

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

WILLIAM ROSS WANGEN for the DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
(Name) (Degree)
in EDUCATION presented on July 28, 1970
(Major) (Date)

Title: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES OF MALE
RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS AND STUDENT LEADERS

TOWARD SPECIFIED ACTS OF STUDENT BEHAVIOR

Abstract approved

Redacted for Privacy

James P. Duncan

The purpose of this study was to compare the acceptance of specified kinds of student behavior of three selected residence hall groups at Oregon State University: male elected residence hall leaders (N = 50), male appointed residence hall judicial board members (N = 50), and a random sample of men living in the residence halls (N = 50).

The participants in the study were administered the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior during a three-week period in March, 1970. This standardized instrument consists of 100 common student offenses classified into the categories of General Conduct, Drug Use, Mischief, Sex Offenses, Drinking, Cheating, and Theft. Participants in the study rated each item on a seven-point scale from "generally acceptable" to "vicious, a serious crime." Eighty-six percent of the initial group of participants returned the instrument. Additional

students were selected, using the same sampling technique as was used in selecting the initial participants, until 150 completed instruments were returned, i. e., 50 in each sample.

An analysis of variance statistical model was used to compare the opinions of the three groups about each of the seven scales of the instrument. When a difference at the .01 percent or .05 percent level of significance occurred, a test of least significant difference was applied to determine which group or groups contributed to the difference.

Null hypotheses for differences among the three groups of residence hall students in over-all behavior standards and in each of the seven scales of the instrument were tested. Null hypotheses for differences between the appointed judicial board members and the random sample of men living in the residence halls in over-all behavior standards and in the Drug Use and Mischief categories were rejected. The null hypotheses for differences between the appointed judicial board members and the elected student leaders in over-all behavior standards and in the category of Mischief were rejected.

The following differences among the three groups involved in the study were observed:

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the over-all full scale items significantly less acceptable than did the random sample of men living in the residence

halls.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the full scale items significantly less acceptable than did the random sample of elected men residence hall student leaders.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the drug use items significantly less acceptable than did the random sample of men living in the residence halls.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the mischief items significantly less acceptable than did the random sample of elected men residence hall student leaders.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the mischief items significantly less acceptable than did the random sample of men living in the residence halls.

No significant differences were discovered among the compared groups in standards related specifically to the following categories: general conduct, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, and theft. In addition, differences between other paired groups on the drug use, mischief, and over-all scales were not significant.

A Comparison Between the Attitudes of Male Residence
Hall Students and Student Leaders Toward
Specified Acts of Student Behavior

by

William Ross Wangen

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1971

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

July 28, 1970

Typed by Mary Jo Stratton for William Ross Wangen

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is most grateful to Dr. James P. Duncan for his assistance throughout the development of this study. His encouragement, advice, and constructive criticism were greatly appreciated. Additional gratitude for their interest and support is extended to the author's graduate committee: Dean Robert W. Chick, and Professors Anna Meeks, William R. Crooks, and Clifford W. Trow.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Norbert Hartmann and Mr. Pete Vennewitz for their assistance in the statistical analysis connected with this study.

Finally, sincere appreciation is expressed to my wife, Elaine, for her constant devotion and encouragement throughout my entire graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Purpose of the Study	6
Statement of the Problem	6
Hypotheses to be Tested	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	9
Significance of the Study	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Student Value and Attitude Differences	14
Residence Hall Conduct	18
Attitudes Toward Disciplinary Offenses and Procedures	20
Characteristics of Students Referred for Misconduct	21
Student Drug Use	26
Student Sex Conduct	31
Student Drinking	33
III. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES	36
The Instrument	36
Reliability of the Instrument	38
Sources of Data	39
Population and Sample Size	39
Sampling Procedure	40
Collection of Data	41
Statistical Treatment of Data	42
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	47
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	60
Summary	60
Findings	62
Conclusions	65
Recommendations	66

	<u>Page</u>
BIBLIOGRAPHY	68
APPENDIX	
Appendix A: Opinion Scale of Student Behavior	72

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Classification of the 100 items on the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior by specified categories.	38
2	Analysis of variance statistical model.	46
3	Test of least significant difference statistical model.	46
4	Analysis of variance of <u>full scale</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	48
5	Test of least significant difference of <u>full scale</u> ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	48
6	Analysis of variance of <u>general conduct</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	50
7	Test of least significant difference of <u>general conduct</u> ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	50

Table

Page

8	Analysis of variance of <u>drug use</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	51
9	Test of least significant difference of <u>drug use</u> ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	51
10	Analysis of variance of <u>mischief</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	53
11	Test of least significant difference of <u>mischief</u> ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	53
12	Analysis of variance of <u>sex offenses</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	55
13	Test of least significant difference of <u>sex offenses</u> ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board	

Table

Page

	members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	55
14	Analysis of variance of <u>drinking</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	56
15	Test of least significant difference of <u>drinking</u> ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	56
16	Analysis of variance of <u>cheating</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	57
17	Test of least significant difference of <u>cheating</u> ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	57
18	Analysis of variance of <u>theft</u> ratings of compared groups: elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.	58

19

Test of least significant difference of theft ratings of compared groups: (a) elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

58

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES OF MALE
RESIDENCE HALL STUDENTS AND STUDENT LEADERS
TOWARD SPECIFIED ACTS OF STUDENT BEHAVIOR

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The education of college students is increasingly conceived of as an experience which produces personal and social growth as well as intellectual achievement. Classroom theory, reading, and discussion alone will no longer suffice for total student development. As early as 1948, for example, the President's Commission on Higher Education stressed that colleges and universities must "concern themselves with the development of self-discipline and self-reliance, of ethical principles as a guide for conduct, . . . of insight into human motives and aspirations, of discriminating appreciation of a wide range of human values, . . . that responsibility for the development of these personal qualities cannot be left to some courses of a few departments or scattered extracurricular organizations; it must become a part of every phase of college life" (Higher Education. . . , 1948).

However, American higher education has not always been conceived of as an attempt to maximize every student's potential. In the early years of higher education, the duties which are now thought

of as student personnel functions were the responsibility of one man, many times the college president. These men performed tasks which grew largely out of crisis situations. Their roles were often reduced to that of campus supervisors and disciplinarians. However, as the philosophy of equal educational opportunity for all expanded in this country, the development of student personnel work helped higher education evolve to its concern for the "total" individual.

This present attention to the experience and the total campus life of students is derived from three basic assumptions: (1) the individual college student is conceived of as a functioning whole; (2) individual differences in college students are anticipated, with the uniqueness of each student not causing surprise, but being expected and planned for; (3) teaching, counseling, student activities, and organized educational efforts of the institution must start realistically from where the individual student is, and not from the point of development at which the institution would like to find the hypothetical average student. In this sense the individual's current drives, interests, and needs are accepted as significant points of origin in determining and developing any institutional program. This pervasive philosophy focused on the individual, then, affects the curriculum of the institution, its teaching procedures, its administrative policies, the selection of its faculty and staff, the regulation of student conduct - in actuality, the institution's entire program (Wrenn, 1951).

Thus, all facets of the college environment, whether it is realized or not, play a role in promoting the personality development of the young adult. A young person becomes what he becomes not only through what he hears in the classroom, but also because of the values he acquires through interaction with his professors, fellow students, and the administration. Therefore, the atmosphere which permeates the college environment, and the educational goals of his college, all have an immense impact on the young person's self-discipline, self-reliance and maturity.

This holistic view of the campus environment, however, is not complete. The process of maturation is not easy, particularly when we consider that the student's interactions with his collegiate environment are not always harmonious. When this occurs we occasionally encounter problems of a disciplinary nature. Discipline as discussed here is not to be viewed as merely a punitive process or act, but instead as a positive and preventive process which can be considered a vital part of the student's educational experience. If a student is to acquire the self-discipline that is the mark of maturity, then a disciplinary approach which is based on planned programs of reasonable expectations consistently enforced, that helps him to understand himself, must be instituted. However, it must also be realized that without proper guidance within an appropriate educational setting, the education of college students could develop as easily

in an undesirable as in a desirable direction.

Considering that a great proportion of the student's out-of-class life is spent in the residence halls, it is evident that these living units serve also as vital centers for learning. The residence hall program can and does provide a laboratory for learning and growth toward social and emotional maturity. By actual implementation of those principles of behavior which contribute to such maturity, each resident may grow in personal and social responsibility. The challenge is one of making decisions, forming judgments, assuming responsibility, and learning to live and work with others in a cooperative, harmonious relationship. It is in this way that the residence hall program represents an integral part of the total educational process.

Most college authorities agree that accepting responsibility for the conduct of his affairs in the residence halls is a valuable part of each student's educational growth. This means, first of all, that each student, like an adult, assumes responsibility for himself, and does not expect someone else to remind or coerce him to observe the regulations, to care for his room, and to live according to a highly acceptable social and moral standard.

Secondly, good citizenship is more than just keeping regulations and observing minimum standards for group welfare. It requires a positive contribution from many students; a willingness to hold office, to serve on committees, and to work on projects which

make the residence hall a better community in which to live.

Every member of the living group must also share the responsibility for the welfare of the group as a whole, and of the individuals who compose it. For example, if a member of the group evades a regulation, others in the group will attempt to alter his behavioral patterns in a direction which would encourage group solidarity.

In many colleges and universities, considerable authority has been granted residence hall councils for the regulation and conduct of student affairs through hall judicial boards. The obvious criterion in granting authority to these residence hall groups has been the willingness of the students to accept responsibility commensurate with the authority granted them, in recognition of the value of student responsibility in teaching self-discipline. Regulations within the residence halls are generally kept to a minimum and left largely to the decisions of the group concerned. This is based on the idea that hopefully, if one is a good citizen with proper concern for the welfare of others, few regulations will be necessary. When rules or regulations specifically intended to serve the welfare of student groups are broken, the logical course is enforcement through student organizations. However, in the enforcement of rules and regulations, it must be remembered that the most positive approach is the teaching of self-discipline and self-reliance by helping the student understand himself

and his relationships with others.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to compare the acceptance of specified kinds of student behavior of three selected residence hall groups: male elected residence hall leaders, male appointed residence hall judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in residence halls. The study is based on the above rationale for student residence hall programs in higher education.

It is further based on two important assumptions: (1) that behavior standards as reflected through personal opinion can be measured, and (2) that ratings of the seriousness of selected offenses reflect the behavior standards of the individual.

Statement of the Problem

The problem to which this study is addressed is: To what extent do the behavior standards as perceived by men's residence hall elected leaders, men's residence hall appointed judicial board officers, and a random sample of the student residents they represent, differ as measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior? *

* The Opinion Scale on Student Behavior was developed by Dr. Thomas C. Schreck in a 1959 study of the acceptability of specified student behavior to students, faculty, and student personnel administrators.

If differences do exist, what is the significance and extent of these differences? What standards do the compared groups support?

Hypotheses to be Tested

The problem stated above will be investigated through the testing of the following general null hypothesis: There are no significant differences among the overall behavior standards of elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

In order to test this general hypothesis, the following specific null hypotheses will be tested:

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to the category general conduct.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to drug use.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to mischief.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to sex offenses.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to drinking.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups

in standards related to cheating.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to theft.

In the event that the above general hypothesis is rejected, this alternative hypothesis will be automatically accepted: There are significant differences among the overall behavior standards reflected between the elected men residence hall student leaders, the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Limitations of the Study

This study will attempt to identify any significant differences in attitude toward standards of behavior for three specific residence hall groups at Oregon State University. No attempt will be made, however, to investigate differences associated with such factors as the test scores, school of enrollment in the University, religious affiliations, age, or socio-economic background of the subjects. The characteristics of the sample of students selected from the residence hall population at large, matched those student judicial board members and student elected leaders.

The study is concerned with the areas of conduct included in the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior, the major emphasis of which centers around those offenses which are typical of the college age

group and the campus environment in general, with a few questions relating specifically to residence halls. Some revisions of the standard instrument were made by this investigator, in consultation with a panel of student personnel administrators at Oregon State University.

As previously indicated, the three groups studied were selected to represent the various subgroups of the men's residence hall community, and therefore are not expected to represent the opinions of all students in all residence halls or all students campus-wide at Oregon State University.

The instrument was chosen for the study based on the investigator's review of the literature, and the suggestions of others. It was the opinion of those surveyed that the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior does provide a suitable measure of student standards of conduct as expressed by compared groups. In this study the measure of student opinion is limited to behavior as measured by the revised form of the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior.

Definition of Terms

The term member is used interchangeably throughout the research with the term leader, both referring to either elected or appointed positions of leadership within the residence hall framework.

Acts of student behavior judged to be questionable, inadvisable,

unbecoming, or lacking social acceptance are referred to as offenses.

Opinion and attitude are defined as follows: In English's (1953) dictionary the definition of opinion is "a belief that one holds to be without emotional commitment of desire." English further stated,

Since verbal statements of opinion are often sought as a revelation of attitude, opinion and attitude are often used interchangeably. This blurs a useful distinction between the ostensibly intellectual opinion and the ostensibly evaluative attitude.

Strang (1937) presented the definition of attitude as, "... including the following concepts: inclinations, feelings, values, prejudices and convictions about any specific topic, all of these being integrated and dynamic in the presence of an activating stimulus... attitudes of an individual are influenced by the established norms or frames of reference and, to a much greater extent, by individual experiences."

In an attempt to further differentiate between attitudes and opinions, Travers (1955) stated: "Opinions are verbal statements hypothesized to be symptomatic of attitude... A single opinion may provide very limited evidence concerning a person's attitudes."

Significance of the Study

In recent years many college authorities have become increasingly aware of the changing attitudes of American college students. The college student himself has been the major proponent of these changes. It is quite apparent that students learn much in matters of

attitudes, values, and standards from other students. It is also apparent that many student personnel administrators lack insight into many of the standards of conduct upheld by students.

Evidence further indicates that most behavioral counseling techniques and theories are implemented before an adequate realistic body of knowledge concerning particular student populations is established. If one of the basic purposes of higher education is to help the student seek maturity through self-actualization, then the college administrator has an obligation to understand student populations through research or any other educational means so that he may aid students in making valid critical decisions and judgments based on factual information.

If discipline is to be viewed as a positive and preventative process and an important part of the educational process, a more realistic disciplinary approach, through understanding, must be implemented. The student personnel administrator involved in men's residence hall programs must know the standards supported by various men's residence hall subgroups such as elected student leaders, appointed student judicial board members, and non-office-holding residents. Increased understanding will help student personnel administrators avoid the complications of any unrecognized disparity in the standards of these groups and will permit the development of more realistic programs.

If the results of this study indicate there are no differences in behavior standards among the selected residence hall groups, an educational program recognizing the accepted standards can be implemented. If areas of disagreement are discovered, the student personnel administrator can then strive to establish the necessary educational programs to deal with differences in existing behavioral standards.

One of the major stumbling blocks that must be overcome in seeking to improve student conduct is the reluctance of students to discipline or even judge their fellows. In a period that calls for tolerance, some students seem tolerant of nearly any form of behavior. Students need to be taught that the educated person discriminates; he accepts certain things and rejects others. This is where the student personnel administrator can do much to help students realize that most people want to do what is acceptable with respect to others, and expect others to follow the same principles of consideration. Students should be helped to realize that they and their fellow students must stand up for their beliefs, and that by the use of discriminating judgment they show their maturity. Student personnel administrators must provide support and wise guidance, so that justice is provided each student and that each student is allowed to develop to the fullest of his capacities and potential.

The value of this investigation then, is in its attempt to

objectively measure and compare the standards of conduct supported by elected student leaders, appointed student judicial board members, and student residents, within a university residence hall community. This information should prove valuable in establishing educational, preventative and rehabilitative disciplinary programs in college and university residence halls for men. While no amount of careful planning or wise administration will eliminate all wrongdoing on a campus, reliance on sound educational principles through research such as this should do much to raise the level of student conduct.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A substantial amount of research has been done in the area of student discipline on the college campus; research related to attitudes toward specific acts of student conduct however, are not plentiful. An attempt has been made to consider only those studies which are related to the problem under investigation. These studies are those concerned specifically with value and attitude differences among college students, attitudes toward disciplinary offenses and procedures, characteristics and personality patterns of students referred for misconduct, and studies relating specifically to student drug use, sex conduct and use of alcoholic beverages.

Student Value and Attitude Differences

In a recent investigation, Teglovic (1968) examined the relationships between values and the sex of the student, and between values and the size, affiliation, and geographic location of the participating institutions. The instrument used in this study was the Polyphasic Values Inventory which assesses value commitments, using 20 multiple-choice items, with the responses organized on a conservative-liberal continuum. The items cover selected philosophical, political, economic, educational, social, personal, moral, and religious areas of

value difference. Figures published by the U. S. Office of Education were used to determine the percentage of students enrolled in schools of various locations, affiliations, and sizes. These figures were used in selecting the institutions surveyed by Teglovic. Random samples (stratified by sex) were drawn from the student directories of 17 colleges and universities in the United States. Of the 5,863 students contacted, 4,005 responded. Areas of widespread disagreement among respondents were attitudes toward Communism, ethical conduct, sexual behavior, nature of the Bible, and to what extent man is responsible for his deeds. Students expressed a belief that a maximum of personal contact was necessary to overcome racial problems; however, they were divided on whether inter-marriage is a desirable solution. Students felt that the use of alcoholic beverages was up to the individual; however, they believed that excessive drinking was undesirable. Female students had a tendency to be more liberal in their attitudes on issues such as war, foreign policy, equality of men, crime, science and voting than did male students. Male students seemed to take a more liberal position on such issues as cheating, sex relations, use of alcohol, and man's responsibilities than did female students.

Another recent descriptive analysis of college student values was undertaken by Zehv (1968). A stratified random sample of 100 male and 100 female students from each of the five grade levels

(freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate) at Colorado State College were selected. These students were administered the revised form of the Polyphasic Values Inventory. The findings of this study indicated that there was a tendency toward homogeneity responses with respect to age, grade level and financial status. There was also agreement on a core of values compared with other students: the need for and acceptance of traditional religious beliefs, the approval of traditional American moral virtues, to favor private initiative, and to regard man as being responsible for his deeds.

Students' values in relationship to four non-academic variables, political, religious and philosophic preferences and socio-economic level, were examined by Thayer (1968). Each of the above variables was divided into five categories. The distribution of responses for each group was examined for significant differences from the total sample on each of the 20 Polyphasic Values Inventory items. The sample consisted of approximately 4,000 students from several different colleges and universities. It was determined that the religious and political groups exhibited more significant differences while the philosophic groups exhibited only slight differences. The socio-economic groups exhibited no significant differences.

It was the purpose of Grieneek's study (1968) to determine whether definite patterns of attitudes could be identified for each of four subcultures or role orientations of students. These subcultures

included vocational, academic, collegiate, and nonconformist. Differences in attitudes among students who remain in a particular orientation over a two-year period were also investigated. The attitudes studied were dogmatism and conservatism. Subjects included 832 students (435 men and 397 women) all from an entering freshman class. Conservatism and dogmatism had only limited or no value for differentiating between the four subcultures. The attitude of conservatism differentiated the groups in almost half the comparisons, but dogmatism had no differentiating power. It was concluded that knowledge of the pattern and stability of subcultures on campus would prove beneficial to students, faculty members, and administrators.

The moral attitudes and behavioral experiences of 753 college students were measured by Heise (1968), using an anonymous, self-report questionnaire focusing on 30 deviant behaviors. Ratings of experiences with the 30 behaviors were factor-analyzed to define dimensions of individual deviancy. Eleven factors were extracted for both males and females. Generally the factors were similar across sex lines, but not all the female factors could be characterized with confidence. Some additional analyses suggested that moral norms, personal motivations, and situational pressures all contribute to deviancy rates, and the latter factor may be intricately involved in development of a pattern of deviancy.

Of particular interest for this present study is Schreck's (1959)

research in which he attempted to assess the standards of student conduct supported by various components of a university community including students, faculty and student personnel staff. It was discovered that differences did exist between standards of student conduct supported by these selected groups. His study concerned itself with the following seven specific categories of conduct: general conduct, automobile and traffic, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, and theft. Schreck's conclusions were: There was a significant difference among compared groups in overall standards of conduct; a significant difference existed among compared groups in standards of conduct related to all seven specific categories of conduct; the faculty group tended to display a higher standard of conduct expectation for students than the remaining compared groups; and the student personnel staff displayed a standard of conduct more compatible with standards reflected by student groups, rather than the standards reflected by the faculty group.

Residence Hall Conduct

White (1963), in a comparative study, surveyed attitudes toward women's residence hall regulations held by students who were members of judiciary boards, students who had appeared before judiciary boards, and students who had never appeared before a judiciary board. It was discovered that (a) board members held more

favorable attitudes toward the social structure and were more inclined to uphold rules than non-board members; (b) rule-breakers and rule-conformists had similar attitudes toward rules, (c) rule-breakers were more likely to perceive board members as punitive and unfair than rule-conformists; and (d) students were not likely to report infractions unless charged with that responsibility. Even though all respondents considered their personal behavior codes more important than residence hall rules, they tended to accept the rules as written.

Five-hundred twenty undergraduate residence hall students were asked by Hodinko (1964) to rank-order 17 hypothetical situations organized into seven major areas, for degree of censure. The sample studied indicated the most serious instances of misconduct were theft for material value, cheating involving collusion, sexual promiscuity, and premeditated cheating. Rated as least serious were theft for novelty value, possession of beer on campus, and drinking by a minor. In a related study Murphy and Hanna (1964), using a revised version of Hodinko's methods, compared attitudes toward misbehavior held by (1) 200 randomly selected students, (2) 43 student tribunal members, (3) 22 faculty members, and (4) 74 residence hall counselors. The authors concluded that the four groups held highly similar attitudes toward dealing with misconduct.

Attitudes Toward Disciplinary Offenses and Procedures

Sillers and Feder (1964) examined variations in attitudes toward disciplinary offenses among four key administrators, a male and female disciplinary officer, an academic dean, and the president, from each of nine institutions. They responded first by questionnaire and again two weeks later in an hour-long taped interview. They found that male disciplinary officers were significantly more consistent in their decisions than were the other three groups. The groups tended to advocate a counseling approach with equal frequency, however in only one case was a preventative group work approach suggested. The researchers concluded that while institutional personnel may tend to hold similar views of the seriousness of a situation, they tend to differ in their approaches to the problem.

Prusok (1961) found, in a survey of a five percent sample of the students at a large state university, that student personnel administrators held more punitive attitudes over the entire range of cases presented to the sample than did the students. In a later study, Prusok (1963) administered a questionnaire based on actual male misconduct cases to students, parents, and student personnel administrators. He found agreement among the groups on rank-order of seriousness of the various categories of misconduct. Students tended to be least punitive, and the attitudes of parents were closer to those of the students than to those of personnel administrators. The

investigator felt that the image of the personnel administrator as having a permissive approach to student misconduct was not supported by the data.

LeMay et al. (1968) summarized the responses of samples of college students and parents on issues concerning university rules and regulations of student conduct. The students in the study (both the student sample and the student leader sample) disagreed with the statement that student behavior should be a concern to the university regardless of where it occurs. Both groups disagreed with the concept that the university should have the right to take disciplinary action on a case which had been previously handled by a civil agency. The parent sample generally agreed that student behavior should be of concern to the university regardless of where it occurs. Parents also felt that the university should have a right to discipline students whose cases have been previously handled by a city or state law enforcement agency.

Such studies as these can offer guidelines in establishing educationally sound campus disciplinary programs and procedures.

Characteristics of Students Referred for Misconduct

Although numerous studies have tried to determine the behavior and personality of the disciplinary offender, few studies have dealt specifically with the characteristics of students referred for

misconduct.

In a comprehensive investigation of the characteristics of misconduct cases by Tisdale and Brown (1965), it was discovered that the student referrals were likely to be: freshmen, males, fraternity members, enrolled in either the College of Engineering or Sciences and Humanities, from large high schools, from the lower half of their graduating class, and to have scored lower than other students on academic aptitude tests. The referred students were also more likely to have used the university counseling services. In a similar study, Bazik and Meyering (1965) investigated the characteristics of student disciplinary referrals attending a teacher education institution with an enrollment of over 6,000. The student disciplinary group was found to be younger, composed primarily of underclassmen, and had significantly lower GPA's than did the non-referrals.

In a more recent survey by Griffis (1969), the Student Characteristic and Attitude Inventory (SCAI) was utilized to ascertain whether there were fundamental differences between male freshman students against whom disciplinary action had been taken, and male freshman students characterized by exemplary citizenship. It was also intended to ascertain whether or not there were attitudinal differences in these two groups, and whether or not it was possible to construct an equation from the information in this investigation for practical use in identifying students who are prone toward

misbehavior. The inventory administered contained 132 items which are assigned to 12 separate tables related to misbehavior. The subjects were selected randomly from two eastern universities. The first six variables of the inventory pertained to the student's background characteristics; the seventh variable was related to the universities' administrators and regulations; the eighth variable to academic endeavors; the ninth variable to leisure time activities; the tenth variable to college peers; the eleventh variable to independence; and the twelfth variable to moral and religious convictions. At one university, attitude variables 7, 10, and 12 discriminated highly, while at the other university variables 7, 9, 10, and 11 showed high discrimination. It was concluded that it is possible to discriminate between misbehaving and exemplary students through utilization of the SCAI as attitudinal differences did exist between the two groups of students at both institutions.

Studies which deal specifically with the personalities of college students who are involved in acts of misconduct were also investigated. LeMay and Murphy (1967) administered the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) to 70 male undergraduate college students who had been referred for disciplinary action. Controls matched for age, school of enrollment, and college class were computed on the clinical scales of the MMPI to the referred students. The Disorderly Conduct group and the Alcohol Misconduct group

differed significantly from their matched controls on the psychopathic deviate (Pd) and the hypomania (Ma) scales of the MMPI. The groups which did not differ significantly from their matched controls were the Theft group, the Minor Misconduct group, and the Miscellaneous group. Nyman and LeMay (1967), using the same samples, scored the sub-scales of the Pd and Ma scales for students referred for alcohol misconduct and disorderly conduct. Disorderly referrals appeared subject to an excess of energy and pressure for action, and tended to disregard the feelings of others. The alcohol misconduct cases appeared to have an "inflated ego" which was easily damaged.

Clark (1964), in a study concerning itself with students involved in residence hall misconduct, discovered differences in Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) patterns among students in sections of male residence halls experiencing unusual degrees of misconduct and students in quieter sections of the residence halls. Elton and Rose (1966), in a similar study, used the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) to investigate male freshman students involved in disciplinary problems in residence halls. These students were categorized into two disciplinary groups and one non-disciplinary group. Forty-five students in each of the three categories were nominated by the head resident. The three categories were defined as repeat reprimands, single reprimands, and non-reprimands. The resulting OPI scores indicated that reprimanded

students have more ability, were less conforming and less able to adapt their impulse controls to their environmental demands.

Cummins (1966) investigated the scores on the Inventory of Beliefs, Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, and the Differential Values Inventory which were taken during the freshman year by 95 males and 49 female students. In all cases each one of these students had been referred for misconduct sometime during their college careers. It was discovered that the female offenders had lower traditional values than did their control group. However, no significant differences were found between male offenders and their control group.

A year later, Cummins and Lindblade (1967) conducted research which supports the need for control of the sex variable in research concerning disciplinary cases. The authors found that disciplinary males appeared to have more traditional value orientations than did females. This did not hold true between male and female non-offenders. They also stated that there was some selectivity involved in referring women to the Dean's office that does not occur in referring men, and that possibly women who break rules and are caught have veered further from traditional values than men who have been caught breaking similar rules.

Osborne, Sanders and Young (1956) used the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) in a study of 41 freshman females involved in two or more offenses during their first year on a

college campus. A matched control group was used and MMPI scores on scales paranoia (Pa), psychosthenia (Pt), schizophrenia (Sc) and hypomania (Ma) were elevated for the problem group beyond the five percent level of confidence. It was concluded that college women disciplinary offenders tend to react to everyday problems in unusual, sometimes unacceptable ways, and were more inclined to possess a distorted outlook on life. They also have a tendency to be overly sensitive and to feel that they are limited, mistreated, and unduly controlled by others. The significance of this particular study was to again reinforce the concept that male and female offenders should be studied separately since research has repeatedly shown the importance of sex differences in studies of this nature.

Student Drug Use

In the area of the use of drugs on campus, several related studies were reviewed with an attempt to include those which were most relevant to the present study under investigation.

Harrison (1965) found by sampling 100 students from San Francisco State College that 60 percent of the student body had used drugs illicitly during their college careers. One-fifth to one-fourth reported smoking marijuana and about three percent said they had had experience with LSD. In another study, Eells (1967) utilized special procedures to achieve a 90 percent return of an anonymous

questionnaire dealing with the extent and use of marijuana and LSD by college students, and with attitudes of these students toward these drugs. He found that 20 percent had tried marijuana and nine percent LSD, with the highest percentage of users being in the junior class. Dealing with future drug use, half of the undergraduates and about three fourths of the graduate students stated that they did not expect to use marijuana again, whereas 65 percent of the undergraduates and 85 percent of the graduates were not interested in beginning the use of LSD. There was no evidence of "hard" narcotics use on the campus.

It was the purpose of a recent Oregon State University survey by Mason and Holloway (1970) to gain reliable information relevant to the problem of drug usage in a university residence hall and to ascertain the attitudes and opinions about drug usage held by the students in that hall. A questionnaire was devised that included questions on most of the areas related to contemporary drug usage as defined by the authors. For the purpose of this study the term "drug" covered marijuana in all its forms, the hallucinogens, amphetamines, barbiturates and narcotics. The sample selected consisted of the total population of a coeducational residence hall. This particular hall was selected because of the availability of both men and women and because the overall number (approximately 300) was determined to be fairly representative. Eighty-four percent of the students returned a

completed questionnaire indicating that 22 percent of the women respondents and 28 percent of the men respondents had used drugs at least once. Other findings indicated that 50 percent of the women users had used drugs other than marijuana; whereas this was the case for only 22 percent of the men users. Women respondents seemed to hold more liberal attitudes toward drug usage than did men respondents. It was also found that student attitudes toward marijuana differed greatly from their response toward other drugs. Many of these young people did not consider the smoking of marijuana wrong. This was substantiated by the fact that over 50 percent of the non-users group and over 87 percent of the users group said that marijuana should be legalized. This would indicate that imposing harsh penalties for marijuana use is not the answer to the problem. On the other hand, however, the data indicated strong student support for restrictions placed on the use of hard drugs.

From all indications there has been a rather rapid increase in the number of college students experimenting with marijuana in the past few years. Hallucinogens appear to be consistently less popular, although their use has also increased markedly. It is apparent, however, from the standpoint of this study, that what is taking place socially should be evaluated not only statistically, but in an appraisal of the kinds of people who are attracted to drugs.

A very careful psychological study of the effects of LSD by

McGothlin, Cohen and McGothlin (1967) revealed much that is important about the characteristics of students who are interested in hallucinogens. The investigators recruited subjects for an experiment without telling the volunteers what the study would use. A large battery of tests were given prior to a series of three LSD sessions at intervals of two weeks and then six months after the last LSD session. Among 122 male graduate students qualifying as subjects (not pre-psychotic and not in therapy), 25 refused to take LSD when they were told what the experiment would be and another 11 remained but were admittedly fearful. These negative students were compared with neutral and positive (toward LSD) students. The students who were against taking LSD proved to be more extroverted, more organized, given to making plans, and more conventional. The students who were in favor of taking LSD were more capable of regressive experience, more intuitive, more introverted, more casual and spontaneous, more psychopathic (amoral, careless of the rights of others), more bizarre, and more excitable. Almost all of those favorable toward taking LSD had used marijuana; fewer were married and attended church.

Kleber (1965) carefully observed 21 students at Yale who had taken peyote, half of whom had also taken marijuana. It was observed that both psychologically stable and unstable students experiment with drugs and that for the unstable ones the reasons offered ("wanting new experience, " "seeking religious meanings")

were superficial and concealed serious problems of adjustment. Kleber found more adverse affects, fewer reports of pleasant experiences, and less intention to repeat use among the unstable students using a hallucinogen, as compared with the psychologically stable and otherwise average undergraduates he observed. Among psychologically adjusted students, the reasons offered for drug use were more likely to be accurate, showing self-awareness and not concealed adjustment problems. Many subjects reported anxiety during the drug experience; half felt drug use had improved their lives; a fourth (these were confined to the maladjusted student group) were observed to have long-lasting adverse effects, including anxiety, persistent hallucinations, worsened symptoms, or drug dependency.

In a recent study by Brehm and Back (1968) important personality factors associated with student drug use were identified. Using 333 college freshmen and focusing on the broad spectrum of psychoactive drugs, the investigators identified five factors derived from the attitude questionnaire which they administered. These factors were insecurity, fear of loss of self-control, sick role, denial of drug effects, and curiosity. Insecurity was found to be a factor related to the use of all agents, from aspirin through opiates. Curiosity was related to the use of hallucinogens, opiates, and energizers, whereas fears about loss of control were negatively related to the use of these illicit substances. Brehm and Back concluded that the combination of

doubt about self and wish to change the self plus a general confidence in the effectiveness of drugs is related to using any type of physical agent, whereas a combination of curiosity about one's potentialities and an absence of fear of loss of control relates more specifically to using that complex of agents known as 'releasers'.

In another study dealing with personality characteristics, Kleckner (1968) administered the Cattell 16PF Test to 40 college students who were psychedelic drug users and compared them with a matched sample of 40 non-users, all from the same college. Users were significantly more aloof, anxious, paranoid, and had less ego strength and super ego. The 16PF interpretation also termed them brighter and more dominant interpersonally. Nevertheless, the scales were further interpreted as indicating that users were more creative, less leader-like, more isolated, and more accident prone.

Student Sex Conduct

Probably one of the most recent and extensively discussed aspects of student conduct has been student sexual attitudes and behaviors. Because of the apparent confusion surrounding this subject, there is a need for more descriptive studies regarding students' sexual attitudes and conduct. It seems apparent that today's students talk more frankly about sex and have greater opportunity to experience sexual relationships within the college community than is

sometimes realized.

According to a recent study by Berns (1969), which supported the above generalizations, it is evident that many college officials are currently inadequately prepared to deal with students' sexual attitudes and conduct. These officials, who include counselors and student personnel administrators, identify with conservative elements on this subject, and treat such matters with detachment. This indicates a need for student personnel administrators and counseling personnel to meet the challenge of greater sexual awareness with greater openness in helping students with problems of sexual identity.

In a questionnaire study of 68 male and 64 female college students, Miller and Wilson (1968) inquired about sexual behaviors (a) experienced, (b) deemed acceptable on a date, (c) deemed acceptable if experienced previously by a fiancée, (d) revealed to peers, and (e) revealed to parent. High scores were viewed as indicative of liberality and differences among measurements as indicative of conflict. Results indicated that the measures of sexual liberality and conflict did not correlate with measures of adjustment, avowed happiness, or religiousness. Students also reported far more sexual experiences than they ever revealed to a peer or a parent.

Knox and Sporakowski (1968) constructed a scale to ascertain the tendency to be "romantic" or "conjugal" in attitude toward love, which they administered to 100 male and 100 female college students.

Findings indicated (a) males were more "romantic" than females, (b) as students progressed from their freshman to their senior year, their attitudes toward love tended to become more "conjugal," and (c) engaged males tended to be more "realistic" about love and sex than non-engaged males.

Kilpatrick et al. (1968) proposed to examine the relationship between dogmatism and personal sexual attitude, predicting that high dogmatics will have more sexually conservative attitudes. Form E of the Dogmatism Scale and a Sexual Attitude Survey (SAS) were administered to 380 volunteers (192 men and 188 women) from an introductory course in psychology. High dogmatic males were found to be more sexually conservative than low-dogmatic males. It was also discovered that there was no significant difference in conservatism of sexual attitudes between high-dogmatic and low-dogmatic females, and that male students, as expected, were significantly more sexually liberal than female students.

Student Drinking

Another common problem on college and university campuses involves student consumption of alcoholic beverages. This is not a recent problem nor is it limited to a small faction of students, isolated in specific situations or periods of time. Over 20 years ago, Hecht, Grime and Rothrock (1948) surveyed 1,700 students from 27

colleges and found that only 13 percent of their sample of men and women students did not drink, and concluded that 17 and 18 seem to be the critical drinking ages for both male and female students. Ten years later, Rogers (1958), utilizing a questionnaire to survey 725 students in a state-supported mid-western university, discussed frequency of student drinking and group influences on student drinking. He found that 60 percent of the men's residence hall sample and 64 percent of the women's residence hall sample reported that they did not drink while a reported 27 percent of the fraternity sample did not drink.

Using evidence that the college drinking problem is apparently related to role deviation and ambivalence, Williams (1965) conducted a self-concept study of 64 students from fraternities in four eastern men's colleges. Using a problem drinking measure and an objective check list, he compared the college sample to a sample of alcoholics. It was concluded that problem drinking is associated with self-concept and real-self/ideal-self correspondence. The problem drinkers were similar to the alcoholic sample in their tendency to endorse concepts suggestive of neurosis.

Strassburger and Strassburger (1965) reported the responses of two groups of college students on a social drinking attitude scale and an attitude scale concerning treatment or punishment of alcoholics. It was learned that generally speaking, students who were favorably

disposed to the use of alcohol and to the treatment rather than punishment of alcoholics scored higher on the personality scales. A year later, both Minowitz (1966) and Wolf (1966) concluded that while student addiction is rare, students do seek social acceptance and relief from anxiety in alcohol consumption.

This review of related literature is relative to the purpose of this study as it presents the following basic conclusions.

Conclusion #1: Student attitudes differ markedly on many points of personal conduct.

Conclusion #2: Differences in attitude derive from differences in such variables as sex, age, class standing, philosophic-religious affiliations, psychological stability, etc.

Conclusion #3: Differences in student attitudes can be measured.

Conclusion #4: Based on this review of literature there is no evidence to indicate differences of attitude toward standards of behavior, between residence hall leaders and non-leaders.

Therefore: The results of this study will contribute to current research related to standards and viewpoints toward college student behavior and will provide necessary data for the development of realistic disciplinary programs in college student residence halls.

CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

The Instrument

The Opinion Scale on Student Behavior was developed in 1959 by Dr. Thomas C. Schreck, Dean of Students at Indiana University. A list of student offenses was developed as a means of ascertaining the acceptability of selected items of student behavior. In developing the list of offenses, a survey was conducted of past disciplinary offenses handled by the Office of the Dean of Students at Indiana University. Selection of statements was based on the persistence of occurrence, range of seriousness, and the variety of types of offenses, such as drinking, theft and sex offenses.

In order to test the internal validity of the instrument, the offenses were subjected to a panel of judges consisting of professionally recognized student personnel administrators at Indiana University. The panel judged the instrument to be representative of student offenses. In addition to determining representativeness of offenses, the judges and the investigator edited the items to avoid loading and ambiguity. The items for the rating scale were intentionally selected because of the variety of statements available. The instrument resulting from this selection process was also edited by these same judges. This scale was originally developed to allow personal evaluation of the seriousness of each statement on a seven-point scale.

The seven choices on this scale are as follows: generally acceptable; inadvisable, occasionally acceptable; undesirable, not good practice; inconsiderate, irresponsible, selfish; unacceptable, harmful, demands punishment; intolerable, demands severe punishment; and vicious, a serious crime. The seven categories of statements included general conduct, automobile and traffic, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, and theft. Schreck's selection was based on the premise that these seven categories proved to be satisfactory classifications for the most significant types of student offenses. All items not logically classified in the six specific categories were listed under general conduct.

In this study the category "drug use" has been substituted for the original category "automobile and traffic" because of the current emphasis on drugs and the relatively minor automobile and traffic problems on the Oregon State University campus. The questions on drug use and other editorial changes of the instrument were submitted to a panel of student personnel administrators at Oregon State University. This panel was asked to judge the statements as to their pertinence and relevance to the contemporary campus community. Points of constructive criticism made by members of this panel were, at the discretion of this writer, incorporated into the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior form used in this study.

The Opinion Scale on Student Behavior as used in this study

consists of 100 items which are classified into categories as shown below:

Table 1. Classification of the 100 items on the opinion scale of student behavior by specified categories.

Category number	Name of category	Number of items
1	General Conduct	31
2	Drug Use	9
3	Mischief	11
4	Sex Offenses	10
5	Drinking	16
6	Cheating	14
7	Theft	<u>9</u>
Total		100

Reliability of the Instrument

In Dr. Schreck's initial study in which he devised the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior, a test-retest method of determining reliability was utilized. This method was selected because only one form of the scale was developed. No attempt was made to rank items in the order of seriousness of offense which would have been necessary in the odd-even or split-half method of computing reliability.

In his attempt to assess the reliability of the scale, Schreck administered his scale to ten individuals in each of five groups included in his study. These individuals were then administered the

retest at a later date. The reliability data was presented in the form of an absolute deviation from the initial test raw score responses. It was discovered through the analysis of this test for reliability that the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior was reliable.

Sources of Data

Two main sources of data have been used in this study: (1) the Residence Hall Official Records, and (2) the student's opinion, through the use of the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior.

Population and Sample Size

The three experimental groups consisted of:

- (1) 50 elected men residence hall student leaders
- (2) 50 appointed men residence hall student judicial board members
- (3) 50 men living in the residence halls

According to official figures for Winter Term, 1970, the total number of men residing in the residence halls at Oregon State University was approximately 1,865. The total population of men residence hall elected leaders (hall or floor presidents, vice presidents, secretaries, and/or treasurers) was approximately 140, and the total population of appointed residence hall judicial board members was approximately 65.

A sample size of 50 for each of the three residence hall student

groups compared is sufficiently large enough to ensure a reasonable degree of stability. It is also important to note that these students were not selected to represent the typical student on campus but rather to represent segments of the University residence halls population which are of significance to this particular study.

Sampling Procedure

The elected men's residence hall student leaders and the appointed men's residence hall judicial board members were identified and located through residence hall records, and were selected by virtue of their positions. Also, because research has shown that there is generally a significant difference in the attitudes toward misconduct as expressed by students who have been involved in acts of misbehavior and those who have not, any student who had been involved in acts of misconduct was eliminated from this study.

The qualifications for holding residence hall leadership positions at Oregon State University are:

- (1) Currently enrolled for a minimum of 12 term hours.
- (2) A minimum grade point average of 2.00.
- (3) Class rank of sophomore or above.
- (4) Residing in the residence hall.

The group of 50 men living in the residence halls was selected from a stratified sampling to control for proportionate numbers of

sophomores, juniors, and seniors. Test scores, family background and income, and school of enrollment at the university were not considered in the selection of the sample. Grade point average and minimum number of term hours were considered in the selection of the non-leader student sample, however, because these two factors are part of the minimum qualifications of all members of the student leader group. The independent variable in this study is the elected or appointed position of leadership.

Collection of Data

The 150 opinion scales used in this comparative study were presented to the three groups of residence hall living group members through: (1) personal contact; (2) hall council and/or hall judicial board meetings; (3) resident assistants; (4) head residents. A brief explanation of the study and the instrument was given, either individually or in groups, to each individual participant. An honest effort was made not to coerce subjects into participating by explaining that their involvement was entirely voluntary and depended largely upon their time and interest.

Students were asked to complete the scale at their convenience and return it either to their resident assistant, head resident, or the investigator. Only two of the 50 scales presented to the residence hall elected leaders were not returned within a three-week period

which was a 96 percent return. Of the scales presented to residence hall judicial board members, seven of 50 were not returned, or an 86 percent return. Thirty-nine of the 50 scales presented to the random sample of residence hall living group members were returned, yielding a 78 percent return. An overall 86 percent return was realized for the total administration of the instrument. In each case at least one follow-up attempt was made.

To replace the 20 students who did not respond, the same sampling techniques were utilized as additional students in each category were contacted and asked to complete the opinion scale. No one declined, and within one week 20 more completed scales were collected for a total of 150 – 50 for each of the three residence hall groups used in the study.

Statistical Treatment of Data

To measure whether differences among residence hall groups in their respective ratings of the acceptability of certain student behavior did exist and the significance of these differences, the analysis of variance statistical model was used. This technique provided a means of testing for differences among more than two groups simultaneously. The basic model for this analysis of variance is:

$$Y_{ij} = u + T_i + E_{ij},$$

where

Y_{ij} = an observation

u = overall mean

T_i = group effect

E_{ij} = random error

i = number of groups

j = fixed number of observations
in each group

Using this model the analysis of variance is carried out by computing the following:

$$SS_t = \sum_{ij} Y_{ij}^2 - \frac{(\sum_{ij} Y_{ij})^2}{N}$$

$$SS_g = \frac{(\sum_j Y_{1j})^2}{k_1} + \frac{(\sum_j Y_{2j})^2}{k_2} + \frac{(\sum_j Y_{3j})^2}{k_3} - \frac{(\sum_{ij} Y_{ij})^2}{N}$$

$$SS_w = SS_t - SS_g$$

where

SS_t = Sum of Square for Total

SS_g = Sum of Square Between Groups

SS_w = Sum of Square Within Groups

k_m = Sum of Observations in a Given Group

N = Total Number of Observations

From the sum of squares the the corresponding degrees of freedom, the mean square values were obtained. Each of these sums of squares has associated with it a specified number of degrees of freedom.

To test for the significance of the difference between groups the following F value was computed.

$$F = \frac{\text{Mean square between groups}}{\text{Mean square within groups}}$$

The statistic F given by the above formula is used in comparing the variances of two or more populations and has a sampling distribution called the F distribution. There are two sample variances involved and two sets of degrees of freedom, $N_1 - 1$ in the numerator of the F and $N_2 - 1$ in the denominator. Each pair of degrees of freedom determines an F distribution, and to indicate which is intended, we shall write $F(N_1 - 1, N_2 - 1)$, where the first number in parentheses is the number of degrees of freedom in the numerator, and the second is the number of degrees of freedom in the denominator.

Through consulting a table of F values, knowing the degrees of freedom, the significance of the F ratio at a specified level of confidence was computed. The conventional 0.05 and 0.01 levels of confidence were used as indicating statistically significant results.

Data for the analysis of variance will be presented in accordance with Table 2, page 46.

When a statistically significant difference was found between groups, a test of least significant difference (L. S. D.) was computed to determine which group or groups contributed to the difference.

The formulas used for computing the least significant difference were:

$$\text{L. S. D. } (.05) = t_{.05} \sqrt{\frac{MS_w}{k_m}}$$

$$\text{L. S. D. } (.01) = t_{.01} \sqrt{\frac{MS_w}{k_m}}$$

where

MS_w = Mean Square Within Groups

k_m = Sum of Observations in a Given Group

The least significant difference test data are presented according to Table 3, page 46; where a (elected men residence hall student leaders, b (appointed men residence hall student judicial board members), and c (a random sample of men living in the residence halls) represent the three groups; \bar{x}_a , \bar{x}_b , \bar{x}_c are the three group means, and $\bar{x}_a > \bar{x}_b > \bar{x}_c$.

Table 2. Analysis of variance statistical model.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between groups	$i - 1$	SS_g	$\frac{SS_g}{i - 1}$
Within groups	$i(j - 1)$	SS_w	$\frac{SS_w}{i(j - 1)}$
Total	$(i)(j) - 1$	SS_t	

$$F = \frac{MS_g}{MS_w}$$

Table 3. Test of least significant difference statistical model.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
a	\bar{x}_a	$\bar{x}_a - \bar{x}_c$	$\bar{x}_a - \bar{x}_b$
b	\bar{x}_b	$\bar{x}_b - \bar{x}_c$	
c	\bar{x}_c		

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The primary purpose of this research was to determine whether or not differences exist in standards of conduct as expressed by university elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

As was indicated in Chapter III, to measure the existence of a difference between groups, the analysis of variance statistical model was utilized. This technique provided a means of testing for differences among more than two groups simultaneously. However, this technique did not reveal which group or groups were contributing to the differences when found. In order to determine the relative effect of each group on the differences found, a test of least significant difference was computed.

The analysis of variance and the test of least significant difference for each category; general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, theft, and the full scale, are presented in Tables 4 through 19. If a significant difference was found, an explanation of which group or groups contributed to the difference follows each set of tables.

Table 4. Analysis of variance of full scale ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	29608.0132	14804.0066
Within	147	536207.460	3647.6698
Total	149	565815.474	

$$F = \frac{14804.01}{3647.67} = 4.0585^*$$

* This value of F is significant at the 0.05 level of confidence.

Table 5. Test of least significant difference of full scale ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) Appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) A random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
b	404.92	32.80*	25.42**
a	379.50	7.38	
c	372.12		

* indicates that difference is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence.

** indicates that difference is significant at the 0.05 level of confidence.

In interpreting the data it must be remembered that a low scale rating means that the group tended to rate the behavior items as acceptable, while high scale ratings indicate a rejection of the item, a tendency to find it unacceptable.

From an analysis of the over-all (full scale) ratings, it was found that there was a significant difference between the behavior standards of the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members and a random sample of men living in the residence halls; and between the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members and the elected men residence hall student leaders.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the behavior items less acceptable than did a random sample of men living in the residence halls, at the 0.01 level of confidence.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members also rated the behavior items less acceptable than did the elected men residence hall student leaders at the 0.05 level of confidence.

Differences between elected men residence hall student leaders and a random sample of men living in the residence halls were not sufficient to be significant.

Table 6. Analysis of variance of general conduct ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	871.4799	435.7399
Within	147	43282.1800	294.4366
Total	149	44153.6600	

$$F = \frac{435.74}{294.44} = 1.4799^*$$

* This value of F is non-significant.

Table 7. Test of least significant difference of general conduct ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) Appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) A random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
a	117.68	5.60	4.42
b	113.26	1.18	
c	112.08		

From an analysis of the ratings, it was found that there were no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to general conduct.

Table 8. Analysis of variance of drug use ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	1071.0933	535.5467
Within	147	17134.7800	116.5631
Total	149	18205.8733	

$$F = \frac{535.55}{116.56} = 4.5945^*$$

* This value of F is significant at the 0.05 level of confidence.

Table 9. Test of least significant difference of drug use ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) Appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) A random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
b	43.26	6.48*	4.04
a	39.22	2.44	
c	36.78		

* indicates that difference is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence.

From an analysis of the drug use ratings, it was found that there was a significant difference between the behavior standards of the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the behavior items less acceptable than did a random sample of men living in the residence halls at the 0.01 level of confidence.

Differences between the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members and the elected men residence hall student leaders, and between the elected men residence hall student leaders and a random sample of men living in the residence halls were not sufficient to be significant.

Table 10. Analysis of variance of mischief ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	649.7200	324.8600
Within	147	8054.8400	54.7948
Total	149	8704.5600	

$$F = \frac{324.86}{54.79} = 5.9287^*$$

* This value of F is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence.

Table 11. Test of least significant difference of mischief ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
b	51.28	4.70	4.06*
c	47.22	.64	
a	46.58		

* indicates that difference is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence.

From an analysis of the mischief ratings, it was found that there was a significant difference between the behavior standards of the elected men residence hall student leaders and the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members; and between the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the behavior items less acceptable than did the elected men residence hall student leaders at the 0.01 level of confidence.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members also rated the behavior items less acceptable than did a random sample of men living in the residence halls at the 0.01 level of confidence.

Differences between the elected men residence hall student leaders and a random sample of men living in the residence halls were not sufficient to be significant.

Table 12. Analysis of variance of sex offenses ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	238.7733	119.3867
Within	147	10597.0200	72.0886
Total	149	10835.7933	

$$F = \frac{119.39}{72.21} = 1.6561^*$$

* This value of F is non-significant.

Table 13. Test of least significant difference of sex offenses ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) Appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) A random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
b	31.86	3.08	1.32
a	30.54	1.76	
c	28.78		

From an analysis of the ratings, it was found that there were no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to sex offenses.

Table 14. Analysis of variance of drinking ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	699.8800	349.9400
Within	147	24190.6800	164.5624
Total	149	24890.5600	

$$F = \frac{349.94}{164.56} = 2.1265^*$$

* This value of F is non-significant.

Table 15. Test of least significant difference of drinking ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) Appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) A random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
b	58.68	4.86	4.30
c	54.38	.52	
a	53.86		

From an analysis of the ratings, it was found that there were no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to drinking.

Table 16. Analysis of variance of cheating ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	709.2933	354.6467
Within	147	24436.5000	166.2347
Total	149	25145.7933	

$$F = \frac{354.65}{166.23} = 2.1334^*$$

* This value of F is non-significant.

Table 17. Test of least significant difference of cheating ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) Appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) A random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked means	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
b	54.70	5.14	3.78
a	50.92	1.36	
c	49.56		

From an analysis of the ratings, it was found that there were no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to cheating.

Table 18. Analysis of variance of theft ratings of compared groups: Elected men residence hall student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Source of Variation	Degrees of freedom	Sum of squares	Mean square
Between	2	245.5200	123.2600
Within	147	6460.9800	43.9522
Total	149	6707.5000	

$$F = \frac{123.26}{43.95} = 2.8044^*$$

* This value of F is non-significant.

Table 19. Test of least significant difference of theft ratings of compared groups: (a) Elected men residence hall student leaders, (b) Appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and (c) A random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Group number	Ranked mean	Ranked means minus smallest mean	Ranked means minus next smallest mean
b	48.48	3.14	1.60
a	46.88	1.54	
c	45.34		

From an analysis of the ratings, it was found that there were no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to theft.

In summary, the above analysis of data indicated that for the general hypothesis which relates to full scale results, there were significant differences among the over-all behavior standards of the compared groups.

The specific scales in which there were significant differences are as follows.

Drug Use: The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the drug use items significantly less acceptable at the 0.05 level of confidence than did the random sample of men living in the residence halls.

Mischief: The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the mischief items significantly less acceptable at the 0.01 level of confidence than did the elected men residence hall student leaders.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the mischief items significantly less acceptable at the 0.01 level of confidence than did the random sample of men living in the residence halls.

No significant differences were discovered among the compared groups in standards related specifically to the following categories: general conduct, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, and theft. In addition, differences between other paired groups on the drug use, mischief, and over-all scales were not significant.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research was to compare the standards of student conduct of three different subgroups in a university men's residence hall community. Those groups of students compared were elected residence hall leaders, appointed residence hall judicial board members, and a random sample of student residents.

The problem under investigation was stated in question form. To what extent do the behavior standards as expressed by residence hall elected student leaders, appointed student judicial board members, and student residents differ? If differences do exist, what is the direction and extent for each group in relation to the remaining group? What are the relative standards supported by each of the compared groups?

The following general null hypothesis was tested: There are no significant differences among the compared groups in over-all behavior standards.

In addition the following specific null hypotheses were tested:

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to general conduct.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups

in standards related to drug use.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to mischief.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to sex offenses.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to drinking.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to cheating.

There are no significant differences among the compared groups in standards related to theft.

A 100-item Opinion Scale on Student Behavior, which was developed by Dr. Thomas C. Schreck, was revised by this investigator and utilized in this study to measure attitudes toward specified acts of student behavior. The instrument includes student offenses classified according to general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, and theft. Each offense was rated on a seven-point rating scale with ratings varying from "generally acceptable" to "vicious, a serious crime."

The instrument was administered to three groups selected to represent various components of a university residence hall community. The three experimental groups included: (1) 50 elected men residence hall student leaders; (2) 50 appointed men residence hall

student judicial board members; (3) 50 men living in the residence hall selected randomly.

Within a three-week period 96 percent of the residence hall leaders, 86 percent of the residence hall judicial board members, and 78 percent of the resident group had returned their completed opinion scales. This constituted a total return of only 86 percent, so additional students were selected in each category, making possible a total collection of the required 150 completed questionnaires.

To measure the differences between groups, the analysis of variance statistical model was utilized. This technique provided a means of testing for differences among more than two groups simultaneously. This technique however, did not reveal which group or groups were contributing to the differences when found.

In order to determine the relative effect of each group on the differences found, a test of least significant difference was computed. When significant differences were found using this statistical model, the direction of these differences was determined. Relative standards supported by the compared groups were also identified.

Findings

The results of this study indicate that some differences do exist between standards of student conduct supported by selected university mens residence hall student groups — elected men residence hall

student leaders, appointed men residence hall student judicial board members, and a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

The general null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that there are significant differences among the full scale scores reflecting over-all behavior standards of the compared groups.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the over-all full scale items less acceptable at the 0.01 level of confidence than did a random sample of men living in the residence halls.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the over-all full scale items less acceptable at the 0.05 level of confidence than did the elected men residence hall student leaders.

No significant differences were discovered between the elected men residence hall student leaders and a random sample of men living in the residence halls in over-all full scale standards.

The specific scales in which there were significant differences found and the group or groups responsible for the differences are as follows:

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the drug use items significantly less acceptable at the 0.05 level of confidence than did the random sample of men living in the residence halls.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the mischief items significantly less acceptable at the 0.01 level of confidence than did the elected men residence hall student leaders.

The appointed men residence hall student judicial board members rated the mischief items significantly less acceptable at the 0.01 level of confidence than did the random sample of men living in the residence halls.

No significant differences were discovered between the appointed men residence hall student judicial board members and the selected men residence hall student leaders, and between the elected men residence hall student leaders and a random sample of men living in the residence halls in standards related to drug use.

No significant differences were discovered between the elected men residence hall student leaders and a random sample of men living in the residence halls in standards related to mischief.

No significant differences were discovered among the compared groups in standards related to general conduct.

No significant differences were discovered among the compared groups in standards related to sex offenses.

No significant differences were discovered among the compared groups in standards related to drinking.

No significant differences were discovered among the compared groups in standards related to cheating.

No significant differences were discovered among the compared groups in standards related to theft.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions may be drawn:

While dissimilarities existed among the three residence hall groups in their opinions toward over-all standards of student behavior and those related specifically to the drug use and mischief ratings, there were also many important similarities among the groups. The three groups consistently held similar opinions regarding standards related specifically to the following categories; general conduct, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, and theft. This would indicate to those who are responsible for residence halls that these standards were held in remarkable agreement by representatives of the three residence hall groups, and should be dealt with accordingly.

It is important to also note the remarkable agreement between the elected men residence hall student leaders and a random sample of student residents. These two groups reported similar standards in all seven categories which indicates the student leaders who are elected by the student residents truly represent them in their opinions toward specified student behavior.

In standards related to full scale, drug use and mischief items,

it must be noted that in most instances the appointed men residence hall judicial board members rated the items significantly less acceptable than did the other two residence hall groups. Therefore the appointed judicial board members tended to support more traditional standards of conduct for students in these particular areas than did the other two groups. This may be because these judicial board members are appointed by residence hall leaders who feel an obligation, because of their positions, to choose the "kind of man" who will uphold the rules and regulations handed down by the administration. Or perhaps these young judicial board members, who are given the responsibility of sitting in judgement of their peers, feel a personal need to uphold the wishes of the university, no matter what their personal convictions might be. It is also possible that these judicial board members are the kinds of people who seek out such appointments because of deep personal commitments to help their fellow students.

Recommendations

This whole area of student behavioral standards should be investigated further using groups representative of other components of the campus community. Comparisons between student attitudes and attitudes of campus faculty, student personnel administrators, administrative deans, presidents, security personnel, etc. toward

standards of student behavior should prove to be very beneficial, particularly during this period of student uprising.

Comparisons between student attitudes and attitudes of non-campus groups toward student behavioral standards and student conduct should also be investigated. Studies comparing students with their parents, legislators, civil law enforcement officials, drafted military personnel, and different factions of the general public would help provide a basis for better understanding among these diverse groups.

In addition other investigators should conduct similar research on other campuses using larger student groups utilizing such differentiating factors as sex, race, religion, school of enrollment, class rank socio-economic background and other applicable classifications.

The codes of conduct supported by the different residence hall groups in this study should be reviewed by those responsible for student development through the "living - learning" concept of college housing.

This study and others like it should also help student personnel administrators to cope with the complications of any disagreement found in the standards within various student groups; therefore aiding in the formulation and implementation of realistic developmental campus student personnel programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bazik, A. M. and R. A. Meyering. 1965. Characteristics of college students involved in disciplinary problems. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 28:173-176.
- Berns, Robert S. 1969. Attitudes of college personnel relating to sexual conduct of college students. *Proceedings of American Orthopsychiatric Association, New York. March.*
- Brehm, M. L. and K. W. Back. 1968. Self image and attitudes toward drugs. *Journal of Personality* 36(2):299-314.
- Clark, D. L. 1964. Exploring behavior in the men's residence halls using the MMPI. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 43:249-251.
- Cummins, E. J. 1966. Are disciplinary students different? *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 44:624-627.
- Cummins, E. J. and L. G. Lindblade. 1967. Sex-based differences among student disciplinary offenders. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 14:81-85.
- Eells, K. 1967. A survey of student practices and attitudes with respect to marijuana and LSD. Report from the California Institute of Technology. Unpublished.
- Elton, C. F. and Harriett A. Rose. 1966. Personality characteristics: Their relevance in disciplinary cases. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 13:431-435.
- English, H. B. and A. C. English. 1953. A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms. Longmans, Green and Co., New York. p. 50.
- Grieneeks, Laura Elizabeth. 1968. Changes in student attitudes and role orientation toward college. Ph. D. thesis. Austin, University of Texas. 127 numb. leaves.
- Griffis, Jerrold A. 1969. Characteristic and attitudinal differences between misbehaving and exemplary freshman male students at the Pennsylvania State University and Bucknell University. *ACUHO Newsletter, Research and Information Committee.* p. 3-4.

- Harrison, G. H. 1965. A shocker on use of drugs at S. F. State. San Francisco Chronicle. May 29. p. 2.
- Hecht, C. A, R. J. Grime and S. F. Rothrock. 1948. The drinking and dating habits of 336 college women in a coeducational institution. Quarterly Journal of Studies in Alcohol 9:252-258.
- Heise, David R. 1968. Norms and individual patterns in student deviancy. Social Problems 16(1):78-92.
- Higher Education for American Democracy. 1948. A report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Vol. 1. Harper and Brothers, New York. p. 10.
- Hodinko, B. A. 1964. A study of student opinion regarding collegiate discipline situations. Journal of College Student Personnel 5: 217-219.
- Kilpatrick, Dean G. et al. 1968. Dogmation and personal sexual attitudes. Psychological Report 23(3):1105-1106.
- Kleber, H. H. 1965. Student use of hallucinogens. Unpublished.
- Kleckner, J. H. 1968. Personality differences between psychedelic drug users and non-users. Psychology 5(2):66-71.
- Knox, David H., Jr. and Michael J. Sporakowski. 1968. Attitudes of college students toward love. Journal of Marriage and the Family 30(4):638-642.
- LeMay, M. L., Janet L. Crist, Robert D. Dyer and J. Franz Haun. 1968. Student attitudes toward university rules and regulations. College Student Survey 2(2):35-37.
- LeMay, M. L. and T. A. Murphy. 1967. MMPI patterns of students for disciplinary reasons. Journal of College Student Personnel 8:85-89.
- Mason, Robert J. and Ronald C. Holloway. 1970. An analysis of student attitudes toward drug usage in a residence hall at Oregon State University: A pilot project. Student Housing Research, ACUHO Research and Information Committee. April. p. 2-3.

- McGlothlin, W. H., S. Cohen and M. S. McGlothlin. 1967. Personality and attitude changes in volunteer subjects following repeated administration of LSD. Proceedings of 5th International Congress Collegium Neuropsychopharmacologicum. March.
- Miller, Howard and Warner Wilson. 1968. Relation of sexual behavior, values and conflict to avowed happiness and personal adjustment. Psychological Reports 23(3):1075-1086.
- Minowitz, O. 1966. Student drink problems. College Student Personnel Abstracts 1:157.
- Murphy, R. O. and N. Hanna. 1964. Campus views of male student conduct. Journal of College Student Personnel 6:74-78.
- Nyman, A. J. and M. L. LeMay. 1967. Differentiation of disciplinary offenses with the Pa and Ma sub-scales. Journal of Clinical Psychology 23:99-100.
- Osborne, R. T., W. B. Sanders and R. M. Young. 1956. MMPI patterns of college disciplinary cases. Journal of Counseling Psychology 3:52-56.
- Prusok, R. E. 1963. An investigation of attitudes toward student discipline. Journal of College Student Personnel 5:12-19.
- _____ 1961. Student, student personnel workers and parent attitudes toward student discipline. Personnel and Guidance Journal 40:247-253.
- Rogers, E. M. 1958. Reference group influences on student drinking behavior. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 19:244-254.
- Schreck, Thomas C. 1959. A study of the acceptability of specified student behavior to students, faculty, and student personnel staff. Ed. D. thesis. Indiana University. 161 numb. leaves.
- Sillers, D. J. and D. D. Feder. 1964. Attitudes of general and student personnel administrators toward student disciplinary problems. Journal of College Student Personnel 5:130-140.
- Strang, Ruth. 1937. Behavior and background of students in college and secondary school. Harper and Brothers, New York. p. 230.

- Strassburger, F. and Z. Strassburger. 1965. Measurement of attitudes toward alcohol and their relation to personality variables. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 29:440-445.
- Teglovic, Steve, Jr. 1968. American college students values: A normative study. Ph. D. thesis. Colorado State College. 123 numb. leaves.
- Thayer, Jerome Dean. 1968. American college student values: Their relationship to selected philosophical and sociological variables. Ph. D. thesis. Colorado State College. 112 numb. leaves.
- Tisdale, J. R. and F. G. Brown. 1965. Characteristics of college misconduct cases. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 6:359-366.
- Travers, R. M. 1955. Educational measurement. The Macmillan Company, New York. p. 254.
- White, J. E. 1963. Dimensions of conformitory and evasion in residence halls for university women: A sociological analysis of normative behavior in a large-scale social organization. *Dissertation Abstracts* 23:4452.
- Williams, A. F. 1965. Self-concepts of college problem drinkers in comparison with alcoholics. *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 26:586-594.
- Wolf, I. 1966. Youth and alcohol. *College Student Personnel Abstracts* 1:194.
- Wrenn, C. Gilbert. 1951. Student personnel work in college. Ronald Press, New York. p. 4-5.
- Zehv, William. 1968. Values and selected variables of Colorado State College students. Ph. D. thesis. Colorado State College. 136 numb. leaves.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Opinion Scale on Student Behavior

Opinion Scale on Student Behavior

Please fill in the following information:

Name (optional) _____ Age _____

Class Standing (Sophomore, Junior, Senior) _____

Check one if applicable: Residence Hall Elected Leader _____

Residence Hall Appointed Judicial Member _____

Instructions

This is a scale for rating campus opinion about student behavior. It includes a list of offenses, some mild, some serious, some frequent, some extremely infrequent. You are to rate each offense individually.

Below you will find an acceptability scale ranging from generally acceptable to a vicious offense.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally Acceptable	Inadvisable, Occasionally Acceptable	Undesirable, not good practice	Inconsiderate, Irresponsible, Selfish	Unacceptable, Harmful, Demands Punishment	Intolerable, Demands Severe Punishment	Vicious, a Serious Offense

Note that 1 means that the behavior is generally acceptable to you and 7 is to indicate a vicious serious offense in your estimation.

Always circle the number that represents your opinion about each statement; how you feel about each offense. This should be your personal judgement. No two people would agree on the seriousness of each offense. It is important that you rate all statements even if you are uncertain.

General Conduct

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Continued absence from class without just cause |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Breaking a housing contract |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Showing discourtesy toward an individual from a minority group |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Bad manners, lack of courtesy in public |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Lending money to a friend |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Failing to vote in a campus election |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Defacing library books by marking or underlining |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Defacing library books by cutting out pages |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Charging bills without intention to pay |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Failing to pay bills due creditors |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Disregarding family wishes in general behavior |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Participating in disorderly demonstrations on campus |

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally Acceptable	Inadvisable, Occasionally Acceptable	Undesirable, Not good Practice	Inconsiderate, Irresponsible, Selfish	Unacceptable, Harmful, Demands Punishment	Intolerable, Demands Severe Punishment	Vicious, a serious Offense

Mischief

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Defacing any university property
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Defacing property of any campus organization of living group
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Using firecrackers to create a disturbance within a living group
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Participating in a "sit-in" on university property
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Discarding beer cans or trash on public or private property
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Creating a disturbance within your housing unit during quiet hours
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inflicting property damage while participating in a "sit-in"
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Taking street or other signs for display in living unit
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Setting off a fire alarm without proper reason
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trespassing on private or unauthorized university property
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Destroying an election display of a rival group

Sex Offenses

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Visiting men's or women's living quarters at unapproved times (opposite sex)
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Petting in public (to the extent that it offends other persons)
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Window peeping
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Using vulgar language in public
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Swimming naked with persons of both sexes
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Going out with a person of the opposite sex, not your spouse, with the motive of having sexual relations
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Living with a person of the opposite sex with no intention of marrying
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Having premarital sexual relations once
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Having premarital sexual relations occasionally
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Having premarital sexual relations regularly or frequently

Drinking

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Excessive drinking when driving alone
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Excessive drinking when driving with passengers
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Mild drinking when driving alone
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Mild drinking when driving with passengers
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Regular drinking of alcoholic beverages
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Occasional drinking of alcoholic beverages

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally Acceptable	Inadvisable, Occasionally Acceptable	Undesirable, Not good Practice	Inconsiderate, Irresponsible, Selfish	Unacceptable, Harmful, Demands Punishment	Intolerable, Demands Severe Punishment	Vicious, a serious Offense

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Social drinking to the point of feeling good at parties
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Social drinking to the point of being disorderly, a nuisance
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Giving an alcoholic drink to an underage college student
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Drinking by a man on or before a date with a girl who does not drink
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Excessive drinking in public
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Possession and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages in a residence hall
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Drinking at a university sanctioned function
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Frequenting bars while under the legal age (in violation of state law)
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Drinking in public places by a person under the legal age
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Drinking while under the legal age

Cheating

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Failing to report another student cheating in a final examination
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Helping a friend in a final examination
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Dishonest daily work in class, themes, problems and translations
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Copying from another person in an examination
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Taking notes or "crib" to an examination
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Buying an authentic copy of a final examination for your own use
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Taking an examination for another student
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Having another student take an examination for you
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Making use of a housing unit file containing themes of science experiments of other students
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Contributing themes to a housing unit file
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Handing in a theme which you know to be the work of another student
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Failing to give proper credit when using material which is not original in writing a theme (plagiarism)
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Reviewing old test, illegally obtained, which are on file in a housing unit file
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Altering an instructor's grade book

Theft

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Stealing a copy of a final examination
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Habitual planned stealing of money or property
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Stealing property from friends

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally Acceptable	Inadvisable, Occasionally Acceptable	Undesirable, Not good Practice	Inconsiderate, Irresponsible, Selfish	Unacceptable, Harmful, Demands Punishment	Intolerable, Demands Severe Punishment	Vicious, a serious Offense
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						Stealing from residence hall rooms which have been left unlocked
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						Taking home, instead of to the lost-and-found department, books or clothing left in a classroom or hall
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						Stealing coats from rack at time of game or party
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						Keeping property known to be stolen
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						Wearing clothes of roommate without asking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						Selling property known to be stolen

Please look over the scale and make sure you did not omit any items!
