

Eastern Illinois University

The Keep

Plan B Papers

Student Theses & Publications

1-1-1966

Attitudes Toward Disciplinary Problems

Thomas O. Adams

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b

Recommended Citation

Adams, Thomas O., "Attitudes Toward Disciplinary Problems" (1966). *Plan B Papers*. 407.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b/407

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Plan B Papers by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

ATTITUDES TOWARD DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS

(TITLE)

BY

Thomas O. Adams

B.S. in Ed., 1963

Eastern Illinois University

PLAN B PAPER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION
AND PREPARED IN COURSE

Education 594

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY,
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1965

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS PLAN B PAPER BE ACCEPTED AS
FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE DEGREE, M.S. IN ED.

2/24/65
DATE

ADVISER

2/24/65
DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is grateful to Dr. William J. Crane for his guidance and assistance. He wishes to express indebtedness to Dr. Clayton Drouillard, Dean of Men, and Miss Cora Forbush, Dean of Women, for their permission to conduct the investigation; to the entire personnel staff; the faculty from the English Department; and especially to the men residents who completed the questionnaire, providing the data for the study.

Finally, he wishes to express appreciation to Ann for her support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.	i
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM AND THE BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	3
Problem	
Definitions	
Limitations	
Related Research	
II. PROCEDURE IN THE STUDY.	13
Sample	
Questionnaire	
Method of Administration	
III. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS.	17
General Analysis	
Specific Analysis	
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.	34
Problem	
Procedure	
Limitations	
Discussion	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentage Frequency of Action Selection.	17
2. Breakdown of Student Responses to Each Question In Percentages.	21
3. Breakdown of Personnel Responses to Each Question In Percentages.	22
4. Breakdown of Faculty Responses to Each Question In Percentages.	23

INTRODUCTION

With the insertion of students on the university scene one can naturally expect student misbehavior. To varying degrees, colleges institute behavioral codes, regulations, and disciplinary measures to insure that while the student is affiliated with a particular university he will not discredit himself or the institution. The college's responsibility is not only to educate the student by filling his mind with data but also to impart and help him examine standards, ethics, and the acceptable behavioral codes that society expects.

An important facet of the disciplinary program based upon prevention, remediation, and rehabilitation is periodic revision to prevent its obsolescence in view of the changing values of successive generations of college students. The administration of the disciplinary program, too, must maintain an awareness of the differences and similarities in his students as regards standards and mores.¹

In dealing with student disciplinary matters, the disciplinary counselor must necessarily base his judgment on his own conception of morality. He should, however, guard against imposing his morality on an unwilling customer. He must acquaint himself with current student values and constantly combat fixity and rigidity on his part.

In this study, an attempt was made to examine current

¹Ralph E. Prusok, "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Student Discipline," The Journal of College Student Personnel, V, (October, 1965), 12.

attitudes of students, faculty, and student personnel staff concerning various disciplinary violations which have occurred on university campuses.

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether there were any differences or similarities of opinion among university students, faculty members, and student personnel staff members as to degree of action to be taken for a variety of disciplinary offenses and to determine whether the responses of one group would be distinguishable from the responses of the other groups.

Definitions

A definition of the terms to be used in this paper is necessary to insure clear and correct understanding of them.

When discussing disciplinary action the writer was referring to six of the eight choices listed on the first page of the questionnaire. They were:

1. Warning- This would be a verbal or written admonishment of improper behavior of a not so serious nature. An example of when a warning would be directed to a student would be when, for the first time, a resident is heard talking loudly and boisterously in the corridor of the residence hall.
2. Letter to parents- This action is self-explanatory. It might be employed in the case of a student who is occasionally seen under the influence of alcohol.

- 3.& 4. Probation not on record and Probation on record- "Probation is a method of allowing a person convicted of a minor offense to go at large under suspension of sentence." ² Whether the offense was on or off an individual's permanent disciplinary record is determined by the seriousness of it.
5. Suspension- This would be the termination of a student's residence at the university for a specific period of time. If a serious offense were to occur in the middle of a semester the suspension might be for the remainder of that period or, possibly, until the completion of another semester.
6. Expulsion- An action of this nature would involve the removal of a student from the university with instruction for him not to enroll at a future date. This would be the most severe action that an institution could take.

The two remaining actions were no jurisdiction and no action. The selection of no jurisdiction indicates that the offense was not within the realm of the university and therefore should be referred to another agency.

Limitations

The main limitation to the questionnaire was that it was difficult to list all possible disciplinary choices. Some respondents felt strongly that two of the actions were appropriate for one infraction while others felt that further action not listed was appropriate. A small percentage of responses to individual questions were discarded for failure to follow instructions. In some cases, notations were made on the questionnaire regarding suggestions for further action. These suggestions were considered during the analysis.

The author's decision to limit distribution of the questionnaire to students, faculty, and members of the student personnel staff

²Funk and Wagnalls College Standard Dictionary (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1943), p. 905.

at Wisconsin State University - Whitewater, caused a further problem. The total population of the student personnel department was fifteen. While the number of people in this group was not exceedingly high, it was felt that the group's responses were a representative sample of the student personnel field in this area.

Related Research

For several years there has been some discussion on college campuses concerning a social, value, and moral change that is said to be taking place. It is said to be a product of the changing times and a new generation that does not accept the restraints, codes, and mores of the society into which it has been thrust. These young people on our campuses are beginning to ask for the answers to many of the paradoxes they are experiencing in their lives.

A recent magazine article points out that in the past college students were criticized for not being active in politics; moral, ethical, and political issues did not stir them to action; there was no adventure, only books. Today's students are vitally active in these areas. It is now said that students are too active.³

Dr. James A. Paulsen, psychiatrist in charge of the Student Health Service at Stanford University, states that one out of every nine students in our colleges is sufficiently emotionally disturbed to

³"Who's Cutting Up on Campus," Life, 56 (May 22, 1964), p. 4

Many students across the country---assert that their parents do not expect a college to have such a policy. They offer as proof the all-too-frequently incontestable fact that parents do not enforce any such definite standards at home... The objecting students say that when he is at home he is allowed to keep a bottle in his closet. Why an 11 PM curfew for a youth who is used to coming in at any hour he pleases? Parents give students cars to drive; but the school turns around and prohibits cars on campus. Students want to know why "parental" standards are so different at school from what they are at home.⁸

He goes on to say that school administrators feel that there are areas where it is their responsibility to protect the students from themselves, whether parents specifically ask for this protection or not. "A school will not and cannot escape blame they know, if their charges get caught in the meshes of alcoholism or narcotic addiction; it is the damage that is done to young lives and thus to society as a whole."⁹

If one were to feel a responsibility for the youth then it would seem logical that one must endeavor to instill beneficial and proper attitudes and values. Lehmann and Payne agreed that even though attitudes and values were more easily modified in infancy and the adolescent years, modern educators assume that they are still modifiable in late adolescence and early adulthood. By observing students from the freshman to the senior year it has been determined that there are significant changes that do take place. Were the causes intellectual or purely maturational; were they because of formal academic experiences or because of non-academic experiences such as bull session in dormitory or

⁸ Ibid. p. 725.

⁹ Ibid.

fraternity living units?¹⁰

It is reported that even though colleges assume that the faculty and curriculum will have a significant impact on attitudes and values, the study does not single out of college experiences one factor to explain the changes in attitudes and values. However, they do not deny that the changes in values and attitudes do occur. The changes may be a combination of one or many factors that the student encounters in the course of his college career.¹¹

Arsenian's purpose was to find if four years of college made a significant difference in student attitudes. He tested student values when they entered as freshmen and again when they graduated. He found that during the four college years the value pattern of students change. A great deal of religious readjustment took place during these years. A majority of the graduating students reported a strengthening of their attitudes toward religion. There was a considerable percentage who reported a decreased influence of religion in their lives. As seniors, an increased emphasis on the social aspects of life was reported. Arsenian frequently states that there were many changes in attitudes and he infers that the college curriculum and the college itself were responsible for these changes. However, he never actually states, which factors were responsible for changes in attitudes.¹²

¹⁰Irvin J. Lehmann and Isabelle K. Payne, "An Exploration of Attitude and Value Changes of College Freshmen," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (January, 1963), p.403.

¹¹Ibid. p. 408.

¹²Seth Arsenian, "Change in Evaluative Attitudes During Four Years of College," The Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 27 (August, 1943), pp. 338-349.

"Students undergo changes in attitudes, in widely varying degrees while attending college. It is difficult, however, to relate such changes directly to college education; during late adolescence some variations in attitude undoubtedly have little to do with formal educational experiences. Intellectual maturation continues well into the college years, but its effect on attitudes at this age level is largely unknown."¹³

Grater tried to determine the behavior standards of college females and see whether they lived up to those standards. He also tried to determine what type of behavior parents expected from their college-aged children and how aware these children were of their expectations. Large differences were consistently shown between both behavior and behavior standards of the daughters when compared with the behavior standards of the mother and the behavior standards the daughters perceived the mothers to have. The results indicate that the daughters frequently fail to abide by their own behavior standards and they quite consistently perceived their mothers as having somewhat more lenient behavior standards than the mothers actually had.¹⁴

Reeves and Arbuckle found that although deans of women were considered to be administrators, frequently they function as counselors in individual cases. Another purpose of this study was to determine what the counseling attitudes of deans of women were and compare the

¹³ Harold Webster, "Changes in Attitudes During College," The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 49 (June, 1958) pp. 109-117.

¹⁴ Harry A. Grater, "Behavior Standards Held by University Females and Their Mothers," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 38 (January, 1960) p. 369.

results with professional college counselors in the field. It was reported that deans were more authoritarian, more persuasive, less sympathetic, and less understanding than college counselors.¹⁵

Prusok conducted a study dealing with an investigation of the attitudes of students, parents of students, and student personnel workers. He found that there were significant differences between the three groups. The personnel workers tended to be the most punitive in regard to offenses concerning disorderly conduct, alcoholic beverages, and violation of probation. Personnel workers appeared most punitive on gambling and automobile cases but held the least punitive attitudes on alcoholic beverages. Responses showed that students selected no jurisdiction 20.8 per cent of the time, parents 11.7 per cent, and personnel workers 4.5 per cent. He reported that university jurisdiction was most highly questioned in cases involving automobile violations away from campus.¹⁶

Students are demanding greater freedom. They want the right to choose their own value system without so much outside pressure. The individuals who seek to guide these students are considering several factors.

There is a great deal of evidence that an increasing percentage of university students need psychiatric help. Dr. Paulsen states that

¹⁵Mary E. Reeves and Dugold S. Arbuckle, "The Counseling Attitudes of Dean of Women," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. V (October, 1963) p. 14.

¹⁶Ralph E. Prusok, "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Student Discipline," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. V (October, 1963) p. 14.

there are gnashing conflicts between the individualized mores of students and the traditional mores of the institutions of higher education.

Another question that is being considered is the institution's responsibility to society, with regard to its influence upon student values, and its responsibility to each student. Paul A. Woelfl felt that it was the institution's responsibility to protect the student from himself at times. It is not only the institution's right but its responsibility to impose a code of discipline and exact a standard of behavior that is consistent with accepted standards and mores. There is a great deal of discussion and research as to whether instructors and curriculum have as great an influence as was once thought. It is recognized that four years of college has a significant effect upon student attitudes. Students undergo changes in attitudes, in widely varying degrees while attending college. It is difficult, however, to relate such changes directly to college education. It would be very difficult to select which experiences were most important.

In a study concerning behavioral standards of college females as compared with behavioral standards of their mothers, Grater found that large differences were consistently shown between both behavior and behavioral standards of the daughters when compared with the behavioral standards of the mother and the behavioral standards the daughters perceived the mothers to have. This seems to indicate that students not only ignore the standards of society but also the standards they set for themselves.

Prusok surveyed the attitudes of students, parents, and student personnel workers toward student discipline. The results showed that the personnel workers were the most punitive of the three groups. The students were the least punitive. In a much greater percentage of the disciplinary incidents, students felt the university had no jurisdiction. The students expressed concern about a double jeopardy situation where they could be disciplined by civil authorities and university officials for the same infraction.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE IN THE STUDY

Sample

Three groups were queried to determine whether significant differences or similarities in their attitudes toward discipline could be determined. The largest group was the student group consisting of 222 freshmen who had just completed one semester at the university. The freshmen had lived in one of two men's residence halls on the Whitewater campus.

Of the 222 questionnaires distributed, 203, or 91.4 per cent were returned with responses suitable for tabulation. Male freshmen were selected to insure, as nearly as possible, similar age, maturity, sex, familiarity with university in general, residence hall experience, and familiarity with university regulations.

With regard to faculty members, further refinement of the selection process was desired. The English department was selected due to the fact that it was the largest faculty group with a similar background and preparation. An additional factor in the selection was that about ninety per cent of the freshmen were enrolled in an English class. The English department had a greater degree of interaction with freshmen than did any other faculty group. Of the thirty two faculty members queried, twenty-five, or 78.1 per cent, returned usable replies.

The third group was the student personnel members. This category included head residents of dormitories with professional training in guidance and counseling, deans of men and women, assistant deans of men and women, dean of students, director of placement, and the registrar. This group was included because of their close and frequent dealings with student problems and their apparent interest in student welfare. The total number in this group was fifteen. Questionnaires were returned by fifteen, or 100 per cent, of the personnel staff.

Questionnaire

The information was obtained by means of a questionnaire designed to elicit the students', faculty's, and student personnel staff's attitudes toward student discipline. Each of the forty-one questions contained in the questionnaire was a description of an incident that might require disciplinary action. It was the task of the responding individuals to select what they felt was an appropriate action. They were asked to select only one action from the list per question. The possible actions were listed on an eight point scale. They were:

1. No jurisdiction
2. No action
3. Warning
4. Letter to parents
5. Probation not on record

6. Probation on record
7. Suspension
8. Expulsion

Method of Administration

A student counselor presented and explained the questionnaire to the freshmen students at a wing meeting. Each of the four floors of the residence hall was divided into two wings. There were about thirty students to a wing, of which approximately seventy-seven per cent were freshmen. The questionnaire was administered in groups of about twenty-three students. It was filled out at that time and returned to the counselor. The upperclass student counselors were instructed in the method of administering the questionnaire and in answers to possible questions that might arise. Students were requested not to sign their names, thus hoping to insure better objectivity and reliability of response. Students were asked not to confer with one another. Any questions concerning the questionnaire were answered for the student. (No further attempts were made to insure the reliability of the results.) No time limit was set. However, the questionnaire took fifteen to eighteen minutes to complete.

It was necessary to send the faculty and student personnel questionnaires through the mail. A letter accompanied each questionnaire describing its intent and further instructing the respondent in how to complete the form. The telephone number of the writer was included and the recipients were asked to call if there was need for further clarification. No further attempts were made, with these

groups, to insure the reliability of the results. No time limit was set for these groups, either. The writer was able to receive a 91.4 per cent return from students, a 78.1 per cent return from faculty, and a 100 per cent return from the personnel staff.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The questionnaire contained forty-one questions and was rated on an eight point scale. The questionnaire was administered to male freshmen living in Albert Salisbury and Paul Carlson Halls; to the student personnel staff; and to the faculty members from the English Department at Wisconsin State University - Whitewater.

General Analysis

The table below indicates, in percentages, how many times the entire responding group selected one of the eight actions.

TABLE I

Percentage Frequency of Action Selection

ACTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Students	17.5	7.2	18.6	9.7	10.6	14.0	11.6	10.5
Personnel	10.6	6.7	18.1	6.7	7.2	26.7	12.6	11.0
Faculty	14.9	6.9	18.9	7.3	6.7	20.8	12.4	11.9

No Jurisdiction #1

In the no jurisdiction category (1) there was a pronounced and significant difference in the varied group response. In this category the students expressed the belief that the university had no jurisdiction in 17.5 per cent of the cases mentioned in the questionnaire. The personnel staff felt that the cases were not within university jurisdiction

"YOU DECIDE"

Below and on the following pages are summaries of cases of students involved in disciplinary action for a variety of reasons. Rate the seriousness of the offense by indicating what disciplinary action you feel should be taken. Use the following list of disciplinary actions as your guide in rating each case. The possible actions are:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. No jurisdiction | 5. Probation not on record |
| 2. No action | 6. Probation on record |
| 3. Warning | 7. Suspension |
| 4. Letter to parents | 8. Expulsion |

Select the disciplinary choice for each case by CIRCLING the number

1. A student under 21 years of age was residing at an apartment not approved by the University but received his mail at a residence approved by the University.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
2. A male student under 21 years of age was living in an unapproved apartment where he was entertaining female students and serving alcoholic beverages.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
3. A student lived in approved off-campus housing. He was asked to move by the householder after an argument over a rent increase.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
4. A student maintained both an approved single room and an unapproved apartment. He shared the apartment with a divorced woman and her child.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
5. A student moved into unapproved housing where he did extensive damage to the room and left owing two months back rent.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
6. A student drove to the scene of a "water fight" at a residence hall but did not leave his automobile.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
7. A student was involved in a snowball fight in which seven residence hall windows were broken.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
8. A male student entered a sorority house during a "pantie raid". All males had been warned by the city police to stay off the property.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
9. A student was seen standing in the hall late at night during a shaving cream fight, but denies participating in the activity.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

10. A student was heard talking in the dining room about setting off a fire cracker in the University residence hall. He later denied any participation.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
11. A student over 21 years of age was arrested by the police as a suspect in a bar brawl. His friends who were with him, but were not arrested, say he was not a participant.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
12. A male student was seen "peeping" into a window of a women's residence hall.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
13. A student was seen butting into the cafeteria line.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
14. A student was creating a disturbance in the residence hall and when asked to quiet down used abusive language.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
15. A student was asked twice at the beginning of the school year not to play his guitar in the room. He was seen playing the instrument a week later for the third time.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
16. A student hit a head resident during a discussion of the students behavior in the residence hall.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
17. A student used a false name to receive records from a record club without paying.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
18. A student was arrested by the city police for speeding and paid his fine with a bad check.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
19. A student falsified his age on his driver's license and was caught by the state police.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
20. A student had a record with the police for passing bad checks. On registration day at the university he paid his fees with a bad check.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

21. A student was found drinking beer in the residence hall.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

22. A student, while home for Thanksgiving vacation, was arrested by his home town police for underage drinking.

11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

23. An under-age student was arrested by the city police in a raid on a city tavern.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

24. A student was seen walking into the residence hall with a bottle of liquor in his pocket.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

25. A student was seen throwing empty beer cans out of the residence hall windows.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

26. A student was in a dorm room with several other students who were drinking beer. This student denied drinking any of the beer himself.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

27. A student went to a class intoxicated.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

28. A student was discovered in the act of stealing a final exam from an instructor's office.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

29. A student was seen cheating on a final examination.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

30. A student handed in a paper as his own work and later the professor discovered that it was copied from a professional journal.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

31. A student was observed looking at some class notes during a weekly quiz.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

32. A student loaned an English theme to a friend unaware that the friend would turn it in as his own work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

33. A student was seen in the linen room of the men's residence hall at 2:00 a.m. searching through the linen cabinets.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

34. A student was discovered to have a city "stop" sign in his residence hall window.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

35. A student who lived in a residence hall was arrested by the police for robbing a laundromat.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

36. A student had possession of a painting that normally hung in the lounge of the residence hall.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

37. A student was discovered wearing a sweater reported missing by a fellow fraternity member.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

38. A student was involved in an accident near his home but did not stop. The other party in the accident got his license number and reported him.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

39. A student was apprehended when a faculty member noted his license number as the student was driving his car on the campus lawn.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

40. A student was seen driving his car fast and recklessly on the streets around the campus.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

41. A student failed to register his car with the university. He was apprehended by the campus police and given a week to register his car. He failed to do so.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

in 10.6 percent of the cases. This is a 6.9 per cent gap between student and personnel opinion concerning university jurisdiction. The judgment of the English faculty was that 14.9 per cent of the cases mentioned were not within the jurisdiction of the university.

No Action #2

The responding students indicated that 7.2 per cent of the cases required "no action" on the part of disciplinary officials. Here again, the greatest disparity of percentage points occurred between students and the personnel staff. The frequency of the selection of no action was 6.7 per cent by the personnel staff and 6.9 per cent by the faculty. The personnel staff felt that in 82.7 per cent of the cases some disciplinary measures were called for, whereas, the student group indicated they felt there were disciplinary implications in only 75.3 per cent of the incidents listed in the questionnaire. This is a percentage discrepancy of 7.4 per cent. The faculty indicated that disciplinary measures were needed in 78.2 per cent of the cases.

Warning #3

The faculty found the warning to be the most appropriate disciplinary action in 18.9 per cent of the cases. The personnel staff issued the fewest warnings at 18.1 per cent. "Warning" was selected by students in 18.6 per cent of the cases.

Letter to Parents #4

In 9.7 per cent of the incidents students selected the letter as the most appropriate disciplinary action. However, the personnel staff selected the letter 6.7 per cent of the time. This is a difference of 3 per cent. Faculty members selected the letter 7.3 per cent of the time.

Probation Not On Record #5

In 10.6 per cent of the questions, students felt that probation not on record was the appropriate action for the offense. The personnel staff and faculty responded less frequently on this choice. The former made the selection in 7.2 per cent of the cases and the latter in 6.7 per cent. The range between faculty and student opinion was 3.9 per cent.

Probation On Record #6

The range in this category reflects the greatest difference of opinion. The student personnel staff selected this action in 26.7 per cent of the cases, while students selected it in only 14 per cent of the cases. The range between the two groups is 12.7 per cent. The faculty was 6.8 percentage points from the students and 5.9 percentage points from the personnel staff.

Suspension #7

Students chose suspension as the appropriate action in 11.6 per cent of the questions. The personnel staff selected suspension in 12.6 per cent of the cases and the faculty in 12.4 per cent. The range of the three groups was only .8 of a per cent.

Expulsion #8

The faculty chose expulsion in 11.9 per cent of the questions. Students chose this disciplinary action the least of the three groups. The student personnel staff indicated that 11 per cent of the cases required expulsion. Students selected it in only 10.5 per cent of the questions.

Specific Analysis

Responses to individual questions are tabulated in tables 2, 3, and 4. The percentages indicate exactly what portion of the entire group selected what actions. Table 2 is the students' response, 3 is the personnel staff's response, and 4 is the faculty's response to questions.

Since the tables for the entire questionnaire are available, this section will concern itself primarily with describing contrasting results and conspicuous similarities.

No startling similarities are evident on one question for all three groups. The personnel responses and the faculty responses frequently are similar. The faculty responses and the student responses were sometimes similar but personnel and student responses were seldom similar.

Breakdown of Student Response to Each Question In Percentages

Table 2

1	3.4%	14.3%	32%	23.6%	10.8%	8.8%	5.9%	.9%
2	3.9	2.5	4.9	5.4	14.7	21.2	24.6	22.7
3	49.8	32.5	6.8	7.9	.9	.4	1.4	.4
4	11.8	1.9	2.9	10.8	6.8	9.8	18.2	37.4
5	21.2	2.9	1.4	11.3	2.9	19.2	18.7	21.6
6	42.8	41.8	11.3	1.4	.4	1.4		
7	1.4	1.9	26.1	28.5	21.1	17.7	1.4	.9
8	4.9	.4	8.9	8.3	20.6	24.1	21.1	10.8
9	8.9	27	55.6	2.9	44.3	.9		
10	8.9	17.7	51.2	8.9	6.8	2.9	2.5	1.4
11	36.4	18.2	27	3.9	7.4	4.9	2.5	
12	1.4	3.4	27	16.2	11.8	14.7	14.7	9.8
13	16.7	22.7	56.7	1.4	.9	.4		
14	.9	.9	43.8	24.6	19.7	7.4	2.9	
15	2.5	1.4	14.2	29.5	35.9	8.9	3.9	.9
16	.4		.9	1.9	6.4	15.3	33.5	41.3
17	48.2	5.4	1.4	14.7	5.9	9.4	12.8	3.4
18	56.1	1.9	6.8	13.8	5.4	9.4	5.9	4.9
19	64.1	36.4	1.9	5.4	3.9	10.3	4.4	3.9
20	1.9	.4	11.8	6.8	3.4	7.8	18.7	58.1
21	.9	1.4	8.3	2.5	15.7	29.1	19.7	22.1
22	88.6	4.4	.9	1.9	2.5	.9	.4	
23	54.1	3.4	8.9	8.3	6.4	12.3	4.9	1.4
24		1.4	17.7	9.4	1.5	27.5	19.2	9.8
25			24.1	6.8	14.2	24.6	21.6	7.9
26	1.9	6.8	31	10.3	22.1	18.2	7.9	1.4
27	9.8	1.9	18.7	6.4	12.3	18.7	21.1	11.3
28	.4	.4		2.5	5.9	16.2	32.5	41.3
29	1.4	.4	5.9	2.5	5.4	26.1	33	25.6
30	5.4	.4	23.1	4.4	14.2	20	19.7	12.8
31	3.9	1.9	43.3	7.9	9.8	19.7	11.3	2.5
32	18.7	28.5	35.9	1.9	7.9	3.4	3.4	.4
33		5.4	41	14.7	14.7	11.8	9.4	1.9
34	24.6	9.8	32.5	13.3	8.3	6.4	3.4	1.4
35	33.5	4.4	2.9	1.4	9.8	13.3	13.3	31.5
36		.9	13.8	11.8	17.2	30.5	16.2	9.4
37	23.1	8.9	14.7	9.8	14.2	17.7	9.4	4.4
38	73.8	3.9	18.2	12.8	3.4	3.4	4.9	1.9
39	2.5	.4	12.8	14.7	15.7	33	14.7	5.9
40	23.6	1.9	31	10.3	12.3	15.7	4.9	.4
41	1.4	1.9	4.9	56.1	24.6	30	11.3	.9
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Breakdown of Personnel Responses To Each Question In Percentages Table 3

1	%	%	%	13.3%	13.3%	46.6%	26.6%	%
2					6.6	26.6	33.3	33.3
3	20	66.6	13.3					
4						14.2	35.7	50
5				20	2	20	33.3	26.6
6	6.6	66.6	26.6					
7			35.7	7.1	14.2	42.8		
8					13.3	46.6	26.6	13.3
9		13.3	73.3	6.6	6.6			
10	6.6		66.6	13.3		6.6	6.6	
11	13.3	6.6	53.3	6.6	13.3	6.6		
12			6.6	6.6	6.6	26.6	40	13.3
13	13.3	13.3	66.6		6.6			
14			21.4	21.4	35.7	14.2	7.1	
15			21.4	21.4	28.5	21.4	7.1	
16						6.6	33.3	60
17	21.4		7.1	28.5		35.7		7.1
18	40	6.6		6.6	13.3	26.6		6.6
19	46.6	13.3		20	6.6	13.3		
20				6.6		26.6	13.3	53.3
21			13.3		6.6	46.6	13.3	20
22	66.6	13.3	6.6		6.6	6.6		
23	13.3	6.6	6.6	6.6		60	6.6	
24			6.6		13.3	46.6	20	13.3
25			14.2		7.1	50	28.5	
26		6.6	40	6.6	6.6	33.3		6.6
27		6.6	6.6	6.6	6.6	40	13.3	20
28	6.6					20	20	53.3
29	14.2					57.1	28.5	
30	21.4		14.2			42.8	14.2	7.1
31	21.4		21.4			35.7	21.4	
32	13.3	33.3	40			13.3		
33			73.3	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.6	
34	14.2		50		14.2	21.4		
35	13.3	6.6		6.6	6.6	20	6.6	40
36			6.6	6.6	6.6	60	13.3	6.6
37	13.3		33.3	6.6		40	6.6	
38	60	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.6	13.3		
39			35.7		21.4	28.5	7.1	7.1
40	6.6		33.3	13.2	26.6	6.6		
41			7.1	28.5	14.2	42.8		7
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

Breakdown of Faculty Responses To Each Question In Percentages Table 4

	%	%	4%	16%	12%	38%	24%	8%
1			4		8	16	38	38
2			4					
3	24	44	28	4				
4	8			4		20	28	40
5	16		4	16	4	20	24	16
6	16	44	24	8		4		4
7		8	28	8	16	20	12	4
8			8	8	16	32	20	16
9	4	20	56	12	4			4
10	8		52	20	4	8	4	4
11	24	12	32	8	12	8	4	
12	4	4	16	16	8	12	24	16
13	20	20	52	4	4			
14	4		36	24	12	12	4	8
15	4	4	24	16	16	24	4	8
16			4	4		8	32	52
17	48	4	4	16		16	12	
18	48		4	16	4	16	4	8
19	52	20		12		16		
20			12	4		16	12	56
21		4	4		16	24	20	32
22	72	8	4	4	8	4		
23	20		8		8	52	4	8
24		4	20	8		32	24	12
25			20		20	36	20	8
26		20	36		16	28		
27	12	4	20	4	8	32	16	4
28	4					20	24	52
29	12	4	8	4		36	24	12
30	16		20		12	24	20	8
31	4		32	4		36	20	4
32	20	40	40					
33			48	12	12	16	12	
34	24	4	32			32	8	4
35	24	4	4			16	20	32
36			8	4	12	48	24	4
37	24	4	20	4	8	36	4	
38	72		12	4		12		
39		4	24		12	28	16	16
40	20	4	24	8	12	24	4	4
41	4		4	28	20	36	8	8
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	

Contrasts and Similarities From Tables 2, 3, and 4

1. A student under 21 years of age was residing at an apartment not approved by the University but received his mail at a residence approved by the University.

The highest student percentage group, 32 per cent, felt that a warning was called for, while 23.6 per cent of the same group indicated that parental notification was the most appropriate action. This is contrasted with 46.6 per cent of the personnel staff and 38 per cent of the faculty who felt that probation on record was the proper action. Another factor to be considered is that 24 per cent of the faculty and 26.6 per cent of the personnel staff were in favor of suspension while only 5.9 per cent of the students agreed. Only 8.8 per cent of the students felt that probation on record was the answer and 10.8 per cent indicated that probation not on record was the acceptable action. Another interesting point is that 14.3 per cent of the students indicated that no action was necessary.

3. A student lived in approved off-campus housing. He was asked to move by the householder after an argument over a rent increase.

A large majority of the personnel staff indicated that there were no grounds for action. The personnel staff selected no action on 66.6 per cent of the questionnaires and 44 per cent of the faculty agreed. However, only 32.5 per cent of the students agreed with this selection. Close to a majority, 49.8 per cent, of the students felt that the university had no jurisdiction in this matter. This is contrasted with 20 per cent of the personnel people and 24 per

cent of the faculty who felt it was a non-jurisdictional question. A more punitive outlook was taken by 28 per cent of the faculty who issued warnings. This is contrasted with a 13.3 per cent personnel staff response and a 6.8 per cent student response to that action.

4. A student maintained both an approved single room and an unapproved apartment. He shared the apartment with a divorced woman and her child.

Probation on record was selected by 20 per cent of the faculty, 14.2 per cent of the personnel staff, and 9.8 per cent of the students. Suspension from the institution was suggested by 28 per cent of the faculty, 35.7 per cent of the personnel staff, and only 18.2 per cent of the students. Another difference of opinion was evident in the expulsion category. Forty per cent of the faculty, 50 per cent of the personnel staff, and 37.4 per cent of the students considered the offense serious enough for expulsion. It is interesting to note that 11.8 per cent of the students and 8 per cent of the faculty considered this a no jurisdictional question. No personnel people indicated that it was not within the realm of the university.

6. A student drove to the scene of a "water fight" at a residence hall but did not leave his automobile.

There were two significant reactions to this question. No action was taken by 44 per cent of the faculty, 66.6 per cent of the personnel staff, and 41.8 per cent of the students. No jurisdiction was the other significant response. It was selected by 42.8 per cent of the students, 6.6 per cent of the personnel people, and 16 per cent

of the faculty. A more punitive approach was selected as an appropriate action by 26.6 per cent of the personnel staff, 24 per cent of the faculty, and only 11.3 per cent of the students. These people felt the student should receive a warning.

7. A student was involved in a snowball fight in which seven residence hall windows were broken.

Forty-two and eight tenths per cent of the personnel staff recommended probation on record, while 35.5 per cent of the same group suggested a warning. Students had a less punitive attitude toward this question. Only 26.1 per cent of the students suggested giving a warning but 28.5 per cent recommended a letter to the student's parents. A less punitive student response, 17.7 per cent, was recorded in the probation on record category.

8. A male student entered a sorority house during a "panty raid". All males had been warned by the city police to stay off the property.

There is a great deal of similarity in all categories except one. The personnel staff indicated that probation on record was an appropriate action on 46.6 per cent of their responses. Only 32 per cent of the faculty and 24.1 per cent of the students rated it as a probation on record offense.

11. A student over 21 years of age was arrested by the police as a suspect in a bar brawl. His friends, who were with him, but were not arrested, say he was not a participant.

Student response on 36.4 per cent of the questionnaires indicated that they felt this problem was not within the jurisdiction

of the university. In contrast to this, 13.3 per cent of the personnel people and 24 per cent of the faculty felt this was a no jurisdiction problem. The personnel staff suggested warnings on 53.3 per cent of the questionnaires, while the faculty and students suggested warnings on 32 per cent and 27 per cent of their questionnaires respectively.

12. A male student was seen "peeping" into a window of a women's residence hall.

Twenty-seven per cent of the students considered this action grounds for a warning. The faculty would issue warnings on 16 per cent of the questionnaires and personnel people on only 6.6 per cent. Personnel people took a more punitive attitude toward this question, selecting suspension on 40 per cent of the questionnaires. Only 14.7 per cent of the students and 24 per cent of the faculty selected suspension. The personnel staff was also more punitive in the probation on record category. Twenty-six per cent of the personnel staff indicated that they felt probation on record was appropriate. Only 12 per cent of the faculty and 14.7 per cent of the students considered it that serious an offense.

14. A student was creating a disturbance in the residence hall and when asked to quiet down used abusive language.

The responses on this question are indicative of the differences expressed by the student and personnel groups. The student group selected the warning category on 43.8 per cent of the questionnaires,

while only 21.4 per cent of the personnel staff selected it. A more punitive disciplinary action was selected by 35.7 per cent of the personnel staff and a less punitive attitude was expressed by 12 per cent of the faculty who chose probation not on record. Students selected probation not on record on 19.7 per cent of the questionnaires.

16. A student hit a head resident during a discussion of the student's behavior in the residence hall.

All groups reported a high percentage in favor of expulsion for this infraction. It should be noted that 60 per cent of the personnel staff, 52 per cent of the faculty, and 41.3 per cent of the students were in favor of expulsion.

17. A student used a false name to receive records from a record club without paying.

The students selected no jurisdiction on 48.2 per cent of the questionnaires and the faculty on 48 per cent. A significantly different result, 21.4 per cent was reported by the personnel staff. On 35.7 per cent of the questionnaires personnel people selected probation on record. Only 16 per cent of the faculty and 9.4 per cent of the students agreed with probation on record.

18. A student was arrested by the city police for speeding and paid his fine with a bad check.

All groups felt strongly that this problem was not within the jurisdiction of the university. Forty per cent of the personnel staff, 48 per cent of the faculty, and 56.1 per cent of the students marked their questionnaires accordingly. The personnel staff had

a strong minority opinion, 26.6 per cent, who felt that probation on record was necessary. Only 16 per cent of the faculty and 9.4 per cent of the students agreed on this point.

19. A student falsified his age on his driver's license and was caught by the state police.

Again all groups heavily favored the "no jurisdictional" point of view. The students had the largest percentage at 64.1 per cent suggesting no jurisdiction. Fifty-two per cent of the faculty and 46.6 per cent of the personnel group chose the same action. A significant 36.4 per cent student response was received indicating that no action was necessary. Only 13.3 per cent of the personnel staff and 20 per cent of the faculty agreed with this opinion. A portion of the personnel staff, 20 per cent, felt that parental notification was justified, while only 12 per cent of the faculty and 5.4 per cent of the students shared this opinion.

21. A student was found drinking beer in the residence hall.

In this question some trends were reversed. The faculty group advocated expulsion on 32 per cent of the questionnaires, while students responded similarly on only 22.1 per cent of the questionnaires. The personnel group considered this question less punitively than the two previous groups. They would expell students on only 20 per cent of the questionnaires. A greater number of personnel people, 46.6 per cent, suggest probation on record as a more suitable punishment. Only 29.1 per cent of the students and 24 per cent of the faculty

treated this question similarly.

23. An under-age student was arrested by the city police in a raid on a city tavern.

The faculty suggested probation on record on 52 per cent of the questionnaires and the personnel staff on 60 per cent. Only 12.3 per cent of the students felt that this offense deserved probation on record. The majority of the students, 54.1 per cent felt that the university had no jurisdiction. The faculty shared this opinion on 20 per cent of the responses and the personnel staff on 13.3 per cent.

24. A student was seen walking into the residence hall with a bottle of liquor in his pocket.

The student personnel staff had a more punitive attitude on this question. They selected probation on record 46.6 per cent of the time but students chose it on only 27.5 per cent of the questionnaires. Thirty-two per cent of the faculty agreed with this disciplinary action. This is a range of 19.1 per cent difference between the high and low groups.

25. A student was seen throwing empty beer cans out of the residence hall windows.

An even 50 per cent of the personnel staff advocated probation on record for this offense, while 36 per cent of the faculty and only 24.6 per cent of the students felt this was the appropriate action. Almost one out of four, or 24.1 per cent, of the students selected warning as the appropriate disciplinary action. Twenty per cent of the faculty and 14.2 per cent of the personnel staff selected the warning category.

28. A student was discovered in the act of stealing a final exam from an instructor's office.

This type of activity is uniformly frowned upon by all three groups. It received an expulsion ranking from 53.3 per cent of the personnel staff, 52 per cent from the faculty, and 41.3 per cent of the students. Almost as many students preferred suspension, 32.5 per cent, while only 24 per cent of the faculty and 20 per cent of the personnel staff agreed with this action.

29. A student was seen cheating on a final examination.

The results to this question do not follow the trends set in previously. Students selected expulsion on 25.6 per cent and the faculty on 12 per cent of their questionnaires. However, no personnel people selected expulsion as their choice of disciplinary actions. Instead, the student personnel staff suggested probation on record on 57.1 per cent of their responses. Only 36 per cent of the faculty and 26.1 per cent of the students agreed with this choice.

31. A student was observed looking at some class notes during a weekly quiz.

A large percentage of students, 43.3 per cent issued warnings, while only 32 per cent of the faculty and 21.4 per cent of the personnel staff took this action. The student group selected probation on record on 19.7 per cent of the questionnaire, while 35.7 per cent of the personnel group and 36 per cent of the faculty selected that

same disciplinary action. An interesting personnel percentage was reported in the non-jurisdictional category. Of this group, 21.4 per cent felt that this problem was not within the realm of the university. Only 4 per cent of the faculty and 3.9 per cent of the students shared this view.

34. A student was discovered to have a city "stop" sign in his residence hall window.

All three groups had their highest percentages for this question in the warning category. The personnel staff selected it on 50 per cent of their responses, while the faculty preferred warnings on 32 per cent and the students on 32.5 per cent of their questionnaires. A striking contrast can be noted in the probation on record category. Twenty-one and four tenths per cent of the personnel group chose this action. A similar faculty response of 32 per cent was recorded, but only 6.4 per cent of the students responded to this category. It is also interesting to note that 8 per cent of the faculty selected suspension as the most appropriate disciplinary action. No personnel people and only 3.4 per cent of the students selected this action.

35. A student who lived in a residence hall was arrested by the police for robbing a laundromat.

The major point of contrast in this question deals with student and personnel opinion of what constitutes a no jurisdiction area. Thirty-three and five tenths per cent of the students feel this is not within the realm of university jurisdiction. In contrast

to this, only 13.3 per cent of the personnel staff and 24 per cent of the faculty groups agreed with them.

36. A student had possession of a painting that normally hung in the lounge of the residence hall.

While 60 per cent of the personnel staff and 48 per cent of the faculty considered this grounds for probation on record, only 30.5 per cent of the students felt that the offense deserved this action. Greater percentages were distributed by students in the warning, letter to parents, and probation not on record categories.

37. A student was discovered wearing a sweater reported missing by a fellow fraternity member.

A large percentage of the personnel staff and faculty, 40 per cent and 36 per cent respectively, felt this was cause for probation on record. Only 17.7 per cent of the students saw it as that serious an offense. While students distributed their ratings rather evenly, the largest single category was no jurisdiction. They selected it on 23.1 per cent of the questionnaires, contrasted to 13.3 per cent by student personnel people.

39. A student was apprehended when a faculty member noted his license number as the student was driving his car on the campus lawn.

While there was some agreement by 28 per cent of the faculty, 28.5 per cent of the personnel people, and 33 per cent of the students that the appropriate action should be probation on record, there were 24 per cent of the faculty, 35.7 per cent of the personnel people, and only 12.8 per cent of the students who felt that a warning should be issued.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether there were any differences or similarities of opinion among university students, faculty members, and student personnel staff members as to the degree of action to be taken for a variety of disciplinary offenses. It was also wondered whether these responses would follow a particular pattern. If so, would it be possible to predict with reasonable accuracy the responses of one group by studying the responses of another?

Procedures

A questionnaire consisting of forty-one questions was administered to three groups. The largest group was the student group consisting of 222 male freshmen who had just completed one semester at the university. Thirty-two faculty members from the English Department made up the second group. The third group consisted of fifteen student personnel staff members at Wisconsin State University. A return of 91.4 per cent was received from the student group, 78.1 per cent return from the faculty, and a 100 per cent return from the personnel staff.

Limitations

Some items were not answered by all individuals from each group. Occasionally, respondents wrote in additional reactions to a question. There was no way to ensure truthfulness and sincerity on the respondents' part.

Discussion

In the section analyzing the data, frequent differences and similarities on the same questions were noted. The students and personnel staff disagreed most often and most emphatically. Faculty responses were generally somewhere between the student and personnel judgments. They were usually closer to the personnel point of view, however, on occasions the faculty sided heavily with the students. With very few exceptions there was a pattern to the responses received from the three groups. In this section the writer will present typical examples of the patterns and will attempt to explain their existence.

Table I indicated that a much larger percentage of students than personnel people felt that many of the offenses were not within the realm of university jurisdiction and, therefore, had no institutional implications. This trend was characterized by questions 3, 6, and 23. Responses to these questions indicate that personnel people, and to a lesser degree faculty, held a more punitive attitude toward offenses than did students.

In most instances, students rated offenses less punitively than did the personnel department. Students frequently rated questions as non-jurisdictional while the personnel people suggested rather severe disciplinary action. This was the case in question 17.

Faculty responses were generally somewhere between the student and personnel judgments. Most frequently they were in closer agreement with personnel opinion. Examples of faculty-personnel agreement were questions 6 concerning warning, 19 concerning jurisdiction, and 31 concerning probation on record and suspension. Two examples of student and faculty agreement were questions 12 and 30, concerning probation on record.

There was a greater display of punitiveness on the part of the student personnel department than by the other two groups. A combination of several factors are involved to explain the response patterns of the various groups. The writer feels that three such factors exist.

It is probable that those individuals dealing with disciplinary matters are in their positions by choice. It seems likely that in some cases it is the authoritarian type of personality that is drawn to this occupation. In a study of counseling attitudes of deans, graduate students, and freshmen Mueller found that the deans held the most punitive attitudes.¹⁷ In Prusok's study of attitudes toward

¹⁷Kate H. Mueller, "Theory For Campus Discipline," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XXXVI (January, 1958) p. 305.

student misconduct he found that personnel workers were the most punitive of all the groups tested.¹⁸ Reeves and Arbuckle found that although deans of women were considered to be administrators they frequently functioned as counselors in individual cases. The study's purpose was to determine what the deans reaction would be to counseling situations compared with the reactions of professional college counselors. It was determined that deans were more authoritarian, more persuasive, less sympathetic, and less understanding than college counselors.¹⁹

This is undoubtedly due in part to the fact that college deans of men and women frequently deal with disciplinary matters and after a period of time become somewhat factual and hardened in their attitude toward student misconduct. In some cases, continuous administration of disciplinary action tends to make some individuals progressively more punitive. A third factor is that advanced training, maturity, and knowledge of precedent may give them an insight into the ramifications and implications of a situation.

If frequent contact with misconduct tends to make some individuals more punitive, then lack of contact may make it possible for others to be less punitive. The writer feels that this is likely the case in regard to the faculty judgments. Faculty responses were less

¹⁸Prusok, op. cit., p. 16

¹⁹Reeves, op. cit., p. 14

punitive than responses from the personnel department in most instances. When questioned about a disciplinary situation with which they were familiar, the faculty was slightly more punitive than the personnel department and much more punitive than the students. The writer is referring to questions 28, 29, 30, and 31 dealing with academic cheating. The writer is sure that the judgments of some faculty members were more valid because of the detached objectivity with which they were able to observe the misconduct.

Less punitive responses were expected and received from the student group. The writer assumed that the students' ages and maturity had a bearing upon their responses. It is possible that student responses were as they were due to certain factors at this university. Students have recently been involved in activities to increase their dependence from the university. They are struggling for adult recognition with fewer university regulations.

Extended women's hours and twenty-one year old housing are two areas of student concern. Students at this institution are aware of the liberal policies regarding individual freedom at a near-by Big Ten university. These policies do have an effect upon the students' concept of what constitutes misbehavior. The writer feels that because the Big Ten university functions under liberal policies with regard to student housing, consumption of alcoholic beverages, and individual freedom, it raises concern in student circles as to the fairness of less liberal policies. These are considerations that have to be made when studying student responses.

The most popular disciplinary action selected by the personnel staff and the faculty was probation on record. The personnel staff selected it on 26.7 per cent of their questionnaires and the faculty on 20.8 per cent. The most popular action selected by the students was the warning category. Students selected it on 18.6 per cent of the questionnaires. It was the second most popular response for the personnel people, 18.1 per cent and the faculty, 18.9 per cent.

These percentages indicate that the personnel staff offered probation on record as their most popular choice on better than one-fourth of the questionnaires. On a little better than one-fifth of the faculty questionnaires, the same disciplinary action was considered appropriate. Only 14 per cent of the students felt probation on record was appropriate.

This is a continuation of the trend by faculty and personnel people to select more punitive disciplinary actions. It is apparent by studying the analysis of the questionnaire that there were no questions where all three groups responded similarly. This is in part due to the personality, maturity, and preparation of the individuals involved.

It was interesting that all groups, particularly personnel and faculty, failed to suggest letters to parents and disciplinary action not on record in more of the cases. The offenses were either considered no problem or given serious consideration. Five of the

eight responses were more frequently selected. They were: no jurisdiction, warning, probation on record, suspension and expulsion.

Due to the wide range of responses to the questionnaire by the three groups, it is suggested that an attempt be made to close the gap. This might be possible if the personnel department would initiate an investigation of student values. The writer feels that members of all three groups would benefit from such a study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles and Periodicals

- Arsenian, Seth. "Change In Evaluative Attitudes During Four Years of College," The Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 27 (August, 1943), pp. 338-349.
- Grater, Harry A. "Behavior Standards Held by University Females and Their Mothers," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 38 (January, 1960), p. 369.
- Lehmann, Irvin J. and Payne, Isabelle K. "An Exploration of Attitude and Value Changes of College Freshmen," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI, (January, 1963), pp. 403-408.
- Mueller, Kate H. "Theory For Campus Discipline," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XXXVI (January, 1958), pp. 302-309.
- Paulsen, James A. "College Students in Trouble," The Atlantic, 214 (July, 1964), pp. 96-101.
- Prusok, Ralph E. "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Student Discipline," The Journal of College Student Personnel, V, (October, 1965), pp. 12-19.
- Reeves, Mary E. and Arbuckle, Dugold S. "The Counseling Attitudes of Deans of Women," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. V (October, 1963) p. 14.
- Webster, Harold. "Changes in Attitudes During College," The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 49 (June, 1958) pp. 109-117.
- "Who's Cutting Up on Campus," Life, 56 (May 22, 1964), p. 4.
- Woelfl, Paul A. "In Place of the Parent," America, 107 (September 15, 1962) p. 724-725.

Books

- Funk and Wagnalls College Standard Dictionary, (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1943).