Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

8-2022

Exploring the Motivations of College Students With ADHD to Disclose Their Disability and Use Accommodations

Carol M. Haynes-Buchanan
cxh17c@acu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd

Part of the Adult and Continuing Education Commons, Community College Leadership Commons, Disability and Equity in Education Commons, Higher Education Commons, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons

Recommended Citation

This dissertation, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the College of Graduate and Professional Studies of Abilene Christian University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

Nannette W. Glenn, Ph.D.

_____

Dr. Nannette Glenn, Dean of
the College of Graduate and
Professional Studies

Date   08/01/2022

Dissertation Committee:

Scott Self

_____

Dr. Scott Self, Chair

Katherine Yeager

_____

Dr. Katherine Yeager

Tracy Spencer

_____

Dr. Tracy Spencer

Abilene Christian University

School of Educational Leadership

Exploring the Motivations of College Students With ADHD to Disclose Their Disability and Use

Accommodations

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

by

Carol M. Haynes-Buchanan

August 2022

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my son, Tariq Buchanan, who is affectionately known as the subject of my dissertation. Words cannot express how proud I am of you for managing your ADHD to become a college graduate, teacher, and coach. You motivate and inspire me to advocate for those with ADHD and learning disabilities. You are an example that one can excel beyond expectations with the proper services and support. I love you, son!

To my husband, Ndubuisi Egele, I want to thank you for your encouragement and love. I am the best version of myself because of your care, attention, and support. Thank you for sharing with me for the past few years as I endeavored to complete this dissertation. I am forever grateful and absolutely love you, my king!

To Eric McKiver, Christina Lundy, Loretta Haynes, and Mary Haynes thank you all for your support as I made the journey to complete my dissertation. Many of you loving rolled your eyes as I pursued another degree (my fourth); however, you understand that learning is intertwined in the fabric of my being, and you still love me. Thank you, family!

Last but certainly not least, I give glory to God, the author, and finisher of my life. I am thankful for the strength, courage, and perseverance that he has instilled to allow me to come this far.

Acknowledgments

I want to acknowledge my dissertation chair, Dr. Scott Self. Your insight, encouragement, perspective, and thoughts helped me complete this milestone in my life, and I am truly grateful for this. I always appreciated your edits, feedback, and ideas to develop this product. I have a product that brings me such pride because of your efforts. I would also like to thank my dissertation committee members, Dr. Tracy Spencer and Dr. Katherine Yeager, for their feedback, advice, and guidance along the way. I am forever appreciative of your support.

Thank you to all the professors, advisors, and university staff that played a role in this pivotal moment in my life. I arrived here because you all guided me to this destination.

Abstract

College enrollment numbers reflect that the admission rates of students with disabilities are increasing as time progresses (Newman et al., 2020). Despite this spike in college attendance, degree completion rates of students with disabilities (SWD) are significantly lower than their nondisabled peers (DuPaul et al., 2018). This disparity was addressed via laws and regulations geared towards higher education institutions to level the playing field for SWD through providing services and support. This study aimed to explore what motivates SWD to disclose their disability and to accept or decline accommodations in the university setting. Students and faculty at a Texas private Christian university were interviewed to shed light on the experience of accessing services and supports to provide insight to enhance disability service provider operations. The findings suggest that institutional barriers are not always the cause of SWD not maximizing accommodations. Factors such as course structure, type, and ADHD symptoms may also serve as barriers to fully embracing services and supports. Consequently, disability service providers should focus on practices such as creating support systems, coaching, and creating alerts and reminders to help combat those specific barriers.

Keywords: ADHD, students with disabilities, disclosure, DSP, and accommodations

Table of Contents

vi

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

It is not uncommon for young adults to set goals that help them achieve their ideal quality of life and evolve into productive members of society. In today's environment, a college degree is a means of fulfilling this vision even for young adults with disabilities. Data shows that students with disabilities (SWD) have increased college enrollment as time progresses. The National Center for Education Statistics indicates that SWD represented 10.9% of all students in 2007-2008 and grew to 19.5% of all students in 2015-2016 (Newman et al., 2020). The ability to earn a college degree opens the door for employment opportunities and the promise of enhanced economic prosperity. Yet, research "found that adults with disabilities are less successful in seeking and maintaining employment, achieving a satisfactory standard of living, developing independence, and other quality of life indicators than persons without disabilities" (Field et al., 2003, p. 339). One of the reasons for this gap is that SWD have lower college degree completion rates than their peers without disabilities. For example, according to the United States Department of Education, an estimated 57% of nondisabled students earned a college degree within a 6-year period, yet only 34% of individuals with disabilities did the same (Huber et al., 2016). This suggests that SWD cannot capitalize on the benefits associated with higher education, including enriched employment opportunities, healthier lifestyles, and enhanced civic involvement (Newman et al., 2020).

It is essential to examine why SWD are experiencing challenges in completing a college degree to provide insight into how college professionals may enhance the delivery model for services and supports. This first chapter serves as the foundation for investigating what motivates SWD to access and accept or decline assistance in the higher education setting. The chapter

includes the background, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, and related definitions associated with college students with disabilities.

Background of the Study

A segment of SWD includes individuals diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). The condition is a chronic disorder that often begins in childhood and persists into adulthood (Hartung et al., 2019). Students with ADHD report organizational deficiencies, poor study and test-taking strategies, and time management challenges in the higher education setting (Francis et al., 2019; Simon-Dack et al., 2016). To address these disparities for students with ADHD, postsecondary organizations utilize campus disability services to create an infrastructure of support to assist with degree completion rates. This infrastructure includes services designed to aid "the person with a disability to access, learn, and benefit from educational services alongside college peers without a disability" (Lyman et al., 2016, p. 124). These accommodations may include notetakers in class, different exam formats, adaptive equipment and technology, assistance with study techniques, and additional exam time (Abreu et al., 2016). However, to access support services and accommodations at institutes of higher education, students must consciously choose to self-disclose their disability and apply these additional services throughout their academic careers.

Research shows that SWD consider four factors when deciding to request accommodations that include academic integrity, disability disclosure, disability acceptance, and the accommodation process (Cole & Cawthon, 2015). A recent study surveying 275 college students with ADHD found that a significant number of participants did not receive appropriate services and accommodations (Taylor, 2018). Even with these services available, students with disabilities withdraw from college before completing a degree. The decision to withdraw from a

university is a personal choice; however, evidence shows that obstacles block the path of SWDs, which prompts an early exit (Thompson-Ebanks, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

SWD are approximately 11% of the collegiate population, including individuals with ADHD (Yssel et al., 2016). Despite the influx of SWD in the higher education setting, these students have low academic performance and are less likely to be successful in college than their nondisabled peers, which is an indication of a significant problem (Kim & Lee, 2016). The inability to obtain a college degree limits SWD vocational opportunities, thus impacting their capacity to earn sufficient wages to sustain a meaningful quality of life (Fleming, Oertle, et al., 2017). ADHD is "a chronic and prevalent neurodevelopmental disorder that often persists into adulthood, with deleterious effects on academic, occupational, health, and social outcomes" (Gray et al., 2016, p. 1). For students with ADHD, this translates to below-average academic skills, interpersonal challenges, difficulty in understanding lectures, problems with completing assignments, and low performance on exams (Weis et al., 2014). Due to these issues, appropriate support is essential to level the playing field in comparison to their nondisabled peers (Nugent & Smart, 2014).

Key legislation has been enacted in the United States that established a standard of services and support for SWD. The first legislation was passed in 1973, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, that required any institution that receives federal funding to provide equal access to all individuals with physical and mental impairments. The second legislation, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, specifically included postsecondary institutions and provided for penalties for noncompliance (Lyman et al., 2016; Weis et al., 2014). In response, higher education institutions created an office of disability services to administer

accommodations (Kim & Lee, 2016). These accommodations may include "qualified interpreters, assistive listening systems, captioning, text telephones (TTYs), notetakers, readers, audio recordings, taped texts, and Braille materials" (Summers et al., 2014, p. 246).

Even with the active legislation and resources provided to SWD, "students with ADHD are overall less likely to complete a bachelor's degree with 12% graduating compared to the 50% of students without ADHD" (Schechter, 2018; Simon-Dack et al., 2016). Research studies heavily focused on the identified barriers to accommodation usage, such as negative faculty attitudes, poorly matched advisors, college stressors, and the quality of services available (Abreu et al., 2016). Yet, research is "limited in analyzing the overall experience of accessing disability support services in postsecondary settings from the perspectives of SWD themselves" (Abreu et al., 2016, p. 324).

Therefore, with roughly 25% of students who receive accommodations self-disclosing having ADHD, it is critical to determine what motivates students to access or decline accommodations (Scheithauer & Kelley, 2017). A key time to examine these motivations are with students who are in their second (sophomore) and third (junior) years of college to allow for acclimation into emerging adulthood and identity development (Squires et al., 2018).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine what motivates college students with ADHD to access accommodations in order to provide disability service providers (DSP) a deeper understanding of the decision processes that go into using accommodations among this population. Overall, research suggests that students with ADHD may benefit from disability support services and academic accommodations to improve college retention and degree completion rates (Nugent & Smart, 2014). This study investigated the decision processes

of sophomore and juniors with ADHD who have disclosed their disability to the DSP at a mid-size private university to gain insight into the post-hoc rationale for using or declining accommodations.

Research Questions

The following questions guide this study to understand the motivations of why college students access or decline accommodations:

RQ1: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?

RQ2: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?

RQ3: How do sophomore and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?

Definition of Key Terms

The following terms are referenced in this study:

Accommodation. A modification to the educational environment creates an environment that allows students with disabilities to have an equal opportunity in relation to their nondisabled peers (Deckoff-Jones & Duell, 2018).

American Disabilities Act (ADA). A key civil rights legislation enacted on the federal level in 1990 protected individuals from being discriminated against due to a disability (Deckoff-Jones & Duell, 2018).

American Disabilities Act-Amendments Act (ADA-AA). An amendment to the ADA adopted in 2008 broadened the definition and protections associated with disabilities (Deckoff-Jones & Duell, 2018).

Attention deficient and hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). A neurodevelopmental disorder that begins in childhood and persists into adulthood characterized by hyperactivity or impulsivity that leads to impairment (Wood et al., 2019).

Disability. A health condition or impairment that significantly impacts one or more of an individual's life functions (Singh, 2019).

Disability service provider (DSP). An entity or group that determines the level of services and supports received by SWD on a case-by-case basis based upon documentation that includes information on the student's functional limitations (De Vries & Schmitt, 2012).

Disclosure. Providing information and/or professional documentation about one's disability to the disability service provider associated with an institution of higher education to obtain services (Thompson-Ebanks & Jarman, 2018).

Individual with ADHD. An individual diagnosed with ADHD and has symptoms along with evidence that academic, occupational, or social functioning is impaired due to the condition (Wood et al., 2019).

Summary

This initial chapter introduces the human need to establish a meaningful quality of life that is achieved by many via a college education. A college degree enhances employment opportunities and civic engagement; however, individuals with disabilities have a lower degree completion rate than their nondisabled peers (Singh, 2019). In response to this disparity, colleges in the United States have established services and supports to assist students with disabilities in removing barriers without compromising academic integrity (Squires et al., 2018). Yet, research indicates that "the graduation rates of students with disabilities consistently lag behind their peers without disabilities," signifying a problem with the accommodation system.

The literature review in Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive review of the higher education setting as it relates to students with disabilities and accommodations, including significant laws and statues. In addition, it details the conceptual framework that describes the motivations for accessing or declining accommodations.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter describe how students with disabilities (SWD) are motivated to participate in the higher education setting and provide an understanding of the relevant theoretical foundation. The literature review's outline mimics the process associated with the provision of disability services and supports for SWD at the collegiate level. This discussion narrows to address a subsection of SWD, students with ADHD. The information presented details the characteristics of an individual with ADHD, outlines the laws and regulations related to disabilities, reviews disclosure in the university setting, and highlights the accommodation process. Overall, the literature review reveals deficits in the quality of postsecondary education received by SWD, explaining why their graduation rates are lower than their nondisabled peers.

In this literature review, the goal is to outline the scholarly conversations on how disability is handled at the university level and provide context for how students with ADHD choose to interact with the established disability system. The review supports the study's design of exploring the decision processes of sophomore and juniors with ADHD who have disclosed their disability to gain insight into their rationale for using or declining accommodations. Furthermore, the chapter uses Wehmeyer's (2003) theory of motivation to understand what motivates students with ADHD to disclose their disability and accept or decline accommodations.

Literature Search Methods

The review's relevant information was located via the Abilene Christian University's online library and Google Scholar platforms. The following search phrases yielded the referenced literature: *disability in college*, *accessing accommodations in college*, *disclosure of disability in college*, *college students with ADHD*, *disability laws*, *college disability offices*,

college ADHD accommodations, *barriers to college accommodations*, and *self-determination in college students with disabilities*.

Theoretical Framework Discussion

SWD often lack the self-determination skills needed to acquire the support services necessary to thrive in a college environment. For example, SWD "are less likely to communicate their needs (lack of self-advocacy), evaluate their performance (lack of self-regulation), develop a sense of empowerment (lack of locus of control), and be aware of their own strengths, interests, and limitations" (Hong, 2015, p. 210). The inability to perform these functions speaks to a deficiency in self-determination. Self-determination through these lenses aligns with Wehmeyer's (2003) functional theory of self-determination. Wehmeyer proposed that "actions are viewed as self-determination based upon the function they serve for the individual, in which self-determination is viewed as a dispositional characteristic, enduring tendencies use to characterize and describe differences between people" (Wehmeyer & Abery, 2013, p. 399).

This theory is appropriate for the study because it speaks to the behaviors that compel students to disclose their disability and acquire accommodations. Self-determination is defined as "volitional actions that enable one to act as the primary causal agent in one's life and maintain or improve one's quality of life" (O'Shea & Meyer, 2016, p. 7). This means that individuals make intentional actions to help achieve a specific outcome that will enhance their life. According to Wehmeyer's theory, the causal agency refers to the individual that purposely causes something to happen in one's life to accomplish a goal or create a change (Wehmeyer & Abery, 2013). Actions that describe self-determination are "acting autonomously with self-regulated behaviors that are psychologically empowered and acting in a self-realizing manner" (O'Shea & Meyer, 2016, p. 7). Students who utilize self-determination are tapping into a combination of skills, knowledge, and

beliefs that empower them to participate in goal-directed, self-regulated, and autonomous behaviors (Field et al., 2003). Lastly, Wehmeyer's theory has been empirically validated, operationalized through the creation of assessments, and serves as the foundation for the self-determined learning model of instruction (Wehmeyer & Abery, 2013). The additional factors collectively strengthen the rationale for utilizing the theory to understand disclosure behaviors and accommodation use.

SWD are more likely to be passive learners who are less likely to initiate or direct their higher education efforts (Herbert et al., 2014). This passiveness results in SWD entering the college environment with needs similar to those in high school; however, without the level of support (Herbert et al., 2014). The higher education setting is different than high school because the student must navigate through the process to register with a DSP, verify disability status, select specific accommodations, and discuss accommodations with college personnel. These activities can be overwhelming for a student that is accustomed to parents, school staff, and other advocates coordinating services on their behalf (Fleming, Plotner, et al., 2017). Considering this, students must develop self-advocacy or self-determination skills that empower them to speak up for themselves and have a keen awareness of their strengths and weaknesses. The student's ability to evolve in this fashion demonstrates the core of Wehmeyer's theory that "self-determined people are actors in their own lives, rather than being acted upon" (Wehmeyer & Abery, 2013, p. 399). This means that all the behaviors, actions, and beliefs of an individual permit them to control their lives and assume a successful adult's role in society (Field et al., 2003).

Research indicates that possessing adequate self-determination skills will allow students to more easily seek disability support services (Fleming, Plotner, et al., 2017). In one study,

SWD recommended that students advocate for their needs and be fearless when asking for help (Francis et al., 2019). However, the reality is that students often lack these skills, which results in difficulties securing services and speaking with faculty members to request accommodations (Fleming, Oertle, et al., 2017). If SWD are not equipped to initiate the services needed to succeed in college, this contributes to their inability to obtain accommodations and graduate from college.

SWD enrolled at higher education institutions have lower degree completion rates than their nondisabled peers, which suggests that SWD face unique challenges in obtaining a college degree (Kim & Lee, 2016). A subset of the SWD population are individuals diagnosed with ADHD who are plagued by the same educational roadblocks. Moreover, students with ADHD commonly report extensive academic problems that make this group at-risk for low retention and degree completion rates (Hartung et al., 2019). Also, these students report "increased difficulties, when compared to their non-diagnosed peers, in several areas including physical health, academic performance, home responsibilities, money management, work performance, social activities, marriage and romantic relationships, and risky behavior" (Hartung et al., 2019, p. 2).

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

ADHD is one of the most common disabilities reported by college students and often starts in childhood with symptoms persisting through adolescence and into adulthood (DuPaul et al., 2017; Nugent & Smart, 2014). According to Sacchetti and Lefler (2014), "the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed; DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2013) characterizes ADHD as chronic, developmentally inappropriate inattention and/or hyperactivity-impulsivity that causes impairment" (p. 1). ADHD's core symptoms include inattention, impulsivity, and hyperactivity (Niermann & Scheres, 2014).

The evaluation and diagnosis of the condition includes the review of self and third-party reports and the direct assessment of symptoms (Tinklenberg et al., 2018). According to Tinklenberg et al. (2018), "ADHD cannot be confirmed with laboratory or radiologic tests but rather is a clinical diagnosis based on self-reported symptoms and a history of ADHD in childhood" (p. 141). The effects of ADHD vary by individual; however, clinical research has shown that "the disorder impairs behaviors essential for adaptive functioning across several domains, including academic, occupational, social, and psychological" (Nugent & Smart, 2014, p. 1781).

Educational statistics reveal that the number of individuals with ADHD pursuing a college education is steadily increasing (Nugent & Smart, 2014). In the higher education environment, individuals with ADHD must deal with developmental changes, "adapt to new environments and social groups and deal with greater educational and organizational demands, often combined with an abrupt loss of parental structure and support" (Nugent & Smart, 2014, p. 1781). Research also suggests that these stressors may contribute or trigger higher levels of ADHD symptoms for students, which adds to the challenge of addressing ADHD. Any level of symptoms has shown to affect the academic functioning of students with ADHD significantly. According to Gray et al. (2016), "ADHD students report that they struggle to keep up with the academic demands of a university, are concerned with their academic progress, take longer to complete assignments, and have difficulty completing tests within the time limits" (p. 2). In addition to these noted issues, students with ADHD have lower self-esteem, are more likely to withdraw from classes, report being depressed, and are more likely to disrupt their college education than their non-ADHD peers (Lefler et al., 2016).

As indicated, the impairments associated with ADHD contribute to academic difficulties and the lower graduation rate compared to their nondisabled peers (Scheithauer & Kelley, 2017). Furthermore, students with ADHD also lack the motivation and persistence to overcome their academic difficulties (Simon-Dack et al., 2016). Undoubtedly, students with ADHD require assistance to offset any problems in their academic performance; however, services and supports remain underutilized by this population (Marshak et al., 2010). Students with ADHD who chose not to use services reported that fears of disclosing their disorder and being stigmatized by peers and professors were factors in their decision (Taylor, 2018). Even though various laws and regulations promote the creation, maintenance, and use of these services, barriers hinder students with ADHD from maximizing benefits.

Disability Laws

The impairments and limited functioning of students with ADHD and other SWD established the need to develop systemic requirements and protection in the higher education setting. Federal laws were enacted to mitigate discrimination against SWDs and resulted in addressing barriers for SWD. The first piece of legislation, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, which passed in 1973, required institutions that receive federal funds to provide equal access for individuals with physical or mental impairments. A second act followed, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 that strengthen the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by explicitly referencing postsecondary education and implementing penalties for noncompliance (Lyman et al., 2016). Together, these laws require that higher education institutions provide reasonable accommodations to otherwise qualified SWD to ensure a fair opportunity to enjoy the benefits of service, program, or activities available (Summers et al., 2014).

Later in 2008, an amendment to the ADA (ADA-AA) was passed to clarify that the determination of a disability is not solely based on diagnostic categories but the functional limitations of an individual (Summers et al., 2014). According to Shaw et al. (2010), "The ADA-AA requires that the impact on functional capacity must be determined without consideration of mitigating measures. The focal point is the impact of the disability on a student's capacity to perform related academic tasks" (p. 144). This amendment to the ADA significantly modified the determination of what is a disability. Furthermore, "This new statutory definition of disability created a substantial change in how eligibility as an individual with a disability is determined and addresses the issue of who is deemed to be an individual with a disability under the statute" (Shaw et al., 2010, p. 145). Thus, shifting the focus from who fits the criteria of being disabled to what is the functional impact of the disability.

In response to the ADA-AA, the Association of Higher Education and Disabilities (AHEAD) developed guidelines to create a framework for acceptable documentation; however, concerns that the guidelines were inflexible led to AHEAD withdrawing the guiding principles (Shaw et al., 2010). As a replacement, AHEAD established best practices in disability documentation that encouraged flexibility and consideration of alternative methods and sources of documentation (Shaw et al., 2010). AHEAD's guidance helped change the landscape for disability disclosure in the higher education arena because it set a standard for adequate documentation. According to a study conducted in 2009 of college administrators, 40% of participants reported using AHEAD guidelines, 22% used AHEAD best practices, 24% reported using institutional guidelines, and 7% used Educational Testing Services Guidelines (Shaw et al., 2010). Studies such as this confirm that AHEAD had a significant role in the disability documentation movement in postsecondary education.

For individuals with ADHD, this act "classifies ADHD as a disability if it substantially limits the ability of an individual to perform a major life activity compared to most people in the general population" (Weis et al., 2019, p. 280). For students with ADHD, numerous data sources support that their academic performance is impaired based on their condition compared to their nondisabled peers. For example, students with ADHD report "frequent careless mistakes on assignments, difficulty remaining focused during lectures, the inability to finish assignments timely, and reluctance to engage in sustained mental tasks like preparing reports or reviewing lengthy papers" (Prevatt & Young, 2014, p. 183). It is these types of reported problems that interfere with the academic performance of students with ADHD. In addition, ADHD symptoms negatively affect other aspects of life, such as self-esteem, social functioning, parent-child relationships, and mental health (Kwon et al., 2018). Collectively, ADHD symptoms and the resulting behaviors and barriers support that the condition may be a disability; therefore, SWD must provide the supporting documentation that demonstrates this impairment. It is this documentation standard shaped by laws and practices that pose a barrier for SWD to acquire assistance. Based on the established system, SWD without adequate documentation cannot access needed accommodations (Aquino & Bittinger, 2019).

It is also important to note that disability laws impact documentation requirements and the transition of services from a secondary school setting to college. SWD, who received assistance under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in secondary school, had access to accommodations and modifications (Connor, 2012). However, in the postsecondary education setting, supports provided under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 only mandates accommodations for qualified students (Connor, 2012). This results in the potential loss of services classified as modifications since Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act

of 1973 does not include these types of supports. Examples of modifications that are excluded in the postsecondary setting include exam content modifications, differentiated instruction, and multiple methods to measure competencies (Daviso & Textor, 2013). This transitional change may be an unintended barrier to accepting or declining services in the higher education setting.

Disclosure of Disability Status

As mentioned, the key to accessing services and supports hinges on students with ADHD ability to disclose their condition. This disclosure triggers the accommodation determination and selection process that includes students, DSPs, professors, and other support staff (Weis et al., 2014). Although disclosure is critical in identifying and utilizing services and supports, only 35% of students who received services in high school shared disability information with the appropriate offices in college (Mamboleo, Dong, Anderson, & Molder, 2020). Included in this statistic are the students who also elected to delay their disability disclosure, which results in increasing the length of time to graduate by almost six months (Mamboleo, Dong, & Fais, 2020).

The action of disclosure has various meanings to different people, especially among SWD, given there are many costs and benefits associated with disclosing (Barnard-Brak et al., 2010). Thompson-Ebanks and Jarman (2018) defined disclosure "as sharing personal information about one's disability to the campus disability support office with corresponding professional documentation of the disability and how it impacts the student" (p. 287). However, De Cesarei's (2015) definition that is more aligned with the ADA-AA guidelines describes disclosure as "the moment in which the student communicates that they have a disability. The communication may be informally directed to professors and peers or take the form of an official request" (p. 666). Both definitions illustrate the essential action associated with disclosure, sharing a disability in some form or fashion to an external party at the university level.

Regardless of how one defines disclosure for SWD, it entails revealing personal and private information and depends upon the communication's audience and context (Barnard-Brak et al., 2010). According to Braithwaite (1991), the following four factors influence SWD disclosure behaviors:

1. Their relationship with nondisabled individuals;

2. The relevance or appropriateness of disclosure dependent on the context of the situation;

3. The appropriateness of the nondisabled individual's response; and

4. The perceived appropriateness of disclosure based upon their personal feelings about their disability.

The referenced factors are associated with variables that dictate if an individual decides to disclose their disability. Even if these factors are accounted for, social and emotional considerations may impact the disclosure decision.

Research has shown that SWD decline to disclose their disability out of fear of being singled out, discriminated against, or mistreated by others (Marshak et al., 2010). There are also students who do not desire to be associated with a disability, so they attempt to blend in with their peers (Hong, 2015). Without disclosure, the accommodation process cannot occur, resulting in these students trying to function in the higher education arena without the assistance that was more than likely available in high school (Hong, 2015). Despite social and emotional concerns about the disclosure process, some students seek help to address academic concerns and are motivated to perform well in college (Kurth & Mellard, 2006).

Aquino and Bittinger (2019) found that during an individual's college career, they may disclose their disability at any time before the completion of their degree. One research study revealed that nearly half of the students surveyed had disclosed their disability on the college

application or during registration, and one-quarter disclosed their disability in their freshman year of college. For the remaining one-third, the disclosure time was unknown or occurred in their second or third year of college (De Cesarei, 2015). This study exemplifies both groups of students, the individuals who immediately accessed accommodations and the individuals who elected to delay their disclosure. Yet, there is not significant research on the rationale for why students with ADHD chose to secure or decline accommodations in the second or third year of college (De Cesarei, 2015). The ability to acquire information on why this select group accepts or declines accommodations may yield recommendations for modifying the service delivery model of services and supports in the higher education setting.

Accommodation Use

The ADA of 1990 requires all colleges to provide reasonable accommodations to SWD that address such areas as "academic programming, examinations and evaluations, housing, and recreational facilities" (Barnard-Brak et al., 2010, p. 411). In the United States, roughly 3,000 institutes of higher education offer accommodations to SWD, and within the past 15 years, disability-related support service programs have increased significantly (Reinschmiedt et al., 2013). These service programs support approximately 24% of students with disabilities in the higher education setting (Krebs, 2019).

For postsecondary institutions, the office of disability services (ODS) is designed to establish, maintain, and connect SWD with appropriate accommodations. SWD who access and use accommodations in a university setting must disclose their disability to the ODS, faculty, and other necessary departments (Cole & Cawthon, 2015). However, a diagnosis alone does not demonstrate a disability: the ODS also requires confirmation that the disability has symptoms that interfere with or reduce essential life functions (Gray et al., 2016). Thus, the ODS intake

process consists of disclosure and documentation that may include professional medical recommendations, student perspectives on symptoms, and parental observations on the impact of the disability. Once registered for support services, SWD and DSPs work together to identify the appropriate accommodations required based on individual needs. According to Kim and Lee (2016), a student's experiences grow with selecting accommodations; they can determine the most productive forms of individualized support that promote academic success.

Accommodations are defined as "the provision of any educational support that is needed for the person with a disability to access, learn, and benefit from educational services alongside college peers without a disability" (Lyman et al., 2016, p. 124). There are two types of accommodations, instructional which alters how students learn and test accommodations that modify the way students demonstrate their learning (Weis et al., 2014). By design, accommodations "remove restrictions to students participating in educational activities without changing the students' educational experience, lowering academic standards, or compromising the validity of exam scores" (Weis et al., 2014, p. 2). Typical accommodations provided by postsecondary institutions include "extra exam time, notetakers in class, assignments or noted given by facility, assistance with learning or studying techniques, different exam styles, and adaptive equipment and technology" (Abreu et al., 2016, p. 324). The degree to which these support services are offered, and the specific types of supports vary by the postsecondary institution (Summers et al., 2014).

Although universities offer different supports, research has shown that students are searching for supports that will allow them to experience a degree of independence (Kurth & Mellard, 2006). For example, a recent study found that 82% of the students rated assistance, such as adaptive technology, which supplements human functions as effective accommodations

(Kurth & Mellard, 2006). From the perspective of Wehmeyer's (2003) motivational theory, this need to utilize accommodations that foster independence aligns with an individual who demonstrates self-determination.

Accommodations not only aid in promoting independence, various research studies have shown that accommodations can positively impact academic performance (Kim & Lee, 2016). Yet, the literature also indicates that there is evidence that disability support services are underutilized by SWD (Lyman et al., 2016). According to Barnard-Brak et al. (2010), SWD "are not maximizing services in two ways: (1) not seeking these services out, or (2) seeking these services to late" (p. 412). The lack of utilization of support services among SWD suggests that barriers may exist in accessing this resource. Some of the reported barriers to services and supports by SWD entail a lack of knowledge of the ODS and services offered, challenging faculty perceptions, the stigma attached to disabilities, and the need to establish a disability-free identity (Lyman et al., 2016; Schechter, 2018).

Lack of Knowledge of ODS

Legislative mandates require higher education institutes to establish accommodations and provide information about disability accommodations (Barnard-Brak et al., 2010). Despite this directive, SWD "often cite insufficient knowledge of disability services at their institution as reasons for not applying for services and accommodations" (Taylor, 2018, p. 287). Other students reported they had an awareness of the office; however, they did not know what specific services were available or how to access these services (Marshak et al., 2010).

These issues not only discouraged SWD from seeking accommodations, but it also prolongs the decision to contact an ODS. SWD who delayed or declined seeking accommodations cite a lack of knowledge of the ODS and available services as a barrier to usage

(Lyman et al., 2016). Ultimately, to address the problem of lack of information sharing with SWD, researchers in the field have recommended that education reform in this area encompass "thoughtful consideration for inclusion and information and resource sharing" for SWD (Francis et al., 2019, p. 254).

Faculty Perceptions

University faculty members play an important role in the accommodation process because of the requirement to consult with faculty on the accommodations suitable for each course. Since faculty members are responsible for "creating the context for the delivery of instruction and developing systems that support knowledge acquisition and understanding," they are critical in selecting accommodations that meet each individual's unique needs (Yssel et al., 2016, p. 385). Several dynamics drive professors' responses to students who request accommodations, such as their knowledge of relevant laws and disability characteristics, perspective on accommodations and instructional design, and the willingness to provide accommodations (Cook et al., 2009).

Customizing accommodations typically consists of a student having a conversation with the faculty member to discuss the disability and associated needs. The faculty member's response to this conversation is mostly contingent upon their perceptions and beliefs. For example, in one study, participants reported that faculty members refused to grant accommodation requests when they did not believe the supports were needed or did not want to compromise intellectual property included in lecture notes (Francis et al., 2019). In the spirit of preserving the course's academic integrity, professors are less willing to disregard misspelling and incorrect grammar, permit course substitutions, and allow extra credit and the recording of lectures (Cook et al., 2009).

In other cases, the DSP will send the professor documentation that details the exact accommodations to be provided or allowed, yet the professor fails to follow through with the request. When this occurs, the DSP will often have to conduct a series of follow-ups to ensure the students receive assistance (Marshak et al., 2010).

Contrary to the poor faculty experience are the positive interactions with SWD professors who are willing to focus on their specific needs. In a recent study evaluating faculty member's mindset and opinions regarding accommodations, 74% of professors reported that they would provide students with a documented learning disability needed accommodations if the course standards were not lowered (Vance & Weyandt, 2008). Although the faculty member's view played a part in the accommodation process, they were still willing to assist students. The truth that arises from these scenarios is that SWD accommodation needs depend upon the faculty member's perceptions.

Stigma Associated With Disabilities

Research demonstrates that the "stigmatizing effect of disability seems to be a significant factor in all the studies and likely influences when college students with disabilities go for help and when they do not" (Trammel & Hathaway, 2007 as cited in Marshak et al., 2010, p. 152). Historically, having a disability has been associated with negative stereotypes and connotations that have resulted in altered treatment or unwanted attention. SWD "do not desire to be viewed or treated differently due to their disability nor singled out or have attention is drawn to them" (Lyman et al., 2016, p. 128).

According to Krebs (2019), SWD feel that their peers misunderstand accommodation usage and are under the impression that supports make classwork easy or that supports are not appropriate for college. These feelings are not unfounded; research verifies that SWD experience

the greatest amount of stigma with relation to how they felt their peers perceived them (Aquino & Bittinger, 2019).

Consequently, in response to these stigmas surrounding accommodation usage, many students shy away from the process or delay the acquisition of services and supports. A study conducted by De Cesarei (2015) found that students who perceived their disability as significantly stigmatizing were discouraged from seeking help. In cases where students were courageous enough to seek support, they sought out nonprofessional sources rather a DSP or faculty member (De Cesarei, 2015). Ultimately, students who do not pursue assistance or connect with the appropriate resources are not accessing the accommodations needed to succeed in college. In addition, stigma lowers self-esteem, self-awareness, self-worth, and contributes to a decreased sense of belonging (Aquino & Bittinger, 2019; De Cesarei, 2015). When students experience hardship in these areas, this may also influence their identity.

Identity and Disability

Aligned with the need to avoid societal stigmas associated with having a disability, SWD do not desire to integrate the presence of a disability into their college life (Marshak et al., 2010). "Even if students can obtain accommodations, they face another challenge: living on college campuses under the label of accommodated" (Krebs, 2019, p. 11). This label becomes an external symbol of their identity, which may impact how they define their identity internally. In this situation, the disability becomes their identity. For some SWD, the need to preserve a disability-free image discourages them from seeking accommodations. Researchers use the phrase "anxious for a new beginning to characterize SWD who choose not to self-identify due to the impact of having a disability" to describe this need (Squires et al., 2018, p. 125).

The noted barriers are only a portion of the reasons why SWD are not seeking, accepting, and utilizing the services and supports offered by an ODS. In a recent study, identity issues were a top barrier reported by students that kept them from seeking services and supports available through a DSP (Marshak et al., 2010). Postsecondary entities are challenged to create systemic changes that will enhance inclusion, share information and resources, and educate faculty on common disabilities and appropriate supports.

Summary

The literature paints a picture of disparity for students with ADHD regarding college degree completion rates compared to their nondisabled counterparts. Various enacted laws set the stage for additional supports and services in the higher education setting that led to the establishment of ODS. Through the ODS, students with ADHD disclose their disability to access accommodations designed to address gaps that prevent academic success. However, there are reported barriers that restrain students from seeking or utilizing these supports. This has led to the current situation; students with ADHD are not persisting in college and successfully earning a degree (Newman et al., 2020). For students with ADHD to overcome all the personal, societal, and systemic challenges, they will have to be motivated to continue until the degree is reached. Therefore, it is critical to develop a well-crafted research design that will explore the motivation that drives students with ADHD to obtain support in completing a college degree so that challenges are transformed into opportunities.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The heart of this study is to examine what drives college students with ADHD to seek out supports that will assist them with being successful in the higher education setting. Motivation may be explored from a quantitative or qualitative perspective; however, to understand how people define, internalize, and interpret their experiences, a qualitative research method is the most appropriate approach (Merriam, 2009). The research questions that guide this study facilitate the collection of detailed descriptions of the participant's experiences and include:

RQ1: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?

RQ2: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?

RQ3: How do sophomore and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?

Through the lenses of qualitative analysis, a case study was utilized to arrive at "an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such as a program, an institution, a person, a process, or a social unit" (Yazan, 2015, p. 139). This chapter shares the plan used to conduct this case study and explains the research methodology, population, sample, instruments, data collection and analysis, ethical considerations, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations.

Research Design and Method

Qualitative research seeks to explore phenomena or occurrences beyond categorizing or classifying numerical data and measures. Researchers employ qualitative research methods to "achieve an understanding of how people make sense out of their lives, delineate the process of meaning- making, and describe how people interpret what they experience" (Merriam, 2009, p.

14). When qualitative research endeavors to explore individualized participant outcomes, a case study method is often deployed (Patton, 1990). A qualitative case study comprises a case that occurs within a bounded system (Yin, 2018). The bounded system may be an individual, organization, group, program, or event. Then the case selection boundary is shaped by the limits or boundaries set by the exclusion and inclusive criterion (Tetnowski, 2015). In this study the case includes sophomore and junior college students, representing the group experiencing a phenomenon. This group is further narrowed to require participants to have ADHD and have worked with the DSS office, resulting in a bound system (Yin, 2018).

Other components of a case study include studying participants over time, reviewing multiple sources of information, and reporting case descriptions and related themes (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The study incorporates interviews with college students with ADHD, a focus group discussion with college professors, and the examination of the study participants' disclosure information.

A qualitative case study design explored the rationale used by sophomores and juniors with ADHD who have disclosed their disability to the DSS office and accepted or declined accommodations at a mid-size private university. A case study allows the researcher to get close to the participant, provides access to subjective factors such as emotions and thoughts, and reveals unique information about the phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). This method best suited the study's goal of describing the phenomenon and the real-life context in which it occurred. This approach also answered the related "how" or "why" questions, which are critical to obtaining the underlying factors associated with the decision to utilize support services and accommodation (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Merriam, 2009). In addition, Yin (2018) proposed that case studies should be utilized when "how or why" questions are present, there is a need to explore a contemporary

set of events, and the researcher has little to no control over natural events. Out of all the qualitative designs, a case study is advantageous when "there are more variables of interest than data points, and when multiple sources of evidence will yield data that converges in a triangulated fashion" (Tetnowski, 2015, p. 39).

Population

The United States Government Accountability Office reported that the number of undergraduate students with ADHD increased from 11.6% to 19.1% in 2008 (Stamp et al., 2014), reflecting that more and more students with ADHD are electing to attend college to complete a degree program. This trend has not slowed down; the United States Department of Education shows that from 2011-2012 more than 10% of college students had a disability, and from this group, 18% of the students identified as having ADHD (Wu & Molina, 2019). With attendance numbers such as these, postsecondary institutions must find ways to address this population's unique needs.

Study Setting

The study occurred at a mid-sized private university and according to the campus website the institution has a student population of 5,293 students, 3,496 undergraduates and 1,797 graduate students from 52 states and territories and 46 nations. Out of the total student population, 375-400 students have a disability, and 371 active students are currently receiving services (N. Sanchez, personal communication, October 5, 2020). Services are provided through the University Access Programs designed to aid students in accessing the college's academic, cultural, and recreational activities.

Study Sample

The study participants were sophomore and juniors who disclosed their ADHD disability to the Disability Support Services (DSS) and either accepted or declined available accommodations. One of the fundamental challenges in qualitative research is determining the appropriate number of participants to classify the study as meaningful and legitimate. Patton (1990) contends that there are no official requirements for sample size in a qualitative investigation and that the sample depends on various factors. These factors include the study's purpose, what will be useful and credible, and the availability of time and resources.

Also, Young and Casey (2019) reported that "rich qualitative findings can be discovered with relatively small sample sizes" if certain conditions are met (p. 54). These conditions include having participants meet predetermined criteria, describe similar experiences, and complete a structured interview (Young & Casey, 2019). The study's design fulfilled the three requirements of Young and Casey, as evidenced by the sample selection of sophomores and juniors with ADHD, the descriptions detailed in chapter 4, and the established interview protocol in Appendix D.

The goal of the study was to recruit at least 10 participants; however, only three individuals provided data for analysis. The recruitment efforts included coordinating with the disability office; however, after 4-5 weeks of marketing there was no interest in the study. In light of this, a second private university was contacted to host the study and the request was declined. After an additional 3-4 weeks, the disability office was able to yield three participants.

Even with three participants, code saturation was reached when the respondents provided reoccurring information that no longer led to new information ("heard it all"), and I was able to make sense of it ("understand it all"; Seidman, 2006; Young & Casey, 2019). When saturation

occurs in a study varies, making it difficult to pinpoint a specific sample size; however, code saturation was demonstrated with three participants for this study.

A purposive sampling method was used to carve out the sample from the general population. Merriam (2009) confirmed that "the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry" (p. 77).

Purposive sampling ensured that the sample focused on a group of college students with ADHD who interacted with the DSS office, who could provide insight into disclosure behaviors and accommodation use. To obtain the sample, the DSS office served as the gatekeeper that permitted and controlled access to participants that fit the study's criteria (Seidman, 2006). All students who fit this criterion were eligible to participate in the study and made-up the sample population. I established an agreement with the DSS office to contact all participants via email, telephone, or mail to take part in the study. Interested individuals were provided with an informed consent package and scheduled for an interview via Zoom (see Appendix B and C).

Interview Design

The student participants underwent a semistructured interview that consists of 18 questions with probes directly related to disclosing their disability, working with a DSP, and accepting or declining accommodations (see Appendix D). The protocol was designed to encourage thick descriptions, the depth, detail, and richness in responses embedded in the participant's experiences through the combination of main questions, probes, and follow-up questions (Rubin & Rubin, 2015). The face-to-face virtual interviews lastly roughly from 45 minutes to 60 minutes in length and adhered to the established interview protocol. The interview

protocol guided each session to ensure that each interview is consistent, organized, and managed effectively (Patton, 1990).

The interview protocol's opening script included reviewing the informed consent, the study's purpose, and the interview format (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). Also, participants were provided an opportunity to ask questions and receive contact information for future inquiries. The interview questions were not from any recognized instrument; however, they are specific questions to encourage dialogue on disclosure and accommodations. Per the interview guidelines prescribed by Seidman (2006), the tool was piloted by a small number of participants to gain feedback on organization, logic, and flow to enhance the instrument. Select participants engaged in the interview process and responded to each question, allowing the interviewer to assess the research question's value and usefulness (Rubin & Rubin, 2015). The testing resulted in editing questions to promote a conversational tone, adding questions to enhance thick descriptions, and modifying the order of the questions to group similar topics or ideas (Rubin & Rubin, 2015). This revised tool encouraged participants to reflect on their experience; therefore, I gained an understanding of the students' feelings, thoughts, and emotions regarding disclosure decisions and the use of support services and academic accommodations.

As mentioned, the face-to-face virtual interview was utilized to obtain the data for the study and was hosted by the Zoom conferencing platform. Zoom was a strong technology solution for the study because participants were already acclimated with the platform and several features were available that ensure confidentiality such as personal meeting identifications (Hill et al., 2020).

Focus Group Structure

In an effort to collect secondary data to provide peer debriefing towards trustworthiness, a virtual focus group session with college professors at the mid-sized private university. Like the face-to-face virtual interviews, Zoom was used to conduct the group discussion and employ the same confidentiality measures, such as personal meeting identification numbers. In qualitative research, a focus group consists of individuals who, through a guided interactional discussion, provide knowledge into the research topic (Powell & Single, 1996). The focus group added depth to the research design beyond the semistructured, in-person interviews because it allowed me to observe participants' interactions on a selected set of attitudes and experiences related to the phenomenon (Morgan & Spanish, 1984). In this study, college professors' voice is essential in understanding the disclosure process and accommodation use of college students with ADHD. Research shows that the "attitudes and willingness of faculty members to provide accommodations may influence the decisions of students on whether or not they disclosure their disability" and use accommodations (Mamboleo, Dong, & Fais, 2020, p. 79). The perspectives gleaned from faculty enhanced the interviewees' experiences regarding disclosure decisions and accommodation use in the postsecondary setting.

The DSP coordinated the recruitment of the volunteer faculty members, and as a researcher, I did not have any power over the participants in any capacity. The focus group activity occurred after the completion of the student interviews. The three-member focus group was conducted using a protocol (see Appendix E) and included one session that will last approximately 60 minutes (Brinkmann, 2013). Focus group interviews are considered a suitable follow-up to in-depth interviews to support data from individual interviews, enhance analysis,

and allows the researcher to explore any unexpected revelations (Liamputtong, 2011; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018).

Artifact Review

The study's last element entailed reviewing documentation used by participants to disclose their disability and acquire services and supports from the DSS office. This documentation may include doctor's notes and recommendations, disability evaluation results, parental questionnaire, and other information to establish and confirm the disability and functional limitations of the participant (Keenan et al., 2019). The analysis of these documents completed the triangulation requirement and served as support for case study findings. The use of this additional source helps to corroborate and supplement evidence from other sources and allows for the researcher to make inferences (Yin, 2018).

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The primary source of data came from one-on-one, semistructured interviews with participants. This type of interview structure works well because it is a flexible method of acquiring descriptions of participants' experiences to interpret the phenomena (Brinkmann, 2013). These types of interviews also allow the interviewer to employ follow-up questions in specific areas at their discretion (Brinkmann, 2013). Another critical element of the data collection plan is to utilize triangulation that entails "considering data from at least three different sources to ensure more dimension to the data" (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018, p. 99). For the study, secondary data sources will include a focus group with college professors at a mid-sized private university. These focus groups allowed attendees to describe their experiences with the target population's disclosure practices and accommodation usage. After the conclusion of the

focus group, a second one-on-one, semistructured interview was conducted with participants to gain deeper analysis on identified themes.

Thirdly, participants could volunteer to share documentation provided to the DSP related to their disclosure and acquisition of accommodations to uncover additional disability disclosure data. The information was reviewed to confirm the condition of ADHD, who provided the diagnosis, recommended modifications and accommodations, and the documentation variability. The assessment process for the documentation required participants to bring the information to the interview setting so that I could review via the conference platform or walk-through it with the individual. In this case, the confidentiality of participants remains protected because the documentation is not collected. The identified secondary data sources will add context to the student's perspectives and paint a holistic picture of any revealed disclosure and accessibility themes. During the semistructured interview sessions, two of the three participants referred to their recent diagnosis and testing results documentation to add value to their interview responses.

A vital component of a qualitative case study in researcher's role is the firsthand experience that occurs with the data. According to Tetnowski (2015), "data collection is viewed as a relationship between the researcher and the data that is observed, organized, and coded in preparation for analysis. When employing qualitative methods, the researcher becomes the key instrument of data collection" (p. 41). This study allowed for my total immersion in the process and data. As the researcher, I created the interview tool as a result of the literature review and conducted and transcribed the interviews and focus group session and analyzed the data to report relevant findings.

In line with the Seven Stages of Interview Inquiry, the following steps occurred after the interview process and focus group session: transcribing, analyzing, verifying, and reporting

(Brinkmann, 2013). During the interview, notes were taken, and after each conversation, I completed thoughts and ideas while the information was fresh and easily retrieved. The recorded interview was transcribed using Otter, an online transcription service. The resulting written document was validated by comparing the audio to the transcript and edited as necessary to reflect a verbatim account. Interview notes went through numerous rounds of review to identify initial themes and concepts (Rubin & Rubin, 2015). From the literature the following themes emerged, independence, motivation, initiative, dependence, identity, and persistence that will serve as a priori codes when reviewing the conversation transcripts.

After the preliminary evaluation of the transcripts, In Vivo, values, and emotion coding techniques are implemented in the analysis of the data. Research suggests that the decision to disclose a disability and accept or decline accommodations is possibly driven by beliefs, feelings, emotions, and values (Marshak et al., 2010; Stamp et al., 2014; Thompson-Ebanks, 2014). The complexity of this decision is described by Marshak et al. (2010), "the student's decision to seek help is complex, multilayered, and highly correlated to the climate and disability environment on campus, as well as, to personal factors related to motivation, which vary from student to student" (p. 152). The theoretical framework of Wehmeyer (2003) fits well within the study's design because of all the factors that comprise self-determination connect with the values, emotions, beliefs, and feelings of the participants to help explain the phenomena.

Using the three identified strategies helps capture general themes, values, and emotions associated with disclosure and accommodation usage for the target population. In Vivo coding required me to extract responses that stand out or are vocally emphasized by participants in the interview (Saldaña, 2016). The words or phrases captured in the notes represented significant issues inspired by the participant and provide rich insight into the phenomenon (Saldaña, 2016).

The second coding method, values coding, addresses the values, attitudes, and beliefs that motivate college students' disclosure and decisions with ADHD. The analysis of the values coding may occur separately and lead to examining relationships between the attributes.

During the interview, participants may exhibit a degree of emotions as disclosure, disabilities, ADHD symptoms, and accommodation usage are discussed. Saldaña (2016) defined emotions as "feelings and its distinctive thoughts, psychological and biological states, and range of propensities to act" noted by the researcher or vocally expressed by the participant (p. 125). Overall, adopting In Vivo, values, and emotions coding techniques will help identify the motivations that lead to college students' disclosures and decisions with ADHD.

After completing the coding passes, the fourth review looked for evidence of the identified a priori codes, the "before the fact codes." Conducting the coding sequences in the specified order allows the data to speak for itself without the researcher's lenses to tamper with the findings. The last coding pass occurred after In Vivo, values, emotions, and a priori reviews and yielded the final list of codes used in the data analysis.

The coding results were verified to authenticate themes through multiple cycles of review and coding. After this repetitive process, the codes are further analyzed to decipher significant meaning. The building towards narratives and descriptions includes sorting, summarizing, describing, ranking, weighing, and combining the coded data. This opens the door for moving towards connections with published literature, the theoretical framework, and the data regarding differences and similarities (Rubin & Rubin, 2015). The findings were then compiled in the appropriate dissertation chapters.

Methods for Establishing Trustworthiness

With any research project, the audience must have confidence in one's findings and methodology selection. Establishing trustworthiness is a function of the following four factors: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Credibility

To build credibility, I plan on implementing two essential practices, prolonged engagement and triangulation. Terrell (2016) described prolonged engagement as spending a significant amount of time in the research environment to understand the phenomenon under review. As part of the study's design, the amount of time invested in the one-on-one interviews and focus group sessions allow for building relationships and exposure to the setting's culture. In conjunction with the personal connections, I transcribed and coded all the insight gleaned from the data collection activities. The second practice of data triangulation entails utilizing more than one source to discover themes and patterns that allow for cross-referencing and validating information (Leavy, 2017). For example, after the initial student interviews, the focus group data were used to confirm or challenge preliminary ideas and themes. A second round of student interviews provided the final interpretation of the experiences of college students with ADHD that shaped the study's findings.

Transferability

The ability to apply research findings to other contexts speaks to transferability (Terrell, 2016). Research findings can be transferred to different contexts if adequate detail is available to determine the fittingness of the two contexts (Leavy, 2017). In this study, interview questions developed encourage meaningful responses that will be documented in full, resulting in thick descriptions that increase transferability (Terrell, 2016).

Dependability

The design, instruments, analysis methods, and findings will be reviewed by an external auditing team that includes the dissertation chair and committee members to enhance the study's consistency and replicability (Terrell, 2016).

Confirmability

Since I have a college-aged son with ADHD, it is vital that, as a researcher, I maintain neutrality during the project. Considering this, I was aware that my actions may impact the study outcomes, so triangulation was implemented to preserve my neutrality. The student interviews served as the primary data source for the experiences of college students, the focus group served as a secondary source and confirmed or refuted essential themes, and the documentation review was the third data source used to validate information provided by the students. Overall, this approach permitted the focus group and documentation data sources to confirm the themes identified in the primary data. As mentioned, utilizing three data sources to validate and strengthen findings ensures that the results reflect those of participants without any external influence (Terrell, 2016).

Researcher Lens

Researchers often select topics with a professional or personal connection, which may be associated with strong views, opinions, and feelings. In qualitative research, a link to the research topic can impact the type of questions developed, how the interview is conducted, and how the data are interpreted (Rubin & Rubin, 2015). A significant factor that may have influenced my perspective is having a college-aged son with ADHD. Being the mother of a student with ADHD allowed me to walk through the disclosure and accommodation process from high school to college. His educational journey helped me develop ideas, thoughts, and perspectives on ADHD

and the acquisition of services and supports. In light of this, I must acknowledge potential biases and examine how this may affect my research to offset any negative ramifications. Some of the practices I deployed include carefully crafting interview questions and seeking my chair's advisement in the data analysis phase (Rubin & Rubin, 2015).

An example of implementing an offsetting measured occurred during the piloting of the interview instrument. According to Rubin and Rubin (2015), researchers should engage in self-reflection during the interview process as a means of combating biases. As I conducted the trial interviews, I evaluated if my questions were leading participants, assessed if questions or responses provoked strong emotions, and determined if follow-up questions were avoided for personal reasons (Rubin & Rubin, 2015).

Ethical Considerations

Before a research project is pursued, researchers should explore the potential value or significance of the study. Particularly, if the study results will add new knowledge on the topic, address a social need, or encourage social reform (Leavy, 2017). After such considerations, researchers must guarantee that the project is designed and completed in a fashion that causes no harm comes to the participants (Leavy, 2017). Therefore, to protect participants, several safeguards are in place to preserve their health and safety. The participants' recruitment will include all the elements of informed consent, such as the research purpose, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and an overview of the interview process.

The potential risk of harm to research participants may occur in the areas of privacy and any associated trauma or poor experiences in college related to ADHD. The names and other identifying information of participants were removed from any interview transcripts, and pseudonym names were adopted to address privacy concerns (Patton, 1990). Also, all data will

be in a secure location that will only be accessible to me. Regarding any negative emotions associated with managing ADHD in college, researchers will monitor for any distress and allow participants to skip questions or conclude the interview at any time.

Assumptions

For this dissertation's purpose, assumptions are the things that are believed to be accurate; however, they cannot be confirmed (Terrell, 2016). It is assumed that during the interview and focus group process that participants will share truthful feedback regarding their experiences. Based on this, I did not construct any controls to prevent the sharing of misinformation, so erroneous information is feasible (Terrell, 2016). It also assumed that interviewing college students with ADHD regarding their experiences with disclosure and accommodations would provide data to aid DSP reshape how services and supports are delivered.

Limitations

In qualitative research, limitations cannot be controlled by the researcher and may impact the results' transferability, the ability of the findings to apply to like individuals not involved in the study (Cope, 2014; Terrell, 2016). Also, the interview's initial design was to conduct in-person face-to-face interviews; however, based on the COVID-19 pandemic, interviews will be conducted via Zoom. The virtual setting may potentially hinder the participant's ability to provide an accurate presentation of themselves (Sullivan, 2012). Another potential limitation is the quality of the interaction; factors such as poor internet speeds and environmental distractions can disrupt communication.

Delimitations

This study focuses on college students with ADHD and their experiences with disclosing their disability and accessing and using accommodations. Although ADHD falls into the

classification of learning disabilities, these other conditions are not part of this study. Secondly, the study does not represent college students with ADHD who did not interact with a DSP or students who disenrolled in college due to ADHD complications.

Summary

This chapter outlined the research methodology related to this study and how and why it will help achieve the project's expected goals. A qualitative case study is ideal because it will provide rich intel on the experiences of college students with ADHD disclosure patterns and accommodation use. The strength of the design lies in analyzing in person, artifact review, and focus group data to identify, validate, and enhance the research findings through triangulation. The following chapter reveals some of the results achieved with this research design.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of the qualitative case study was to understand what motivates college students with ADHD to use accommodations to help enhance the service delivery of DSP. Purposeful sampling yielded three sophomore and junior participants with ADHD at the mid-sized private university. Three individuals participated in the initial interview, while two completed the second follow-up interview session. It was challenging to locate participants for the study during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the symptoms of ADHD added another layer of difficulty in scheduling interviews. A successful interview resulted from multiple outreaches, numerous reminders, and at least two rescheduled sessions.

The sample consisted of all females, one Hispanic and two Caucasians. The participants shared commonalities, such as being enrolled in the special education at the high school level and having significant family support. In addition, they enrolled in college services remotely via email and telephone. Not one of the participants had ever experienced an in-person meeting with the collegiate DSP.

All interviews were conducted via Zoom, a web video conference platform, and were approximately 30-45 minutes in length. Semistructured interviews were conducted using a survey instrument of 18 questions designed to reveal information about the student disclosure experience and motivations for accommodation usage. Students were also free to share disability documentation to address specific questions during the interviews. The coding techniques of Vivo, Values, and Emotions were utilized "to attribute interpreted meaning to each individual datum for later purposes detection, categorization, assertion or proposition development, theory-building, and other analytic purposes" (Saldana, 2016, p. 4). This, coupled with direct quotations, added context and shape to the participant's experience.

To supplement the information discovered in the interviews, a focus group consisting of two professors and a DSP was conducted using a survey instrument of 10 questions. The questions were crafted to help fill in the details of participants' experiences regarding motivation, disclosure, and accommodations. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study, including essential themes supported by participants' statements from the in-depth interviews and confirmed by focus group feedback as appropriate. The results detailed in Chapter 4 assist in answering the following research questions associated with this study:

RQ1: How do sophomores and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?

RQ2: How do sophomores and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?

RQ3: How do sophomores and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations? The interviews and focus groups yielded insightful themes that get to the heart of the research questions.

Participant Profiles

Understanding the experiences and background of each participant helped shape the feedback and interpretation of the results. Simple pseudonyms such as Participants 1, 2, and 3 were utilized to help protect the participants' identities.

Participant 1

She is a Caucasian female diagnosed with ADHD and Asperger's Syndrome. Her appointment occurred via Zoom; however, she was outside on a patio during the interview session. Her camera was set-up to capture her face and did not reveal any of her attire. She appeared distracted and not fully engaged in the conversation with our eyes darting back and

forth from the screen to her surroundings frequently. There was one moment, when a dog having puppies caught her attention, and she paused the interview to look at the animal. After approximately 20 seconds of silence, she was able to reconnect with the interview. Even then it took her a second to figure out where we left off in the conversation. Her overall demeanor in the interview was nonchalant and she remained that way throughout the discussion.

Participant 1 reported that ADHD runs in her family, with her uncle and mother having an ADHD diagnosis. She registered for services and supports online based on the recommendations of her high school counselor. Participant 1 identified her ADHD symptoms to include disorganization, impulsiveness, forgetfulness, difficulty focusing, and poor emotional regulation. She is the only participant that revealed that she was taking medication for ADHD and did not appear to be taking it consistently.

Although Participant 1 spoke well of her overall college experience, she discussed a bullying incident that led her to lash out inappropriately on campus. As she talked about this moment, she struggled with finding the right words to classify her emotions. Her face looked pained as she recalled her feelings and the reactions of others to her outburst of anger. The incident resulted in her being enrolled in counseling services, and during the interview, she indicated that she was still trying "to make sense" of the event.

Participant 2

Participant 2, also a Caucasian female, chose to complete her interview in her room, so that she could be focused. She maintained eye contact with the camera the entire duration and did not have any distractions. She was animated throughout the interview often gesturing to emphasize her comments and particular points. Although not overly excited, she exhibited energy as she addressed each question.

In addition, she was thankful to her parents for supporting her ADHD and collegiate efforts. Her mother taught special education in the public-school setting and was very understanding and supportive throughout her academic career. Like Participant 1, she referenced a family history of ADHD, besides herself, her sister has ADHD.

Participant 2 has always struggled in school; however, the services and support she has received in college have helped her exceed her secondary education academic performance. Her ADHD symptoms include difficulty focusing, being easily overwhelmed, and poor time management, which she reports is effectively managed in college.

Participant 3

Participant 3 a Hispanic female described the strongest parental involvement and proudly referred to her mother as her biggest advocate. She reports a co-diagnosis of ADHD and dyslexia and heavily relies on services and supports. At the start of the interview, our cameras where not on and she struggled with the first question and appeared discombobulated. Once we both turned on our cameras, she seemed engaged.

After the cameras were situated, she was very energetic, yet, appeared scattered in her responses. She used several "yeah" and "um like" phrases to connect her thoughts. She often became lost in her responses and had to check back in to confirm the initial question. Like Participant 2, she was animated and used her hands to gesture and emphasize key points. Overall, she appeared outgoing and maintained eye contact with the camera during the conversation. There were no external distractions, however, she often touched her hair, either moving it from her face or tucking it behind her ear.

Unlike the other participants, she has connected her condition to a higher purpose. Participant 3 feels like the "lord made her this way" so that she can help others overcome ADHD

as well. She hopes to establish a social club at school that will allow individuals with learning disabilities to share their stories and support one another. She exhibited some of the strongest self-determination attributes. Participant 3's ADHD symptoms include difficulty focusing, poor time management and planning, and disorganization. She views her symptoms as significant and feels that her success in college is dependent on the services and support that she receives.

Coding Analysis

In accordance with the established methodology, three coding passes were used to analyze the data, In Vivo, values, and emotion. The top three codes for each coding pass are reflected in Table 1.

Table 1

Top Three Codes Resulting From In Vivo, Values, and Emotions Analysis

Analysis	Result 1	Result 2	Result 3
In Vivo	Be Like Others	Different than others	It's a struggle
Values	Belief that High School is different	Value Education	Belief that ADHD is for a reason
Emotion	Weird, Bad	Unashamed	Confident

In Vivo, coding utilizes short terms from the qualitative data to give meaning to the experience (Strauss, 1987). The top three codes revolve around the individual's identity with others and the struggle ADHD causes with self and others. For example, Participant 2 talks about feeling different than others who do not use accommodations, "it definitely makes you feel you're a bit different because everyone doesn't have to have them, right." Throughout the interviews, all participants had short phrases that echoed how they fit into social groups and the tensions there. Table 2 captures three quotes from the participants that support the In Vivo codes, be like others, different than others, and the belief that ADHD is for a reason.

Table 2

Statements From Participants to Support In Vivo Codes

Participant	Be like others	Different than others	Belief that ADHD is for a reason
Participant 1	"So, this semester I noticed that the accommodation thing would have you come to a separate room. I kind of wanted to be with the other students."	"So, test questions aren't really made for people like me. I guess they are made for more normal people"	"I suggested I had ADHD to my mom because I was struggling in high school and I thought I had an attention issue."
Participant 2	"Okay, somewhat of a normal thing in society, people have disabilities and sometimes need extra help."	"Well like with my academics, I always kind of felt like an outsider"	"It's like, there's like, some blessings in disguise that I've learned with ADHD."
Participant 3	"I always thought like, if everyone else can do it, what can't I?"	"I felt like I was struggling a lot harder than I should be. I was like, I don't know if this is how much a person should be struggling."	"But maybe someday I'll be able to help other people who go through the same thing (ADHD) and be able to like, look I was in your shoes, and I totally get it. Let me help you."

Values coding consists of a participant's values, attitudes, and beliefs and sheds light on those internal factors that influence the perspectives and actions of participants (Saldana, 2016). Some values, beliefs, or attitudes that shaped participants' thoughts and actions were based on high school experiences and fundamental ideas. When speaking about their high school versus college experiences, all participants agreed that high school is different than college. Participant 1 noted how the accommodations provided changed, "in high school, I had extensions on due

dates, but now I have the same due dates as everyone else, so that has been hard." The change in setting from secondary to postsecondary proved to be a challenge for participants. Despite this difference, the participants were still motivated to navigate through any obstacles because they valued education. They all felt like education was the key to a productive and meaningful future.

Although having ADHD was not intentional, two of the three participants believed that it was for a reason. Whether it is for building character or influencing the lives of others, there was this belief that having ADHD was not in vain or a random accident. As Participant 3 reflected, "the Lord made me this way for a reason." Table 3 captures three quotes from the participants that support the values codes, belief that high school is different, value education, and it is a struggle.

Table 3

Statements From Participants to Support Values Codes

Participant	Belief that high school is different	Value education	It's a struggle
Participant 1	"I feel like if High School was more framed like college, I would be doing better than I have been."	"It was during one of my accommodations meetings, we spoke about college, and what we would need to do following that." *(College was her identified next step)*	"Even in counseling, I felt like I was being demonized and interrogated. And I even told them, I have ADHD and they still kind of treated me that way."
Participant 2	"Well in high school, I was very insecure about telling people that I have ADHD because there was kind of like a stigmatism against it. But in college I am more open with it"	"So, it's kind like a mix routine. I'm pleasing myself and my family and all that" (*by going to college*)	"You know college is difficult with this disability"
Participant 3	"I feel like my ADHD has gotten slightly worse when it comes to being in college, probably because it is a new environment."	"We are here (in college) because we want to learn and it might be a little bit harder for us.	"ADHD has caused me to struggle a lot harder than I thought I was going to."

Emotions coding notes participants' feelings recalled or experienced (Saldana, 2016). Overall, the feelings varied throughout the interviews; however, a few appeared frequently. For example, feeling weird is attributed to being different and bad when their academic performance was not good, or they accepted accommodations. Participant 1 shared, "I felt weird asking for an extended time; I feel bad about doing that." For participants, there were moments associated with these feelings. While other times were marked with feelings of being unashamed and confident.

Participant 2 declared that "I shouldn't be ashamed of this (of having ADHD)." Table 4 captures

three quotes from the participants that support the emotions codes, weird or bad, unashamed, and

confident.

Table 4

Statements from Participants to Support Emotions Codes

	Weird, Bad	Unashamed	Confident
Participant 1	"I feel kind of weird asking for extended time, I feel kind of bad about doing that."	"I wasn't fazed by it" *(when describing the disclosure and accommodation process)*	"I feel like that's just an issue in general with ADHD, it's more normalized, so people can say I have ADHD."
Participant 2	"I kind of felt like the black sheep of my grade."	"I felt like going into college, I shouldn't really hide anything." "I shouldn't be ashamed of this."	"I feel more confident in my self-worth like with my ADHD than I was at the beginning."
Participant 3	"I always thought like, why am I too lazy? Why can't I just figure things out for myself? Why can't like why am I not good enough."	"I have ADHD and that is okay."	"Yes, I do feel comfortable talking about my disability. I don't mind if my friends have questions, if my parents have questions."

The codes are well supported by the statements of the participants found in Tables 2-4 that

provide glimpses of their lived experiences from different lenses.

Identified Themes

The codes paved the way for the discovery of the themes that directly support the

research questions by creating more manageable units to help expedite analysis and extract

greater meaning from the interviews (Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). Data analysis of the three

student interviews and faculty focus group sessions revealed five key themes connected with motivation, disclosure, or accommodation usage and barriers (see Table 5). All three interviewees (100%) made statements that generated the themes that provide insight into the motivations to disclose a disability, the decision to use accommodations, and any barriers that may prohibit access to those services and support.

Table 5

Summary of Themes & Associated Research Question

Theme	Motivation	Disclosure	Accommodation (Usage)	Accommodation (Barriers)
Successful/Family	X	X	X	
Parental/High School Support		X	X	
No in-person Access		X	X	
Trial and Error			X	X
ADHD Symptoms				X

Theme 1: Successful/Family

Each participant identified two motivations for outreaching a DSP to embark on the accommodation journey, their desire to be successful in a school or career setting and their need to please their family. For Participant 1, during a conversation with her high school counselor about ways to succeed in college, she was directed to a DSP. "I talked to my high school counselor about accommodations in college, and she told me to look into each private university because it would be different depending on the university." Once she settled on the college, she researched engaging in the accommodations process and the requirements. For Participant 1, she followed the advice of her high school guidance counselor because she wanted to be successful in college.

Participant 2 was more specific about completing college for her family, financial status, and self-confidence, stating:

> The university is kind of expensive school, and I don't want to waste money. So I thought about my family and finances. I also thought about my self-confidence, because if I do not do as well as I could have done, then I will be kicking myself constantly. So it's kind of like a mixed routine. I'm pleasing myself and my family.

The participant's statement conveys the need to do well in college for her family, future, and to use money effectively. This speaks to her motivation to obtain accommodations to solidify her college success. Participant 3 initially enrolled at the mid-sized private university without any accommodations or collegiate support and quickly struggled academically. Her desire to turn around her academics and be successful in college prompted her to seek out help.

> Without help, I feel like I was struggling a lot harder than I should be. I was like, I don't know if this is how much a person should be struggling. So, I was like, you know what, I think I should go and contact Alpha.

The need to change academic failures into successes motivated Participant 3 to disclose. All three participants were motivated to disclose their ADHD diagnosis to obtain the assistance needed (accommodations) to do well in college for their family and future careers or to preserve their confidence in their abilities.

Theme 2: Parental/High School Support

As noted, all participants identified and described a high level of involvement from their parents and the high school special education staff. It was apparent from the interviews that the guidance from both parties directly influenced decisions and actions regarding disclosure and accommodations, as well as shaped their attitudes towards the experience.

Participant 1 recalls a meeting in her senior year of high school to determine the next steps after graduation. "Oh, yeah, it was during one of my accommodation meetings, we spoke about college and what we would need to do following that, and providing documentation, they helped provide documentation to the university." The information provided at the high school setting prepared Participant 1 for the documentation requirements at the collegiate level.

For Participant 2, her mother's influence helped her start the accommodations journey.

I heard about it when I was touring the university because my mom brought up the question with our tour guide, or it was either my tour guide or my academic advisor; it was just like, okay, she has ADHD, she will need accommodations, where can she get them? And so, I filled out a link last summer, just like providing my documentation. And then, I met with [redacted], and then she set up my accommodations with me.

The mother's inquiring about the process opened the door for Participant 2 to disclose her ADHD condition to receive accommodations. Participant 2 indicated that her mother's support was key to helping her manage ADHD.

Similar to Participant 2, Participant 3 also discussed how her mother's support and encouragement helped her identify and manage ADHD.

My mom is actually my biggest advocate. She was the one, when all through elementary school and she's like, no, there's something different with my child, we need to find out what it is, and everyone else is kind of like, Nah, she's fine. It's just a normal thing that that happens at this age. Like, she'll be fine. Even though I wasn't, I wasn't fine. So, my mom was actually my biggest advocate, and she was really willing to help me. Um, she's really willing to go further than and is willing to get me the help that I need, which I absolutely love.

Based on other descriptions and comments of Participant 3 regarding her mother, she appeared to have the highest level of parental involvement compared to the other study participants. As demonstrated by the participants' statements, parental involvement and high school support served as drivers for them to feel comfortable disclosing their disability and obtaining accommodations.

Theme 3: No In-Person Access

Amid the COVID-19 pandemic, it is no surprise that all study participants initiated and obtained services virtually without any physical contact with an individual. None of the participants felt like this virtual process negatively impacted the accommodations process or the quality of the services. When researching the DSP, Participant 1 felt it was easy to locate the necessary information to request accommodations. She reports the following, "I just Googled it. I would say it was pretty easy." After finding the right contacts online, she followed up with an email that eventually led to her accessing key services. She described the entire process as simple to understand.

> Participant 2 further details the virtual process and the submission of the documentation. I got the information; then I sent in my documentation. And then I filled out like this Google form, kind of introducing myself, and then I set up and like, a Zoom meeting with [redacted], and then we discussed everything.

Overall, the virtual encounter was described as helpful and valuable to the participant in obtaining the necessary support.

An email initiated the process for Participant 3, who inquired about services after finding the contact information on the website.

I think it took me a while to actually go in, and contact them, but I ended up emailing

them first. I ended up contacting them through email and was like, hey, look; I'm

struggling; I need a little bit of help. And they were really willing to be like, okay, we'll

get you connected to all the right people and help you there. And so, yeah, that was

helpful. I think I found that email on the website.

The majority of participants had a successful interaction with the school website that led

to the acquisition of services and support. In addition, the DSP mentioned that the virtual

enrollment process works well with servicing many students with a limited number of people.

"And, another component is like, we're a small office, you know, I manage the online side by

myself. And then there's me and maybe one or two other people." Through the testimonies of

students and staff (focus group), the virtual process worked well for students and staff alike.

Also, it is important to note that all three participants had services and support in high school,

which served as a foundation for understanding the basics of obtaining services. What is

unknown is whether a person who did not participate in special education in high school would

have found the virtual process meaningful.

Theme 4: Trial and Error

The participants all received accommodations through a virtual enrollment process;

however, each selected which supports to use based on the class type and how much they

struggled with the subject. This evaluative process can be described as a trial-and-error strategy

that directly determines accommodation usage.

Participant 1 details the importance of prioritizing accommodations for classes that worry

her. "I guess I was less worried about my classes this semester, so I didn't prioritize it. But last

semester, I did feel like I really needed to." When Participant 1 was concerned about her success

in the class, the assigned accommodations became a priority. This suggests that when she feels comfortable with a class, accommodations are deprioritized; therefore, not used.

The class structure dictates which accommodations will be used as well. Participant 2 describes the interaction with university professors to help her in selecting the right accommodation.

> So, I usually send my accommodations, like the week before class starts. And then, depending on how the class is set up, my professors will either email me back saying they want to talk about it, like after the first day of class, or they will also say, sometimes, oh, that's how the class works, you will not need those accommodations.

This is an example of a university professor's role in using accommodations. However, this approach is not praised by all faculty members. Focus group participant 2 stated,

> So the trial and error that students are going through and figuring out when and when they don't need them. I think it freaks me out as a faculty member; it freaked me out from a disability service provider perspective because there's a lot at stake for that trial-and-error course. By course, by course. Assignment by assignment.

The recommended approach is to use accommodations for all courses to get consistent support.

Contrary to Participants 1 and 2, Participant 3 started college without any support and later obtained assistance.

> I'm like, I'm gonna try to go without accommodation to see if I can do it. Spoiler alert. I couldn't do it. So I ended up getting in contact with the Alpha program at the beginning of last semester. And, um, and was like, hey, look, I need some help. Please help.

Participant 3 was academically successful in high school, which gave her the confidence to try college without services and support. The idea of trial and error was identified as a barrier

to fully utilizing services and supports. Instead of students using the services and support consistent with each class, the trial-and-error system implemented allowed for them to select accommodations based on the difficulty level, professor input, and type of class. When Participant 2 was asked if she consulted with others, such as the DSP, before making any selections, she reported that she did not; however, it was a good idea.

Theme 5: ADHD Symptoms

Another barrier to accessing accommodations was the ADHD symptoms of lack of attention, forgetfulness, and poor time management. For example, Participant 1 did not access one of her accommodations because she forgot. "I'm not gonna lie. I, I should have signed up for the extension on the exams, but I did not. I honestly kept forgetting to." The result of the forgetfulness was that Participant 1 never used extended exam time, even though she had exams in the class. She simply weathered through the storm.

Focus group Participant 2 confirmed that forgetfulness is a common reason students do not use accommodations. "And for ADHD, I think one of the reasons that students don't ask for accommodations is they forgot to. Seriously." Students and faculty members agree that the ADHD symptoms associated with forgetfulness are barriers to accommodations. For students with ADHD, forgetfulness occurs when their attention is diverted to multiple things.

Even with multiple accommodations, Participant 2 does not allocate the time to inform her professors of the assigned services and support.

> I always automatically send in my five accommodations to all my teachers. I haven't done
> that for the summer. So, I'm halfway through the class. So that's my fault. But I need to
> get around to it. I just haven't gotten around to it.

As a result of not making time to notify her professors of her support, she never fully used her services and support. Similar to Participant 1, she weathered the storm.

Only one individual, Participant 3, referenced difficulty in navigating the system that made it easy for her not to use accommodations.

It's not because I didn't want to use them. It's just because I didn't know how to set it up. So that was my doing. It would probably be the private testing room was the one that I really struggled with getting and figuring out because I didn't know where to find it.

Participant 3 never reached out for help in navigating the testing center challenge because time and other factors got in the way. However, she does not consider this a significant loss because her classes were online. This was also an example of services and support not being adequately adjusted to account for virtual environments or some of the unique challenges of COVID-19.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the overarching themes that spoke to the motivations to access and use accommodations in the college setting for students diagnosed with ADHD. The themes were gleaned from semistructured interviews with three participants with artifacts and focus group feedback support. The exploration of the participant's experience with managing ADHD in college provided rich insight into understanding how institutes of higher education can structure services and supports. The next chapter will dive further into the discussion related to the research questions, literature, theoretical framework, and resulting recommendations.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Postsecondary education provides a solid foundation for gaining meaningful employment and may increase the quality of life for those able complete a course of study. College attendance statistics show there has been a significant increase in SWD on university campuses during the past 25 years (Mamboleo, Dong, Anderson, & Molder, 2020). SWD, particularly those with ADHD, have difficulty performing well at the collegiate level due to limitations in notetaking, prioritizing assignments, and time management (Cohen et al., 2020). These limitations prompted governing bodies to institute a system of services and supports to help SWD successfully earn a degree. This system requires the SWD to register with a DSP and request and utilize accommodations (Toutain, 2019). However, only 11% of SWD seek or receive accommodations in the postsecondary setting (Cohen et al., 2020).

The purpose of this study is to explore the motivations of students to disclose their disability and to use or decline accommodations. Through qualitative study and analysis, information is gleaned from the real-life experiences of sophomores and juniors on how they are navigating college diagnosed with ADHD. Chapter 5 examines the participant's responses and applicable interpretations related to the three research questions and past literature. The chapter concludes by exploring the relationship between findings and the theoretical framework, study limitations, and recommendations for further research.

Discussion of Findings in Relation to Past Literature

This section connects the findings to the applicable research question and past literature. Table 5 summarizes the themes associated with the research questions.

Research Question 1

How do sophomores and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?

All three participants describe their virtual disclosure of their disability as easy and effective. In fact, "research indicates no significant difference in students' attitude toward requesting accommodations online or in face-to-face learning environments" (Mamboleo, Dong, & Fais, 2020, p. 79). Even coordinating services and supports with professors is initiated and completed via email with very few in-person interactions. Participant 3 shared how she emails the professors at the start of each semester to notify them of her accommodations, which seemed to work well. All these steps are aligned with how research documents the accommodations process, "the participants first approach a DSP; they meet with the DSP, have ongoing contact with the DSP, and implement the accommodations" (Lyman et al., 2016, p. 129).

With respect to potential negative feelings associated with disclosure, the participants reported that they had no significant issues or negative feelings with disclosing their condition. In addition, they report that their high school experiences with disability services produced a comfort level with using a DSP in college. However, research findings reveal that high school experiences are helpful to some and not others. According to Newman et al. (2020), "nearly two-thirds of post-secondary students who received special education services in high school do not disclose their disability when they attend college" (p. 6). Yet, this is not true for the participants who align with the other side of the research debate. Another study found that students' high school experiences helped them understand their disability and led them to disclose to a DSP in college (O'Shea & Meyer, 2016). The study confirms that there are two sides to this discussion.

Not only did respondents feel comfortable with working with their DSP provider, but they also demonstrated an acceptance of their disability as part of their identity. Students who exhibit this level of acceptance fall into the category of "self-attribute" based on research by O'Shea and Meyer (2016). Students classified as "self-attribute" make statements that embrace their disability and show signs of taking ownership of managing their condition (O'Shea & Meyer, 2016). Also, research shows that "students who can reframe their understanding come to see how Learning Disability or ADHD is not an academic deficit, but rather an integral part of who they are and how they operate in the world" (Connor, 2012, p. 17). The participants demonstrated this reframing through comments such as "the Lord made me this way" and "I am this way for a reason." Overall, the participants describe the disclosure of their disability as effective, and their experiences fit into the body of research.

Research Question 2

How do sophomores and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?

The participants described the decision to use or decline accommodations based on motivators such as pleasing one's family, being successful in school, and the desire to gain meaningful employment. In line with Wehmeyer's self-determination theory, it is these motivators that enabled the participants to serve as a causal agent, "an individual that makes or causes things to happen in his or her life to accomplish a specific end or to cause or create change" (Wehmeyer & Abery, 2013, p. 399). For the participants accessing accommodations was a means to achieve their goals. The desire to be successful in college required them to communicate their needs, evaluate their performance, develop a sense of empowerment, and be

aware of their own strengths, weaknesses, and limitations (Hong, 2015, p. 210). All of which are key components of the self-determination theory.

After considering what drives the decision to access or decline accommodations, it is also important to note how participants utilize accommodations. Participants discussed the "trial and error" concept of figuring out which accommodations were useful per class. Instead of using all assigned services and supports, they would wait and see how the class evolved before tapping into the needed resources. According to research, this is not odd for students with disabilities to stop using or not use accommodations they did not find practical or useful for courses (Lyman et al., 2016).

Research Question 3

How do sophomores and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?

The participants in this study did not identify any external barriers to using their accommodations. The enrollment with the DSP was adequate, the documentation review went well, and services and supports were identified promptly. In light of this, there did not appear to be institutional barriers to accommodation use. The barriers most noted by participants were associated with their ADHD symptoms, such as lack of organization, poor time management, and forgetfulness.

Two participants recalled not using accommodations because they simply forgot to use them or failed to send the email to the professor. Research confirms that ADHD symptoms such as "inattention, impulsivity, and hyperactivity create challenges to academic success because of poor time management and organizational skills, difficulty staying focused, and failure to complete work on time" (Meaux et al., 2009, p. 251). Persistent ADHD symptoms hinder the individual's ability to use accommodations assigned to them by the DSP.

Limitations

Although the results of the study bring to life several themes and motivations, there are some limitations. The primary issue was with the research samples and selection. It took roughly 4-5 months to recruit the three participants for the study during the COVID-19 pandemic, and it is unclear how the pandemic influenced the results. Also, the participants lacked significant diversity in gender and race, which may limit the perspective about the accommodation process. For example, research shows that women are more likely to seek help or disclose their mental illness than men when faced with stress or challenging situations (Mamboleo, Dong, & Fais, 2020). This social trend was unable to be explored in this study, for the participants were all women with substantial family support.

Recommendations for Practice

Research and college admissions numbers suggest that the number of students with disabilities attending college is increasing (Miller et al., 2019). With this type of growth, the DSP needs to understand how to serve this population. One of the essential points gleaned from the study is the importance of the family unit to SWD. All participants discussed the support of families and friends in helping them identify and manage their ADHD. This finding is consistent with literature where other studies have found that participants detail positive relationships with families and friends and how their continued presence helped them to be successful in college (Meaux et al., 2009). This recommendation allows DSP to tap into these relationships to help build postsecondary support for SWD. Therefore, it is recommended that DSP staff communicate with parents on a case-by-case basis by first talking with students to gain consent (Francis et al., 2018). Once the student consents, then the DSP can utilize collaborative meetings with students

and families, send newsletter updates, and allow families to participate in academic counseling sessions (Francis et al., 2018).

In addition, research confirms that students with family involvement tend to have self-determination attributes. Family members provide students with support, information, and guidance that helps to empower them (Francis et al., 2019). With literature pointing to the need for self-determination skills in college to help transition from high school and navigating accommodations in college, DSP providers that can use the family unit to build these skills are essential (Wu & Molina, 2019). For example, Participant 3 notes that her mother "really helped her along with her journey." With that support, she has acquired accommodations and is trying to help others with learning disabilities manage their college life.

With the recommendation of tapping into family support, it is also important to note that the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act limits the involvement and interactions of family and college professionals (Francis et al., 2018). In light of this, it is critical that DSP obtain waivers and use collaborative strategies to ensure that the student leads any discussions and decisions.

The results not only spoke to family support but highlighted the importance of providing a proper transition from high school to college for SWD. All three participants were involved in high school special education services and utilized accommodations. Based on their description of their high school experiences, they were empowered and encouraged to seek similar services in the postsecondary environment. According to research, special education programs in high school "prepare students for postsecondary education by connecting students early with disability services offices, ensuring that evaluations used to obtain accommodations are current, and sharing critical information about how to access services in college" (Schechter, 2018, p.

341). DSPs that strive to partner with high schools to develop transition plans are aligning with best practices and assisting in setting up SWD for success.

The study also spoke to ADHD symptoms posing as a barrier to using accommodations. All the participants had at least one experience of not accessing accommodations due to the symptoms of ADHD, such as poor time management, lack of focus, and forgetfulness. Past studies have found that SWD attempts to use accommodations were impacted by their disability symptoms, especially when "disabilities impact them differently in different situations, and to degrees, they were unable to anticipate" (Toutain, 2019).

There are several interventions addressed in the research that can offset this disadvantage. It is recommended that the DSP help students set alarms and reminders, remove distractions, and schedule key events or actions (Meaux et al., 2009). If possible, DSP may also want to consider adopting some of these strategies, such as sending an email or text alerts reminding students to send accommodations notifications to professors at the start of the semester.

Another proven method of managing ADHD symptoms is coaching, an approach that entails working with a professional to develop plans and strategies to reach goals (Green & Rabiner, 2012). Participant 3 introduced coaching as a tool for helping her combat the negative impact of her ADHD symptoms. She credits the coach with helping her, "the coach was very helpful and was able to help me not be overwhelmed all the time by all my grades and all my homework. And she helped me find a system that's really beneficial." Also, researchers have found that coaching is an effective tool for students with ADHD and can assist with developing effective self-regulatory behaviors (Green & Rabiner, 2012). Not only does coaching enhance self-regulatory behaviors, but studies also indicate that it was associated with increasing an individual's grade point average (GPA) by .02 points (DuPaul et al., 2017).

Similar to coaching, students participating in programs to develop organization, time management, and planning (OTMP) skills have a track record of success. Building OTMP skills occurred through a series of sessions on time management and organization and opportunities to apply information gained. Students who completed the OTMP intervention report felt that it benefited them academically and added to their confidence (LaCount et al., 2018). Even though OTMP was received, it does not appear to be a strong fit for the participants because it is often conducted in a group setting and is limited to time management and disorganization.

Coaching sessions can incorporate participants' needs and are often conducted on a one-to-one basis. "Coaching can focus on behavioral, emotional, and cognitive outcomes and building life skills to change negative outcomes and beliefs" (Prevatt & Young, 2014, p. 188). Participant 3 described her interactions with her coach as connecting, which speaks to the significance of the interaction. The best intervention fit for ADHD students is one that can address them holistically.

University campuses that do not cultivate a culture of diversity, acceptance, and empowerment will struggle to implement the recommendations and support SWD. Administrators must be willing to coordinate the respective departments (i.e., marketing, strategic communications, office of disability, enrollment, student life, operations, etc.) to modify the campus environment to fulfill this goal. For example, when planning services and support for students, systems should be designed to research and evaluate accommodations, assess usage, and obtain student feedback (Costello-Harris, 2019). This will ensure that the office of disability services is providing relevant options to SWD that yield the greatest benefit. Studies also suggest that redesigning the website can assist in creating an inclusive academic environment. Listing information (e.g., student organizations for SWD, accommodations

choices, and advertising tutoring services) make it easier for students to locate and access needed resources (Costello-Harris, 2019). The website adjustments and the advertisement of those changes can be done through the marketing and strategic communications department.

Also, administrators can mobilize faculty advisor councils to address gaps in faculty knowledge on reasonable accommodations, various disabilities, and inclusion (Fleming, Plotner, et al., 2017). These are some of the examples found in research that college administrators can employ to transform the college campus. It is evident that university leadership sets the stage for diversity, inclusion, and acceptance on the campus and coordinators the various departments to achieve this vision.

Recommendations for Future Research

Due to the limited number of participants in the study, future research is needed that includes more participants to provide deeper insight into the disclosure habits and accommodation usage of students with ADHD in the private religious university setting. Also, more comprehensive research in this setting will determine if there are unique attributes with this student population than other public educational settings. For example, this study resulted in a homogenous sample of women who had been diagnosed while still in high school. Other populations that include diversity of gender, race, onset, and diagnosis should be investigated with the same design.

Aligned with the recommendations for practice, additional research on how to create a supportive network for students at the collegiate level that does not violate individual rights or applicable laws will extend the support often received in high school to the postsecondary arena. Developing programs and evidence-based practices for building a strong community for college

students with ADHD may be beneficial in increasing the degree achievement rate for this population.

Conclusions

This study was designed to explore what motivates college students with ADHD to access accommodations to provide DSP insight into the decision processes associated with accommodations for students with ADHD. The study's findings were based on qualitative interviews and a comprehensive literature review. This study shed light on the motivations for accessing accommodations and the decision to use or decline services and supports in a college setting.

Participants' lived experiences align with literature and support internal and external factors motivate students to seek services and support, and ADHD symptoms can be a barrier to using accommodations. Also, the result contributes to the body of knowledge on accommodation usage in students with disabilities, specifically ADHD, by providing recommendations to facilitate accommodation usage.

References

Abreu, M., Hillier, A., Frye, A., & Goldstein, J. (2016). Student experiences utilizing disability support services in a university setting. *College Student Journal*, *50*(3), 323–328. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1112130.pdf

Aquino, K. C., & Bittinger, J. D. (2019). The self-(un) identification of disability in higher education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability*, *32*(1), 5–19. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1217454.pdf

Barnard-Brak, L., Lechtenberger, D., & Lan, W. Y. (2010). Accommodation strategies of college students with disabilities. *Qualitative Report*, *15*(2), 411–429. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ875262.pdf

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544–559. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573

Braithwaite, D. O. (1991). "Just how much did that wheelchair cost?": Management of privacy boundaries by persons with disabilities. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *55*(3), 254–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570319109374384

Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing*. Oxford University Press.

Cohen, A. K., Hoyt, L. T., & Dull, B. (2020). A descriptive study of COVID-19 related experiences and perspectives of a national sample of college students in Spring 2020. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *67*(3), 369–375. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.06.009

Cole, E. V., & Cawthon, S. W. (2015). Self-disclosure decision of university students with

    learning disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *28*(2), 163–179.

    https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1074663.pdf

Connor, D. J. (2012). Helping students with disabilities transition to college. *Teaching*

    Exceptional Children, *44*(5), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005991204400502

Cook, L., Rumrill, P. D., & Tankersley, M. (2009). Priorities and understanding of faculty

    members regarding college students with disabilities. *International Journal of Teaching*

    and Learning in Higher Education, *21*(1), 84–96.

    https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ896246.pdf

Cope, G. D. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative

    research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *41*(1), 89–91. https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.89-91

Costello-Harris, V. A. (2019). Evidence of inclusion on college websites: Academic

    accommodations and human support. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and*

    Disability, *32*(3), 263–278. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1236850.pdf

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among*

    five approaches (4th ed.). Sage.

Daviso, R. L., & Textor, A. (2013). Modifications and accommodations for students with

    disabilities in vocational education programs. *International Journal of Vocational*

    Education & Training, *21*(2), 45–57.

De Cesarei, A. (2015). Psychological factors that foster or deter the disclosure of disability by

    university students. *Psychological Reports: Disability & Trauma*, *116*(3), 665–673.

    https://doi.org/10.2466/15.PR0.116k26w9

Deckoff-Jones, A., & Duell, M. N. (2018). Perceptions of appropriateness of accommodations for university students: Does disability type matter? *Rehabilitation Psychology*, *63*(1), 68–76. https://doi.org/10.1037/rep0000213

De Vries, R. S., & Schmitt, A. J. (2012). Postsecondary disability service providers' perceived usefulness of a model summary of performance. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *25*(4), 283–296. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1002141.pdf

DuPaul, G. J., Franklin, M. K., Pollack, B. L., Stack, K. S., Jaffe, A. R., Gormley, M. J., Anastopoulos, A. D., & Weyandt, L. L. (2018). Predictors and trajectories of educational functioning in college students with and without attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *31*(2), 161–178. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6586431/

DuPaul, G. J., Pinho, T. D., Pollack, B. L., Gromley, M. J., & Laracy, S. D. (2017). First-year college students with ADHD and/or LD: Differences in engagement, positive core self-evaluation, school preparation, and college expectations. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *50*(3), 238–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219415617164

Field, S., Sarver, M. D., & Shaw, S. F. (2003). Self-determination: A key to success in postsecondary education for students with learning disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, *24*(6), 339–349. https://doi/org/10.1177/07419325030240060501

Fleming, A. R., Oertle, K. M., Plotner, A. J., & Hakun, J. G. (2017). Influence of social factors on student satisfaction among college students with disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *58*(2), 215–228. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0016

Fleming, A. R., Plotner, A. J., & Oertle, K. M. (2017). College students with disabilities: The relationship between student characteristics, the academic environment, and performance.

Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, *30*(3), 209–221.

https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1163997.pdf

Francis, G. L., Duke, J. M., Bringham, F. J., & Demetro, K. (2018). Student perceptions of

college-readiness, college services and supports, and family involvement in college: An

exploratory study. *Journal of Autism & Developmental Disorders*, *48*(10), 3573–3585.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-018-3622-x

Francis, G. L., Duke, J. M., Fujita, M., & Sutton, J. C. (2019). "It's a constant fight."

Experiences of college students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education

and Disability*, *32*(3), 247–262. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1236871.pdf

Gray, S. A., Fettes, P., Woltering, S., Mawjee, K., & Tannock, R. (2016). Symptom

manifestation and impairments in college students with ADHD. *Journal of Learning

Disabilities*, *49*(6), 616–630. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219415576523

Green, A. L., & Rabiner, D. L. (2012). What do we really know about ADHD in college

students? *Neurotherapeutics*, *9*, 559–568. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13311-012-0127-8

Hartung, C. M., Lefler, E. K., Canu, W. H., Stevens, A. E., Jaconis, M., LaCount, P. A., Shelton,

C. R., Leopold, D. R., & Willcutt, E. G. (2019). DSM-5 and other symptom thresholds

for ADHD: Which is the best predictor of impairment in college students? *Journal of

Attention Disorders*, *23*(13), 1637–1646. https://doi.org/10.1177.1087054716629216

Herbert, J. T., Welsh, W., Hong, B. S. S., Byun, S., Atkinson, H. A., & Kurz, C. A. (2014).

Persistence and graduation of college students seeking disability support services.

Journal of Rehabilitation, *80*(1), 22–32.

https://pennstate.pure.elsevier.com/en/publications/persistence-and-graduation-of-

college-students-seeking-disability

Hill, M. V., Bleicher, R. J., & Farma, J. M. (2020). A how-to guide: Virtual interviews in the era of social distancing. *Journal of Surgical Education*, *78*(1), 321–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/jsurg.2020.07.016

Hong, B. S. S. (2015). Qualitative analysis of the barriers college students with disabilities experience in higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, *56*(3), 209–226. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2015.0032

Huber, M. J., Oswald, G. R., Webb, T., & Avila-John, A. (2016). Degree completion and employment outcomes among graduates with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, *45*(3), 241–247. https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-160826

Keenan, W. R., Madaus, J. W., Lombardi, A. R., & Dukes, L. L. (2019). Impact of the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act on documentation for students with disabilities in transition to college: Implications for practitioners. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, *42*(1), 56–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143418809691

Kim, W. H., & Lee, J. (2016). The effect of accommodation on academic performance of college students with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *60*(1), 40–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355215605259

Krebs, E. (2019). Baccalaureates or burdens? Complicating "reasonable accommodations" for American college students with disabilities. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *39*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v39i3.6557

Kurth, N., & Mellard, D. (2006). Student perceptions of the accommodation process in postsecondary education. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *19*(1), 71–84. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ844625.pdf

Kwon, S. J., Kim, Y., & Kwak, Y. (2018). Difficulties faced by university students with self-reported symptoms of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: A qualitative study. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, *12*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-018-0218-3

LaCount, P. A., Hartung, C. M., Shelton, C. R., & Stevens, A. E. (2018). Efficacy of an organizational skills intervention for college students with ADHD symptomatology and academic difficulties. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, *22*(4), 356–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054715594423

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. Guilford.

Lefler, E. K., Sacchetti, G. M., & Del Carlo, D. I. (2016). ADHD in college: A qualitative analysis. *Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorders*, *8*(2), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12402-016-01090-9

Liamputtong, P. (2011). *Focus group methodology: Principles and practices*. Sage.

Lyman, M., Beecher, M. E., Griner, D., Brooks, M., Call, J., & Jackson, A. (2016). What keeps students with disabilities from using accommodations in postsecondary education? A qualitative review. *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability*, *29*(2), 123–140. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1112978.pdf

Mamboleo, G., Dong, S., Anderson, S., & Molder, A. (2020). Accommodation experience: Challenges and facilitators of requesting and implementing accommodations among college students with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, *53*, 43–54. https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-201084

Mamboleo, G., Dong, S., & Fais, C. (2020). Factors associated with disability self-disclosure to

    their professors among college students with disabilities. *Career Development and*

    Transition for Exceptional Individuals, *43*(2), 78–88.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/2165143419893360

Marshak, L., Van Wieren, T., Ferrell, D. R., Swiss, L., & Dugan, C. (2010). Exploring barriers to

    college student use of disability services and accommodations. *Journal of Postsecondary*

    Education and Disability, *22*(3), 151–165. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ906688.pdf

Meaux, J. B., Green, A., & Broussard, L. (2009). ADHD in the college student: A block in the

    road. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, *16*, 248–256.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.2008.01349.x

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Miller, S., Zayac, R., Paulk, A., & Lee, S. (2019). Disability accommodation requests:

    Prevalence and preference of review processes at postsecondary institutions in the United

    States. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *32*(3), 217–226.

    https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1236833.pdf

Morgan, D. L., & Spanish, M. T. (1984). Focus groups: A new tool for qualitative research.

    Qualitative Sociology, *7*(3), 253–270. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00987314

Newman, L. A., Madaus, J. W., Lalor, A. R., & Javitz, H. S. (2020). Effect of accessing supports

    on higher education persistence of students with disabilities. *Journal of Diversity in*

    Higher Education, *14*(3), 353–363. https://doi.org.10.1037/dhe000170

Niermann, H., & Scheres, A. (2014). The relation between procrastination and symptoms of

    attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in undergraduate students. *International*

Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, *23*(4), 411–421.

https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.1440

Nugent, K., & Smart, W. (2014). Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder in postsecondary

students. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, *10*, 1781–1791.

https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S64136

O'Shea, A., & Meyer, R. (2016). A qualitative investigation of the motivation of college students

with nonvisible disabilities to utilize disability services. *Journal of Postsecondary*

Education and Disability, *29*(1), 5–23. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1107472.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Powell, R. A., & Single, H. M. (1996). Focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in*

Healthcare, *8*(5), 499–504. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/8.5.499

Prevatt, F., & Young, J. L. (2014). Recognizing and treating attention-deficit/hyperactivity

disorder in college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, *28*(3), 182–200.

https://doi.org/10.1080/87568225.2014.914825

Reinschmiedt, H. J., Buono, F. D., Sprong, M. E., Upton, T. D., & Dallas, B. (2013).

Postsecondary students with disabilities receiving accommodations: A survey of

satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, *79*(3), 3–10.

https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/post-secondary-students-with-

disabilities/docview/1404746997/se-2

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. (2015). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.).

Sage.

Sacchetti, G. M., & Lefler, E. K. (2014). ADHD symptomology and social functioning in college

students. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, *21*(12), 1009–1019.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054714557355

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Sage.

Saldaña, J., & Omasta, M. (2018). *Qualitative research: Analyzing life.* Sage.

Schechter, J. (2018). University students with disabilities: Factors that contribute to their self-

predicted likelihood of graduation. *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability*,

31(4), 335–349. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1214186.pdf

Scheithauer, M. C., & Kelley, M. L. (2017). Self-monitoring by college students with ADHD:

The impact on academic performance. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, *21*(12), 1030–

1039. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054714553050

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education

and the social sciences.* Teachers College Press.

Shaw, S. F., Keenan, W. R., Madaus, J. W., & Banerjee, M. (2010). Disability determination, the

Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act, and the summary of performance:

How are they linked? *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *22*(3), 142–

150. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ906687.pdf

Simon-Dack, S. L., Rodriguez, P. D., & Marcum, G. D. (2016). Study habits, motives, and

strategies of college students with symptoms of ADHD. *Journal of Attention Disorders*,

20(9), 775–781. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054714543369

Singh, D. K. (2019). Educational rights of college students with disabilities. *College Student

Journal*, *53*(2), 243–251.

https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/prin/csj/2019/00000053/00000002/art00010

Squires, M. E., Burnell, B. A., McCarty, C., & Schnackenberg, H. (2018). Emerging adults: Perspectives of college students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *31*(2), 121–134. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1192068.pdf

Stamp, L., Banerjee, K., & Brown, F. C. (2014). Self-advocacy and perceptions of college readiness among students with ADHD. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *27*(2), 139–160. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1040529.pdf

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge University Press.

Sullivan, J. R. (2012). Skype: An appropriate method of data collection for qualitative interviews? *The Hilltop Review*, *6*(1), 10. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/hilltopreview/vol6/iss1/10

Summers, J. A., White, G. W., Zhang, E., & Gordon, J. M. (2014). Providing support to postsecondary students with disabilities to request accommodations: A framework for intervention. *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability*, *27*(3), 245–260. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1048787.pdf

Taylor, Z. (2018). The attention deficit: Can prospective and current students comprehend ADHD documentation guidelines? *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *55*(3), 285–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/19496591.2018.1474755

Terrell, S. R. (2016). *Writing a proposal for your dissertation: Guidelines and examples*. The Guilford Press.

Tetnowski, J. (2015). Qualitative case study research design. *Perspectives on Fluency & Fluency Disorders*, *25*(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1044/ffd25.1.39

Thompson-Ebanks, V. (2014). Personal factors that influence the voluntary withdrawal of undergraduates with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability*, *27*(2), 195–207. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1040539.pdf

Thompson-Ebanks, V., & Jarman, M. (2018). Undergraduate students with nonapparent disabilities identify factors that contribute to disclosure decisions. *International Journal of Disability, Development & Education*, *65*(3), 286–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2017.1380174

Tinklenberg, J., Patel, B., Gelman, K., & Albucher, R. (2018). Assessing adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in the university setting. *Journal of American College Health*, *66*(2), 141–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2017.1389733

Toutain, C. (2019). Barriers to accommodations for students with disabilities in higher education: A literature review. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *32*(3), 297–310. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1236832.pdf

Vance, T. A., & Weyandt, L. (2008). Professor perceptions of college students with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of American College Health*, *57*(3), 303–308. https://doi.org/10.3200/jach.57.3.303-308

Weis, R., Dean, E. L., & Osborne, K. J. (2014). Accommodation decision making for postsecondary students with learning disabilities: Individually tailored or one size fits all? *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *49*(5), 484–498. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219414559648

Wehmeyer, M. L. (2003). Self-determination, vocational rehabilitation, and workplace supports. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, *19*(2003), 67–69.

https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/17905/WehemeyerM_JVR_19(2)67
.pdf;sequence=1

Wehmeyer, M. L., & Abery, B. H. (2013). Self-determination and choice. *Intellectual &
Developmental Disabilities*, *51*(5), 399–411. https://doi.org/10.1352/1934-9556-51.5.399

Weis, R., Till, C. H., & Erickson, C. P. (2019). Assessing and overcoming the functional impact
of ADHD in college students: Evidence-based disability determination and
accommodation decision-making. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*,
32(3), 279–295. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1236801.pdf

Wood, W. L. M., Lewandowski, L. J., & Lovett, B. J. (2019). Profiles of diagnosed and
undiagnosed college students meeting ADHD symptom criteria. *Journal of Attention
Disorders*, *25*(5), 646–656. https://doi/org/10.1177/1087054718824991

Wu, I. C., & Molina, R. M., Jr. (2019). Self-determination of college students with learning and
attention challenges. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *32*(4), 359–375.
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1247134.pdf

Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and
Stake. *Qualitative Report*, *20*(2), 134–152.
https://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2102&context=tqr

Yin, K. R. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage.

Young, D. S., & Casey, E. A. (2019). An examination of the sufficiency of small qualitative
samples. *Social Work Research*, *43*(1), 53–58. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svy026

Yssel, N., Pak, N., & Beilke, J. (2016). A door must be opened: Perceptions of students with
disabilities in higher education. *International Journal of Disability, Development &
Education*, *63*(3), 384–394. https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2015.1123232

Appendix A: Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
Educating Students for Christian Service and Leadership Throughout the World

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
320 Hardin Administration Building, ACU Box 29103, Abilene, Texas 79699-9103
325-674-2885

January 12, 2021

Carol Haynes-Buchanan
Department of Educational Leadership
Abilene Christian University

Dear Carol,

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board, I am pleased to inform you that your project titled "Exploring the Motivations of College Students with ADHD to Disclose their Disability and Use Accommodations",

was approved by expedited review (Category 6 & 7) on 1/12/2021 (IRB # 20-210). Upon completion of this study, please submit the Inactivation Request Form within 30 days of study completion.

If you wish to make any changes to this study, including but not limited to changes in study personnel, number of participants recruited, changes to the consent form or process, and/or changes in overall methodology, please complete the Study Amendment Request Form.

If any problems develop with the study, including any unanticipated events that may change the risk profile of your study or if there were any unapproved changes in your protocol, please inform the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and the IRB promptly using the Unanticipated Events/Noncompliance Form.

I wish you well with your work.

Sincerely,

Megan Roth

Megan Roth, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Sponsored Programs

Our Promise: ACU is a vibrant, innovative, Christ-centered community that engages students in authentic spiritual and intellectual growth, equipping them to make a real difference in the world.

Appendix B: Initial Recruitment Email

Attention, Attention, All…..

Share Your Voice and Thoughts!

On behalf of Carol Haynes – Buchanan, you are invited to participate in a research study to find out why students with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) disclose their disability and choose to accept or decline accommodations. Students can volunteer to participate by agreeing to and electronically signing the informed consent form.

Students who choose to sign the consent form, will receive a link to schedule a 1-1.5-hour appointment for a virtual interview using Zoom. The risks associated with this study are anticipated to be minimal. The primary risks associated with this study include a breach of confidently or slight uncomfortableness when discussing an event or emotions associated with a disability. However, steps to minimize this risk will be taken by the Principal Investigator.

For any questions, concerns, or complaints, please contact the Principal Investigator of this study, Carol Haynes – Buchanan at xxxxxx@xxx.edu.

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board on Month, Date, Year.

To review the informed consent, including the purpose, procedure, risks, provisions for confidentiality, other contact information, and to participate in the study, click the link below.

Appendix C: Confirmation Email to Participants

Thank you so much for signing the informed consent to the participate in a research study to find out why students with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) disclose their disability and choose to accept or decline accommodations.

All that is required is an interview using Zoom that can be scheduled by clicking the link below. It is requested that you schedule this interview by XXXXXXX.

Also, students who have any documentation about their disability or accommodations may voluntarily have this information available during the interview.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Carol Haynes – Buchanan at

xxxxx@xxx.edu

Appendix D: Student Interview Protocols

Interview Protocol to Examine the Motivations Associated with Students with ADHD Accessing and Using Accommodations in the Higher Education Setting

Instructions: Use this protocol to interview college students from the selected institute of higher education. The purpose is to obtain information about what motivates students with ADHD to access and utilize accommodations obtained through a disability service provider (DSP).

Interview Protocol		
Introduction		
Welcome (Where appropriate, modify the script and questions)	Script: Hello, my name is XXXXX. Thank you for participating in this interview. Before we begin, are there any questions about the informed consent form you completed earlier through HelloSign? (If there are questions, the interviewer will clarify any details using the actual form the individual signed, or if there are no questions, the interviewer will proceed.) In this interview, we will focus on answering questions about Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), any impact of ADHD on your college performance, the accommodation process, and your experience with the Office of Disability Services. As a volunteer participant in this study, you may request to stop the interview at any time and quit the study. Before we start the interview, is there a name or identifier that you would like to use? (interviewer records the name) To be sure that we have an accurate record of today's conversation, I will be typing your responses and may need to seek clarification throughout the interview. Is that okay? (If the participant objects, explain that, unfortunately, the interview will have to be concluded. If the participant agrees, continue with the session.)	Probe N/A
Beginning the Interview	Today is (Date/Time), and I am speaking with (Participant). I am going to be asking you some general questions. If there is a question you are	

	Questions	
	uncomfortable with or do not know the answer to, no problem, that question can be skipped.	
	Q1 –In high school did you ever go to any meetings that included your parents, teachers, principals, to talk about school and how you were doing? If yes: What did you talk about in those meetings? If no: proceed to Q2.	Follow-up – How did you participate in the meeting?
	Q2 –How has ADHD impacted you in college? What are some of your symptoms?	Follow-up - Please provide an example of XXXX symptoms?
	Q3 – How do these symptoms impact your ability to study, take tests, or concentrate?	
	Q4-What do your parents think about your disability?	
	Q5– Do your friends know about your disability? If yes: How do you think your friends feel about your disability? If no: proceed to questions Q5.	
	Q6 - How did you hear about the office of disability services?	
	Q7 – In your own words, describe what help you received from the office of disability services?	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations? How do sophomore and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?	Q8 - Please tell me about an experience with working with the office of disability services. Perhaps recalling a conversation or an appointment.	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?	Q9 – How did you feel working with the office of disability services?	

Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?	Q10 – Why did you make the decision to share (or not share) with the office of disability services about your disability?	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition? How do sophomore and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?	Q11 – Tell me how you told the office of disability services about your disability. What did that feel like?	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?	Q12 – What motivated you to tell the office of disability services about your disability?	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?	Q13 – What services were recommended by the office of disability services? Which of these services did you choose to use?	Follow-up: Provide an example how you used a service that helped you with your ADHD. Where there any services you did not use?
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?	Q14 – Why did you choose to use or not use the services from the office of disability services?	

Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?	Q15– (Interviewer, if the individual has used services, ask question 11 and continue with interview sequence, if not skip to Q13.) What conversations have you had with professors about your disability?	Follow-up: How did you feel? Would you share one of the conversations you had?
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?	Q16 – Describe how the services you used helped you manage your ADHD symptoms.	Follow-up: What services did not help you manage your ADHD symptoms? Please provide an example of how a service did not help you manage your ADHD.
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?	Q17- What are some of the things that stopped or prevented you from using services?	
	Q18 – Please share anything else you would like to add regarding your experience. (If the participant does not have anything to add, conclude the interview.)	
Conclusion		
Concluding the Interview	Thank you so much for taking the time to share with me today. I appreciate your assistance with this. If you have any questions in the future or would like a copy of the final report, please feel free to contact me using the information on the paperwork I provided earlier. Thank you again!	

Appendix E: Focus Group Protocols

**Focus Protocol to Examine the Motivations Associated with Students with ADHD
Accessing and Using Accommodations in the Higher Education Setting**

Instructions: Use this protocol to conduct a focus group with college professors from the selected institute of higher education. The purpose is to obtain information about what motivates students with ADHD to access and utilize accommodations obtained through the office of disability services.

Focus Group Protocol		
Introduction		
Welcome (Where appropriate, modify the script and questions)	Script: Hello, my name is XXXXX. Thank you for participating in this focus group session. Before we begin, are there any questions about the informed consent form completed earlier through HelloSign? (If there are questions, the interviewer will clarify any details using the actual form the individual signed, or if there are no questions, the interviewer will proceed.) The purpose of this focus group is to explore the experiences and perspectives of college professors with working with students with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). As a volunteer participant in this study, you may request to stop the interview at any time and quit the study. Your input is valued, and I would be grateful if you could share your honest and open thoughts with us.	Probe N/A

Beginning the Focus Group Session	To set the tone for the discussion, we will implement the following ground rules:
	• I want you to do the talking.
	  - I would like for everyone to participate.
	  - I may call on you if I have not heard from you in a while.
	• There are no right or wrong answers.
	  - Every person's experience and opinions are essential.	

	- Feel free to speak up whether you agree or disagree. • What is said in this room remains here? - I want everyone to feel comfortable sharing when sensitive issues come up. • I will be recording this group session. - I want to capture everything you have to say. - I don't identify anyone by name in my report. You will remain anonymous.	
	Questions	
	Q1 – What do you know about the office of disability services?	
	Q2 – How do you interact with the office of disability services?	
	Q3 – Have you participated in any training that included topic (s) related to disabilities? If yes: How has this training helped or hindered your ability to work with students with disabilities? If no: proceed to Q4.	
	Q4- What do you know about Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)?	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the experience of disclosing their ADHD condition?	Q5 - Describe how you interact with students with ADHD.	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?	Q6 – Describe how you work with students to provide accommodations.	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to	Q7 – What things do you consider when granting accommodations to students?	

use or decline accommodations?		
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and junior college students describe the decision to use or decline accommodations?	Q8 – Why do you think that students choose or decline accommodations?	
Map to Research Question: How do sophomore and juniors describe the barriers to using accommodations?	Q9- What barriers prevent students from accessing or using accommodations?	
	Q10 – Please share anything else you would like to add regarding your experience working with students with ADHD or providing accommodations. (If any of the participants do not have anything to add, conclude the focus group.)	
Conclusion		
Concluding the Focus Group	Thank you so much for taking the time to share with me today in this focus group session. I appreciate your assistance with this. If you have any questions in the future, please feel free to contact me using the information on the paperwork I provided earlier. Thank you again!	