not full members of the organization.

Lastly, ruptures in standing occurred when Cadets were prohibited from participating in organizational events and activities. For example, C020 felt that her loss of standing was manifest in both her loss of rank and being barred from organizational activities. She explained,

I was one of the most squared away cadets in my company. I had a lot going for me. So, losing my rank means I was basically a freshman again. I couldn't go anywhere. I couldn't go to any clubs. I couldn't go on trip section. It was a bad day. I was like, "What am I supposed to do with my life?" (C020, B, HR)

C020 contrasted her previous high status and full standing to her post-violation inability to participate in Academy activities. Her questioning of how she will even function at the Academy – questioning what she will do with her life – indicates C020 may have experienced ruptures as a result.
As will be seen below, ruptures and repairs in violators’ sense of self, support, and standing are central to violators’ experiences of reintegration. For ease of reference, a summary of the concepts of sense of self, support, and standing are provided in Table 1 of Appendix IV.

**Awareness of Organizational Expectations and Violators’ Repair Attempts**

After violators were found guilty of committing honor violations, they knew they could have been expelled from the Academy. When they were retained at the Academy, they felt that they had been given a second chance. For example, C010 explained that he felt grateful for being retained, because he knew what the alternative was. He said,

> When I think about the decision by the Superintendent, I am very, very grateful for his lenient decision. Because…[I did a] panel interview with some old [Academy] grads, and they were like, “What? You didn’t get kicked out?” Because that used to be the norm…..if you commit and honor violation, you pack your bags and leave. And they didn’t make me do that. And I’m extremely grateful for that (C010, M2 – reflecting on beginning, NR).

C010 knew that he could have been told to leave the Academy, but he did not, so he felt like he had been given a second chance. C011 echoed this sentiment. She knew she could have been kicked out of the Academy, but because she was retained, for which she felt grateful. She explained, “I do feel grateful in a lot of ways that they let me stay here after this. Because if this happened 5, 6 years ago, I would have been booted, no questions asked” (C011, B, HR). C006 had a similar experience, saying that after she was retained at the Academy, she was conscious of “how important it was to me to get a second chance, because some people don’t. And how everything I wanted to do to be better so I could hold on to it” (C006, M – reflecting on beginning, HR).

Violators were aware that in return for being given a second chance, the organization had certain expectations for their behavior. Because they were given a second chance, violators felt
obligated to comply with the organizations’ expectations. For example, one expectation the organization had was that the violators would take responsibility for their violations. The Academy’s handbook for honor, which most Cadets were highly familiar with, explicitly stated that “admission” had to be the first reparative step required of violators during a rehabilitation process (Academy Honor Handbook, 6-1). Violators were aware of this expectation. For example, C010 knew that the organization required him to take responsibility for the violation, saying,

[the Commandant] was looking for ‘are you going to take responsibility for what happened, and say, “well this is what happened and it’s my fault because I did XYZ”? Or are you going to say, ‘well this is what happened, because this person did this, or this situation was like that,’ and try and pass the buck?” (C010, B2, NR)

This illustrates that C010 knew that the organization expected him to take responsibility. Not only were violators aware of this expectation, but they engaged in repair behaviors that involved taking responsibility for the violation. For example, C011 explained how she did this, saying,

I’ve gotten really good at figuring out how to rectify situations and make them a lot more manageable. So the next day, first thing in the morning I had a handwritten letter on [the supervising officer’s] desk saying, ‘I know this was so wrong and I’m so sorry, blah blah blah, I take full responsibility. I realize this isn’t want you need in the [military]’ (C011, B, HR)

She later added, “I’m just trying to stay positive, not blame the institution, not blame other people here” (C011, B, HR). Both of these quotes suggest that C011 was keenly aware of the fact that the Academy wanted her to take responsibility for the violation, and she was making attempts to comply.

The organization held other explicit expectations of violators as well. As another example, the honor handbook stated that Cadets who were found guilty of committing honor violations should “modify their behavior to align with…Academy values” (6-2). Violators were aware of this expectation too. For example, C012 articulated her awareness of this expectation
when she said that being retained at the Academy “has given me that extra push to be like, ‘hey, you're not shit. You need to fix yourself so you can get to where you need to be and then surpass the expectations that they have for you’” (C012, B2, PR, emphasis my own). Not only did C012 understand that the organization expected her to improve herself, but she was also making active attempts to meet those expectations. For example, she described,

> before this happened, I never really looked back and did self-assessments, self-evaluations, how I could better myself…. you're forced to take a step back and look at who you really are and look at your goals, look at your values, look at who you surround yourself with, look at how you spend your time (C012, B2, PR)

This demonstrates that C012 was actively attempting to improve herself, thereby complying with the organization’s expectations.

**Violators’ Formal and Self-Generated Expectations**

It is not particularly surprising that organizations had expectations for violators, and that violators complied with the organizational expectations in return for being given a second chance. What is surprising, however, is that my data suggest that in return for complying with the organization’s expectations, all violators also formed their own expectations about what they would experience in the future. These expectations revolved around the violators’ self-development, sense of support, and sense of standing.

Some of these expectations were formal expectations – that is, violators came to hold those expectations because they were explicitly promised by the organization. Other expectations were self-generated. Self-generated expectations were not explicitly promised by the organization, but were “filled in” by violators on their own.

**Expectations of Self-Development:** All violators appeared to expect that they would change, grow, or develop in some way from the remediation program. These self-development
expectations tended to be formally set, as the organization explicitly told violators that they
would change in some way as a result of the program. For example, the honor handbook – an
official Academy document that all violators were deeply familiar with – explicitly stated that
the remediation program would enable violators to “examine and modify his/her own actions,
thoughts, values, and beliefs” (6-2). It also said that the program would help violators “[change]
those root behaviors that are incongruent with the values of integrity and honor” (6-2). By
explicitly promising violators that they would change in some way from the remediation
program, this formally set violators’ expectations that they would experience some form of self-
development.

Violators did indeed appear to internalize these formal expectations about self-
development, as all violators talked about how they expected to change or improve in some way
from the program. For example, C013 articulated this general expectation when he said,

My expectations are for this thing to actually make me learn something and make me feel
different than I actually do. That’s what I’m expecting. Because if they’re going to make
me go through this process…..then I should get something out of it (C013, B, PR)

This demonstrates that C013 had general expectations that he would change in some way from
the program. Other Cadets voiced similar expectations. For example, C004 said that in the
program, “I can make changes” (C004, B, NR). C008 echoed this general expectation of change
by saying, “[the remediation program] is just a perfect opportunity to become who you need to
be” (C008, B2, HR). As these quotes demonstrate, Cadets held general expectations that
reflected what the organization formally “promised them” -- that they would change, grow, or
improve in some way as a result of the program.

Other Cadets had more specific expectations about the ways they would change or
develop. For example, C001 expected that he would become a better writer as a result of the
remediation program. He stated, “my writing skills will improve. Cuz I hate writing, so 60 pages [of written requirements for the program] will be a forcing function to make me write better” (C001, B2, PR). This shows that C001 expected to develop a skill because of the program. As another example, C018 explained that the program,

is all just about my development….we're doing a lot of character development …. [And] physically, I want to get back to where I was before my surgery, too. And I want to get my grades back up, too, after last semester's disaster (C018, B, PR)

C018 had many specific expectations about his self-development – improving his character, his physical fitness, and his academic performance. This illustrates that he – and other Cadets – all expected that they would change, grow, or improve in some way.

Expectations of Support: In addition to expectations of self-development, Cadets also formed expectations about whether and how they would experience emotional support. In general, violators expected that close others would continue to care for and support them, despite the violation. These expectations appeared to apply to close friends, family, and officers that violators had personal relationships with.

For example, C012 explained that although she expected some people to shun her, she expected that her closest friends would continue to support her. She said,

when you get an Honor Board you're kind of classified as a shit bag for lack of a better term, and it takes your true friends who knew you before that know you're a good person to stick with you. You understand the fair-weather friends that are with you when you're doing fine and then when you're kind of in a rough patch they're like, “all right see ya” (C012, E - reflecting on beginning, PR)

C012 expected that support would come from her closest friends, even if others did not “stick with” her.
Other Cadets expected that support would come from continued relationships with close friends, even if those friends graduated or left the Academy. For example, C005 believed that he would still be in close contact with his friends that were graduating. He said,

I'm trying to maximize the amount of interaction time with [friends] before they disappear…. I'm trying to work out how I'm going to Face Time with them, I'm going to keep up with them, and it'll work…..I'm not becoming a shut-in, don't worry (C005, B2, NR)

C005 fully expected to maintain his relationships with close friends, who would serve as sources of support.

Cadets also expected that their close friends would still view them as good people, despite the violation. C004 – who was accused of plagiarism – explained, “I have a lot of close friends in the [academic department] and their opinion of me isn’t going to change” (C004, B2, NR). C004 expected that his close friends would still view him as a good person, which may have been linked to beliefs about feeling supported despite the violation.

In contrast to the formal, organizationally-set expectations regarding self-development, violators’ expectations of support tended to be self-generated. The Academy did not formally promise to violators that they would receive support from close others. Rather, violators seemed to develop expectations about support on their own, without explicit statements, promises, or hints by the organization.

Expectations of Standing: Violators appeared to develop expectations about their standing. These expectations pertained to how, when, and the extent to which violators would eventually become full members of the organization in terms of participation, inclusion, respect, status, and fair treatment.
Violators came to develop both formal and self-generated expectations regarding their standing. Formal expectations about standing – those expectations explicitly promised by the organization – focused on rank. The Academy explicitly told violators that once they completed the remediation program, they would receive their rank back. This expectation was often conveyed in meetings that Cadets had with officers who were affiliated with the honor system at the Academy. For example, C012 explained that after meeting with the officers affiliated with the honor system, “you knew what the requirements of the [remediation program] were going to be, you knew the timeline where this entire process would kind of be over, and you'd finally get your rank back, get back to living normally” (C012, B2, PR, emphasis my own). This suggests that interactions with organizational representatives set C012’s expectations about when she would receive her rank back.

C011 also hinted at the organizationally-promised aspects of this expectation. She said, “there's something, somewhere that says you can rejoin your class, and rejoin the Corps….once you earn your rank back” (C011, E, HR). C011’s remark that “something, somewhere” was written about getting rank back indicates that this was indeed a formal expectation promised by the organization. Her use of the word “rejoining” also suggests that being returned to full rank was an indicator of being a full member at the organization. Other Cadets talked about the connection between rank and standing. For example, C020 explained, “Once I get my rank back, I will feel integrated back into the Corps. I won't feel like an outsider anymore” (C020, E, HR). C020’s assertion that having rank back will make her feel “integrated” and no longer like an “outsider” suggests that rank is indeed linked to feeling like a full member of the organization, and therefore to violators’ perceptions of their standing. Because the Academy explicitly promised violators they would get their rank back, and because rank was tied to a Cadet’s
inclusion, participation, and status at the Academy, Cadets viewed getting their rank back as an indicator of regaining standing in the organization. In total, this evidence suggests that the organization’s promises created formal expectations regarding standing in the minds of violators.

However, in addition to the formal expectation of returned rank that the Academy explicitly promised, violators also appeared to develop other, self-generated expectations about their standing. These other expectations were not explicitly promised by the organization, but were instead “filled in” by violators. Self-generated expectations of standing seemed to revolve around two things: violators believing that others would treat them “fairly” and in ways that did not simply reflect the honor violation (e.g., being treated like other Cadets, being given chances to prove themselves, not being treated worse than other violators), and violators believing that they would be able to reassume previous positions and activities.

Violators came to assume that the organization and its representatives would treat the violators “fairly” and in ways that reflected more than simply the violation. For example, C012 explained that she expected that the organization would give her a second chance to prove herself, saying, “once you punish [violators], then you allow them the opportunity to develop themselves and prove to you that they're worthy” (C012, M, PR). This shows that she expected the organization to see beyond her violation and give her a chance to prove that she was indeed “worthy” of being a full member of the Academy. In addition, mentioning both punishment and then redemption hints at the idea that violators expected the organization to exhibit a certain amount of fairness or justice toward violators.

C004 also expected others to treat him fairly and in ways that reflected more than simply the honor violation. One way that violators assessed “fairness” was whether they were treated differently from other Cadets, or from other violators. C004 indicated that after the remediation
program, he expected to feel like a full member of the organization by being treated no
differently than any other Cadet. He said,

"after I get my rank back, and after everything happens, no one remembers anymore. They
know that I’m the guy that got an honor board, but I’m still here, and once I graduate [the
Academy] a couple years down the road, no one’s going to remember what I did wrong"
(C004, B2, NR)

C004 expected to be seen as “the guy that got an honor board” but also that “no one’s going to
remember” what he did wrong hints at C004’s assumptions that he will be treated just like
everyone else. Being treated like any other Cadet would indicate to C004 that he was once again
a full member of the Academy, and a signal that his standing would be restored. Thus, C004
appears to have developed self-generated expectations about his standing in the future.

Self-generated expectations of standing were also apparent when violators assumed they
would be able to reassume previous roles or activities. For example, C021 was on an athletic
team, but as part of his punishment, he was unable to participate until he had completed the
remediation program. But even at the beginning of the remediation program, C021 was saying,
“I’m going to be able to rejoin the team next semester” (C021, B, NR). Importantly, the
Academy’s punishment only forbade Cadets from participating on teams while in the
remediation program; it never promised that Cadets would be able to regain their spots. This
shows that C021 developed a self-generated expectation that he would return to his previous
roles and activities, which he believed was an indication of his standing as a full organizational
member.

As indicated by the violators’ statements, violators developed both formal and self-
generated expectations about their standing. Formal expectations in standing involved Cadets
regaining their rank, while self-generated expectations in standing involved violators being
returned to previous roles and activities, and feeling like they were being treated fairly and in ways that reflected more than simply the violation.

To summarize, violators held both formal and self-generated expectations about self, support, and standing. Self-development expectations were typically formally set through organizational promises that violators would change and grow; support expectations appeared to be self-generated, as the organization never made explicit promises about how others would treat the violator; and standing expectations were both formal and self-generated – violators were promised by the organization that they would receive their rank back at the end of the process, but violators “filled in” their own expectations that other organizational members would treat them “fairly” and see beyond their violations, and violators would be returned to their previous roles and positions.

**Formal Expectations Met for All Violators**

By the end of the process, all violators had their formal expectations met – every violator feel like they experienced some sort of self-development, and every violator regained their rank. Most violators started noticing their self-development early on. For example, halfway through the program, C011 said,

> I’m a lot less cynical....I’m definitely more of a rule follower. But it’s not necessarily out of fear of punishment anymore, it’s because I legitimately want to do the right thing…. I think that my decisions are now not guided out of self-preservation or looking out for a friend, it’s like, “what’s the right thing to do?” (C011, M, HR)

Experiencing this change helped this Cadet meet her expectation of self-development, as she remarked in her interview at the end of the program: “I do think the honor board made me a better person” (C011, E, HR).
As another example, C012 also began to experience self-development early on. At the midpoint of the program, C012 remarked, “I think I'm taking away very beneficial things. I think I'm developing myself in various different aspects” (C012, M, PR). She also described,

I know that if I had never had this experience, I wouldn't be the person I am today, and I think that the person I am today is a lot stronger, at least mentally, and emotionally. I just know myself better than I did before the whole honor board process (C012, M, PR).

These quotes demonstrate that violators felt that they changed, grew, or improved in some way, which fulfilled their formal, organizationally-promised expectations regarding self-development.

All violators also had their expectations about regaining full, formal standing met. As C011 described at the end of the remediation program, “I got my rank back, so there's no longer any administrative sanction against me” (C011, E). Getting their rank back was a positive experience for all Cadets. C021 said “the big thing was getting my rank back and the meeting with Supe… that was reassuring” (C021, E). Some Cadets even had friends celebrate their return to full standing. For example, C012 described, “my friends threw me a promotion ceremony where they re-pinned my rank and made me swear on the honor code. It was super silly but it's worth the memory” (C012, E). Thus, all violators regained their rank, which met their formal, organizationally-promised expectations regarding standing.

In short, all violators’ formal expectations were met; the organization followed through on what it explicitly promised to violators regarding self-development and standing. From the perspective of the organization, this means that reintegration should have been completed successfully, and all violators should have felt reintegrated. However, my data suggest that not all violators felt fully reintegrated by the end of the remediation program. Some violators completed the remediation program feeling not reintegrated at all, while other violators felt only partially reintegrated. Only a portion of violators seemed to experience complete reintegration.
This suggests a puzzle: if all violators’ explicit expectations were met, why do some violators experience high levels of reintegration, while others do not?

My data suggest that both self-generated and formal expectations needed to be met in order for violators to feel reintegrated. Although all violators had their formal expectations met, the reintegration path that violators experienced, and ultimately how reintegrated they felt appeared to be linked to how well violators’ self-generated expectations were met. To demonstrate this, I trace each of the reintegration paths below, and provide data that show the differences in how well self-generated expectations were met over time. For each path, I highlight the experience of one violator whose experience typifies the pathway and outcome: Cadet 011 experienced consistent recovery and became highly reintegrated; C012 experienced oscillating recovery and became partially reintegrated; and C021 experienced misleading recovery and became not reintegrated.

Pathway #1: Consistent Recovery, High Reintegration

Violators like C011, who experienced consistent recovery and eventually became highly reintegrated, had their self-generated expectations met or surpassed both early on and at the end of the program. They felt supported by close others initially and continued to experience support throughout the process. They also felt that other organizational members were treating them fairly and in ways that reflected more than simply the violation, both at the beginning and at the end of the program.

Self-Generated Expectations Met Early On

Violators who experienced consistent recovery and eventually became highly reintegrated had their self-generated expectations of support met early on. For example, C011 talked about how her close friends provided emotional encouragement and comfort halfway
through the program. She explained what this support felt like, saying, “one of my best friends…. was like, ‘I’m so proud of the changes you’ve made.’ She was like, ‘I can see a night and day difference between who you were and who you are now’” (C011, M, HR). This kind of emotional support not only met the self-generated expectations that C011 had developed, but it seemed to contribute to her overall sense of recovery. She explained, it seems so insignificant, but it means so much, after just getting constantly shit on for the last six months. So I say a significant component of the [remediation program] working is people telling me they believe in me. People saying, ‘I see your effort, I see you’re working,’ and that’s not lost on them (C011, M, HR)

Having close others encourage her meant that C011’s expectations of support were met during the early part of the remediation program.

C011’s self-generated expectations regarding her standing were also met early on. Like other violators, C011 expected that people would treat her “fairly” and in ways that reflected more than simply the fact that she had committed an honor violation. By the midpoint of the program, C011 indeed felt that others were seeing beyond her violation. This is apparent when she remarked, people have not treated me any differently really. I think that’s because I’ve taken ownership of it. People ask me about it, I’m just like, “yea, this is what happened.” …. if you can have the confidence to say, “yea, I screwed up, this is how, this is what you can do to not make the same mistake as I did,” people will respect that more (C011, M, HR)

By saying that she felt that others had not treated her “differently”, this suggests that C011 felt like others were treating her like other organizational members. Being treated like other organizational members who had not committed violators may have made C011 feel that her standing in the organization remained somewhat intact – meeting not only her expectations, but also possibly contributing to a repair or restoration in her sense of standing.
Violators also gauged whether they were being treated in ways that reflected more than simply their violation based on whether they were able to return to roles and activities they had previously taken part in. Like other violators, C011 was prohibited from formally competing with her athletic team because of the violation. However, by the midpoint of the program, C011’s coach encouraged her to come to team events, even if she was not allowed to compete at events. This made C011 feel like she was still able to participate in some way, which contributed to her sense of standing. She explained this, saying,

the OIC, or the officer in charge of the team that I'm on, having her be like, "Yeah, it'll be okay. I understand that this position sucks. It doesn't mean you're a bad kid"…just the fact that she still let me come to [team] meetings when I could…she was like, "Yeah, you can come back. You just got to finish this first." I think knowing that she wasn't like, "No, you're off the team. That's bad," knowing that she saw the good in it too was huge (C011, E – reflecting on earlier parts of the program, HR)

Being able to participate on the team, even in a non-competitive way, made C011 feel like others were seeing beyond her violation – likely making C011 feel like her self-generated expectations of standing were met early on.

Self-Generated Expectations Continued to be Met Later

Violators who experienced consistent recovery and eventually became highly reintegrated continued to have their self-generated expectations met, even at the end of the process. Violators expected that close others would continue to support them, even despite the violation. C011’s expectations of support were met, as indicated by how she talked about her best friend’s reactions to her. C011 explained, “my new best friend was encouraging…. [she] is like, ‘No, I can tell you've come a long way. I can tell that you're changing for the better’” (C011, E, HR). Because C011’s best friend was so encouraging, this likely contributed to C011’s sense that her self-generated expectations of support continued to be met throughout the program.
C011 also continued to have her self-generated standing expectations met. C011 was explicitly told that she was well-respected by other organizational members, which was a signal to her that others saw her for more than the violation. She explained,

I've heard indirectly through my mentor. He said that I've been spoken of in very high regard throughout multiple email chains, or whatever. I've heard from various cadets on the Honor Committee that…the head of the [Honor Center], has brought me up before in meetings and used me as an example of what right looks like (C011, E, HR)

Being told that others viewed her as a positive example impacted how C011 viewed her own standing in the organization. She explained, “coming out of this I think a lot of people in there hold me in higher regard in terms of how I did, how I conducted myself, and composed myself throughout the [remediation] journey” (C011, E, HR). Notably, C011 believed that others held her in *higher* regard – indicating that she thought others actually viewed her as a better organizational member after the remediation program than they did before the violation. Feeling more valued as an organizational member suggests that C011 had her self-generated expectations of standing not just met, but surpassed.

Violators also assessed whether their self-generated standing expectations were met based on their ability to participate in roles and activities. Violators who became highly reintegrated were either returned to previous roles and activities, or – as was the case for C011 – had their expectations surpassed by being given even more prestigious positions at the Academy. C011 confided, “I'm actually on the committee that advises the Superintendent on Honor issues” (C011, E, HR). Being given a high-profile role likely made violators realize they were being seen for more than their honor violation. Others’ indications that violators were valuable organizational members may have made violators feel that their expectations regarding standing were met.

**Outcome: High Reintegration**
Violators whose self-generated expectations were met both initially and at the end of the program appeared to experience consistent recovery and high reintegration. This manifest in violators feeling a repaired sense of self-worth, support, and standing. For example, C011 demonstrated her repaired sense of self-worth by saying, “I do think the Honor Board made me a better person” (C011, E, HR). Feeling like a “better” person suggests that she had fully repaired – and perhaps even improved – how she felt about herself, as compared to before the honor violation. C011 also experienced repair in her sense of support. Compared to her pre-violation state, C011 said, “I think that I definitely have more good relationships [now]” (C011, E, HR). Having more positive relationships suggests that C011 felt more emotionally supported and cared for, indicated a repaired sense of support. Violators like C011 also experienced repairs in sense of standing. C011 explained that by the end of the program, she felt like she was a full organizational member again. She described, “I'm part of the Corps again. I'm not this weird outsider” (C011, E, HR). Feeling like an “insider” once again suggests that C011 experienced repair in her sense of standing.

Violators who experienced consistently met expectations and repaired self-worth, support, and standing also seemed to hold positive attitudes toward the Academy. For example, by the end of the program, C011 came to believe that the Academy was looking out for her best interests. She explained that her experiences “led me to believe that yes, this truly is a developmental system. It's not out to get you….It showed care for the individual” (C011, E2, HR). Feeling that the organization was developmental and cared about Cadets made C011 feel more respect for the institution. She said,

"I think I've always had a certain amount of respect for [the Academy], but now I have a better understanding of why I have that respect. It's been more refined. Before it was just, "I respect this place because other people in society respect this place. I respect this place
This illustrates how C011 came to hold positive views of the Academy by the end of the program.

In short, when violators had their self-generated expectations met consistently throughout the remediation program, they came to feel repaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing, and hold positive attitudes about the organization. Additional quotes illustrating other highly reintegrated violators’ self-generated expectations and reintegration outcomes can be found in Table 3 of Appendix IV.

Pathway #2: Oscillating Recovery, Partial Reintegration

Another group of violators, like C012, initially had their self-generated expectations unmet, but eventually had more experiences that met their expectations regarding support and standing. These violators experienced oscillating recovery, and ultimately became partially reintegrated.

Self-Generated Expectations NOT Met Initially

Violators who experienced oscillating recovery and eventually became partially reintegrated did not have their self-generated expectations met initially. Violators expected that close others would emotionally support them throughout the process; however, violators like C012 often had friends distance themselves from the violator soon after the violation. At the beginning of the program, C012 talked about one friend who she expected to stand by her, but did not. She recalled, “a girl that I roomed with at [training], who I thought was a pretty good friend, she just doesn’t talk to me now, since I got [the honor violation]…. [actively crying] so that was kind of hard to deal with” (C012, B1, PR). This demonstrates that C012’s expectations of support went unmet early on in the program.
Violators’ self-generated expectations regarding standing were also often unmet initially. Although violators expected to feel like full members of the organization by being treated fairly, by being seen for more than their violation, and by being allowed to participate in roles and activities, violators like C012 did not have these expectations met early on in the program. For example, halfway through the program, C012 felt that other organizational members were not giving her chances to redeem herself, and they only saw her in light of the violation. She described, “my TAC officer has been pretty toxic in the whole process… giving people no opportunity, no real hope to regain the same image in his eyes” (C012, M, PR). This suggests that C012 felt like organizational members were not giving her second chances, which prevented her from feeling like she was regaining standing. Even later, when she reflected on her initial experiences in the program, she recalled,

I had been losing a lot of faith in the chain of command [initially]….they don't take the initiative to recognize your efforts. When you get everything done on time, you meet all the [requirements]….you're seen as a statistic of bad behavior so they don't really want to try hard to give you back privileges. You might have earned them but they think that “you did that bad [thing], so why should I bust my ass to give you something back?” I was really frustrated with the whole thing. Just because I did my part, I expected you guys to do yours (C012, E - reflecting on middle, PR, emphasis my own)

C012’s reflections on the early stages of the program indicated that C012 felt that she wasn't being treated fairly initially. She believed she had done things to “earn” back her standing, but other organizational members still saw her as a “statistic of bad behavior” and were not reciprocating or giving her second chances. This seemed to make her feel that she was not being treated fairly, and by extension, like a full organizational member.

C012’s expectations regarding standing also went unmet because she was not given leadership roles, even when she thought she deserved them. C012 knew that other violators at the Academy had recently been placed into certain leadership positions. She wanted to have one of
the positions as well, and even had other organizational members advocate for her. She explained,

we have a shortage of people to be in the leadership positions….My chain of command has continually pushed for me [to be in a leadership position]. ‘Hey, C012 would be a good fit, let’s have C012 do this.’ [Supervising officer’s response was] ‘no, no, no no’” (C012, M, PR)

Taken together, these unmet expectations in standing made C012 feel like she was not getting closer to feeling like a full organizational member. She described her overall experience halfway through the program by saying, “I feel a little bit distant…I feel kind of – not on the outside looking in, but just in a different position than I expected to be in” (C012, M, PR). This quote demonstrates not only that C012 felt unmet in her expectations, but also that these unmet expectations made her feel like she was not a full organizational member.

Self-Generated Expectations Met Later

Although violators who became partially reintegrated did not have their self-generated expectations met initially, they eventually had some of their expectations met by the end of the program. For example, C012 did not feel completely supported halfway through the program, but by the end of the program, her expectations of support were met. She explained that she had many close others encouraging her, saying, “all of my friends who knew me before it happened….it was nice to have them be like, ‘You're a good person. Just keep going’” (C012, E, PR). Officers that C021 was close to also gave her support at the end of the process. One officer told her, “‘I completely understand how it sucks to go through it but you're going to become a better person [from this experience]’” (C012, E, PR). Statements like this from close others made C012 feel supported. She explained that especially when officers offered support, it gave me a little faith that there are people here that care about your struggle, they care about your actual development….it was nice to finally have that person in your chain of
command that was on your side, willing to step up to the plate for you, willing to be there on your behalf (C012, E, PR)

In short, such support made C012 feel cared for, such that by the end of the program, C012’s expectations of support were met.

Violators who eventually became partially reintegrated also had more of their self-generated expectations regarding standing met by the end of the program. C012 eventually felt that she was being treated fairly and seen for more than simply the violation. C012 felt that officers in charge of the honor program had treated her disrespectfully and unfairly, which caused her expectations of standing to go unmet. However, the Superintendent eventually reprimanded these officers for their behavior, which helped restore C012’s sense that she was being seen as a full, respected member of the Academy. She recalled,

I guess there was a memo in my packet that explained that it had gotten lost. He [the Superintendent] looked to the dude who was responsible for it getting lost who was so rude to me, and he just spent 10 minutes reaming him out. I was like “thank you, at least someone realized the mistake that was made.” He was like, "This is how we treat our soldiers? Letting them just wait in limbo without any privileges, just letting them be in prison?” It was nice to have him care that it hadn't gone smoothly. He told them, "She did her part. Why didn’t you do yours?” The recognition for the failure in communication for the whole Honor Board process, that was nice for him to acknowledge (C012, E, PR)

The Superintendent’s recognition that she had not been treated fairly and the verbal discipline that he administered to the officers appeared to make C012 feel that she was being seen for more than simply her violation, which likely contributed to a sense that her expectations of standing were being met.

C012’s expectations of standing also became met when she was given a leadership role. Her first supervising officer had previously denied her a leadership position, but another officer eventually placed her into a prestigious role. She explained, “I had my interview for the [leadership] position next year, with my [new supervising officer]….he was like, ‘I don't care
what anyone says, you have that spot. You did so well. I'm so impressed.’ He gave me a hug. It was just really nice” (C012, E, PR). Being given a leadership role not only meant that her expectations were eventually met, but it may have also signaled to C012 that she was seen as a full organizational member in good standing.

Outcome: Partial Reintegration

Violators whose self-generated expectations were unmet initially but became met by the end of the program appeared to experience oscillating recovery. For example, C012 described her overall experience in the remediation program by saying, “it's been a rollercoaster” (C012, E, PR). This choice of words suggests that C012 felt like the recovery process oscillated back and forth, perhaps as a result of experiencing both unmet and met expectations.

Ultimately, this oscillating recovery process ultimately led violators to feel a somewhat repaired sense of self-worth, support, and standing, and an overall feeling of partial reintegration. For example, C012 felt like she overall felt positively about herself and her development, though with some reservations. She explained, “It's disjointed but I feel like this whole process was so developmental…. I feel a lot more developed” (C012, E, PR). She added that this development “made me a better person. It's kind of like forced growth. It may be painful but you're glad it happened” (C012, E, PR). Because she felt like she was a better person, but also felt that the process was “disjointed” and “painful”, this suggests that – compared to violators who became highly reintegrated – she felt partially repaired in her self-worth.

Violators like C012 also felt partially repaired in her sense of support. She described how she had a group of close, supportive friends, but she also felt socially marginalized by some Cadets in her company, who were supposed to be “close” peers. She said,

I have my strong circle of friends that I had before but then you don't really have those fair-weather friends. They're kind of just gone. [But] you feel secluded….in my new class
I don't know anyone so it's like, hey just showing up in your class. I have people in my company that I know in my new class, and obviously [the Academy]’s like a huge high-school so there's all the rumors, the whisper mill. Obviously people hear stories about why you're in their class now, so it's awkward. You're like, hi I got in trouble so here I am (C012, E, PR)

C012 appeared to feel supported by close friends, but unsupported by other peers that she was supposed to be close to. This suggests that C012 felt partially repaired in her sense of support.

Violators like C012 also experienced partial repair in their sense of standing. C012 explained how she did not feel like she was fully a member of the Corps of Cadets, even at the end of the program. She said, “It's like you're not really on the same page [with peers] anymore…..In many ways I still feel a part of the Corps [of Cadets] but in some ways I feel like I belong more with our little Honor Board group more than I do with the whole Corps” (C012, E, PR). Explicitly saying that she both felt and did not feel like a full member of the Corps suggests that she did not feel completely repaired in her sense of standing.

This partial reintegration appeared tied to ambivalent feelings about the Academy. Violators like C012 appeared to view the Academy both positively and negatively. For example, C012 described,

[the Academy], it's a great place to be from but a horrible place to be at….Once you graduate you're proud to be from here. You may have hated being here but graduating from here is like, “You graduated from [the Academy].” As for how I feel about [the Academy], I can't say that I hate it, because I don't (C012, E).

Later, C012 added, “I'm here for a reason. This is a good place to be, just finish it out” (C012, E). C012’s mixed response – saying that it’s both “a horrible place to be at”, and it’s “a good place to be” – illustrates how conflicted she felt about the organization.

In short, when violators had their self-generated expectations unmet initially but later met, they came to feel partially repaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing, hold ambivalent attitudes about the organization, and feel partially reintegrated overall. Additional
quotes illustrating other partially reintegrated violators’ self-generated expectations and reintegration outcomes can be found in Table 4 of Appendix IV.

**Pathway #3: Misleading Recovery, No Reintegration**

Another group of violators experienced misleading recovery – they initially appeared to recover and repair, but then by the end of the program they were not reintegrated at all. These violators, like C005, had their self-generated expectations met early on; however, by the end of the experience, their expectations about support and standing were no longer met, leading them to feel not reintegrated.

**Self-Generated Expectations Met Early On**

Violators who experienced misleading recovery and were not reintegrated had their self-generated expectations met early on. They expected close others to support them, which they did indeed experience at the beginning of the program. For example, C005 explained how even though his friends were graduating, he still felt very close to them. He explained that he was spending a lot of time with

the same people I've always been friends with…. I'm just trying to reach out to them because this is like the final roll here. This is the final time I get to thank them for all the good years we had together. I'll go to brunch with them on Sunday. I'll go to dinner with them on the weekdays. I'm trying to maximize the amount of interaction with them before they disappear, is the best way I can phrase it…. getting breakfast with anyone and everyone that asks me to. Like I said, I want to spend some time with them before they leave. I'm not becoming a shut-in, don't worry (C005, B2, NR)

C005 wasn’t just spending a great deal of time with close others, he actually experienced support from it. He explained that they “really care about me and I want to show them that I care about them these last 34 days” (C005, B2, NR). C005’s use of the word “care” signals that he felt a great deal of support from these close friends during the early stages of the program.
Like other violators who did not reintegrate, C005 also had his expectations about standing met early on. He felt that others were seeing him for more than the violation – namely because he felt like he was being given second chances, and because he felt treated fairly. C005 felt that he was being given second chances by officers. For example, he knew that the violation called into question his trustworthiness, and that it would take a while to earn back that trust. However, early on he saw that his supervising officers were giving him chances to demonstrate his trustworthiness. C005 described,

[I’m having to defy this trust deficit….if you lose your trust in the [military], that's how life is. It takes a long time to build it back if you can…..To an extent with my TAC team, I’ve built back trust] for sure, because they entrusted me with thousands of dollars of money for rations. They know that I spent the money on the company store. Even though they're not asking for it, I have it on my computer. All the receipts, digitized. For right now, they do trust me, though. They sign off that I can withdraw this money (C005, M, NR, emphasis my own)

The fact that his supervising officers allowed him to handle thousands of dollars without oversight made C005 feel that he was being given a second chance to be trusted again. This in turn may have contributed to feeling like others were seeing beyond his violation. He had experiences with other officers who also seemed to give him second chances. For example, he wrote a journal entry about how he spent the summer working

with officers and noncommissioned officers that did not have any prior knowledge of who I was or my honor case. They knew I was in trouble because I did not graduate on time and was assigned to the [office] with other seniors who were turned back, but [they] gave us all a chance to prove our merit (C005, Journal 22, NR)

Being given a chance to “prove” himself may have made C005 feel like he was being seen for more than the violation, which may have contributed to his met expectations around standing.

In general, C005 also felt fairly treated, which may have further contributed to his met expectations. He explained how he felt like he was fairly treated by the system, and received similar punishments to other violators. He explained,
I was defending the Honor Code. I feel like I was treated fairly by it. I didn't feel like there was any racial bias….There was none of that. The system worked (C005, M, NR).

Feeling like he was treated the same as other violators likely made C005 feel like he was not “lesser” than other Cadets in comparable circumstances, which may have fostered feelings of standing.

C005’s participation in many roles and activities that he had previously been a part of may have also contributed to his met expectations and his sense of standing. In some cases, members of the activities even asked him to continue his leadership roles. C005 recalled that the other Cadets “were asking like, ‘Oh, what are you going to do next semester?’ They were asking if I wanted to stay on as vice president, or do something else” (C005, B2, NR). Being asked to stay in a leadership role, despite his violation, may have made C005 feel that others were seeing him for more than simply his violation. If so, this likely contributed to C005’s met expectations and sense of standing. In addition to being asked to stay in current roles, early on C005 became involved in many new activities as a way to participate as much as possible at the Academy. He explained,

I made myself fully available to my company as a supply officer trying to make sure the quality of life is the best that I can provide. Also I have willingly taken on additional jobs. I help out the Physical Development Officer by going to morning workouts, and I have offered myself to help the Academic Officer by watching weekday study hall. I also helped the cadet first sergeant of my company by taking the responsibility of the maintaining the cleanliness of the company upon myself. I formally wanted to do nothing that would even remotely help the company, and now I found myself tutoring and mentoring many people in the company (C005, Journal #1, NR).

Increasing his participation at the Academy may have been one way for C005 to feel more like a full organizational member, which may have affected his sense of standing. In short, violators like C005 had their self-generated expectations regarding support and standing met early on.

Self-Generated Expectations Unmet Later
Although violators like C005 had their self-generated expectations regarding support and standing met initially, as the program continued their experiences changed. By the end of the program, violators’ expectations were no longer met. Regarding their expectations of support, violators like C005 often began to lose close others as the program continued. Halfway through the program, C005 recalled how he started feeling distanced from his friends, saying,

I sat with people at weddings and who told stories of the plebes they slept with, the [curfew] times they blew, the money they stole from the company store….they're like, "Ah, it's a shame you got caught." That's the only negative part has been seeing a lot of people I thought were good friends actually were scumbags (C005, M, NR)

Learning that C005’s friends had – in his eyes – committed worse violations without being caught appeared to make C005 view his close friends in a more negative light. On top of this, C005’s friends responded in ways that seemed insensitive to C005’s plight. This may have made C005 feel less supported, which would have prevented his self-generated expectations from being met.

As C005 began to feel more distant from his Academy friends, he started to perceive a lack of support coming from close others at the Academy. Because his self-generated expectations about support at the Academy were no longer met, he increasingly made attempts to find sources of support elsewhere. He explained that by the end of the program,

I really started gravitating back towards my [hometown] friends…..At [the Academy], they really instilled in you the desire to form those connections with your classmates. I have just been forging my connections back again with my old friends, making sure that's stronger. As [the Academy] reminds me, I'm not [graduating with my Academy friends]….I go, "You know what? If that's what you want me to do, I will go make other friends" (C005, E, NR)

C005’s focus on actively building friendships outside of the Academy indicated that he no longer assumed that he would find support from close others at the Academy. He likely believed that his expectation of support would remain unmet, so he sought support from outside sources instead.
Like expectations of support, C005’s expectations regarding standing were also unmet by the end of the program. Violators believed that they would be treated fairly and in ways that reflected more than simply the violation, which would signal to them that they were regaining their standing in the organization. Although C005 initially felt he had a fair experience, by the end of the program, he felt like he was being treated worse than other Cadets and other violators. He recounted the first time he found out other violators had been treated more leniently than he had been, and how it deeply upset him. C005 recalled,

[Another Cadet said] "You know the Honor Code's not legit." I'm like, "What do you mean?" She goes, "Didn't you hear what happened to [Cadet X]?" [Cadet X] is our starting [player on athletic team]. I'm like, "No." She goes, "Oh, he just had his second honor violation now." I go, "No, no, no! No, the Honor Code works like this: on your second honor violation, you're kicked out. There's no recourse." That's when she laughed at me. She's like, "Oh, you're so naïve. You can't catch a [ball], that's why you can't get that special treatment"…..[I was] so upset. So upset. Here I am trying to extol ... I generally believe I was treated fairly by the Honor Code. Then to see someone just break the Honor Code for the same offense twice…. He's still here because he can catch a [ball]…..I can't catch a [ball], so that's why I can't do that (C005, M, NR)

Realizing that other violators had been treated more favorable than him made C005 deeply upset.

In addition, being treated as “lesser” than other organizational members may have made C005 feel like his expectations were not being met, and he was not regaining his standing.

These unmet expectations of fairness and standing persisted through the rest of the program. Even at the end of the program, C005 was still ruminating about how violators on athletic teams were given better treatment.

this [other violator on the athletic team] since the beginning of this program [has] just being helped along in ways that I could've never even dreamed of being helped along because he has a letter from [athletic coach]….they still care deeply about this fellow, while I have to still fight tooth and nail to even get my [immediate supervising officers] to care for me, which is hard. I want the tiniest bit of what he has, but I know I'll never get it because I'm not a [athletic team] player. That's the most frustrating part, is to see that (C005, E, NR)
Seeing another violator getting favorable treatment made C005 feel like he was being treated unfairly. In C005’s mind, these experiences of unfairness were directly linked to being viewed as “lesser” in the organization. C005 explained that when he heard about unfair treatment – either other violators being treated more leniently, or other Cadets not being punished for worse offenses – he felt like it was the organizations’ way of conveying his standing. He said,

I had a roommate that was a [violator] as well. We would lay in bed and we would talk about our classmates. We would be like, "Yeah, you know, so-and-so is such a dirt bag and he did this-and-that" and my roommate would go, "Well, [the Academy] thinks he's better than us. He graduated on time" (C005, M, NR, emphasis my own)

This quote shows that perceptions of unfair treatment made C005 feel like he was “worse” than other Cadets and violators in the eyes of the organization. This shows that his expectations of standing – that he would be treated fairly – went unmet by the end of the program.

All violators also expected that they would be treated in ways that reflected more than simply their violations. However, by the end of the program, violators like C005 came to feel that they would never fully escape the stigma of the violation, and others would always discount them because of it. C005 explained how conversations with organizational representatives reinforced this belief, saying,

all the honor mentors would say, "You will always be marked. You're always going to be an honor violator. You'll always have to rise above your classmates who do the bare minimum just to prove you have changed, that you are proficient"….because even after you leave….[it] never leaves you (C005, E, NR, emphasis my own)

This quote demonstrates how C005 came to believe that others would never see beyond his violation, and that he would always be treated differently because of it. This meant that his expectations regarding standing went unmet, likely preventing him from feeling like he was – or would ever be – a full organizational member again.
Violators also assessed their standing based on their participation in roles and activities. Violators like C005 expected to continue to participate in roles and activities at the Academy, or be returned to roles that they were previously removed from because of the violation. Like many other violators who were not reintegrated, C005 actively participated in roles and activities early on in the program; however, by the end of the program, he was no longer involved with many of the positions and groups. He said,

I don't go to [singing group] anymore. I don't go to church. I don't go to [club]. I think that's a big thing is just not being a part of these community forming groups anymore, because it just reminds me of what I had before. Now what I had before was gone (C005, E, NR)

No longer participating in activities not only meant that C005’s expectations went unmet, but this quote indicates that C005 felt like he had permanently lost a sense of his place at the organization. Between their experiences in roles and activities, being treated fairly, and being seen for more than simply the violation, violators like C005 came to feel that their expectations of standing were unmet by the end of the program.

In short, although violators like C005 had their expectations of support and standing initially met, by the end of the program, they no longer felt supported or felt like they were regaining their standing at the organization.

**Outcome: Not Reintegrated**

Violators whose self-generated expectations were met initially met but became unmet by the end of the program appeared to experience misleading recovery, and ultimately did not feel reintegrated. They believed that they were recovering well initially, but by the end of the program, they felt unrepaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing.

Although all violators – including those that did not become reintegrated – experienced self-development, it appears that having unmet expectations about support and standing may
have had spillover effects on violators’ sense of self-worth. C005 indicates that he did indeed change – his formal expectation of self-development was met – but he also felt more negatively about himself as a result of the unmet self-generated expectations. He described, “I know from going through all these [remediation program requirements], spending 44,000 words compiling just the journals, that there's been a change. I also know that there's been a more jaded change…” (C005, E, NR). Saying that he’s changed – but also that he feels more jaded – suggests that his self-worth was negatively affected by the other unmet expectations. This negative sense of self-worth was apparent when C005 said things like, “now I've lost everything….I've got nothing to lose” (C005, E, NR) and “people look at me, no one wants my life. I don't want my life” (C005, E, NR). In short, although C005 knew that he had changed and developed, he felt negatively about himself, indicating that he did not experience repair in his sense of self-worth.

Violators like C005 also failed to repair their sense of support. By the end of the program, C005 felt like he didn’t have any close others at the Academy. He said, “I'm not going to go around saying how wonderful life is without any friends and without any clubs, without anything to do” (C005, E, NR). He further explained how this lack of close others affected his sense of support, saying

I guess in my link to the corps was with my classmates. Then when they all left, like I said, it's hard to talk to them because they are now doing [officer training]. They have houses, they have units, some of them. They can't relate to cadet things..... and now I can't really connect to 2017 because we never knew each other” (C005, E)

This quote suggests that C005 felt like his old friends could no longer “relate” to him, and he didn’t have connections to others at the Academy. C005 felt like he had no one who cared for him, suggesting that he felt unrepaired in his sense of support.

Violators who experienced misleading recovery also did not feel repaired in their sense of support. C005 never regained the feeling that he was a full member of the organization again.
Even after receiving his rank back – which, in the organization’s eyes, indicated that he was a full member of the organization – he explained how he detached he felt, saying,

I stand in the back of formation with the other two turn-backs….No one really checks up on us. We are accountable for ourselves. You're treated like a normal Cadet. No one requests me to do things. I don't know that many people here, so they don't look for me. It's quiet. … Just me and my roommate, who doesn't have a good grasp of English. No one hangs out with him, either. The two of us are just tucked away in a little room and we're fine with it. It's kind of nice to be forgotten. I'm able to look at [the Academy] and see all the cadets doing their things and not take part of it” (C005, E, NR, emphasis my own)

Using words like “forgotten” indicates that C005 did not feel like he was a full participating, contributing member of the organization. In short, violators like C005 felt that their standing was unrepaired, even despite getting their ranks back.

Feeling unrepaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing – in short, feeling not reintegrated at all – appeared linked to negative feelings toward the Academy. For example, C005 explained how he felt about the Academy at the end of the program, saying,

I no longer am going around saying, "[the Academy] is the best thing you could ever do, the best school you could ever go to. This is amazing. I am so happy." I don't wake up the first thing in the morning and say, "I'm so happy." When I wake up, I just go, "Well, it's another day.”…. There's no joy, it's just like a sense of this is what needs to get done (C005, E, NR)

He explained that these negative attitudes toward the Academy were a significant change from before. C005 compared how he was before the violation to how he was after the remediation program, saying, “I came in, I was 19, loved [the Academy]. Now I'm leaving, I'm 24 [and] I don't” (C005, E, NR). This demonstrates that C005 did not always hold negative attitudes of the organization; rather, they seemed to develop over the course of the remediation program.

In short, when violators had their self-generated expectations met initially but later unmet, they came to feel unrepaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing, hold negative attitudes about the organization, and feel not reintegrated overall. Additional quotes illustrating
the self-generated expectations and reintegration outcomes of other violators who did not become reintegrated can be found in Table 5 of Appendix IV.

**SUMMARY**

The data presented above describe how violators in my sample experienced the process of reintegration over time (see Figure 2). When a violation occurred, violators appeared to experience ruptures in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. Violators knew they could have been terminated from the Academy, so when they were retained, they believed they had been given a second chance. Violators came to realize that in return for being given a second chance, the organization had certain expectations of them, which they attempted to meet. However, as violators complied with the organization’s expectations, the violators themselves also began to form expectations about what they would experience, and how they would be treated in the future. Specifically, violators formed expectations about self-development, support, and standing. Some of these expectations were formal – that is, they were explicitly promised by the organization – while other expectations were self-generated, or “filled in” by violators. All violators had their formal, organizationally-promised expectations met. Thus, from the perspective of the organization, the organization followed through on what it promised to violators, so all violators should have felt completely reintegrated. However, as see in Figure 1, not all violators felt reintegrated at the end of the program; some violators did become highly reintegrated, but others experienced only partial reintegration or no reintegration at all. This presents a puzzle: if all violators had their formal expectations met, what accounts for the different experiences of reintegration?

My data suggest that the answer lies in how well violators’ self-generated expectations were met. When violators had their self-generated expectations continually met, they
experienced consistent recovery and high reintegration. When violators had their self-generated expectations unmet at first, but eventually met later, they experienced oscillating recovery and partial reintegration. And when violators had their self-generated expectations met early on, but unmet at the end of the program, violators experienced misleading recovery, and did not feel reintegrated at all.
CHAPTER 5: TOWARD A THEORY OF REINTEGRATION

Building on the findings in the previous chapter, I offer a general model of reintegration from the perspective of the violators (Figure 3). This model illustrates how the data and findings presented in the previous chapter may generalize beyond the Academy; it attempts to articulate a more generalized process of reintegration that may occur in other contexts. To do this, the process model presented here focuses on features of the reintegration process that my data suggested were common across all violators’ experiences.

The model depicts a process of rupture, psychological contract formation, psychological contract fulfillment, and repair, which lead to feelings of reintegration. In the aftermath of violations, violators first experience ruptures in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. When they are retained at the organization and disciplined, they form expectations about the mutual obligations that exist between themselves and the organization (and its members) – in short, they come to perceive a “psychological contract” to exist between themselves and the organization. To the extent that these expectations and mutual obligations are explicit and formally promised by the organization, the contract is transactional (MacNeil, 1985). To the extent that the expectations and mutual obligations are implicit and exist primarily in the minds of the violators, the contracts are relational (Rousseau, 1990; Rousseau, 1995). How well these explicit transactional and implicit relational psychological contracts are fulfilled affects how well violators repair their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. The degree to which violators repair their self-worth, support, and standing in turn affects the extent to which violators feel reintegrated overall.

In this chapter, I unpack each part of this generalized model. In doing so, I connect the descriptive data presented in the previous chapter to each part of the generalized model. When
appropriate, I also discuss how existing research relates to or supports various pieces of the generalized model, thereby situating this model in relation to existing theory.

Figure 3. General Model of Reintegration

Ruptures in Self, Support, Standing

As can be seen from the descriptive findings presented in the previous chapter, when organizational members are accused of violations, they experience ruptures in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. My data suggest that sense of self-worth pertains to how violators feel about themselves, and whether they see themselves positively. Violators’ sense of self-worth appears tied to their self-evaluations, self-perceptions, and identities. When violators believe they are good people, and when they feel positively about themselves, they experience a high sense of self-worth.

Sense of support describes whether violators feel cared about, encouraged, and emotionally supported by close others. These close others can include friends, family, significant others, mentors, or anyone that violators expect to care about them on a personal level. Violators feel supported when close others spend time with them, include them, offer help, follow through on promises, or provide emotional comfort to them.
Sense of standing indicates the extent to which violators feel like full members in the organization. This can be in terms of participation, respect, status, or inclusion. My data suggest that sense of standing is influenced primarily by how other organizational members treat the violators. When others respect violators, treat them fairly or no differently than other organizational members, include violators, or allow them to participate in organizational activities, violators are more likely to feel that they are full organizational members and experience a high sense of standing.

Although sense of self-worth, support, and standing are dimensions that arose inductively from my data, existing theory and literature suggest that these are particularly important dimensions that tie individuals to organizations. Organizational members have basic motivations to maintain a positive self-concept (Heine et al., 1999), to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), and to acquire and maintain status (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), which roughly map on to violators’ sense of self-worth, support, and standing. Organizational members often satisfy these motivations through membership in organizations. Thus, it is not surprising that when violators are at risk of being terminated from an organization – a major source of self-esteem, belonging, and status – they would be likely to experience ruptures in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing.

My data suggest that violators experience ruptures in sense of self-worth when they experience threats or dissonance about who they are. This may occur when their positive beliefs about themselves are at odds with their behaviors, or at odds with others’ perceptions of them. The nature of self-worth induced from my data is consistent with what previous research has illuminated about individuals’ self-esteem (e.g., Brown, 2014) and self-concepts (e.g., Baumeister, 1999). Existing research suggests that how individuals feel about themselves is
influenced by the interactions organizational members have with their social and physical environments (Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976; Bong & Skaalvik, 2003), which can include comparisons of the current self to previous or future selves; social comparisons to others; and feedback or evaluations from others.

The data also indicate that ruptures in support occur when close others distance themselves from violators, or when close others fail to offer help, comfort, or encouragement to violators. This is consistent with scholarship on social support (e.g., Wortman & Dunkel-Schetter, 1979; 1987) and belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), which indicate that positive, inclusive interaction fosters feeling of support and belonging, while negative, exclusionary behavior reduces it (e.g., Leary & Springer, 2001).

Ruptures in standing appear to occur when violators feel disrespected, treated unfairly or differently from other organizational member, or are excluded from organizational roles, activities, or events. Previous research on the group engagement model is consistent with these findings (Tyler & Blader, 2003). This work shows that individuals infer their standing in a group based on how much others respect or disrespect them (Rogers, Corley, & Ashforth, 2017; Tyler & Blader, 2003), whether others treat them fairly or unjustly (Lind and Tyler, 1988; Lind and Earley, 1992; Tyler, 1989), or whether others marginalize or include them (Fuller et al., 2006, p. 822). Unfair or different treatment in particular sends symbolic messages to group members that they are not valued or full members of the group (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1989; Tyler & Lind, 1992; Restubog et al., 2008).

**Psychological and Transactional Contracts**

After violations occur and violators experience ruptures in self-worth, support, and standing, organizations respond to the violations. In situations in which a reintegration process
occurs, organizations choose to retain – but typically punish or discipline – violators. Folk theories (e.g., Adams & Mullen, 2014) appear to treat punishment as the “end” of a violation episode. It is frequently assumed that once punishment is administered, the system is restored to a relatively normal state (e.g., Okimoto & Wenzel, 2009), so no further examination is needed.

However, my data suggest that experiencing punishment is actually a beginning, as it triggers new processes relevant to reintegration. When violators are punished but retained at the organization, they interpret this as the organization giving them a second chance. However, violators come to realize that in return for the second chance, the organization holds certain expectations of the violators and how they will behave. As discussed in the findings, violators comply with these expectations in return for being retained. This tendency to comply may be related to research showing that violators often make amends and offer apologies in the aftermath of transgressions (e.g., Carlisle et al., 2012; ten Brinke & Adams, 2015; Schumann, 2014).

My data, however, suggest something more: that when violators comply with the organization’s expectations, they also begin to form expectations of their own. They come to believe that in return for their compliant behavior, they have been promised – either explicitly or implicitly – that certain things will happen in the future. To the best of my knowledge, the tendency for violators to form their own expectations after a violation has never been theorized or empirically shown by any previous research.

My data show that violators’ expectations involve the violators’ sense of self, support, and standing. At the Academy, the specific content of these expectations included expectations of self-development, of close others continuing to support the violators, and of being returned to full rank. These specific expectations are likely to be idiosyncratic to the Academy; the
expectations that violators form in other organizations are likely to be quite different. However, the general categories of expectations – self, support, and standing – involve universal motivations and therefore are likely to generalize across contexts. In other words, all violators, regardless of context, are likely to form expectations about self, support, and standing, but the specific details of those self, support, and standing expectations will likely be unique to the organization and situation.

My data suggest that violators’ expectations are either formally set or self-generated. Formal expectations are those that are explicitly promised by the organization, while self-generated expectations are those that violators were not promised, but “filled in” themselves.

The existence of these expectations – whether formally, explicitly promised or self-generated – suggests that violators are aware of a set of mutual obligations between themselves and the organization. These expectations are not simply what the violator predicts will happen in the future; rather, they are perceived as experiences that they are owed by the organization and its members. These explicitly or implicitly “promised” expectations imply the existence of “psychological contracts” in the minds of violators (Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993; Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau, 1990). Psychological contracts are based on individuals’ beliefs about obligations and reciprocity between themselves and an organization, and exist primarily in the minds of individuals (Rousseau, 1990). Research suggests that there are several kinds of psychological contracts in organizations: transactional and relational (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1989; McLean Parks & Rousseau, 1993; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Scholars argue that psychological contracts are based on promissory beliefs, not simply on predictions about what the future will entail (Montes & Zweig, 2009; Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Although I have chosen to use the word “expectation” here – because that is the label that arose inductively from my coding and analysis – my conceptualization of “expectation” is akin to the promissory beliefs that comprise psychological contracts. Violators in this study appeared to believe that the expectations they held were “promised” to them, either explicitly (formal expectations) or implicitly (self-generated expectations). Thus, the psychological contract literature is an appropriate lens for my findings.

---

3 It should be noted that the psychological contract literature has distinguished between general employee expectations and the “promises” that comprise psychological contracts (Montes & Zweig, 2009; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Scholars argue that psychological contracts are based on promissory beliefs, not simply on predictions about what the future will entail (Montes & Zweig, 2009; Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Although I have chosen to use the word “expectation” here – because that is the label that arose inductively from my coding and analysis – my conceptualization of “expectation” is akin to the promissory beliefs that comprise psychological contracts. Violators in this study appeared to believe that the expectations they held were “promised” to them, either explicitly (formal expectations) or implicitly (self-generated expectations). Thus, the psychological contract literature is an appropriate lens for my findings.
1990; Rousseau and McLean Parks, 1993). Transactional contracts are those that are explicit, delimited, and pertain to specific, observable behaviors (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1990). Relational psychological contracts, on the other hand, tend to be implicit, open-ended, and involve socio-emotional expectations about obligations involving support, loyalty, and care (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1990).

Interpreted through the lens of contracts, my data suggest that holding formal expectations makes violators perceive that explicit transactional contracts exist between themselves and the organization, while holding self-generated expectations makes violators develop implicit relational psychological contracts with the organization in their minds.

In my data, transactional contracts involved expectations about self-development and standing, while the implicit relational psychological contracts contained expectations about support and standing. However, this may not be true in other contexts. How expectations are divided between explicit transactional and implicit relational contracts – which expectations were explicitly promised versus filled-in by violators – may vary by context and situation. For example, in other settings, organizations may make explicit promises about support, but violators may “fill in” their own expectations about self.

It may be that some types of expectations are more conducive to one type of contract versus another. Behaviors that the organization has some control over may be more likely to be part of explicit transactional contracts, while behaviors that are harder for the organization to control may be left to implicit relational contracts. For example, organizations often have control over outcomes such as promotions and disciplinary outcomes; thus, organizations may be more likely to make explicit promises to violators regarding the timing of sanctions or the magnitude of promotions. Organizations often have less control over interpersonal interactions between
employees; therefore, expectations involving support may be more likely to be perceived as part of implicit, relational contracts. Because explicit transactional contracts may be limited to expectations involving organizationally-controllable outcomes, implicit relational contracts are likely to contain a wider range of expectations than explicit transactional contracts.

**Fulfillment of Transactional & Psychological Contracts**

My data suggest that how well both types of contracts are fulfilled – the explicit transactional contract with its formal expectations, and the implicit relational psychological contract with its self-generated expectations – determines the pathway of reintegration that violators experience, and ultimately how well-reintegrated violators feel overall. Other organizational members’ treatment of the violators appears to affect how well violators’ expectations are met. My data suggest that violators infer their sense of self-worth, support, and extent of standing based on how others act toward them. When other organizational members treat violators in ways that conform to violators’ formal or self-generated expectations, it contributes to the fulfillment of violators’ explicit transactional and implicit psychological contracts.

In my sample, all violators had their explicit transactional contracts fulfilled; their formal expectations of self-development and regained rank were met. However, not all violators had their implicit relational psychological contracts fulfilled. Some violators’ self-generated expectations regarding support and standing were met, while other violators’ expectations were not met. Thus, in the context of the Academy, which pathway and what reintegration outcome violators experienced depended on the extent to which the implicit relational psychological contract was fulfilled.
However, this may not always be the case. In some organizations, violators may not have their explicit transactional contracts fulfilled, but their self-generated expectations – and therefore their implicit relational psychological contracts – may be completely met. Or, in other contexts, violators not have either type of contract fulfilled.

I theorize that, in general, explicit transactional contracts have a greater likelihood of being fulfilled, as compared to implicit relational psychological contracts. Organizations may be more aware of the formal expectations violators hold, because they overtly promise them to violators. Organizations may therefore exert more effort to fulfilling the expectations that were part of the explicit transactional contract. On the other hand, organizations may be entirely unaware of violators’ self-generated expectations, making it is less likely that they would act in ways that would fulfill the violators’ implicit relational psychological contracts. Even if organizations are aware of violators’ self-generated expectations, they may be unable to influence how well violators’ self-generated expectations are met. For example, this is likely to be the case regarding expectations around “support”, which rely on other organizational members providing care and comfort to violators. Mandating organizational members to care about violators is very difficult to do, and therefore violators’ self-generated expectations and implicit relational psychological contracts have a greater likelihood of going unfulfilled.

**Repair in Self, Support, Standing**

The extent to which violators’ explicit transactional and implicit relational psychological contracts are fulfilled affect how well violators repair their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. My data suggests that when violators have both their explicit transactional and implicit psychological contracts consistently fulfilled over time, they experience consistent recovery over
time. This often leads violators to feel a stronger sense of self-worth, support, and standing than they did before the violation.

My data suggests that when violators have their formal and self-generated expectations unmet initially but then met later, violators experience an oscillating recovery process. Having some expectations unmet is akin to having parts of the psychological contract breached (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 1995; Dulac et al, 2008). Research on psychological contract breach indicates that unmet expectations can lead to negative consequences, including negative attitudes and damaged relationship with the organization (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000; Kickul and Lester, 2001; Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Turnley and Feldman, 2000; Zhao et al., 2007). Even when these expectations are later met and the breached psychological contract is mended, my data suggest that the negative effects of the original breach are likely to linger. Thus, it is not surprising that violators who experience psychological contract breach at first, but later have them fulfilled, experience only partial repair in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing.

When violators’ explicit and implicit psychological contracts are initially fulfilled but later breached, violators experience a misleading recovery process. They initially believe they are recovering and reintegrating, but when the psychological contract is breached, this makes violators feel unrepaird their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. As noted above, this is consistent with existing research on psychological contract breach (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000; Kickul and Lester, 2001; Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Turnley and Feldman, 2000; Zhao et al., 2007). It also parallels research on the group engagement model. When individuals expect to feel respected and treated fairly, but instead are disrespected or treated worse than other organizational members, this prompts violators to feel like less-than-full-organizational members
(Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1989; Tyler & Lind, 1992; Blader & Tyler, 2003). As a result, violators do not feel repaired in their sense of standing.

It is important to note that violators’ sense of support and standing may have “spillover” effects on violators’ sense of self-worth. My data suggest that violators often began to repair their sense of self-worth as they experienced self-development from the remediation program; thus, repair in self-worth was often initially tied to fulfillment of formal expectations and the explicit transactional contract. However, how well violators’ self-generated expectations regarding support and standing were met appeared to influence violators’ sense of self-worth as well. When violators felt more supported and like they had been granted more standing, this seemed to reinforce violators’ sense of self-worth. Conversely, when violators felt less supported and like they had lower standing, this seemed to erode violators’ sense of self-worth. In short, recovery of self-worth appeared to be interdependent with support and standing. Research by Restubog et al. (2008) provides additional evidence for this phenomenon. The authors argued that breaches of psychological contracts rupture trust between employees and organizations, which “may facilitate a sense of decreased self-worth and a corresponding desire to dissociate from the organization” (Restubog et al., 2008). Thus, the relationship between psychological contract fulfillment or breach and repair in self-worth, support, and standing that arose inductively from my data appears consistent with previous research.

Reintegration

My data suggest that the extent to which violators’ sense of self-worth, support, and standing are repaired then affects violators’ overall feelings of reintegration, and their attitudes about the organization. When psychological contracts are consistently fulfilled and violators experience repair in violators’ sense of self-worth, support, and standing, violators feel more
highly reintegrated over all. In addition, violators hold much more positive attitudes toward the organization. When psychological contracts are initially breached but repaired later, violators feel partially repaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. This leads them to feel partially reintegrated overall, and to hold ambivalent attitudes toward the organization. And when violators’ psychological contracts are initially fulfilled, but later breached, violators feel unrepaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. This prevents violators from feeling reintegrated, and leads to negative attitudes toward the organization.

The link between psychological contract fulfillment and attitudes toward the organization has some support in existing research. For example, psychological breach is associated with reduced employee commitment to organizations (Zho, Wayne, Glibkowski, & Bravo, 2007; Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Chen, Tsui, & Zhong, 2008), with ruptures in trust between employees and organizations (Restubog et al., 2008), and with employee deviance in organizations (Bordia, Restubog, & Tang, 2008; Chiu & Peng, 2008). This supports the finding that a lack of reintegration – fueled by unmet expectations and unfulfilled psychological contracts – would be associated with negative violator attitudes toward the organization.

**Summary**

Based on the data presented in the findings section, this chapter attempted to articulate a generalized model of violator reintegration that applies across organizations, contexts, and situations. By focusing on the common aspects of violators’ experiences, I identified how violators experience rupture and repair, and the role that psychological contract fulfillment or breach plays in this process.

When violators are accused of violations, they experience ruptures in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. When they are retained at the organization, violators begin to
develop psychological contracts about the obligations that they have to the organization, and the obligations that the organization has toward them. To the best of my knowledge, no previous research has considered the fact that violators form psychological contracts with organizations in the aftermath of their violations. Specifically, my data suggest that violators form *explicit, transactional contracts* with the organization based on what the organization has explicitly promised to violators. Violators also form *implicit relational psychological contracts* with the organization based on self-generated beliefs that violators hold about what the organization and its members “owe” them.

The model shows that the extent to which violators repair their sense of self-worth, support, and standing depends on the extent to which the explicit transactional contract and the implicit relational psychological contract are fulfilled. When both are consistently fulfilled over time, violators feel more repaired in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing, and feel more highly reintegrated. When these psychological contracts are breached at first, but fulfilled later, violators experience partial repair in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. This leads violators to feel partially reintegrated overall. And when violators’ psychological contracts are initially fulfilled, but later breached, violators remain unrepaired in their self-worth, support, and standing, and do not feel reintegrated. The theoretical and practical contributions of this work, as well as the limitations of it, are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This research explores how violators become reintegrated back into organizations following work-related failures. Through a longitudinal, qualitative, inductive study of violators at a military service academy, I articulate the process by which violators reintegrate back into organizations in the aftermath of violations. My data suggest that violators experience ruptures in the aftermath of violations, and the extent to which these ruptures are repaired is driven by the extent to which the psychological contracts violators form with the organization in the aftermath of violations are fulfilled or breached. The theoretical and practical contributions of this work are highlighted below.

Theoretical Contributions

Despite the vast amount of work that has investigated the antecedents of employee violations (e.g., Kish-Gephart, Harrison, & Trevino, 2010; Vardi & Weiner, 1996; Aquino, Lewis, & Bradfield, 1999; Umphress & Bingham, 2011; Schweitzer, Ordonez, & Douma, 2004; Moore & Gino, 2015; Kilduff et al., 2016), much less research has explored the aftermath of violations in organizations. Of the research that exists, most of it has focused on discipline and punishment (e.g., Trevino, 1992; Butterfield, Trevino, & Ball, 1996; Wiltermuth & Flynn, 2013), but we know very little about what happens in the aftermath of punishment. In particular, we know very little about what happens when organizations choose to retain violators, and how employees become reintegrated back into organizations. One reason for the dearth of attention to the aftermath of violations may be because folk theories and organizational scholars have implicitly assumed that punishment is the “end state” of violations (e.g., Adams & Mullen, 2012). It has frequently been assumed that punishment returns systems to functioning states (e.g.,
Okimoto & Wenzel, 2009), and therefore it is unnecessary to consider what happens after punishment is administered.

My research significantly changes our understanding of the aftermath of punishment. It highlights how retaining and punishing violators actually creates a new set of processes, interactions, and obligations between organizational members and the organization. Whereas prevailing assumptions hold that retaining and punishing violators is an “end” (e.g., Adams & Mullen, 2012; Okimoto & Wenzel, 2009), this research shows that retaining and punishing violators is actually the beginning of a revised relationship between violators and the organization. Furthermore, the way this revised relationship plays out – as embodied through the fulfillment or breach of the new psychological contract – has significant effects on violators’ recovery, and their future involvement with the organization.

Furthermore, the present research is the first to describe in detail the nature of these “new”, ongoing interactions between violators and organizations. My data suggest that in the aftermath of violations, violators develop new or revised psychological contracts with the organization. To the best of my knowledge, no previous research has theorized or shown that violators form psychological contracts with organizations in the aftermath of their violations. Furthermore, this is the first study linking the fulfillment or breach of psychological contracts to violators’ experiences of repair, recovery, and reintegration in organizations. As a result, the present research significantly develops our understanding of how violators relate to organizations in the aftermath of violations.

In addition, this research is the first to show that both explicit transactional and implicit psychological contracts must be fulfilled in order for full reintegration to occur. When only one type of contract is fulfilled, full reintegration is unlikely to happen. This is important
theoretically, because it suggests one reason why some violators recover after violations, while other violators do not. It may explain why some violators end up leaving organizations after violations, while others remain. This insight may also explain why some organizational attempts to help violators recover may be ineffective – they may fail meet violators’ expectations.

At a broader level, this is the first work to empirically show that reintegration is a process that can have multiple paths and multiple outcomes. This is an important contribution, because it means that researchers can no longer treat reintegration as a binary outcome; rather, the extent to which reintegration occurred must be attended to. Both highly reintegrated and partially reintegrated violators may appear to be “reintegrated” when considered through a binary perspective; however, treating both violators as having the same outcome would be problematic. These violators not only experienced different pathways and experiences, but they also likely hold different attitudes toward the organization, and may have different relationships to the organization and its members. Partially reintegrated violators experience very little recovery initially, likely feel ambivalently toward the organization, and may not feel fully supported or like full members of the organization. Highly reintegrated violators, on the other hand, experience consistent recovery from the beginning, feel positively about the organization and feel like full organizational members. Therefore, treating partially and highly reintegrated violators as identical would be inappropriate.

Though not the explicit focus of this dissertation, these findings may also contribute to our understanding of employee resilience, socialization, and relationship repair. Because research on resilience attempts to understand when and how employees recover from ruptures or other types of setbacks (e.g., Norman, Luthans, & Luthans, 2005; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), it is possible that psychological contract fulfillment and breach – especially as they pertain to
expectations of self, support, and standing – may play an important role in fostering employee resilience. Thus, the findings from this dissertation may contribute to our understanding of when and why employees demonstrate resilience in other situations.

In a different vein, the present research could make contributions to the socialization literature. Organizations attempt to socialize organizational members (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977; Chao et al., 1994; Allen & Meyer, 1990), and violations of organizational standards may be interpreted by organizations as indications that violators were not sufficiently socialized. Viewed through this lens, reintegration may be one way that an organization re-socializes violators. However, re-socialization is not well understood, and therefore the present research may shed light on how re-socialization can happen. Importantly, psychological contracts are known to be important in socialization attempts of newcomers (e.g., Rousseau, 1990; De Vos, Buyens, & Schalk 2003; Thomas & Anderson, 1998). In light of the present research, it is possible that re-socialization involves a modification of the psychological contract, which may happen in the way described by this research.

Lastly, this research might contribute to theory on relationship formation and repair. My data suggest that violations generate ruptures in violators’ sense of support and standing – and many of these ruptures manifest in strained relationships between the violators, close others, and organizational members. Most of the research on relationships at work tends to assume that the more relationships individuals have, the more socially embedded and integrated they feel (e.g., Sparrowe et al., 2001). Extending this logic, it may seem that the more relationships violators repair – with close others, organizational representatives, subordinates, outside friends – the more violators will feel reintegrated. However, my data suggests that in order to feel reintegrated, violators close others in the organization to provide them with emotional support,
and they need other organizational members to confer standing on them. Even if violators repaired relationships with many friends, family, and close others, if they failed to repair relationships with organizational members – and therefore they did not receive respect or signals of standing – they would still not feel reintegrated. This suggests that the source or target of relationship repair is just as important as the quantity of relationships that are repaired following a violation. Therefore, for successful reintegration to occur, the type of relationship repaired – and specifically, the type of entity involved in the repair – matters just as much or more than the number of relationships that are repaired.

**Practical Contributions**

This work makes several practical contributions as well. First, it offers several insights of what organizations can do to reintegrate violators. If organizations choose to retain violators in the aftermath of a violation, they should recognize that violators are likely to have experienced ruptures in their sense of self-worth, support, and standing. Offering violators ways to repair their sense of self-worth, support, and standing may help violators feel more reintegrated.

In addition, my data suggests that in the aftermath of disciplinary action, violators are likely to form expectations about how they will be affected, and how the organization and its members will treat them. It is important to point out that only some of these expectations are explicitly communicated by the organization; the rest are “self-generated”, and will be formed without the organization explicitly promising things to violators. This means that many organizations may be unaware of the self-generated expectations that violators hold. Because violators’ experiences of reintegration hinge significantly on whether their expectations are met or not, organizations should not only be clear when conveying what expectations violators should hold regarding the organization (formal expectations), but organizations should also
attempt to understand the self-generated expectations violators hold after a disciplinary event. Understanding these self-generated expectations may help organizations either meet or modify violators’ self-generated expectations, thereby making it more likely that violators will feel reintegrated.

If expectations go unmet initially, my data suggests that violators may still become partially reintegrated, if the organization and its entities are later able to meet violators’ expectations. Therefore, if organizations are unable to shape or meet the expectations of violators early on, they may still be able to foster reintegration, if the organizations are able to engage in repair attempts later.

Limitations, Future Directions, and Conclusion

Any study conducted within a single organization raises questions of generalizability. The highly formalized nature of the Academy’s reintegration program makes it an extreme case of organizational attempts at reintegration. Most other organizations do not have such regimented processes and programs for reintegrating employees after they have fallen short of organizational standards and violations. Therefore, it is likely that the dynamics that exist here may play out differently other organizational contexts. For example, other organizations with less formal reintegration processes may make no explicit, formal promises to violators at all. This would mean that violators would not form explicit transactional contracts, and only have implicit relational psychological contracts. As described earlier, organizations are often unaware of violators’ self-generated expectations and implicit psychological contracts, and therefore it may be more likely the violators’ psychological contracts would be breached, resulting in a higher likelihood of violators failing to be reintegrated.
However, because the focus of this study was on the psychology of violators as they navigated reintegration, it is still likely that much of the psychological processes and experiences would be similar in nature, if not magnitude, in other contexts. Thus, analytic generalization may still be possible. To address this limitation, future research should explore reintegration in other settings. Studies of reintegration in other organizations could reveal other types of reintegration trajectories, beyond those described here. For example, there may be violators whose explicit expectations are unmet, but their self-generated expectations are met. Because all of the violators in my sample were returned to full standing and experience self-development, I was not able to sample violators whose explicit expectations remained unmet.

As with many qualitative studies, participants had to “opt in” to the research, and therefore not all violators at the Academy agreed to be part of the study. I was initially concerned about biases from self-selection, and thought that violators who agreed to participate would be systematically different from those that did not. However, informal conversations with Academy officers suggests that the violators in my sample were highly similar to those that did not participate. In addition, the participants in this study came from a range of demographic backgrounds and had a wide variety of experiences and reintegration outcomes, suggesting that my sample contained a great deal of heterogeneity despite the self-selection.

My research raises a number of unanswered questions. First, why do some violators have their self-generated expectations met, while others do not? It appeared that all violators held the same basic type of self-generated expectations – all violators expected to be supported, and to be treated in way that reflected more than simply their violation. Differences in how self-generated expectations were met may simply be due to random differences in the actions of peers and
organizations; some violators get lucky and have their peers and the organizations act in ways that meet expectations, while other violators do not.

Alternatively, there could also be a range of ways that violators interpret expectations to be “met”. Some violators may feel that their expectations are only met if all of their friends offered support; if one friend did not provide support, they interpreted this to mean that they were not supported. Other violators, on the other hand, may view their expectations to be met if a single close other supported them, even if other friends did not. In short, different violators may have different thresholds for when they consider their expectations to be “met” or “unmet”.

Another question that remains is: where do violators’ self-generated expectations come from? If violators were not explicitly promised things about their support or standing by the organization, then how is it that violators formed similar self-generated expectations about these things? One possibility is self-generated expectations are formed through vicarious learning. Many of the violators in my sample knew of at least one person that had had an honor violation before they committed their own. Violators often sought out these other violators at some point, asking for information and advice about the process. It is therefore possible that violators’ expectations about support and standing were influenced during the conversations they had with violators who had previously gone through the program. However, future research should explore how violators’ self-generated expectations and implicit relational psychological contracts come to be formed in the aftermath of a violation.

While my study is one of the first to empirically unpack the process of reintegration, my findings – and the questions that arise from them – make clear that we have only begun to understand how reintegration occurs in organizations. Additional work will not only clarify how
and why reintegration occurs, but may shed light on what organizations can do to help employees recover in the aftermath of violations.
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APPENDIX I - Interview Protocol

**Cadet Interview #1:**

**Background:**
- Can you tell me about your background? How did you end up at the Academy?
- What were your first few [months/years] like at the Academy?

**Honor Violation:**
- In as much detail as possible, can you tell me about the events leading up to your honor violation?
- Can you tell me about the approach for clarification?
- What did you do after you were approached?
- What was the time between the approach for clarification and the honor board like?
- Can you tell me about the investigation/honor board?
- Can you tell me about the meeting with the Commandant? The meeting with the Superintendent?
- How did you choose your HMP Mentor?

**General Responses to Honor Violation:**
- Who, if anyone, did you talk to about the honor violation?
- What, if anything, have you taken away from this experience?
- How do you feel about the Academy?

**Cadet Interview #2 - #4:**

**General Life at Academy:**
- Can you tell me about your experiences being at the Academy since the [board/superintendents’ meeting/starting HMP]?

**HMP:**
- Can you tell me what it’s like to interact with your Mentor?
- Can you tell me about your most recent meeting with your Mentor?
- In your own words, what do you think the Academy views as the purpose of HMP?
- Speaking from your experience, what do you think actually happens in HMP?

**General Experiences Related to Honor Situation:**
- What have you taken away from this experience, if anything?
- How would you compare yourself to before you got an honor board?
Can you comment on the role of friends, family, peers in this experience?
If one circle was you at the time of your honor violation and the other circle is you now, which of the following best describes you?

About the Academy/Other Cadets:
- How do you feel about the Academy?
- How bought into HMP are you? Into the Academy? Into becoming an officer? [Added later, based on coding]
- How do people view Cadets in HMP? How do people view you? [Added later, based on coding]
- How much a part of the Academy do you feel? [Added later, based on coding]
- If one circle is you and the other circle is the Academy, which of these best describes how you feel right now?

[Note: in the early stages of data collection, interviews 2 – 4 also asked Cadets about the specifics of the HMP program, including:
- Can you tell me about a particularly memorable journal entry you wrote?
- Can you tell me about [teaching the honor class, the final project, the character role model interview, other program requirements, etc.]?
- Can you tell me about a memorable meeting with your mentor?
- How would you describe your mentor?
- How would you describe your character?
- If you had a subordinate who experienced something similar to your honor violation, how would you handle it?]

However, as I became more interested in reintegration, recovery, and how the Cadet felt in relation to the Academy, I moved away from asking about specifics aspects of the HMP program]
Cadet Interview #5

Experiences Post HMP:
  o Can you tell me about the meeting with the Superintendent?
  o How are you feeling now that you have gotten your rank and privileges back again?
  o In your own words, what do you think the Academy views as the purpose of HMP?
    o Speaking from your experience, what do you think actually happens in HMP?
  o How are you thinking and feeling about the future?

General Experiences from Honor Situation:
  o Looking back on this experience, what have you taken away from it, if anything?
  o How would you compare yourself to before you got an honor board?
  o Can you comment on the role of friends, family, peers in this experience?
  o If one circle was you at the time of your honor violation and the other circle is you now, which of the following best describes you?

About the Academy/Other Cadets:
  o How do you feel about the Academy?
  o How bought into HMP are you? Into the Academy? Into becoming an officer?
  o How do people view Cadets in SLDPH? How do people view you?
  o How much a part of the Academy do you feel?
  o If one circle is you and the other circle is the Academy, which of these bests describes how you feel?
APPENDIX II – Reflection Exercises

Name:
Mentor’s Name:

Instead of completing a journal entry this week, you will be asked to reflect on your most recent HMP meeting. This reflection will NOT be seen by your mentor or by any officers or USMA personnel. Only researchers at Harvard Business School will view your answers. Therefore, please be as open and honest as possible in your answers.

Please complete this reflection exercise within 24 hours of your most recent HMP meeting.

--------------------------------------------------

General Questions:

1. Taking all things together, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? Are you:
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ not very satisfied
   ___ not at all satisfied

2. Next, let’s turn to your life at USMA. Overall, how satisfied are you with your life at USMA? Are you:
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ not very satisfied
   ___ not at all satisfied

3. And about your academic life? Overall, how satisfied are you with your academic pursuits and performance? Are you:
   ___ very satisfied
   ___ satisfied
   ___ not very satisfied
   ___ not at all satisfied

4. Now we would like to know how you feel and what mood you are in when you are at USMA. When you are at USMA, what percentage of the time are you
   _____ in a bad mood
   _____ a little low or irritable
   _____ in a mildly pleasant mood
   _____ in a very good mood

5. We would also like to know how you feel and what mood you are in when you are doing academic work. When you are doing academic work, what percentage of the time are you
   _____ in a bad mood
   _____ a little low or irritable
   _____ in a mildly pleasant mood
   _____ in a very good mood

6. Please list the athletic and extracurricular activities that you do at USMA.
7. How many close friends would you say you have?
- None
- 1-3
- 4-7
- 7-10
- More than 10

7. Think about the people that you spend the most time with now. Are they the same people that you spent the most time with two months ago? If not, please explain:

Diary of HMP Meeting

We would like to learn what you did and how you felt about your most recent HMP meeting. Not all HMP meetings are the same — some are better, some are worse and others are pretty typical. Here we are only asking you about the HMP meeting you just had.

Because many people find it difficult to remember what exactly they did and experienced, we will do this in three steps:

1. On the next page, we will ask you when the meeting occurred.

2. Then we'd like you to reconstruct what the meeting was like, as if you were writing in your diary. Where were you? What was said? What did you do and experience? How did you feel? Answering the questions on the next page will help you to reconstruct the HMP meeting.

This journal page is meant to help you remember the details of your most recent HMP meeting. Use whatever methods are most useful for you (jotting down words, writing out phrases, writing complete sentences, drawing diagrams/pictures, etc.). *No one at USMA will see your journal pages, or read anything you write about the HMP meetings. Only outside researchers from Harvard Business School will see what you write. Therefore, please be as open and honest as possible.*

3. After you have finished reconstructing the meeting using the journal page, we will ask you specific questions about your experiences. In answering these questions, we’d like you to consult your journal page and the notes you made to remind you of what you did and how you felt.

To begin, please tell us when your most recent HMP meeting occurred.

- What day of the week did your most recent HMP meeting happen?
- What was the date of your most recent HMP meeting?
- About what time did you begin the meeting?
- And when did you end the meeting?
- How many days ago did this meeting happen?
Now, please describe what you experienced right before the meeting, during the meeting, and right after the meeting. Think of the meeting as a continuous series of scenes or episodes in a film. Give each episode a brief name that will help you remember it (for example, “talked about journal entry”, or “B interrupted me”, where B is your HMP mentor). Write down the approximate times at which each episode began and ended, if possible.

There are three sections for you to fill in – one section to record events that occurred right BEFORE the HMP meeting, one section to record events/episodes DURING the HMP meeting, and one section to record events that occurred directly AFTER the HMP meeting. There is room to list multiple episodes for each section, although you may not need that many, depending on your day. It is not necessary to fill up all of the spaces – use the breakdown that makes the most sense to you and best captures what you did and how you felt before, during, and after the HMP meeting.

Try to remember each episode in detail, and write a few words that will remind you of exactly what was going on. Also, try to remember how you felt, and what your mood was like during each episode. What you write only has to make sense to you, and to help you remember what happened when you are answering the follow-up questions later.

Remember, no one at USMA will see what you write on your journal pages, or how you answer the questions about the HMP meetings. Therefore, be as open and honest as possible.

### What Events Occurred BEFORE the HMP Meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode Name: What happened?</th>
<th>Time Began</th>
<th>Time Ended</th>
<th>Notes to Yourself: What did you feel?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What Happened DURING the HMP Meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode Name: What happened?</th>
<th>Time Began</th>
<th>Time Ended</th>
<th>Notes to Yourself: What did you feel?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What Events Occurred AFTER the HMP Meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode Name: What happened?</th>
<th>Time Began</th>
<th>Time Ended</th>
<th>Notes to Yourself: What did you feel?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please look over your journal once more. Are there any other episodes that you’d like to revise or add more notes to? If so, please go back and make the necessary adjustments on your diary pages. If not, you may go on to the follow-up questions.

Follow-Up Questions

Now, we would like to learn in more detail about how you felt during those episodes. For each episode, there are several questions about what happened and how you felt. The notes from your journal pages are included below, so that you can refer back to them.

[NOTES FROM JOURNAL PAGES WILL BE COPIED HERE]

Please answer the questions for every episode you recorded DURING the meeting, beginning with the first episode DURING the meeting. If you recorded less than 10 episodes, only complete the questions for the number of episodes you recorded.

D1 - First Meeting Episode:

Please look at your diary and select the earliest episode you noted during the HMP meeting.

Please describe this first episode in detail. What happened? What were you doing?

How did you feel during this episode?
Please rate each feeling on the scale given. A rating of 0 means that you did not experience that feeling at all. A rating of 6 means that this feeling was a very important part of the experience. Please circle the number between 0 and 6 that best describes how you felt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impatient/Annoyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent/Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassled/Pushed Around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm/Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry/Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried/Anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying Myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticized/Put Down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D2 - Second Meeting Episode:
Please look at your diary and select the second episode you noted during the HMP meeting.

Please describe this second episode in detail. What happened? What were you doing?

**How did you feel during this episode?**

Please rate each feeling on the scale given. A rating of 0 means that you did not experience that feeling at all. A rating of 6 means that this feeling was a very important part of the experience. Please circle the number between 0 and 6 that best describes how you felt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impatient/Annoyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent/Capable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassled/Pushed Around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm/Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry/Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried/Anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying Myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticized/Put Down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

…… [page for each episode recorded]

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Additional Questions:**

- Please provide at least one specific example of when you felt that your HMP mentor was being helpful during the most recent HMP meeting.

- Please provide at least one specific example of when you felt that your HMP mentor was NOT being helpful at the most recent HMP meeting.

- On a scale from 1 to 5 (1=very unhelpful, 3=neither helpful nor unhelpful, 5=very helpful) please indicate how helpful your mentor was overall at your most recent HMP meeting.

  1   2   3   4   5

- Please provide at least one specific example of when you felt that you were gaining new insights about yourself at the meeting.

- Please provide at least one specific example from the meeting of when you felt that the HMP meeting was not a good use of your time.
On a scale from 1 to 5 (1=learned nothing, 3=learned a little, 5=learned a great deal) please indicate how much you felt like you learned/grew from your most recent HMP meeting.

1  2  3  4  5

On the scales below, please answer the following questions (1=not at all, 3=somewhat, 5=a great deal). Please also provide a specific example to explain your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale (1=not at all, 3=somewhat, 5=a great deal)</th>
<th>Example from HMP Meeting that Illustrates Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, how well did your mentor listen to you at the most recent HMP meeting?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, how well did your mentor understand you at the most recent HMP meeting?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much could your mentor relate to you at the most recent HMP meeting?</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- About what percentage of the speaking did you do? [slider scale]
- About what percentage of the speaking did your mentor do? [slider scale]
- Roughly how many times did your mentor interrupt you at your most recent HMP meeting?
- If you had to describe your mentor’s mood at the most recent HMP meeting, how would you describe it?
- What was the most uncomfortable part of your most recent HMP meeting?
- What was the best part of your most recent HMP meeting?
- How did you feel when you left the HMP meeting?

*Thank you for completing this reflection! This reflection will take the place of your journal entry this week, so you will not have to write a journal entry for this week. Journal entries will resume next week.*
APPENDIX III – Mentor Interview Protocol

[First Interview Only] Can you give me a brief background of your time in the military? How did you come to join the military? And how did you come to the Academy?

[First Interview Only] How did you come to be an HMP Mentor?

Cadet
Tell me about the experience of being [CADET’S] coach.

Can you comment on your meetings with [CADET] overall?

What changes, if any, have you seen in [CADET] since you started working with him?

In your opinion, how “bought in” is [CADET] to HMP? To the honor code / system? To the Academy? To the military?

How, if at all, do you think [CADET]’s relationship with [Academy/peers] has changed since starting SLDPH?

HMP:

What do you view your role to be, with respect to [CADET]?

What would success look like?

What do you think the Academy sees as the purpose of HMP?

In your opinion, what does HMP actually do?

General Honor Violations:

How do you think the Academy views Cadets:
- Who violate the honor code?
- In HMP?

How do you personally view Cadets:
- Who violate the honor code?
- In HMP?
**Personal Experiences:**

How is the experience of engaging in this program impacting you, as a person, as a coach, as an officer?

How would you describe yourself as a Mentor?
### Table 1. Summary of self-worth, support, and standing self-constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Self-Worth</th>
<th>Sense of Support</th>
<th>Sense of Standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition / Description</strong></td>
<td>Feeling like a good person</td>
<td>Feeling cared for and emotionally supported by close others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Ruptures</strong></td>
<td>Violators feeling like they are not good people / not living up to own or others’ standards</td>
<td>Close others no longer signaling care or providing emotional support to violators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Indicators of Rupture** | - Negative self-evaluations  
- Damaged identities  
- Questioning who they are  
- Uncertainty about self | - Close others distancing from/ ostracizing/ not including violators  
- Close others not helping / not emotionally supporting/ not trusting violators | - Rank removed  
- Others telling violators they are “lesser”  
- Others treating disrespectfully  
- Being treated unfairly/worse than others |
| **How Expectations are Manifest** | Violators would experience self-development and would change in some way | Close others would continue to engage with and emotionally support the violator | Violators would be returned to full rank; violators would be treated fairly, in ways that reflected more than simply violation, and would be able to participate in roles/activities |
| **Expectations are Formal or Self-Generated** | Formal | Self-Generated | Formal (rank) and Self-Generated (treated fairly, treated in ways that reflected more than simply violation, participation in roles/activities) |
| **Expectations are Met When….** | - Violators believe they have grown/ improved/changed in some way | - Violators positively interacting with close others  
- Close others help, include, | - Returned to full rank at end of program  
- Treated no differently from other Cadets/violators  
- Perceptions of fairness |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 (Continued)</th>
<th>Indicators of Repair</th>
<th>Related Concepts (from Qualitative Coding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Others validate that violators are good people  
  • Others indicate they have seen changes in violators | Violators feel like good/improved people  
  Violators feel like they have close friends/sources of support who care about them | • Self-evaluations  
  • Self-concept  
  • Identities  
  • Self-image  
  • Feeling like good/bad person  
  • Living up to own standards  
  • Care  
  • Friends / family / mentor  
  • Help  
  • “Being there for me”  
  • Listening / spending time together  
  • Reaching out  
  • Telling others about struggles  
  • Encouragement, confiding, support | • Being given second chances  
  • Participating in roles/activities  
  • Being given higher roles/positions | • Rank, privileges  
  • Respect  
  • Fairness / justice  
  • Second chances  
  • Being looked up to/looked down upon  
  • Regard / status / esteem  
  • Trust  
  • Treated normally / treated like other Cadets & violators  
  • Treated differently from other Cadets/violators  
  • Outsider/insider  
  • Participation  
  • Exclusion/inclusion |
### Table 2. Examples of the Range of Reintegration Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Reintegrated</th>
<th>“It sucks to make that mistake and that had happened to me, but at the same time it was one of the best things that could have happened to me. It really put my butt into gear. I don't know, it brought a lot of good things in my life” (C008, end)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I feel like I was in a car and it was stalled for a while, and finally the wheels are turning….It's a really good feeling definitely.” (C008, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The fact that I'm going to be a graduate from the [Academy] and I basically fought all the odds that were against me...what happened here isn't going to matter, what will matter at the end of the day is that I graduated. I was a [Academy] cadet, now I'm a commission officer. That is a very proud feeling, a very confident ... I feel like I accomplished one of life's most difficult tasks basically” (C008, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“With everything that's happened I'm definitely all in.....just through the different things and my situation, and everyone that has come into my life, it's starting to become more and more apparent that this is what I was supposed to do. Just being here at the academy and understanding how good it is for me, the development and everything. Just buying into it has helped me out so much and made me a better person” (C008, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I had to put a big pause on all my goals for [the Academy]. Initially, I thought I had to delete them all and they weren't ever going to be possible because of my violation, but I really had to put it on pause. I had to stop and start working on my character and improving myself, and now that I have I will still continue to work on myself, improving my character, but I can still go and try to reach for my goals.....they are possible. They're going to take longer than I thought they would, but it's still possible. That's really what I'm looking forward to.” (C020, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Reintegrated</td>
<td>“I'm much more bought into the school itself. I'm still proud of the ring and graduating from here. I still feel a sense of connection to the school. I know other kids in my situation have no buy in at all and they have denounced the school entirely. They're just ready to burn everything they have. I'm still proud of it. I think there'll always be that piece that I've missed out on in graduating with my friends.” (C001, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I feel like there's some emotional recovery involved in this. I feel like I was pretty beat down to who I was and my purpose here....To going from there [lowest of the low] to now, &quot;Oh, you're someone about to graduate and be a lieutenant.&quot; It's not clicking yet. I still see myself as recovering from this injury more or less.” (C001, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2 (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I still grew. I hate to say it, but at the end of the day I did grow. But I don’t now if it’s all because of [the remediation program].” (C015, E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel like I’m still proud to graduate from here. I feel like I definitely question whether I should have come here in the first place, for sure.” (C015, end)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I guess I view myself as a little bit separated from the rest of the Corps, because I’ve already done 4 years.” (C015, end)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“it's more like climbing a mountain. You do all these little things and then you get to the top of the mountain. The other side of the mountain is freedom. As you're slowly getting to the top, you're turning in your SLDP stuff, you're meeting with the Supe, you're getting your rank back, you're maybe at the top of the mountain. At any point, [the Academy] can come in, a huge blizzard comes in, and you're killed off the mountain essentially. You're kicked out and you're not entirely free until you're off the mountain. I'm on the last 10 meters of the mountain, wanting to get off, but just having to wait” (C001, end)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If I was to describe my situation, &quot;He just fell in his deep depression in his room and didn't do anything and now is finally, climbing out of it.&quot;” (C001, end)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The core is fine. I really enjoyed my time here as a Cadet…..I guess the leadership is what I have a problem with.” (C014, end)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Just feeling like I've been kicked while I was already down. Just feeling bad. I feel good now. I've kinda just accepted it, right? There's the denial. First you go into denial. Then you come to terms with it, and then you're like, &quot;I just accept it.&quot; At this point I'm just trying to accept it, run with it, and have a good time while I'm still here.” (C014, end)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“my friends who have reflected on their time now and actually have come to love the academy, I might come to do the same thing. I'm kind of like a disgruntled employee right now” (C014, end)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel like I'm part of the corps, but my opinions on a lot of things are drastically different then many of other cadets. Especially in regard ... maybe it's just me personally, but especially in regards to honor and standards and all that kind of stuff.” (C018, E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“before my honor board, I had a clean record. Totally squeaky clean, nothing there. Get in trouble, and so the people that are real sticklers for the rules as cadets within that point of time had negative opinions about me because I got</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienated</th>
<th>“People look at me, no one wants my life. I don't want my life.” (C005, end)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“all the honor mentors would say, ‘You will always be marked. You're always going to be an honor violator. You'll always have to rise above your classmates who do the bare minimum just to prove you have changed, that you are proficient.”” (C005, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“As [the Academy] reminds me, I'm not [member of class year]….I go, &quot;You know what? That's what you want me to do, I will go make other friends.&quot; It sucks” (C005, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I guess in my link to the Corps was with my classmates. Then they all left…. They can't relate to cadet things….now I can't really connect to [new class] because we never knew each other.” (C005, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You grow up. I came in, I was 19, loved [the Academy]. Now I'm leaving, I'm 24. I don't, I plan on, I always keep telling myself I don't plan on coming back” (C005, end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m disappointed a little bit because it’s supposed to be this pinnacle of American ingenuity and creativity and leadership. Everything good and American about [the Academy] is just kind of corrupted in my head now, because I realize that if something can take one of it’s – I view myself as a [Academy] employee I guess, or as someone who has given a lot to [the Academy], and the fact that they treat me so poorly off of a mistake or off of a violation, regardless of how completely clean by record was before and how high performing my record was before, the fact that they could take someone like me and put them through such a horrible negative experience – I view [the Academy] as much more toxic than I viewed it before. [the Academy] changes people, and [the Academy] definitely takes away a lot of people’s optimistic outlooks. [the Academy] can ruin people pretty deeply.” (C004, E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)  

“And the fact that I am going to have a college degree from here and that diploma is going to be hanging on my wall, my [the Academy] ring and being associated with that – it seems kind of wrong. I’ve seen parts of the system that most other Cadets don’t even know exist.” (C004, E)

“I didn’t feel like I had some huge restructuring of myself. And I don’t know, maybe that’s not the point of [the remediation program], maybe you’re not supposed to have some big giant restructuring. Maybe I’m over thinking it. But you would think, at least I would think, a program like this, they would want something huge to happen.” (C010, E)

“So I’m pretty disenchanted with [the Academy], with what they provide for us. I really don’t think that it provides us anything other than this network and this brand.” (C010, E)
**Table 3. Highly Reintegrated Violators’ Self-Generated Expectations and Reintegration Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Expectations Met</th>
<th>Met Initially: “This whole time I had those resources in my life, my fiance, her family, everyone, believing in me and helping me show me that I am a really good ... I'm not that [bad] person” (C008, M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I told [mentor] &quot;hey, I don't think that I committed an armor violation. I think this whole thing was kind of bogus.&quot; She didn't even bat an eye. She said &quot;all right, let's get some value out of this.&quot; The focus of our discussion has been more towards leadership and leadership lessons as opposed to the whole character side of things. We still talk about that type of stuff but it's less focused on &quot;you were a bad kid, you need to improve on these areas.&quot; I've been really, really grateful for that because I was really nervous about saying that but I didn't want to become this every week I meet with her and I'm just like lying through my teeth about how sorry I am and how much I'm learning about character. I felt like that would have just been a really bad experience for the both of us. All in all, she's been really helpful and really good.” (C025, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Met Later:</strong> “Everyone else was very excited for me so that was nice too. I had a whole support group there. Everyone's still rooting for me....It's just like I had my own little support group, my own little fan base. Everyone was cheering me on through the whole process... it made me feel a lot better about everything. It gave me some confidence back.” (C008, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We have each other, but we do feel less- for me, and I've heard other people say it too- like we don't feel like we're part of the Corps yet, because they, even though some of them have done this too, treat us differently. Our friends who know our situations, they don't treat us any differently, but others who don't know our case and don't bother asking us why, they give us weird looks or stuff like that. They won't, they won't approach us, so we feel disconnected from the Corps.” (C020, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'm an introvert, I've always been an introvert, whereas this semester my friends have pointed out that I'm more social. I'll approach people more than I ever would have before. I'll say hi to them on, passing the classrooms. Before, I'll just nod or whatever. I'll wait for them to say hi to me, but I will never start the conversation, and stuff like that. It's gotten me out of my shell in some ways. For me, that's a big deal, because all of my friends are always trying to get me out of my shell and it doesn't work.” (C020, E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standing Expectations Met

Met Initially:
“the company commander... he expressed what my TAC [officer] expressed, that ‘this kid has potential, yes, he made an egregious mistake, but he’s coachable. He’ll do whatever it takes to make things right and develop and better himself’” (C008, B1)

Met Later:
“I was walking through and the plebes [said]...."You're such an awesome leader. I want to be just like you." Just little things like them calling me [NICKNAME]. That just was like, “I really am making some sort of impact on these underclassmen”....seeing those younger guys and girls looking up...just thinking and believing that they're looking up to you” (C008, E)

“I felt like she never judged me for anything, and she was one of the few people who agreed with me that just because I have an honor rep leash, and before I- my honor violation doesn't make me a dishonorable person. She doesn't believe I was one beforehand. I made a mistake.” (C020, E)

“I realized that honor reps within the company level is mostly one of those last positions that are given out to- it's just a handout that no one really wants, so I didn't feel comfortable by just being thrown into that position just because I have gone through the honor violation, but my TAC was the one who said, " No, you've learned so much from this program. I figured you'd be a good influence to actually put that position into the position it needs to be in instead of just order a hand-down.”” (C020, E)

“Also, I was talking to Cadet [inaudible 00:22:23], who's in charge of the [the remediation program], and he mentioned during my interview if I was...
interested in continuing to be a part of the honor committee and brigade-level stuff like that. I went, "Yeah, that's amazing." I really love that, because I feel like the higher up I can go with it the more influence I'll have in changing the program.... That's exciting, and I'll also be working with those in those higher positions, are those people who really want to make the honor system change for the better, so it will be exciting to work with other people who are also on the same level.” (C020, E)

“...I don't know. I feel like I'm repeating myself, but it's like, the more times I talked about my case the more I was able to get over myself, because I had a lot of pride going in before this, so it's almost as if before I was walking around and I thought I was better than most of my peers, but just because that might be true in some areas- we all have our strength and weaknesses- it doesn't mean I should act like that, or prissy, or ignore people because of it just because they aren't on the same level as me or they don't have the same goal as me. The more I talked about my case, I realized this was, it's not fair for me to cut them off.” (C020, E)

“I kind of got over my- I wasn't perfect and I needed to understand that.... As I started telling more people about my case I got more comfortable in general talking to people, and it forced me out of my shell.” (C020, E)

“In the beginning, I felt very uncomfortable telling people about my case because I wasn't over it yet. It was still hard for me to process; whereas now, I've thought about it almost every day now, and I've been able to accept it and be able to move past it. Now, I can take the time, if anybody who asks me "why you have the rank" or anything like- I'll give them a short version; if they're really interested, I'll go to the long version. I want people to know my story” (C020, E)

“I feel like I was in a car and it was stalled for a while, and finally the wheels are turning” (C008, E)

“it's just like everything's worth it, it was all worth it. It was probably the best thing that could happen for me.” (C008, E)

“it sucks to make that mistake and that had happened to me, but at the same time it was one of the best things that could have happened to me. It really put my butt into gear. I don't know, it brought a lot of good things in my life.” (C008, E)

“like I said creating a stronger bond with people I already knew and put into perspective who my support group was, and just doing the different requirements.” (C008, E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 3</strong> (Continued)</th>
<th><strong>Standing:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“made me more excited to be a leader just because seeing those younger guys and girls looking up ... I don't know just thinking and believing that they're looking up to you and people are actually watching, and looking up to you to be the example, set the example, and be that rock. I wanted to be that rock.” (C008, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Toward Academy</strong></td>
<td>“I think [the Academy] tries too hard and it relies too much on tradition, but I think that they have ... The right intention is there, they just might not have the best approaches in some areas, but it's great.... I'm glad I'm here, it's a great academy” (C020, E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Partially Reintegrated Violators’ Self-Generated Expectations and Reintegration Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Expectations Partially Met</th>
<th>Initially Unmet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I can't leave so I can't go and hang out with them. My house was the focal point for the group, they'd all just go to my house, I live so close then springboard from there. Then everyone just kind of went off and did their own things. I wouldn't say I was necessarily the glue between everyone but it certainly helped. I had the initiative and the friend group to like, &quot;Oh we should go do this this weekend, go do that.&quot; Everyone's kinda now just doing their own thing.&quot; (C001, M2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think that kind of added to the rift in the friend group, slightly.” (C001, M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;at least like with my immediate friends. I would like to think we had this idea of posting to the same place or having a more, like, concrete future after graduation, like okay, we have these 60 days of leave off and we can all go do this together. I just like, kind of figured it would be more like a stronger relationship after graduation, where everyone was going, when you can visit, stuff like that. Now it's kind of like, all right I'll see you guys later. I'll get out there when I do type of thing. I think it's definitely put a pretty big strain on everything.&quot; (C001, M2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I thought I had to go, even knowing I wouldn't get a post... I just sat in this room while all the other people found out where they were going. I kind of just felt like a fly on the wall, like &quot;Oh I'm just here. Okay.&quot; I left that feeling like, well I should have just stayed in my room. I'm not going to go celebrate with my friends or anything like that or talk about where we're going or post on Facebook like, &quot;Oh I'm going here.&quot; I felt pretty removed from the class I would say. I understood that going in I just wasn't prepared for that.” (C001, M2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would say no role at all. It's probably added to how difficult it was. Yeah, my friends didn't help. I didn't talk to them once about that situation at all. One, I didn't want to sound complaining, because if I were them, I would be &quot;Dude, you cheated. You were an idiot. That's what happens.&quot; I didn't even bother talking to them about it at all.” (C001, E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Met, Repaired, or Partially Met: |
| "A lot of people were so happy for me, so that was kinda cool. Sometimes I just figured that people didn't notice, but everybody noticed when my rank came back and everybody's like, "Oh my god, congratulations." It was a big deal” (C006, E) |
Table 4
(Continued)

“I remember going into the beginning of that [training], like ‘I feel like I shouldn’t be here.’ I felt like the people I was working with knew that something had happened. None of them knew me. None of them knew what was going on, but it felt like they could sense, ‘oh, she's dishonest or oh, she broke regs violation so she clearly isn't going to be a good leader.’ Which isn't ... Nobody saw that. When I told them -- I finally was like ‘no, I'm going to tell them what's going on.’ Then they were like, ‘oh my gosh, I never would have guessed that’” (C007, M)

“I think this has really re-connected my parents and I in a way, which I didn't think was going to happen at all. I thought it was going to drive us apart. I think that was a good thing.” (C007, E2)

“Still I think I’m a lot better friends with my TAC [officer] too, I know it's probably not supposed to be a thing but at least a lot stronger relationship between myself and my TAC, my TAC NCO whereas I'll go in and I'll just drop in maybe once, sometimes twice a week” (C018, E)

“I was very stuck on ‘[TAC officer] is jerk’ and things like that. Then we were at [cadet’s] funeral and [TAC] stepped down and was human to me for the first time. He spoke of emotions. We talked about baseball and [city] .... I was like, wow, he's actually human...Then it made me click. Maybe I didn't like the way he was going about things, but he was doing it because he thought he was helping us. I think that was the barrier I needed to mature again and got over that.” (C007, M)

“Usually people tell me that the Supe just reads the summary essay, but he reads a lot more than that because he tagged every single journal so, I was like, ‘Wow.’ It kinda made me feel good because it's like, ‘Well, at least he looked at the stuff that I put so much time into,’ so that made me feel good.” (C006, E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Expectations</th>
<th>Initially Unmet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>“I guess it kind of started with the new Commandant coming in and like, denying these passes that I thought I had for this one weekend, which looking back seems kind of ridiculous to just let that one situation govern the way I think about this entire process” (C001, M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“not being allowed to leave this past weekend just pulled the carpet right out from under me, and just proved to me that while they say its developmental in nature, like, everything SLDP does, not being allowed to leave, not being allowed to wear civilian clothes, or walk to McDonalds outside the gate just seems more punitive now than ever, I guess. And, the fact that no ones understanding of the difference between someone who’s been approached for clarification and now just starting the honor process, to someone who’s
Table 4 (Continued)

almost done with the rehabilitation 9 months later, just, I don’t know, kinda baffles me a little bit.” (C001, M)

“I was just like, okay well I'm not on the list which sucked because I was like, "That's my class event." I never thought I would not be going to a class of 2018 event” (C007, M2)

“Going into graduation in May was pretty tough. That was probably the worst day as a cadet, watching my classmates graduate. I actually went to the graduation.” (C001, E)

“maybe at some point I kinda rationalized it, maybe after talking to the Superintendent, or some other people that “okay, I get it, it’s supposed to be developmental, maybe I’ll buy into it a little bit.” But then, like, not being allowed to leave really just added on top of my notion that it was punitive, not developmental.” (C001, M)

“everyone says it's supposed to be developmental and it's not punitive in any way but I've seen this as pretty much purely putative in it's nature. Well, that's what the six month turn back is for. It's fine if you say that you have to do this in addition to your punishment and for people to view this as punishment but to just say no it is developmental, it kind of detracts a little bit.” (C001, M2)

“Or like kids that had DUIDs can take pass this weekend, but that I can’t” (C001, M)

“Hearing that other people were allowed to leave in this same situation and how no one's talking together. Just a simple looking out for people in my situation would know, "Hey, let's be fair to these people. Either no one leaves or everyone leaves." The fact that someone sends out an e-mail before or another, something so stupid, kind of just ruins the idea that people care about you.” (C001, E)

“And so I think a disconnect just because of the environment I’m in. No one’s sat down and tried to help, they’re just like, ‘here’s the bleeding, just keep going, let's just keep having her mess up.’ So I want to be a part of it, but as I see myself keep breaking the rules, I can’t be super aligned, because I have not met up with what they want. ” (C007, B1)

“And then our TAC [officer] didn't really send it up the way he was supposed to do so that kind of made me lose faith in him, and lose faith in the system. Because you can do everything you're supposed to do. Like with me, I was doing everything he told me to do. I was doing the program, I was doing the memos to send up for nothing. For no action to be taken, even though I was doing what I was supposed to be doing. That kind of made me not really trust him.” (C006, M2)
"I think the cynicism derives from, you kind of expect the [military] to be looking out for its soldiers and its Cadet's rights almost. It seemed like it's the total opposite. When you expect the United States of America, protecting legal rights and all that kind of stuff, that's like the bare minimum of what you want to at least have as a person. When that's taken from you, it's a little bit tough to stay positive." (C018, M)

“It makes me hate [the Academy]. I guess it wouldn’t be [the Academy], it would be the leaders....It’s really just the leadership’s responsibility for all of this. They’re the ones who set everything up, so it’s a failure on their part to really figure out what’s going on, or to pay attention to those who are in the program, or who are in trouble. I feel like once you get in trouble, they’re waiting for you to mess up so they can kick you out. That’s how I feel” (C013, M)

**Met, Repaired, or Partially Met:**

“That was pretty great not being a second class citizen. That was pretty awesome. The coolest thing was going from a private first class to a first sergeant.” (C001, E)

“Then I was selected as the first sergeant for my company, which is a pretty big deal, I guess....Like a CO and a first sergeant run the company, so that was pretty cool.” (C001, E)

“I met with the Supe, who said my [the remediation program] packet was one of the best he had ever seen and asked me to put my final essay into the core newsletter, which he did. He was super impressed with what I wrote. It was a good feeling about that.” (C001, E)

“Definitely being first sergeant. It's a very public position, so I have to interact with other people and care about what other people say, things like that. That's I guess, good in the sense, that it's pulling me out of that depression zone I was in. If I wasn't first sergeant, I would just sit in my room and wait until I could leave.” (C001, E)

“I feel like that was my turning point....I got in that trouble, but [Mentor 007] gave me that second chance. Even with all the stuff I had done, he was like, 'I believe in you and I want to make you an officer.' I think that just someone who cared about me and was telling me I could do it, was great.” (C007, E2)

**Mixed Effect on Self-Worth**

“Going from someone of a pretty valuable person, you're on track to graduate from [the Academy], you're going into the [military], all these great things to someone's who's pretty worthless, more or less, I would say, that
people who go through honor boards or are turnbacks, they're kind of like the lowest of the low.” (C001, E)

“I guess seeing from his perspective how far I've come and developed. Personally I don't know if there's a way to measure this kind of change, it seems very difficult but seen from his perspective that he's noticing something that counseling was positive the entire way through. That was good..... That helped reinforce my perception that we're close to the end and that if he sees something positive and he sees a change, most likely other people will see some sort of change, which is what I'm most fearful of.” (C001, M2)

“From that point to even now, I'm still not nearly at the same level of happiness that I could be.” (C001, E)

“I would definitely say I'm more resilient, but also somebody that's weathered the storm, veteran of the system, I guess. Just because I take things and they don't bother me.” (C001, E)

“I felt people looked at me as not necessarily brave, but they kind of know the importance of things and this person could take a beating and still come out on top.” (C001, E)

“Both of my TACs spoke of how great an example I was of someone who went through the honor code process and honor board and stuff like that and how I am a good example for them. I felt pretty good.” (C001, E)

“That was pretty great not being a second class citizen. That was pretty awesome. The coolest thing was going from a private first class to a first sergeant....Not that this position only goes to high performers, that do well, and stand out, but it was a big moment for me that other people saw this kind of change.” (C001, E)

“Everything he [supervising officer] said was, ‘You don't follow the rule, you didn't follow this rule, so you couldn't create a positive environment. Even though you aren't pouting about getting in trouble, you got in trouble again. You didn't really bounce back, so you can't be resilient.’ Then everything was basically like, ‘You're a rule breaker, and you had an honor violation, so you can't be any of these things. You don't fit the mold to be an officer.’” (C007, B2)

“and I’m finally just making my way back to where I thought I would be.” (C007, E1)

Self-Worth:
“I know that I've developed and I'm definitely better off than I was before, but I still struggle a little bit.” (C007, E1)
Support:

“I know I could pretty much guarantee that if I'm not having a good time in the [military] or with what I do, I will always go back to this situation of not doing it with my friends.” (C001, E)

“While I wouldn't enjoy doing all this military training and living in the woods or any of that, it's so much easier when you're doing it with people you like, that it's almost worth it at that point. Going through it and not engaging with the people there and not going with my friends and not being able to talk to them, because they're six months removed from it, won't make it seem worth it.” (C001, E)

“I'll always be pretty upset about the situation, not graduating on time and things like that. I don't know....It'll be different. I feel like going forward, I'll be behind six months. First, I'll move to Austin, Texas. I will need a roommate, but everyone will already have one, because they'll have been there six months before me. I think it will have some long term effects.” (C001, E)

“I think that through the whole process people generally have thought I'm a good person. That I just made a mistake and I'm able to see that clearly now whereas I couldn't before....A lot of my friends that I had met, friends from the [team] have always said that.” (C007, E1)

“I'm also kind of weird right now because 2017, they're not in my class, I feel really close to them, I have a lot of really good friends and they're graduating, so I'm sad that they're graduating....I think that's also been part of the melancholy part of getting out of SLDP because it's kind of blended into the fact that like, "Oh, they're all leaving." And my boyfriend is also in 2017, so it's like, "Oh, everyone's leaving me." So, that kind of washed into that a little bit.” (C007, E2)

Standing:

“I feel like there's some emotional recovery involved in this. I feel like I was pretty beat down to who I was and my purpose here....To going from there [lowest of the low] to now, "Oh, you're someone about to graduate and be a lieutenant." It's not clicking yet. I still see myself as recovering from this injury more or less.” (C001, E)

“I feel like I fit in just like normal, like any other Cadet....I guess it's weird because while you're [in the remediation program] you're like, "I just want to normal, I just want to be like a normal person in the Corp," but then all of a sudden people don't...all of a sudden...You know what I mean?” (C007, E2)
### Table 4 (Continued)

“Now, I have a deeper appreciation for not necessary the honor code, but in following the rules and being a more honorable person.” (C001, E)

“I've come to accept "Your life sucks and things are going to suck and there's nothing you can do about it." When other cadets complain about these daily things that are going on and how upset they are, I've just accepted that I have no control over any of that and you just kind of learn to lay down and let [the Academy] do whatever” (C001, E)

“[At first] I wanted to leave, I didn't think I should be [at the Academy], and then second semester last year I thought I was being kicked out. I thought that was the end of the road. To be here and to almost be a Firstie, I'm so happy and thankful that I made it through here and I never would've seen myself here. I'm crying just thinking about it.” (C007, E2)

“I thought I was going to turn my packet in and my rank and everything's going to be great, I was gonna be so happy and I honestly feel like I'm not as happy without [the remediation program]. At first, I didn't get this, but then I realized for the last year I have met with [Mentor 007] every week and had someone to talk to about stuff and somebody who's invested in me. I'm missing [Mentor 007] every week and just someone like ... I guess this is going to sound strange or weird, but I'm just another cadet. Before, people were spending time and checking up on me and being personally invested in me and now I'm just here” (C007, E2)

### Attitudes Toward Academy

“I'm much more bought into the school itself. I'm still proud of the ring and graduating from here. I still feel a sense of connection to the school...I'm still proud of it. I think there'll always be that piece that I've missed out on in graduating with my friends.” (C001, E)

“I still feel a sense of connection to the school. I know other kids in my situation have no buy in at all and they have denounced the school entirely. They're just ready to burn everything they have. I'm still proud of it.” (C001, E)

“[the Academy] wears down on everyone but I think I got worn down really, really fast” (C007, E1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Expectations Met at First, then Unmet</th>
<th>Met or Repaired Initially:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“some people who I was like, ‘I know them, but not that well, so they probably won’t [write a letter of support]’ … not like acquaintances, I knew them, but in my head they weren’t in my inner circle of friends, but they were like [snap] boom, five minutes later they had this long, detailed character statement of every experience we had together and stuff they had seen me do. It was like, ‘wow, that’s kind of surprising’” (C010, B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was pretty happy [with his mentor], because I was like, “alright great.” Because he was the first name that I put on there. I had just come out of being in a class with him, so that rapport and that relationship was still ongoing. I knew he was someone I could be myself around, so I was pretty happy that I had gotten paired up with him.” (C010, B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I wanted someone who was going to be flexible. But so I was excited, I knew it was going to be a good time being paired up with him [as a mentor]. He’s also an infantry guy and he’s pretty young, and we have a lot of the same personality traits” (C010, B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Later Unmet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My core friend group left. And I tried to replace them with some new friends, but it didn’t really mesh out. I go to [club], and met some guys there and I was like, ‘this is great, I can make some good, new, Christian friends.’ But it didn’t really take, I don’t know what happened. I guess cuz they already had their little friend group niche, so I didn’t really fit into the puzzle, which is fine, but I didn’t really have that social support group.” (C010, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I still have some friends here, so I don’t want – I don’t know, if’s kind of hard since my best friends are gone” (C004, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“before this, I had never hated anyone. There were people I didn’t like, there were people I chose not to associate with, but there was no one I genuinely hated, and now, because of this program, I hate some of these people, because of what happened.” (C004, E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                             | “And the meeting with him was less than I expected…..he kind of picked up the binder that had all my stuff in it, and he kind of flipped through it. He was very uninterested, and was like, “yea, looks pretty good.”…. He set the folder down and was like, “looks pretty good to me. I got other stuff to do—“ He literally said, “I’ve got other stuff to do,” as he’s signing his name to it, and he’s like, “why don’t you go slap some rank on and get out of here.” I was
“I think sometimes I picked [his mentor] poorly, because I picked a guy that I like, and I picked a guy that I have a lot in common with and I connect with. He was one of my instructors before he got promoted to the brigade executive officer. And I was like, “this guy gets me, this guy knows me, we’ll be on the same page.” And that’s true, but at the same time, he’s so busy that he’s not able to put the time and effort into it that I would like my developmental coach to put into it. So maybe I should have picked someone who has more free time over the summer and who isn’t so busy. So it’s conflicted.” (C010, M)

“everyone’s like, “oh yea, I’d love to help you,” but then it’s like when it actually comes down to it, they don’t want to take the time. They would love to take the time, but everyone’s busy. So there are a couple of officers that I got verbal “yea man, I got you,” and then I sent them reminder emails and swing by their office, and they’ve be like, “I got you man, I got you.” And some of them came through immediately, some of them came through toward the end, and some of them – I was like, “whatever, I guess they just don’t want to do it.”” (C010, E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 (Continued)</th>
<th>like, “okay.” Good thing it took 2 months to get to this meeting. I guess with all the anticipation and buildup I was expecting something more, but hey, whatever.” (C010, E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Expectations Met at First, then Unmet</th>
<th>Met or Repaired Initially:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yea, things were getting better for a long time. Things were on the up and up, obviously the last major hurdle I thought was going to be graduation, just surviving that was going to be the hardest thing I had to experience…..watching my class graduate without me. And then it turns out that not only does it not just end there, but I may have to suffer all the way through the summer too.” (C004, M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My TAC officer [is an example of that]. He’s one of those guys that – when he first started out, he was really helpful, I really trusted him a lot, and I thought he was a really great guy. And the longer he’s been at the Academy, and the longer he’s been in charge of Cadets, he kind of made a compete 180 – it really seems like all he cares about is his promotion ability, his own career. If he has a decision where he can use his own discretion and show a little bit of mercy or compassion in certain situations, instead of exercising that discretion, he just asks whoever is in charge of that situation” (C004, M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Instead of treating me like I’m just a crappy Cadet -- I’ve been feeling that vibe from a lot of people [HONOR OFFICER] and my TAC included – He’s [M004] the only one who’s been effective about it, and actually supportive,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“So I volunteered to be part of the staff. And the day before the kids showed up, they had a meeting, we all huddled up, and they were like, ‘Cadet C010 is going to be in charge of it all’…. being in charge of that whole show. One, it was awesome feeling in charge of something again, the responsibility” (C010, M)

“I was like, “this is what I want to do, this is my agenda.” Come in, okay, [mentor] was supposed to get me on [officer]’s calendar to conduct a role model interview, he was supposed to have read my past 5 journals, we was supposed to have commented on them…. And so there are these tasks. And then he comes in for the meeting, and….I was like, “okay, sure, what about these [tasks]?” And he was like, “yea, I just haven’t been able to do any of that.” Like, “alright, that sucks”…So it was really frustrating for me….. I was really starting to feel that I was on the way back burner, and he wasn’t’ caring about helping me out…. I basically tuned him out for that meeting, like, “look man, you don’t care, I don’t care, this is just not working out”…..And on the next one, he sat down and he was like, “hey, I’m sorry.” All the stuff that I wanted to do, he had gotten done by the next meeting, cuz I texted him afterwards…. he was like, “I should have done all those things I said I was going to do, I said I would have them all done by the meeting and I didn’t, and I own that, and I’m sorry. The next one will be better.” And it was. He got stuff done” (C010, M)

“[Supervising officer] was like…. ’you know, since you do have a high level of maturity, you don’t screw around like the other guys do, I trust your opinion.’ That’s when he was like, ‘I don’t have a TAC NCO [a supervising officer’s ‘right-hand man’] so I need someone to help me out around here. I want you to be that person.’” (C010, M2)

Unmet:

“It says that on the paperwork that I'm here as a reminder to the corps what could happen if you have an honor violation….It just talks about how your presence is meant to discourage them from doing something bad.” (C005, E)

“a lot of friends I held dear were living a lie…..I just look back at that and I'm like, why did I not see that? Why did I... Why did they graduate ... Why did the school feel that they were fully qualified to graduate but I am not? I struggle with that….it's painful when I go on Snapchat or any kind of social media and I see people who I knew did drugs, went out and did molly, did cocaine, came back. They knew the time span that they had to take before a
drug test to pass. Now they're in the [military]. Here I am, sitting in my room, looking at my computer, because I have Honor stuff to do. They're considered better than me because they graduated.” (C005, M)

“me, a friend of mine, and another friend of mine, we all three had violations, pretty similar. Anyway, we were all Firsties, all at the same points in our Cadet careers. All three of us got different punishments. So it’s like, why? I got the least severe punishment. So I was like, why? I don’t know. Actually I do know. It’s because I’m prior service. That went so far in all my meetings. Meeting with the Commandant, with the Supe, you go in there with your shirt, it’s got all your medals, whatever. And they glance you up and down and they’re like, “yea, he could bounce back from this,” whatever they think. They gave me a less severe punishment than the other two guys, and no one explicitly said this, but the only difference – honestly both of those guys probably have better book scores that I do, they were probably ranked higher in the class than I was, both had better physical scores that I did…. And the other guy, he just got military service, he’s going out into the [military] for 5 years, and he’ll just be done. He doesn’t even get the opportunity to come back. So it’s three different punishments for three violations, and the only difference is that I was prior service and I wasn’t. Is that fair? On paper they were better off than I was with overall ranking, with academic grades, military grades, physical grades. When people see prior service, they automatically view you higher. But that’s some of my beefs with the honor system.” (C010, M)

“it’s just frustrating, it’s really frustrating that for the past year, since my approach for clarification where things started going down hill, I went from one of the top tier Cadets, flawless Cadet record, to just being completely in the slums as far as Cadets are concerned. And then when I made one of the hardest choices I ever had to make to admit guilt to it, I thought that after that, things would slowly start to get better. And they did for a while, and then I started to realize that every time they kind of hit me with something really difficult and really crappy, they’d just say, “oh, it’s just penance for what you did. This is you paying for what you did, tarnishing your honor.”” (C004, M)

“And by continuing to treat me like a child and not allowing me any sort of freedom, and any sort of freedom to make my own choices, it’s just made me realized that I’ve pretty much outgrown [the Academy], and there’s not really much left for me here. With one end of the path or the other, there’s not much more that [the Academy] can do for me, or I can really become out of [the Academy].” (C004, M)

“it’s just getting really frustrating, because just when I think they can’t – I thought the most they could possibly do was take away graduation from me. For every Cadet, that is just the ultimate sacrifice. And I figured that after
graduation, why would they want to do more, because that’s the ultimate thing that they could do. But in the past couple weeks when I’ve heard them talking about taking away – I’ve been a PFC for 7 months, I haven’t been able to do anything or be a normal person for 7 months, aside from spring break, and aside from the couple days I got off after finals. I feel like I’ve been paying for what I did, not just or the past months, but for the past year and a half. So the fact that I’m still – instead of just allowing me to claw my way back up, they keep pushing me back down. It’s getting really frustrating.” (C004, M)

“It’s difficult to describe, but whenever I ask him about it, I’m like, “sir, this really seems like it’s going a little bit above and beyond what I think paying for what I did is concerned,” he’s like, “well what you have to understand is that you don’t have any rights, you don’t have any say in any of this, and you’re going to do whatever we tell you to do until you’re finished this program and until you graduate.” And it’s just getting really frustrating” (C004, M)

“I would never complain that it was unfair that I don’t get to graduate on time. It’s the precedent that’s been set, and I understand their logic that before they want to put people’s lives in my hands, that I’m trustworthy. So I completely understand that, I would never complain about not gradating on time, but at a certain point, I feel it just kind of becomes cruel, how debasing and demeaning all of it is.” (C004, M)

“I feel like my commander had adopted this idea that he had to micromanage me and show me how to do things and live my life. And that was really annoying to me. I feel like he was expecting me to screw him over. Cuz in the beginning he did go to bat for me, in my board and things like that. So I think he was afraid that I was going to mess up and have it reflect negatively on him. Since I’ve been back, he’s been constantly on my back.” (C004, E)

“Just [HONOR OFFICER] last year, every time I saw her talking to people in SLDHP, or talking to me, I couldn’t help but sense this general distaste in her voice, like she just kind of looked down on all of us. It’s very easy to develop some resentment toward that.” (C004, E)

“So despite my previous record, despite how well I performed before, that they grouped me in to the same group of people who lie to get extra passes or cheat because they’re too lazy to study, it was upsetting and very annoying to me.” (C004, E)

“It was just kind of frustrating how they treated everybody in [the remediation program]. When you’re with your mentor it’s developmental, but how the Academy approaches it is like you’re a criminal.” (C004, E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 5 (Continued)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative Effect on Self-Worth</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But the fact that I feel like it’s changed at all, and the fact that I don’t think people see me any differently, it makes me wonder, “okay, so nothing at the fabric level was altered.” And maybe that’s okay, maybe that’s not the intent of [the remediation program], but I don’t know. I was kind of expecting more.” (C010, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I don’t know if anyone has that clouds parting sun comes out kind of revelation. I would like to think someone does, I hope someone does because if someone does then maybe you can say that [the remediation program] is worth it. If no one does, then it is worth it? I don’t know. You still grow personally and professionally from the program, so maybe that’s good enough.” (C010, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“And you think, “I just went through this really really long program, what did I learn from it, how did it change me?” And you want the answer to be like, “yes it changed me, yes I learned from it.” Because if not, then what was the point, then it’s all for nothing. So you convince yourself, “yee, sure, I totally learned from it, I totally grew from it. Because if I didn’t then that means I just wasted three months of my life doing something else.” So what I was really trying to think about was, “Alright, what did I learn from it, what did I take away from it?” And I did take away a bunch of personal and professional development, being paired up with an officer who’s there to lead and guide you on your mystical journey through honor or whatever. It’s been awesome, so that’s been great…. But when I think about, “did my fabric of being change or twist or is my DNA restructured now because of [the remediation program]?” No, I don’t think it is. I mean, maybe that’s not supposed to happen, but you feel like a process like this, you should probably have some bigger impact than some personal and professional development. And I don’t think I got that huge changing of my moral fabric or something.” (C010, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think I was just so upset and depressed for so long. You can only feel so negatively for so long before it starts to change you.” (C004, M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                          | “I understand why there would be a certain image of a [remediation program] Cadet, but I feel like I’ve shown over the past year, and in my Cadet career, that I can handle the responsibility of representing the academy, and I can handle the responsibility of holding leadership positions. I’ve represented the Academy on tons of trip sections, I’ve spoken at [event], and I’ve gotten positive letters from high academy leadership, like ….the last Commandant, just for things I’ve done. And then this one thing happens, and then I’m automatically the scum of [the Academy]. It’s just getting to the point where it’s really frustrating, because I’ve finished every portion of the honor
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Extent of Reintegration (Self-Worth, Belonging, and Standing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“it was just a really tumultuous journey. There would be times where I would start to go up and then I would just crash down again, and then I’d start to go up, and then I’d crash down again.” (C004, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So it took some of the flavor out of it, just feeling like you got one arm tied behind your back in terms of – I can’t really fully enjoy this.” (C010, E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-Worth:**
“I guess just [the Academy] itself, what it’s become as far as “this is where we want you to be, if any of us see you as being anywhere other than there, we’re going to treat you like garbage.” How I was treated and what I went through, I’ve never seen another human being be treated like that.” (C004, E)

“I would say I’m very different. That guy – the guy who committed the honor violation, he’s the guy who believed his own legend. That was him. I honestly believed for a little while that [the Academy] needs me more than I need them…. I would blow off briefs, I would skip training, I did whatever I wanted. I was out of control, I did anything and everything that I wanted to do….. So I’m really trying to not buy into my own legend. I’m trying to stay humble, I’m trying to fight temptation of going back into those hold habits…. I’m not going to claim to be a hero, or anything like that, there’s honestly not much intrinsic value of “I’m going to go because it’s the right thing to do”, it’s like, “I’m going to go because if someone catches me not up there, that’s going to endanger my chances of graduating.” I’m not going to pretend that I’m taking the moral high ground. It’s just the fear of getting in trouble is way higher now.” (C010, E)

**Support:**
“that's why I've gone back to my friends back home, because they really reminded me of how I was before I came to [the Academy], like how I was in high school.....it's just nice to remember that there is something besides [the Academy]. I've been stuck here with no privileges, so I talk to them to remind myself no, there's still more out there.” (C005, E)

Standing:
“I just feel like a fish out of water, I just don’t belong. I’m too old to be with the young guys, and I was on my way out last year, so I didn’t really fit in with them, so I’ve always been on a different frequency, since this whole thing happened, and it’s just made it difficult, and it’s made it hard to mesh with the Corps when you’re on a different wavelength.” (C010, E)

“I feel like a leper.” (C010,E)

“miss-givings at the program's lack of accountability on me for....how I was doing my best to fulfill the obligations, and then they were just ignoring me, and how even people [IN CHARGE OF THE HONOR PROGRAM], all they could say was, "Man, I'm sorry. I'm sorry that you were forgotten." That's it.....this entire process I have been forgotten” (C005, E)

**Table 5**
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 (Continued)</th>
<th>“I definitely fell out of love with [the Academy] though. I still want to graduate, still want to commission, still want to lead soldier, but man, [the Academy]'s a big old joke..... I’m kind of over the whole [the Academy] thing.” (C010, M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing:</td>
<td>“So I’m pretty disenchanted with [the Academy], with what they provide for us. I really don’t think that it provides us anything other than this network and this brand.” (C010, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Academy</td>
<td>“I feel like my place is no longer at [the Academy].” (C004, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m still committed to [the Academy], I’m still committed to finishing out, but I’m not drinking the [the Academy] Kool-aid anymore. I understand how much smoke and mirrors the bureaucracy is. So even though I’m still involved with [the Academy], but not necessarily – I’m not [the Academy], and [the Academy] isn’t me.” (C004, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m disappointed a little bit because it’s supposed to be this pinnacle of American ingenuity and creativity and leadership. Everything good and American about [the Academy] is just kind of corrupted in my head now, because I realize that if something can take one of it’s – I view myself as a [Academy] employee I guess, or as someone who has given a lot to [the Academy], and the fact that they treat me so poorly off of a mistake or off of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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a violation, regardless of how completely clean by record was before and how high performing my record was before, the fact that they could take someone like me and put them through such a horrible negative experience – I view [the Academy] as much more toxic than I viewed it before. [the Academy] changes people, and [the Academy] definitely takes away a lot of people’s optimistic outlooks. [the Academy] can ruin people pretty deeply.” (C004, E)

“this idea that [the Academy]ers have of themselves. If you get [the Academy] commanders and big brass together, this smug, “we’re the best, we’re better than all of you” image that they project is just sickening” (C010, E)
**Table 6. Other Supporting Quotes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruptures</th>
<th>Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[I] just got thinking about it….I was like, &quot;Well maybe I am deceitful, maybe I've tricked myself into thinking I'm a good person.&quot; Then it all started rolling again in my head and being angry about it. Then I settled in and was like, &quot;No, that's dumb. I know that I'm a good person and can move on.&quot;…. Then something will happen, and it'll spark it back up. Then I'll internalize it. Then I'll be like, &quot;Wait, no,&quot;…..think about it and be like, &quot;Yeah, I could improve this,&quot; and move forward (C007, B, emphasis my own, PR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“getting found on honor taught me that there's a gap in the character of who I was and who I thought I was” (C007, M, reflecting on violation, PR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I didn't know what to think. I was so confused, and I was pretty upset. But mostly, I was just defeated, honestly. I don't know how else to describe the feeling. I just felt upset, sad, angry, crushed. It was probably the lowest point of the whole thing.” (C025, B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I started thinking, “I could get kicked out, all of this over a stupid engineering project.” There was some remorse, there was some guilt. Kind of those emotions.” (C010, B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“getting found on honor taught me that there's a gap in the character of who I was and who I thought I was” (C007, M, reflecting on violation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belonging</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It sucks watching every one of my friends, now that we’re upperclassmen with privileges, [be able to go out]….so my roommate’s going to dinner with some of my really good friends and it’s like, “oh I really wish you could come.” It’s like, “yea, I really wish I could come too.” The fact that I haven’t had privileges in 8 months, that really sucks (C011, M, HR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people look out for you, some people don’t….So [classmate] for example….we’ve always been friendly…. I asked him over the summer if he could write a character statement for my file. And at first he said yes….then asked what happened and I told him, and he was like, “yea, cool, I’ll get you something.” And then, it never came. And then I saw him during the academic year… and I asked him, like, “you still going to write for me?” And he was like, “yea, I got you.” And it never came. Never. And there was no explanation or anything (C002, B, PR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I've ruined a relationship with an officer just because I was ashamed of what happened. He sent me an email because he was checking up on me. It was in the midst of the whole process and I just never responded. I was like, ‘he's one of my favorite officers here I can't tell him what I did’…. He was one of the officers that I respected the most here. The fact that he was checking up on me just goes to show how much he cared…. He made me such a better person. Then I ruined it by not responding (C012, E, reflecting on violation, PR)

“So then he asked if I believe other Cadets saw me differently now, having known that I commit and honor violation. And I said yea, I think they do, even if they still like you, even if they’re still your friends, even if nothing seems to change in the dynamic of the relationship with them. If the first time they see you, that instant moment, they just have that thought of “oh [C010] committed an honor violation,” then it’s changed. It’s changed. And maybe that’s the only way it’s changed. But if that thought pops into their head, something has changed. How could it not?” (C010, B)

**Standing**

[Supervising officer] was like, "I think that you're deceitful and you have the heart of a tiger. They can't train your stripes”…. I was mad about it. Then I just dismissed it like, "No. He just goes off the handle sometimes. It's not a big deal." Then even though I said that, I was still mad and just got thinking about it…. (C007, B, PR)

“I just really didn’t like the not cheering part, because I didn’t really understand that. The whole time I was doing it, and even though it happened so long ago, all of the suddenly they took it away, and they were like, “it’s not a punishment”, but it seemed like a punishment. It’s weird that they say that it wasn’t a punishment, because everything seems like a punishment. They take everything away from you” (C006, B2, HR)

“Yeah, so she recommended separation. And she told me that flat out. She's like, "I don't think you deserve to be here" in the meeting.” (C025, B, HR)

“[officer] was like, ‘dude, you made a really, really big mistake. An egregious decision that will probably get you kicked out of here.’ And just hearing that, it made me feel even worse. Like ‘ah man, I’m definitely getting kicked out, I have no chance anymore. I ruined any sort of legitimacy I had here.’” (C008, B1)

“I have to rebuild everything I built. I loved the company I was in. It was great. I already had plans for the next year. I was supposed to be in a
| Table 6 (Continued) | leadership role. I had summer plans. That all went away. Everything I had built was gone” (C020, B) |

“I have a PFC rank, so [officers] know I got in trouble for something, but they don't know if it's honor related or what it's related to. I experienced this [at summer training], big time, because at first I had the regular…rank on for the first few days. All of the staff members….got to know me. Then one day I come back in and I have US rank on. The toughest pill for me to swallow was them looking at that rank and then seeing their faces change. Seeing their internal perception of who I was, even though they didn't necessarily know me, change.” (C018, M, reflecting on violation) |

“So it just kind of made me not trust [Supervising officers] as much, because they were telling me, ‘oh, you should be able to graduate on time, we’re behind you the whole time,’ and then the Supe was like, “well your TAC recommended six months turnback.” And I was like, “well that’s not what he told me.” So I was kind of, I don’t know, I was really disappointed in the meeting. So at the Supe’s meeting I was bawling, crying, and then I was just like – cuz I didn’t expect that from my [supervising officers], so that was the only thing” (C006, B) |

And then when we got our ranks stripped it was kind of worse, because it’s kind of like a scarlet letter. Like everyone knows that you did something back to get it, so every time I would see one of my friends, they’d be like, “oh, what did you do? What happened?” (C012, B1, PR) |

[the violation made] me think pretty heavily on wanting to leave….every single day, ”I want to leave. I don't want to deal with this any more. Why am I putting myself through this?”…..I don't know if I feel it's necessarily because of the punishment, or because I felt like I wasn't cut out for it, or, ”I made this mistake. I shouldn't have made that mistake, so obviously that is telling into my character, which [the Academy] doesn't approve of, so maybe it's not the correct career path for me” (C012, M, reflecting on violation, emphasis my own, PR) |

“I very seriously considered not coming back. Thought about throw in the towel” (C021, M, reflecting on violation, NR) |

“when….I turned myself in, there was this immediate feeling of ‘I’m not going to graduate, I know I’m not going to graduate.’ So I kind of started to feel less involved with my class because they’re talking about graduation, they’re talking about all these things, and I felt like an outsider….So I kind of started withdrawing from them a little bit.” (C010, E, reflecting on violation, NR) |
Table 6 (Continued)

| Violators Aware of Organizational Expectations | “I think for me, [the remediation program] is like ‘I need to do really well on this not only because I got a second chance, but also because if I do really well in this they could potentially shorten my punishment.’” (C007, M, PR, reflecting on violation) |
| “I'm trying to reduce my cynicism. It's definitely come out in my journal writing a little bit. They said that's normal for the beginning, but they want to see that progression, so I'm working on it” (C021, B, NR, emphasis my own) |
| “So, what made me different from them and why did they think I was worthy of remediation? My first response was that they had to keep me because of all the money that have put into me. That response is a little too simple though. If I don’t deserve to be here, then I should not be here, so someone must have thought I had some redeemable characteristics. The same characteristics that got me in here in the first place. My chain of command must have realized that my problem was one that was fixable and that did not define the type of leader that I would become. They are taking a gamble on the future and this program hopefully the means to ensure that I do not let my integrity slip again” (C014, B - Journal 8, PR) |

| Violators Attempts to Comply with Organizational Expectations | “I don’t want to show the Academy it was not a mistake for them to let me stay, and so by me showing them that it wasn’t a mistake to let me stay, I’ve been able to show myself that it wasn’t a mistake either. The self-loathing I had last summer is not even a fragment of what it used to be. And I think that’s because through proving myself to other people, I’ve been able to prove myself to myself.” (C004, M, NR) |
| “if you talk to anyone who's been under suspended separation, they'll tell you, "I'm the best cadet there is because I want to graduate. Not because I did all these papers and assignment and really grew as an individual." I think the growth comes from looking over your shoulder every minute of the day and thinking about every single thing that you do, "Will this get me kicked out?" That's why there is this artificial sense that kids who have the honor boards are the best cadets.” (C001, E, PR) |
| “I have willingly taken on additional jobs. I help out the Physical Development Officer by going to morning workouts, and I have offered myself to help the Academic Officer by watching weekday study hall. I also helped the cadet first sergeant of my company by taking the responsibility of the maintaining the cleanliness of the company upon myself. I formally wanted to do nothing that would even remotely help the company, and now
| **Table 6**  
**Table** (Continued) | I found myself tutoring and mentoring many people in the company” (C005, B - Journal 1, NR) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I guess it was just a different mindset, it’s just “you know, I really have to do my best here.”…. after the honor violation, I was like, “well, I’m really nothing now. I need to prove myself.”” (C008, B1, HR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Cause that's what they want to see, is a willingness to change, willingness to step up and own up to your mistake and correct it…. It was just like a, ‘okay. I can't fight this anymore. I have to roll over.’” (C025, B, HR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'll be committed to [the Academy] and do whatever they tell me to do” (C012, B2, PR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“there have been moments where it’s been like, ‘okay, maybe I don’t necessarily agree with everything that I’m saying in this paper, maybe this is a little radical, but this is what they want me to say, so I’m going to say it’” (C011, M, HR, emphasis my own)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I owe it to them to give a shit. I owe it to them to pay attention in class and come to class prepared. I guess there’s just a greater sense of duty in a lot of what I do” (C011, M, HR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to prove to [the Academy] that I'm not a bad person because I did this one action. I want to prove to them, ‘You accepted me, because I can be all of these things.’ I want to be a good person, not only for me, but for the institution and for the future and the people that I'll lead (C012, B2, PR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think an example would be like morning PT. Some mornings I wake up and I really don't want to do it. It's 5:15 in the morning, but then I just sit up and I just remind myself like, &quot;Hey, I've been given a second chance. I need to take advantage of it,&quot;” (C005, B2, HR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Development Expectations</strong></td>
<td>“I think my character….has a lot of potential to grow and is well on its way” (C012, B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think that's the best thing that [this program] can give you, is all of that room to grow” (C012, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And my whole thing is, it sucks….it’s kind of a bump in the road, and it sucks, and [the Academy] definitely knows how to make it very painful, but I’m not going to resent [the Academy]….this will be one of those things I look back on and I’m like, “yea, it sucked, but I got through it” (C011, B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6 (Continued)</td>
<td>“I’m grateful to have SLDPH to show me that this doesn’t have to be the defining thing of who I am. I can make changes and I can still be the person that I am proud to be.” (C004, B, #1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“SLDPH is just a perfect opportunity to become who you need to be in order to graduate and become a leader of character” (C008, B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“That's the goal for it is to rehabilitate you, but also to make you give that knowledge back in a bigger way. Change personal habits.” (C005, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Expectations</td>
<td>“I feel like he, as a TAC [supervising officer], you're supposed to be like the dad or like the mom. Even if someone's getting in trouble, yes, you need to discipline them, but you're supposed to help them and develop them” (C007, B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some people will probably just write me off if they know I’ve had an honor board. But there are other people that I think have a better understanding of rehabilitating character and think that it can be done, and it’s like, I screwed up, I paid my dues, I earned back my rank (C011, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Expectations – Formal</td>
<td>“I was supposed to have a meeting with the honor department….and then the Supe, and that would give me my rank back” (C021, F, reflecting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Once I get my rank back, I will feel integrated back into the Corps. I won't feel like an outsider anymore” (C020, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Once we get our rank back you get all your privileges back and stuff like that, like you're one of them [Corps] again” (C020, E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“hopefully when I earn back my rank, I’ll have earned back trust as well….Cuz I think that when that happens, people will be able to trust me more” (C011, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Expectations – Self-Generated</td>
<td>“I think that, as an institution as a whole, [the Academy should]....make sure the Corps knows that, yeah, they actually care about our development” (C012, B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Academy “should enforce to the fullest extent that is reasonable, but [the Academy] should also be humane” (C011, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’m going to be able to rejoin the team next semester” (C021, B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I have a pretty good chance of getting a position within the Executive Board of the Honor Committee” (C011, B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                     | “I was so happy that I could be given the mentorship process, because your rank and your privileges are tied to that program, so not only do I want to start that process, but I’ve been stuck to [the Academy] since January, and I’m getting cabin fever and stir crazy. So it’s like the sooner I finish the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Self-Development</th>
<th>program, the sooner I can get my rank back, so I was excited to start that.” (C010, B2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations Met</td>
<td>“we’ll be done, I’ll be completed with the program, I’ll be able to live my life as a normal person again, after so long being in the honor system.” (C004, B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I had that moment of clarity when I laid it out on the table and looked at everything and was like, “this is a problem, this is something that I don’t like, that I don’t want to continue to do. I don’t want to be the kind of person that decides for himself what rules are important, what rules aren’t. I don’t want to be the kind of person who will cut corners to get a job done because he didn’t manage his time well.” And then I was like, “well that’s it then. I’m going to stop doing that. I’m going to stop cutting corners, I’m going to stop doing this stuff.”” (C010, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“So since the summer it’s been kind of up and down, but I had all these changes that I wanted to make, and I stayed true to them, not in terms of honor, but with other stuff. There were all these things I wanted to do, and for a while I was really strong, not even thinking about it twice, doing great, and then all of the sudden it was like, “wait, what happened? I’m almost back to the same place I was before, what happened? I was doing so great. How did I circle back around to the same person I was.” And it was because you get lackadaisical if you’re not staying vigilant, bad things happen. I was like, “alright, I got to get back to that place that I wanted to be at.” So it was kind of like an up and down over the course of the summer, things have been in constant flux…. so now I’m working toward staying diligent and doing those things I’ve wanted to do. Or not doing those things that I used to want to do.” (C010, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“So the fact that I had had enough time to really look inside myself and ponder it and do a lot of soul searching, and that I arrived at an enlightened conclusion, that makes me feel good about me becoming a better person, about me being able to believe that I am actually a good man.” (C004, B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“in general my experience has been very, pretty good. Made a lot of changes. I've definitely bettered myself through it all, just through self reflection, everything, research, I've learned a lot. I've learned the lessons that I really needed to take away from what I did.” (C008, M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | “I guess I've learned a lot about myself, because going through the programs and going through each requirement that they have us, have it laid out for us, it made me stop and think about my character and situations, things I would normally just glance over and assume that I knew to do in situations, whereas now I have to actually stop and think about it and actually do some of them. I learned a lot about myself, and also about others and how I'm not
so- I don't have to judge, be so judgemental of other people, just because I know how it feels to be on the other end of the US rank, so now I'm okay talking to people and not being so quick to judge them in a similar situation, because I wouldn't want them to do that to me, so I wouldn't do that to them.” (C020, E)

“I don't want to say I'm over it like as in I forget about. It's always with me, and it always will be a part of me. It's literally been a year since my, since the violation period, so not to say that I'm over it, it's just …. I'm not afraid to tell people. That was a big sign for me to say that, okay, I've internalized my mistake and **I'm working towards being a better person for it.**” (C020, E)

“Now, yes, I messed up, I don't necessarily, I don't think I'm a bad person. Before I was like ‘I'm a terrible person, how'd I do this, what kind of person would do this?’ Now, I'm like, I messed up. I made a mistake. I can move on from this. I can still be a good person.” (C007, M)

“I think making me come out of my comfort zone.....My expectations coming into this and going through it, would be first getting me to come out of my comfort zone in terms of speaking to my mentor. It's already happening in the sense that I'm opening up about things. Whereas from all my experiences from this past year, I think I built very high walls. That is getting me to open up a little bit.” (C018, M)