

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

DONALD JAMES COLES for the DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
(Name) (Degree)  
in EDUCATION presented on Oct 27, 1972  
(Major) (Date)

Title: AN EXPLORATION OF CURRENT SPECIFIC MORALS,  
VALUES AND BELIEFS OF PARENTS, STUDENTS AND  
FACULTY AT A CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE

*Redacted for Privacy*  
Abstract approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Robert W. Chick

The purpose of this study was to ascertain to what degree, if any, there was a difference of opinion among students, parents and faculty in regard to student behavior as that behavior pertained to general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating and theft.

The research study was conducted at Pacific Union College which is a private, coeducational, liberal arts college affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The college is located in a rural setting in the unincorporated community of Angwin in northern California.

Out of a population of 1,950 enrolled students 1,597 met the criteria for this study. All foreign students and students whose parents reside overseas were excluded. Using the random number

sampling technique, 400 students were selected. One parent of each student and the entire faculty were also included. Student respondents numbered 355 for a 88.7% participation. Parent returns numbered 300 or 75% of the selected group while faculty participation was 128 or 94.8%.

The instrument (Opinion Scale on Student Behavior) used in the collection of data was first developed by Dr. Thomas Schneck (1959) and was revised by consulting with a panel of professionally recognized educators at Oregon State University. Questions dealing with behavioral standards of concern to a church related college were included as well as a demographic information section. A seven-point rating scale was developed to allow personal evaluation of the seriousness of each statement. Each choice increased in severity and ranged from generally acceptable to intolerable, vicious, demands punishment. All data was collected during the spring term of the 1970-71 school year and was analyzed on the Oregon State University CDC 3300 Computer using the analysis of variance and t test statistical models. The 15 null hypotheses about student behavior and demographic information were tested at the .05 and .01 levels of significance.

The findings revealed that there were significant differences of opinion about student behavior among students, parents and faculty in regard to the seven areas of student conduct. The differences were in the direction of greater liberalism on the part of the students.

Understandably the faculty group was the most conservative in opinions about cheating while parents were the most conservative in the six other categories of student behavior.

No significant differences were found among students when those differences were determined by class standing, grade point average or marital status; however, differences were found among students when differences were determined by academic major. Students with majors in Behavioral Science, Business Administration and History were the most liberal.

Other variables revealed significant differences among the three groups compared with students being the most liberal, faculty next and parents last. Faculty and parents were closer in opinions about student conduct than were faculty and students.

© 1973

DONALD JAMES COLES

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

An Exploration of Current Specific Morals, Values and  
Beliefs of Parents, Students and Faculty at a  
Church-Related College

by

Donald James Coles

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Doctor of Education

June 1973

APPROVED:

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor of Education

in charge of major

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Division of Foundations and

Educational Specialties

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented

Oct 27, 1972

Typed by Clover Redfern for

Donald James Coles

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge his appreciation for the assistance and encouragement from all who made this study possible. Special acknowledgment is due to Dr. Arthur Tollefson who provided valuable advice and constructive criticism as Chairman of the doctoral committee during the major portion of this project. Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert W. Chick who assumed the chairmanship of the committee after the resignation of the former chairman. His friendly and kindly manner is much admired. Thanks are also extended to the other members of the committee: Dr. J. Franz Haun, Dr. Lloyd W. Klemke, Dr. Austin F. Walter, and Dr. Charles F. Warnath.

In addition, the author is indebted to Dr. Norbert Hartman and Dr. David Neise for their assistance in the statistical analysis of this study.

In addition a special thanks is extended to my wife, Rosalie, and daughters Joleen and Judi whose usual way of life was interrupted during this graduate period. Their help and encouragement in so many ways were much appreciated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Chapter</u>   | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION  | 1           |
| The Problem  | 6           |
| Hypotheses   | 6           |
| Definition of Terms  | 10          |
| Assumptions  | 11          |
| Limitation of the Study                                    | 11          |
| Significance of the Problem                                | 12          |
| II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH              | 15          |
| Attitudes Can Be Measured                                  | 15          |
| Studies on Changing Values                                 | 17          |
| Peer Group Influences                                      | 22          |
| The Impact of the College Environment on<br>Student Values | 23          |
| Marijuana Use  | 27          |
| Student Sex Life   | 31          |
| Drinking   | 35          |
| Cheating While at College                                  | 36          |
| Summary of Related Literature                              | 38          |
| III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES                            | 41          |
| Location of the Study                                      | 41          |
| Participants and Size of Sample Groups                     | 41          |
| The Instrument   | 43          |
| Collection of the Data                                     | 45          |
| Statistical Treatment of Data                              | 47          |
| IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA                                       | 50          |
| Findings and Discussion                                    | 50          |
| Summary of Findings  | 79          |
| V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS                | 82          |
| Summary  | 82          |
| Participants   | 82          |
| The Instrument   | 83          |
| Collection and Treatment of the Data                       | 84          |
| Findings   | 84          |
| Recommendations  | 97          |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY   | 101         |
| APPENDICES   | 112         |



## LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u>  | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Number of items in each of the seven categories in the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior.  | 44          |
| 2. Population, participants, and percentages by group.  | 47          |
| 3. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct.  | 51          |
| 4. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated educational level of the students' father. | 53          |
| 5. F scores resulting from comparisons of student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated family economic background.  | 55          |
| 6. Students and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated family economic background.  | 56          |
| 7. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated degree of church commitment.      | 59          |
| 8. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' marital status.                                    | 60          |

| <u>Table</u>  | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 9. F scores resulting from comparisons of student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the geographic home location.   | 62          |
| 10. Student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the geographic home location.   | 63          |
| 11. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by students attending Pacific Union College of their free will, because of family pressure or for some other reason. | 64          |
| 12. F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by church attendance patterns.   | 66          |
| 13. Student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by church attendance patterns.  | 67          |
| 14. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by church membership.  | 69          |
| 15. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated mod or traditional status.   | 71          |

| <u>Table</u>   | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 16. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated liberal or conservative status. | 73          |
| 17. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' college major.                                   | 75          |
| 18. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' class standing.                                  | 77          |
| 19. F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' stated grade-point average.  | 78          |
| 20. Summary of significant differences in the seven categories of student conduct as determined by 15 variables.   | 81          |

# AN EXPLORATION OF CURRENT SPECIFIC MORALS, VALUES AND BELIEFS OF PARENTS, STUDENTS AND FACULTY AT A CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGE

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

During the past several years, parents, educators and the older public in general have been shaken by the rebellious attitudes of college and university students toward the established pattern of education. These changes in student attitudes have become a major concern to the college community. No college is totally isolated nor immune to these changes. The mood of the campus is largely determined by the attitudes of the students to the college program; therefore, it is important that students clearly understand the institution's objectives and expectations. It is also important for college personnel to analyze and understand the forces of change and assist in the resolution of the problems facing higher education. This is true for the small private college as well as for the large public university.

The experience of the state university will be somewhat different from that of the small private college. Since each has a special function, giving diversity to higher education, each is guided and influenced by the forces responsible for policy at that particular institution. The state university is subject to legislative regulation and must abide by

the decisions of the state board of higher education; therefore rules and regulations governing the lives, conduct and acceptance of students will be different from those of the denominational or private college, whose policies may be regulated by a board of trustees made up primarily of the clergy. The state institution must be more submissive to the public will. It must be more accepting of a broad range of moral conduct and student political activity.

The private school can be more selective of students since it operates with less public control. It may choose to accept only students who agree to a certain style of life and moral conduct. The concept of inherent authority and paternalism places the student predominantly under the jurisdiction of college regulations. However, even denominational colleges are experiencing a rejection of some traditional values. They are faced with the forces of cultural change. The fact, that private, church related and public all share a common problem does not exempt them from the need to study and deal with that problem on their individual campuses.

The Seventh-day Adventist church began a system of education in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The system first developed in the United States, as the church grew so did the educational system. Now Seventh-day Adventists have educational facilities in many nations of the world and provide religious oriented educational opportunities to interested students from kindergarten through

university. The schools now number over 5,000 with an enrollment of nearly 400,000 students. Most Seventh-day Adventist children and youth attend one of these schools for the majority of their school experience.

Since its founding the church has devoted special attention to the education of its young. A statement from an early official church publication shows the attitude of the church to education. "In the highest sense, the work of education and the work of redemption are one . . ." (White, 1903, p. 30). Speaking of the first Adventist College established at Battle Creek, Michigan, this same prominent church leader said, "The College at Battle Creek should stand higher in moral tone than any other college in the land, that the safety of the children entrusted to her keeping may not be endangered" (White, 1968, p. 41). It is still the belief of the members that schools play a vital part in the mission of the church. In this respect, Seventh-day Adventists are not unlike the Catholic Church. Rossi (1968) in speaking of some effects of Catholic parochial school education in America says,

The manifest purpose of the schools is to preserve Catholics in the faith of their fathers. A good part of the curriculum is given over to the teaching of ritual behavior and the doctrinal tenets of the church. According to the studies we have surveyed, the parochial schools are apparently successful in achieving their purposes. . . " (p. 66).

Pacific Union College is part of the Seventh-day Adventist system of education, and most of the students who attend Pacific Union College, as well as their parents, are members of the church supporting this institution.

In an effort to fulfill its mission and objectives, Pacific Union College maintains a specific code of conduct in regard to student behavior. The 1971-72 College bulletin on standards reads:

Pacific Union College is generally regarded as a conservative, private, coeducational, church-related college . . . . Hence there is a continuous, conscious effort to maintain an atmosphere in which character and knowledge combine to provide quality preparation for lives of usefulness. . . .

Experience has proved the value and practicality of maintaining various basic norms for the promotion of individual progress. Such specific guidelines provide the essential self-discipline and stimulation necessary to maximum learning and development. In the favorable atmosphere of conscious individual effort and discipline the student is afforded the most likely opportunity for outstanding educational achievement.

With this purpose in view, students are expected to refrain from the use of psychedelic drugs, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and profane or vulgar language. For the same reason, gambling, card playing, social dancing, indecent conduct, and improper familiarity between the sexes are not permitted. Students in good standing will constantly avoid all forms of entertainment and any personal involvement that are scholastically deleterious, or spiritually or morally destructive (p. 25, 26).

In dealing with students at Pacific Union College, student personnel administrators have observed that many of today's students do

not seem to agree with those ethical, spiritual and moral standards outlined and maintained by the college. It has been assumed by the faculty that the standard of conduct set forth by them is right in terms of the objectives of the school, and any deviation from this standard is a breach of conduct on the part of the students. This concept is not shared by educators in general.

Across the nation there is open disagreement between faculties and students in regard to acceptable student behavior and changes are taking place. Logan (1965) reports that college administrators are experiencing increased pressure from the students to relax or do away with many rules and regulations. Thornton (1969) in a study on morals, ethics and values found that the pressure to relax rules started with the return of World War II veterans who questioned certain restrictions and moral standards imposed on them by the college or university that they attended. Butler (1965) says that the main areas of concern in the early challenges were in the nature of restrictions regarding housing, curfews and personal conduct.

Today on most college campuses we find a more relaxed attitude toward regulations governing personal life style, however, the Seventh-day Adventist system of education still maintains a strong in loco parentis emphasis. It is the purpose of this study to see if the code of conduct maintained by Pacific Union College is being accepted by the students, their parents and the faculty, or if a more relaxed



view currently expressed in the educational milieu has influenced any of the examined groups' thinking and beliefs.

### The Problem

The problem is to ascertain to what degree, if any, there is a divergence of opinion among students, faculty and parents in regard to student behavior as it pertains to general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating and theft.

### Hypotheses

The problem of the study will be investigated through the testing of the following research hypotheses which are formulated in the null form:

- I. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings on opinion subscales among students, parents and faculty, as measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior, concerning any of the following seven specific student conduct categories: general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating and theft.
- II. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by

differences in the stated educational level of the student's father.

- III. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated family economic background.
- IV. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated degree of church commitment.
- V. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated students' marital status.
- VI. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated geographic home location.

- VII. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences stated by students whether they are attending P. U. C. of their own free will, because of family pressure or for some other reason.
- VIII. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in stated church attendance patterns.
- IX. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in stated church membership.
- X. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated mod or traditional status.

- XI. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated liberal conservative status.
- XII. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the students' stated college major.
- XIII. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by the students' stated class standing.
- XIV. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated grade point average of the student.
- XV. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion subscales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the

Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by the student, parent, paired combinations.

### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarity to this study, several terms are defined.

The term attitude is defined by Rokeach (1968) as follows: "An attitude is a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (p. 112).

The term belief is used to refer to one's personal opinion, attitude or conviction about how one should behave morally.

The term morals is related to the distinction between right and wrong conduct.

The term opinion refers to an expressed attitude or judgment.

The term the instrument will be used interchangeably with the term Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and with the term questionnaire.

The term values refers to that quality of a thing in terms of worth, desirability or importance.

The term the church means the Seventh-day Adventist Church unless otherwise specified.

### Assumptions

Several assumptions are made that apply to this study.

First, opinions expressed on the questionnaire reflect behavior standards held by the individual completing the questionnaire. Next, the instrument used to gather the opinions of the participants in this study is valid and the opinions expressed in it are measurable. And lastly, the individuals sampled in this research project will take the study seriously by giving honest answers.

### Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to a random sample of 400 students enrolled at Pacific Union College during the spring term of the 1970-71 school year, one parent of each student in the sample, and the entire faculty of 135 listed in the 1970-71 Pacific Union College Bulletin. The random sample is limited to those students who hold freshman, sophomore, junior or senior standing, and whose parents live in the United States. All foreign students and students whose parents resided overseas were excluded.

The questionnaire was administered in such a way as to insure complete anonymity therefore no attempt will be made to learn if the opinion expressed on the questionnaire in regard to the acceptability of student conduct is the same as overt behavior engaged in by those individuals.

This study attempts to measure areas of student behavior commonly found on a college campus, and is limited to the seven general areas of: (1) general conduct, (2) drug use, (3) mischief, (4) sex offenses, (5) drinking, (6) cheating, and (7) theft.

### Significance of the Problem

Each application blank for admittance to Pacific Union College requires applicants to sign that they agree with the code of conduct outlined for students in the college student handbook.

It is unrealistic to assume that all applicants signing that statement do indeed agree fully with the rules in the student handbook. Gottlieb and Ramsey (1964) suggest that it is not uncommon that "there is a lack of agreement between what the student sees as important and his perception of what the school represents" (p. 190). They further state that when there is not a "uniform embracing of formal school values" then a subgrouping of the student body may result. This concept is supported by Newcomb et al. (1967):

Deviants are likely to resist conformity when such conformity would entail substantial cost to them; when imposed norms present specific problems of adaptation for individuals, then deviant subcultures tend to arise (p. 212).

Much of the current literature reports the difference of opinion and ideology of the young. Hadden (1970) says that even among the younger clergy more and different kinds of concern are arising;

therefore, it is not surprising that if the clergy differs in opinion as to valid norms, that young college students will also have divergent attitudes and seek change. Yet, because of its strong religious emphasis, would it hold true at Pacific Union College that students do not agree with the stated norms? Jacob (1957) found that some colleges have a distinctive "climate" and that students respond differently at these institutions than they do on the average national scene. All personnel involved with this type of college are very aware of the mission of the institution and that awareness produces a unity of expectation in fulfilling that mission. Students then feel compelled to live up to the standards of that college even if these standards are at odds with the opinions of the general society. Jacob (1957) stated that there is a need for more study at these special types of institutions. Without research there are gaps, and "These gaps are the more significant because the influence of distinctive institutional characteristics upon values appears so important" (p. 130).

As previously indicated, Pacific Union College is in the category of a special religious type institution. This study will fill one of those gaps spoken of by Jacob. It will provide insight into beliefs on vital moral issues as expressed by students, parents and faculty. It will show which group holds the highest standard of conduct for students and if the standards expressed by the college are more stringent than those standards accepted by the student for himself. It will show to



what degree the special religious training affects student opinion about student conduct. Lastly, it will show, if there is a difference of opinion, if that difference is in the area of a vital belief system.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Research on the lives, conduct and values of college and university students has increased impressively during the last decade. Most of the studies that deal with student conduct report the nature of and the amount of involvement or give the reasons for the student behavior. Only a few articles report on the parental and faculty attitudes toward specific acts of student behavior.

In this section of the study, literature is reviewed in each of the areas related to the problem under investigation. They are reported in the following order: (1) attitude measurement, (2) changing values, (3) peer group influences, (4) the impact of the college environment on student values, (5) marijuana use, (6) student sex life, (7) drinking, and (8) cheating while at college.

#### Attitudes Can Be Measured

Allport (1967) says that an attitude is really an opinion and Thurstone (1967) explains that opinions are verbal expressions of an attitude but measuring these attitudes expressed as opinions does not mean that the individual will act the way he states an opinion. People may be inconsistent in what they say they believe and what they do. Their attitudes are subject to change.

Fendrich (1969) supports this idea by saying, "measurement of verbal attitudes does not normally tap commitment. Verbal attitudes are statements of preference that have no specific consequence for subsequent behavior" (p. 201). Also, "Verbal attitudes can be either consistent or inconsistent with overt behavior, depending upon the way respondents define the attitude measurement situation" (p. 211).

Newcomb (1969) says that an individual's attitude towards something is determined by his involvement in his environment. Also that one's attitude will determine the kind of environment in which one will choose to live in the future. An individual will select a supportive environment in order to continue with the attitude that he has, and he will tend to manipulate his personal environment so that it corresponds with his own attitudes. In other words he will be friends with individuals who hold like values and ideas.

Sherif, Sherif and Nebergall (1965) say that it is one thing to change a person's attitude about some momentary guess or hypothesis in a laboratory situation and it is another thing to change a person's commitment about his value system, his religion, his politics, or the virtue of his way of life. These things have become a part of his ego involved attitudes. They are not temporary and do not change easily. These attitudes are made up from the norm system of that individual's reference group. Sherif has reviewed the literature on techniques of measuring and sampling attitudes and their change, and has

established the fact that attitudes and attitude change can be measured. Some of the methods and techniques used for this purpose are reported by Lehmann (1966). He indicates that the most common are the Likeart, Thurston, and Guttman type of comparisons. They may be used in the form of scales, questionnaires, or inventories.

Changes take place not only in attitudes but also in language terminology observed Lehmann (1966). He says that until 20 years ago the term values was not used very much in psychological circles. A more popular and widely used term was the word attitudes. Barton (1969) claims that there are two kinds of values. First, those that are a matter of obligation and second those that are a matter of taste. In judging one's conduct as to right or wrong the judger is using the obligatory value as a norm or standard. Obligatory values arise out of social requirements set by groups living together. Different groups will have different value norms. Rewards or punishments are imposed for those who follow or reject these values. In a given situation, individuals will behave according to their beliefs and values held about the situation.

#### Studies on Changing Values

Chickering (1969) made an extensive review of the current literature, synthesized it and reported that a great deal of change is taking place in the values held by college students. He says that

young people are at the crossroads. That prior to this time they have pretty well accepted their parent's values but now they see their parents for what they are, middle-aged adults, capable of making mistakes. Students see that rules and regulations concerning sex and honesty have been able to shift and change just like the rules at a ball game. The changes are in the direction of sophistication and greater liberalism (Chickering, 1969; Kauffman, 1966). Once changed, values tend to persist as was found in the longitudinal studies conducted by Newcombe et al. (1967).

Hodgkinson (1967) traces the forces that have caused social change since 1900 and concludes that there is more openness today than at any other time. In a study of entering college freshmen at Habersford College, Heath (1968) found that freshmen had changed most of their religious and aesthetic values. He said that they had declined in their interest and in their appreciation of religious values.

Proof that students are seeking change is given by Long and Foster (1970) who conducted a protest survey which included every college and university in the United States. The results of this rather comprehensive survey indicated that approximately 50% of all college and university campuses in the United States have experienced some form of protest. Three percent of the colleges had violent protest, 9% destructive protests, 33% physical but nondestructive protests, while the remaining 55% only had some kind of vocal or diplomatic

protest. Peterson (1969) contends that student protest is a rather recent development of the past eight or nine years and that it has developed because of a rejection of the social institutions in America. Sharing this view is Dennis (1966). He says that the current generation of students have the older generation's wisdoms, values and institutions on trial, but college student's views will differ from campus to campus.

Le May et al. (1968) in a study of attitudes and opinions of parents, faculty and students, reported differences of opinion among the groups studied in regard to visitation, housing and other student activities. Parents were the most conservative of the three groups. McArthur (1971) says that students have shifted from apathy to action. Today students are sharing experiences and are reading and listening to philosophers. These philosophers were not read by their parents.

Gallagher (1966) reports that in almost every generation there has been a varying degree of question or rejection of the moral codes of the day, but now there is a greater testing, questioning and rejection of the moral codes of the times. Students have not only rejected former patterns in the areas of sex, use of alcohol and academic honesty, they have established their own patterns of behavior which are very different from those held by their parents. Gallagher (1966) calls it a revolution in morals.

The term revolution has two meanings says Lerner (1966). The

first is the transfer of power usually from one class of individuals to another. The second meaning is a drastic, highly accelerated rate of change. He says that the college and university campus is a converging point for change and that in his terms revolutionary changes are occurring on the campus. Reporting on student radicals, Ehrenreich (1969) states that we should not be surprised by the revolution taking place, rather we should be surprised if it did not happen.

Blaine (1966) comments on sex, drugs, and extremism and says that there is no reliable evidence that proves that there is a radical change in student behavior or attitudes during the last 20 years. He says that the evidence is contradictory and no reliable conclusions can be drawn. Others, such as Kauffman (1966), Zimmerman (1969), Warren (1969), and McArthur (1971) point out that it is not just student's values that are changing but also parents, faculty and society at large. Society stands in transition. Zimmerman (1969) says that probably no action by either church or state will slow down the advance of the permissive society.

In a nation wide survey of college student opinion by Roper Research (1969) and reported in School and Society, it was found that 66% of the students agreed with their parents on most things. The psychological thread that runs through the book, Don't Shoot We Are Your Children by Lukas is that the values of the ten young activists reported in the book were the same as their parents. Based on the

results of a study at the University of Chicago, Lipset and Altbach (1967) report that there is a great similarity between generations in terms of student's values and parent's values.

So far the literature appears to be contradictory. Some researchers claim that there has been a rapid change in the value system of college students. Some say that there has been no change and that students believe much like their parents. Still others say that values are hard to change except in those areas that are not very important anyway. The controversy exists primarily in the areas of personal appearance, drug usage, choice of music, residence in coeducational halls and visitation privileges, and sexual behavior. The areas of agreement encompass deep seated moral values, such as the undesirability of murder and major acts of theft and dishonesty.

Dressel (1965) stated that some students should change their values while in college. He also stated that there are five kinds of changes possible.

- (1) The individual can become aware of value differences or conflicts.
- (2) The individual may change the hierarchal order of values.
- (3) The individual may develop a different normative base.
- (4) The individual may develop a shift on the value continuum.
- (5) Previously held values may be rejected and replaced by different values.



Dissatisfied with the reports in the literature, Dressel and Lehmann (1965) studied 3,000 freshmen at Michigan State University and later did a follow up study. They also compared two small church related colleges. Their conclusions indicate that there is great diversity in student experiences. Some students modify their values a great deal during college while others do not. Different factors are involved in shaping those changes that do occur. One of the most important factors in creating a climate for change is the peer group.

### Peer Group Influences

Newcomb (1966) explains after citing the evidence of 95 articles that changes in student characteristics do not just happen. Change takes place because of the environment in which a student places himself. It is believed, according to Newcomb (1966) that the student's peer group exerts the greatest influence on its members. Chickering (1969) also reviewed the literature in this area and concludes that roommates and close friends have direct and forceful influence on the individual. This inner group of friends gives the student an indication of acceptable behavior and norms so the student adjusts his own values and norms to fit those of the group to which he belongs.

Sanford (1967) expressed the idea that college students will meet new ideas and life styles, they will have their unexamined belief systems challenged, and they will learn from their peers. He cites his

own study to show that once a new value is formed it will be long lasting. Because students live close to each other says Heath (1968), they are forced, to communicate and share ideas. As a result a student will adopt new ideas.

Mack (1967) says that social groups expect certain kinds of behavior from its members and Hodgkinson (1967) says that the group provides security while the individual member is changing his values to meet those of the group. The freshman learns by trial and error and through acceptance or rejection on the part of his peers.

Although one's peer group is a major factor contributing to change, another important factor is the college environment.

#### The Impact of the College Environment on Student Values

Jacob (1957) reviewed much of the literature up to his time and concluded from the review and his own research that college does make a difference but not very much. Colleges have a distinctive atmosphere and the atmosphere of a particular college attracts a certain kind of student or the student's parent who sends their children to that college because it is congenial with their own attitudes and values. College has a socializing influence on the values of the student. Students tend to accept the prevalent norms of the college they attend.

Mayhew (1969) and Warren (1968) say that colleges attract

students who hold the same values as the dominant values of the school. Holland (1959) found that different types of colleges and universities attract different kinds of clientele according to their abilities, goals, values, personalities and family background. These limiting or predominant factors should produce a unified student body. The idea that students who attend a particular school because of its values, will produce a fairly homogeneous student body is challenged by Gottlieb (1965). In a study by Jenks and Reisman (1968), it was observed that colleges differ because they are shaped by different interest groups.

Heist (1960) is of the opinion that the campus milieu can be changed by the selection of students. Berry (1967) is more specific. She sees many forces shaping the institutions, values, traditions, and way of life. She sees the institution tied to the culture of society at large. Pace (1962) points out that about 30% of the distinctiveness of a college is made up by the students and the rest by the board, administration and faculty. Hodgkinson (1967) states that some colleges have a greater impact for change on student values than do others.

Kiesler (1969) says that educators use strategies to make students behave in a given way. These strategies are pressure and the more pressure applied the more likely they are to make a student behave in a prescribed way. Pace (1966) found that denominational colleges use more pressure and are more restrictive in the

supervision of students' behavior and organizations. Goldsen (1960) in a study of 11 colleges found that religious believers were reluctant to tolerate deviation or nonconformity from the group standards but that even religious values do change during the college years although they do change the least. Raushenbush (1957), after studying church related colleges and state universities, feels that the environment of the college is important and states that the institution must take the responsibility for giving direction to student mores.

In comparing recent studies with earlier research reports, Axelrod (1969) found that the recent studies show that the college experience has a more profound influence than was previously believed. He says that few students escape untouched and that the changes are in the direction of independence, sophistication and complexity. Changes usually occur within the first two years of the college experience.

Katz (1968) studied students at two universities over a four year period and reports that these students became more self-confident and independent during the four years. He also found that 22% of the men and 16% of the women engaged in rule breaking just for the fun of it.

Dressel and Lehmann (1965) summarize a host of both longitudinal and cross-sectional studies and concluded that significant changes in beliefs, values interests and attitudes do take place among college

students during their four years at school. They found violently contrasting views among students and faculty in regards to the responsibility of the college in promoting changes in attitudes and values. They also found significant differences in attitudes held by students attending protestant fundamentalist schools. Lehmann (1965) reports that students differ in attitudes and values according to the academic major they are pursuing.

After doing a longitudinal study on 18 college and university campuses, Nelson (1968) explained that college attitudes tend to persist in post college years but that 51% of the alumni shifted toward liberalism.

Feldman and Newcomb (1969) review the literature and present summary tables of a great many studies. In the area of religious attitudes toward the church, a study of 18 colleges and universities across the United States revealed that seniors are less favorable toward their particular church than are freshmen. Yet other studies indicate that about one-fourth of the students at all class levels experience an increase in the importance of religion in their lives. Still other studies report that about one-third of the students had a decrease in their commitment to a set of religious beliefs while at school. In spite of the seemingly conflicting reports about religious beliefs it can safely be summarized that most students had their religious beliefs changed during their four years of college. Few were

untouched.

Researchers have looked within the college, inquiring as to the kinds of experiences that affect student values. They have found little evidence to indicate one major thing responsible. Rather it is a multitude of experiences that shape the changes. They have found that there seems to be a constancy of basic values, however even these deep seated values are changing on the college campus. There is greater flexibility, sociability, liberalism and independence on the part of the student.

### Marijuana Use

During the past several years, it has become quite popular to write about marijuana--its history, effects, dangers and legal aspects. This review of the literature does not consider these areas of marijuana use; rather it will examine the extent of use by college students, the type of student who uses it, and opinions about its use.

A number of writers indicate a recent sharp increase in the use of marijuana by college students. Goode (1970) says that marijuana use is commonplace, whereas ten years ago it was almost unknown. Walters (1971) uses the same term "commonplace" to describe the current situation. He found that as many as 66% of the students at some colleges have tried marijuana. McArthur (1971) says that students consider passing along a joint of marijuana an act of brotherhood

and of sharing. Rogan (1969) disagrees, feeling that the brotherhood part has long since past. He says that marijuana use is now taken for granted and accepted as a part of college life. It is not a campus problem any longer because its use has become wide spread in all classes of society. Zochert (1969) and Kaplin (1970) agree that marijuana is the most widely experimented with and most available drug used by college students. Kurtz (1969) reported on one study at a midwestern university that showed a 20% increase in marijuana use over a four-year period.

Blum's examination (1970) of publications from the mass media, police, governmental agencies, educators and social scientists indicated that all writers are consistent in reporting a nationwide increase in the use of drugs. In his own investigations and repeated testings at several colleges he found significant increases in the use of marijuana. At Ithaca College, Rand, Graf and Thurlow (1970) in a followup survey to a study by Rand, Hammond and Moscou (1968), likewise found a marked increase in the use of marijuana. They also learned that attitudes about drugs are formed before college, that most users are in liberal arts and drama curriculums, and that most students who use marijuana also use alcohol.

Blum (1970) reports on marijuana and alcohol use at five western colleges or universities. All students were privately interviewed and guaranteed anonymity. At school number one Blum found that 21% had

smoked marijuana and 94% had used alcohol. At school number two 11% had used marijuana while 91% had used alcohol. School number three was exactly the same as school number one. At school number four 33% had smoked marijuana and 97% had used alcohol, whereas at school number five the marijuana users totalled only 10% and the alcohol users only 89%. Blum also learned from this study that marijuana users are apt to be older, to be upper classmen, and to be majoring in the arts, humanities or social sciences. They tend to come from families that are well off financially. In comparing users with nonusers, Blum found that 97% of all users have some friends who are also users, and that they are ten to one in favor of their friends using marijuana, while nonusers are opposed three to one to their friends using marijuana. Many studies show that the number of students involved with marijuana smoking varies widely from school to school.

In a study reported by Hochman and Brill (1971) at the University of California, Los Angeles, 52% had tried marijuana, 40% of them had used it more than 50 times and 78% of the nonusers said that they would use it in the next few years. King (1969) reports the incidence of use at Dartmouth as 16.7%, Yale 18% and Wesleyan 20%. De Fleur and Garrett (1970) in a survey at a western land-grant university found that of the 12.8% marijuana users, almost half had used in only once and that the users were more likely to come from cities of over



50,000 population.

Mizner, Barter and Werme (1970) reporting research on 26,000 students in nine schools in the Denver-Boulder area found that 26% of the students had used marijuana, 58% had used it out of curiosity, 75% had used it no more than twice and 39% had discontinued its use altogether.

Smith (1970) reports 21.1% usage of marijuana and 87% usage of alcohol on a university campus. The noteworthy thing he found was that a much larger number of students used alcohol because of peer pressure than did those who used marijuana.

Ells (1968) found 14% had used marijuana at the California Institute of Technology while 50% of the students were sure they would never use it.

Roper Research Associates did a random sample of 96 colleges which included large and small, public, private and religious institutions across the nation. The findings of the confidential forms revealed that freshmen, seniors and alumni hold similar views about the use of marijuana by college students. Twenty-four percent of all seniors had tried marijuana.

Curtis (1970) found that only 11% of the Catholic students at a metropolitan Catholic University had experimented with marijuana. The low figure was attributed to the students' religious orientation. Gergen, Gergen and Morse (1972) found that the incidence of marijuana

use increased with grade point averages and selectivity of students. They surveyed 38 colleges and universities and five junior colleges. Keniston (1969) explained that drugs are more common on campuses where there is a noticeable intellectual climate.

Collecting data on marijuana users Messer (1969), discovered that users are less goal and future oriented. They are more likely to deny the value of truth systems.

Wolk (1968) found that 70% of the marijuana users at one university had first used in it high school.

Goode (1970) found that 26% of the men in his study had introduced marijuana to at least ten other people. He also reports that the affluent class is more tolerant of the use of marijuana by their children than the working class.

Carey (1968) and Goode (1970) both agree that those who are using marijuana typically do not come from religious backgrounds. Goode (1970) found that at one school 54% of the nonusers attended religious services while not a single user said that they ever went to church.

### Student Sex Life

There is a great diversity of opinion about premarital sex. One side feels that it is wrong; the other, that it is acceptable. One side feels that premarital sex is on the increase while the other feels that

its frequency is about the same as it has always been.

Freedman (1967) says that from his studies usually fewer than 25% of the women are non-virgins by their senior year and that at least 50% of the college men had experienced intercourse by their senior year. Sanford (1967) and Corry (1967) report similar findings. When asked the question whether society should condone premarital sexual relations of college students, 29% of the women and 54% of the men felt that it should be condoned by society (Freedman, 1967).

Kaatz (1969) in a study at the University of Colorado reports that women held a significantly more permissive attitude toward sex at the end of the school year than they did upon entrance. Forty-four percent of the women and 59% of the men experienced intercourse during the year. Diamont (1969) reported that 59% of the upper division men and 47% of the upper division women at the University of North Carolina had experienced premarital sex but found no difference in emotional adjustment between those engaging in sex and those abstaining.

Speaking of sexual behavior on the college campus, Mayhew (1970), says that we are living in a much freer society but that no one has come up with an acceptable norm for student sexual behavior. Lief (1969) claims that the attitudes held by adolescent youth toward sex reflect adult openness toward the subject.

The following statement by Katz (1968) was agreed with by

75%-95% of the senior men and women at Berkeley. "Between the freshmen and the senior years, dramatic changes take place in attitudes toward premarital sex, with both men and women moving toward acceptance or even advocacy of premarital sex" (p. 49).

It was found by Mirande (1968) that sexual behavior at a mid-western university was influenced by attitudes, behavior, and expectations of the student's peer group and two closest friends.

Bell and Claskes (1970) repeated a study at a university after an interval of ten years. The findings indicate that the 1968 coed was more apt to have had intercourse while dating, going steady or while engaged, than was her 1958 counterpart. Engagement was a less important prerequisite for sex in 1968 and those involved felt less guilty about it.

Christensen and Gregg (1970) also did a 1958-1968 study at two United States Universities and the University of Denmark. They found that there had been no change for American men in ten years in approval of premarital intercourse but that American women had liberalized 21% in their approval of premarital sex.

In a study by Bell and Buerkle (1961) on mother-daughter attitudes toward premarital sexual behavior, the general conclusions were: (1) there is no difference in mother-daughter attitudes until the college experience; (2) at age 20 there is a sharp difference in the attitude of the daughter; (3) daughter's ideas change from being a

virgin at marriage to being a virgin at engagement; and (4) the daughters ideas may be of short duration. After marriage or upon ageing her ideas will again parallel those of her mother.

Sanford (1965) contends that there is no sexual revolution, and no decline in student morality on campus. Kinsolving (1965) disagreed with Sanford, stating that from his viewpoint we are in an age of "thoroughgoing demoralization" (p. 23). Graham (1965) would support this idea. He is disturbed that "Many pastors and university chaplains now openly condone premarital sex" (p. 205).

Clanton (1969) says that the Christian church is still trying to give old answers of sexual abstinence in the age of the pill. He says that at least half of the young people are involved in premarital sexual acts and that the Christian church must give guidance rather than just saying don't. Using a five dimensional measure, Cardwell (1969), found that the higher the religious commitment the less permissive one's attitude is toward premarital sex.

Mosher and Cross (1971) report that those with high sex guilt scores on the Mosher Forced-choice Guilt inventory were less involved sexually and held less permissive sexual standards. The reason given for noninvolvement in premarital sexual behavior was a high moral belief. Rubin (1972) found that premarital sexual permissiveness varied according to one's background and as church attendance decreased that permissiveness increased. Also permissiveness

decreased with age.

Decoster (1970) reviewed the literature from 1890 to 1970 and found that there was a marked increase in premarital sex during the 1920's but that there has been only a slight increase since that time. He states that behavior changed during the twenties but norms did not. Now the standards are catching up to what is taking place. There is a general sanctioning of premarital relations where there is mutual affection toward the partner.

### Drinking

Astin (1968) in a study of 60,000 college students at 246 institutions found a great deal of diversity among the various schools. He found that students who drink do not have a very high score on religiousness. He states that if you knew the amount of drinking at any given school, you could predict the amount of religiousness of the students. He found that students at protestant institutions seldom drink but frequently engage in religious activities.

Mizruchi and Perrucci (1969) indicate that many protestant churches use proscriptive or thou shalt not norms for drinking alcoholic beverages. Members of these organization who do not believe in total abstinence drink more than individuals who had no norm set for them. They do not know how, when, or how much to drink, and they drink as if they were rejecting the total set of rules.

Mizruchi and Perrucci (1969) state that college students who have internalized proscriptive drinking norms will have friends who also encourage total abstinence.

Katz (1969) in a study at Stanford and Berkeley found that 77% of the male and 70% of the female freshman students drank occasionally. As seniors, only slightly more than ten percent never drink at all.

Blum (1970) reported an incidence of drinking from 89% to 97% in the five schools that he surveyed. These figures compare to 80% of the adult population use of alcohol as reported by Smith (1970).

Sanford and Singer (1968) found that where drinking is the norm that those students who abstain stand out as rigid, intolerant and immature. They state that evidence shows an increase in drinking among young people in the last ten years.

### Cheating While at College

Cheating is a fairly common behavior trait of college students according to Sherrill (1971) who found that 66% of the undergraduates at a large state university cheated when given an opportunity to do so. Further investigation revealed that cheaters considered cheating less seriously and felt that it was a standard practice more than did non-cheaters. Jacobson, Berger and Millham (1970) state that students with high self-esteem tended to cheat more than students with low self-esteem. This was especially true of women.

Johnson and Gormly (1971) discovered that cheaters had no higher grade point averages, but cheaters belonged to more clubs and held more leadership positions than did noncheaters. In their study 33% of the students cheated.

Garfield, Cohen and Roth (1967) studied religious attitude and cheating at a urban university. Their conclusions were: (1) that about 50% of the students cheated; (2) that cheating did not correlate with attitudes and guilt feelings; and (3) that cheating is a particular type of cultural transgression.

In another study White, Zillonka and Gaier (1967) cited different results. They found distinctive patterns of personality behavior for cheaters and noncheaters consistent with moral behavior and honesty as determined by a personality factor questionnaire given each student.

Johnson and Klores (1968) observed that students were more willing to cheat if they thought their peers also cheated and condoned it. They had less guilt feelings about cheating if a low quality of teaching existed or if some other negative characteristic existed in the classroom.

A study conducted by Zastrow (1970) on graduate students at a large midwestern university showed that students cheated when under pressure to get good grades; that about 40% cheated during their test and that 100% had cheated during their school years. He found no personality differences in cheaters and noncheaters on the MMPI.



Studying 5,000 students on 99 college campuses, Bowers (1968) cites evidence to show that about 50% of all students cheat. He says that pressure on the poor student to get good grades makes it more probable that he is the one who will cheat. The best deterrent to cheating Bowers says is a strong internal disapproval of cheating and next is disapproval by one's peer group.

Uhlig and Howes (1967) found that about one-third of all college students will cheat if given an opportunity to do so. It makes little difference if stress or lack of it is present. Also attitudes expressed towards cheating had little to do with actual behavior.

Hassinger (1967) studied cheating at four colleges, two of them Catholic and two non-Catholic. The findings indicate that 40% of the students at the two Catholic colleges admitted to cheating while at the two non-Catholic colleges only 20% admitted to cheating.

### Summary of Related Literature

An examination of the current literature reveals a number of interesting things about student conduct and the attitudes of different groups toward that conduct. Measurement of attitudes and the various techniques involved has been established by several men. That values change was evidenced in a number of ways. One way was that many students hold different value norms than their parents. Another way was in longitudinal studies where individuals are retested after a

lapse of time.

Recently changes have been so rapid that some authors have referred to it as a revolution. Not only are student's values changing but society in general is moving towards permissiveness. The greatest changes in student's values occur in the first two years of college and is in the direction of independence, sophistication and acceptance of others as they are. Roommates and close friends provide the greatest impact for change. The daily conversations, life styles, and pressure to be like the group have an effect on unexamined belief systems and change is the result. The type of institution a student attends will determine to some degree the kind of influences he will have to meet. An increase in the use of marijuana is common to higher education. Incidence of use varies from 10% to 66% but an even more widely accepted way of life among students is drinking. Attitudes towards these activities varies from campus to campus among students and by occupation, among parents.

There are conflicting ideas about the increase in premarital sex activity. Reports indicate that about 20% to 50% of the women and 50% to 60% of the men have experienced premarital sex by their senior year and those involved generally have little or no guilt feelings.

Cheating is an activity engaged in by about one-third to one-half of the college students and attitudes toward cheating is determined to some degree by the attitudes of the cheater's peers. The best deterrent

to cheating is an internal prohibition against it.

The overall view towards student conduct is that standards have changed in the last two decades and even if students are more permissive, so is the acceptance of this permissiveness by students and to some degree parents, faculty and society at large.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

It was the purpose of this study to explore the differences of opinion, if any, among parents, students and faculty in regard to student conduct.

This chapter describes the location and source of the information, the selection of subjects, the instrument used for the collection of the data, the collection methods and the statistical treatment of the findings.

#### Location of the Study

The college chosen for this research study was Pacific Union College which is a private, coeducational, liberal arts college, affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Pacific Union College is located in a rural setting atop Howell Mountain at an elevation of 1,800 feet, in the unincorporated community of Angwin, in Napa County California. The college estate contains 2,800 acres of mountainous woodland; some 200 acres of it comprising the main campus.

#### Participants and Size of Sample Groups

Students attending Pacific Union College during the academic

school year of 1970-71 (when this study was conducted) came from 34 states and 23 foreign countries. Eighty-one percent of the students came from California. Graduate students, foreign students and all students whose parents reside outside of the United States were excluded from this study. Out of a population of 1,950 students, 1,597 met the criteria for this research. Of that number 645 were freshmen, 399 were sophomores, 268 were juniors and 285 were seniors.

The student participants and their parents were selected from IBM cards made available by the data center of Pacific Union College. One card was supplied for each student enrolled and living in the United States. The cards indicated the student's name, number and class standing. Also, the cards were separated into four groups, each group representing an academic class. Cards were arranged in alphabetical and numerical order for each class. Using the random number sampling technique and a table of random numbers, 100 each of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors were chosen from the IBM cards. The data center then matched students with their parents and supplied a list giving names, addresses and class standing of the students and the names and addresses of these students' parents.

The entire faculty of 135 listed in the 1970-71 Pacific Union College Bulletin was used as the faculty participants in this study.

### The Instrument

The Opinion Scale on Student Behavior (Appendix I) as used in this study was developed by consulting with a panel of professionally recognized educators at Oregon State University. The panel was comprised of Dr. Robert W. Chick, Dean of Students and Professor of Education, Dr. Lloyd W. Klemke, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Dr. Arthur L. Tollefson, Professor of Education, Dr. Austin F. Walter, Professor of Political Science, and Dr. Charles F. Warnath, Professor of Psychology.

The present instrument resulted from editing, revising and shortening a longer model first developed by Schreck (1959) and revised by Wangen (1970). In addition to deleting 50 questions, 16 more were revised to sample opinions about student behavior at a religious institution. The 16 revised questions met Edwards' (1957) criteria for writing attitude statements. Statements were carefully chosen so as to be debatable and belonging to the same attitude variable. They were edited to guard against ambiguity, double interpretation and compound sentence construction.

A new demographic information section was developed in order to gather data necessary for the completion of requirements in the design of this study. Retained in the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior were the seven categories of student conduct. Table 1 lists the

seven categories and number of items in each.

Table 1. Number of items in each of the seven categories in the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior.

| Category        | Number of Items |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 19              |
| DRUG USE        | 4               |
| MISCHIEF        | 4               |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 7               |
| DRINKING        | 4               |
| CHEATING        | 6               |
| THEFT           | <u>6</u>        |
| Total           | 50              |

A seven-point rating scale was developed to allow personal evaluation of the seriousness of each statement. Each choice increases in severity as the following list shows:

- (1) Generally acceptable
- (2) Inadvisable, occasionally acceptable
- (3) Questionable, dubious
- (4) Undesirable, not good practice
- (5) Unacceptable, harmful
- (6) Appalling, shocking, demands reprimand
- (7) Intolerable, vicious, demands punishment.

In order to test the effectiveness of the revised questions, a pilot study was conducted at Pacific Union College during the summer

term of 1970. A total of 80 questionnaires were distributed in three education classes. Sixty-four questionnaires were returned and all responses were tabulated by the data center for all questions with all possibilities on the acceptability scale. It was found that the revised questions were useful for this study.

### Collection of the Data

Three methods were used in the collection of the data: (1) student group meeting, (2) personal contact, and (3) mail. On April 14, 1971 a letter (Appendix II) was sent to each of the 400 students asking them to meet in Irwin Hall chapel April 20, at 9:30 p.m. for the purpose of completing the questionnaire for this study. Over one-half of the students were there and completed the task according to the instructions (Appendix III). Upon arrival each student was checked against the roster of randomly selected names and given a packet containing instructions, a post card (Appendix IV) to indicate completion of the task and a pair of questionnaires. The Opinion Scales on Student Behavior were numbered in pairs with five digit numbers. Students were to address even numbered questionnaires to their mother and odd numbered questionnaires to their father. The purpose of the numbers was so that a correlation of opinion in each area sampled could be made between parent's and their children.

The parents questionnaire was in an envelope which also



contained a letter of instruction (Appendix V), a self-addressed postage-paid card to be returned separately from the questionnaire (Appendix VI), and a postage-paid addressed envelope. Since the questionnaire was anonymous, the card was the only way of telling who had not participated so that a follow-up letter could be sent.

No questionnaires were mailed for one week allowing for personal contact. At the end of one week the remaining questionnaires and a letter of instruction (Appendix VII) were sent to students and their parents. Three weeks later reminder letters were sent to parents who had not yet returned their cards. Two parents responded stating that they did not care to participate in the project. Several sent letters requesting more information about the study. Only one additional questionnaire was obtained from the follow up letter; however, it was received too late for the information to be included in this report. This brought the total number of parent returns to 300 or 75% of those sent out. Student returns numbered 355 or 88.7% of the 400 distributed.

All faculty questionnaires were mailed along with instructions and explanations (Appendix VIII). They too were asked to return a card stating their completion of the questionnaire. Those not completing the task by the end of two weeks were contacted by telephone. Two faculty members declined participation. Total faculty returns numbered 128 or 94.8% of the 135 sent.

Table 2 represents the number and percentage of each of the three groups participating in this study.

Table 2. Population, participants, and percentages by group.

|          | Population | Men | Women | Total Returns | % of Returns |
|----------|------------|-----|-------|---------------|--------------|
| Students | 400        | 176 | 179   | 355           | 88.7         |
| Parents  | 400        | 137 | 164   | 300           | 75.0         |
| Faculty  | 135        | 96  | 32    | 128           | 94.8         |
| Totals   | 935        | 408 | 375   | 783           | 83.3         |

### Statistical Treatment of Data

In order to test the hypothesis under investigation, the analysis of variance statistical model was used. This research design was selected because it allows for multigroup comparisons simultaneously. Following are the two analysis of variance models utilized:

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

where

$Y_{ij}$  = an observation

$u$  = overall mean

$T_i$  = group effect

$E_{ij}$  = random error

$t$  = number of a given group

$n_i$  = fixed number of observations in each group

The above model was used where the three groups, students, parents and faculty, were compared with each other. The following model was used when interaction comparisons were made between groups and blocks as well as group and block effects individually.

$$Y_{ijk} = u + T_i + B_j + (TB)_{ij} + E_{ijk} ,$$

where

$Y_{ijk}$  = an observation

$u$  = overall mean

$T_i$  = group effect

$B_j$  = blocking effect

$(TB)_{ij}$  = interaction effect

$E_{ijk}$  = random error

$t$  = number of groups

$b$  = number of cases in a given group

$n_{ij}$  = fixed number of observations in a group-case cell

The analysis of variance consisted in obtaining independent estimates of variance between and within the groups. To determine whether the variances differed significantly from each other the F distribution was used. F is defined as follows:

$$F = \frac{\text{Mean of square between groups (larger)}}{\text{Mean of square within groups (smaller)}}$$

Each null hypothesis was tested at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels of significance.

Because of unequal numbers in each group, a general analysis of variance table will not be presented, rather results of the computer print out will be presented for each null hypothesis.

In order to test the variance of opinion in the seven specified categories of student conduct between parents and children pairs, the t statistical model was used. Following is the t formula utilized in this research:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d_1^2}{k_1(k_1-1)} + \frac{\Sigma d_2^2}{k_2(k_2-1)}}}$$

where

$\bar{X}_1$  = mean of parent

$\bar{X}_2$  = mean of student

$\Sigma d_1^2$  = sum of squared deviations of the scores away from the mean of the parents

$\Sigma d_2^2$  = sum of squared deviations of the scores away from the mean of the student

$k_1$  = number of cases in the parent sample

$k_2$  = number of cases in the student sample

All data was analyzed on the Oregon State University CDC 3300 computer.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The primary objective of this study was to determine to what degree, if any, different values and beliefs existed among college students, their parents, and the faculty in seven behavioral categories: GENERAL CONDUCT, DRUG USE, MISCHIEF, SEX OFFENSES, DRINKING, CHEATING and THEFT. The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings and discussion of the data relative to the objectives of this investigation.

#### Findings and Discussion

The analysis of variance statistical model was selected because it tested differences among two or more groups simultaneously. As was indicated in Chapter III, two analyses of variance statistical models were employed to test the hypothesis under investigation. Two models were required in order to determine the relative effect of each group on the differences found among the three groups surveyed. In addition a "t" statistical model was used to measure differences between paired student, parent combinations. All hypothesis were tested at the .05 and .01 level of significance.

Presented in Table 3, are the analysis of variance F scores and the student, parent and faculty mean scores for the seven categories of

student conduct examined under Hypothesis I.

Table 3. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct.

| Category        | df | F Score | Mean Score         |                   |                   |
|-----------------|----|---------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                 |    |         | Student<br>N = 264 | Parent<br>N = 168 | Faculty<br>N = 90 |
| OVERALL         | 2  | 42.44** | 4.52               | 5.24              | 5.11              |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 2  | 51.10** | 3.72               | 4.58              | 4.30              |
| DRUG USE        | 2  | 28.91** | 5.26               | 6.14              | 6.02              |
| MISCHIEF        | 2  | 13.92** | 4.50               | 5.05              | 4.78              |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 2  | 27.78** | 4.92               | 5.75              | 5.66              |
| DRINKING        | 2  | 23.14** | 4.95               | 5.78              | 5.76              |
| CHEATING        | 2  | 10.87** | 4.81               | 5.20              | 5.41              |
| THEFT           | 2  | 15.56** | 5.42               | 5.85              | 5.80              |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

df = degrees of freedom.

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference in the mean rating on opinion sub-scales among students, parents and faculty, as measured by the Opinion Scale on the Student Behavior, concerning any of the following seven specific student conduct categories: general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating and theft.

F. 01 from the F table for 2/521 degrees of freedom = 4.60; therefore F scores in all seven categories are significant at the .01

level and Hypothesis I is rejected.

The student average on the 19 general conduct items was 3.72, on the seven point opinion scale, while the parent average was 4.58 and the faculty average was 4.30. Parents are slightly more conservative in their opinions than are faculty, and students are considerably less conservative than either of these two groups. This general pattern of scores is the same for all seven categories except cheating, where the faculty mean score rating is the most conservative of the three groups.

The faculty group was dropped from the next hypothesis because comparisons involved only students and parents.

Hypothesis II. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated educational level of the student's father.

Table 4 indicates that there were significant differences of opinion between students and their fathers in the category of SEX OFFENSES. These differences were significant at the .01 level. The remaining six categories showed no significant differences at either the .05 or .01 level.

Table 4. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated educational level of the students' father.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         | Mean Score |      |             |      |         |      |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|------------|------|-------------|------|---------|------|
|                 |          |         |          |         |          |         | Elementary |      | High School |      | College |      |
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | N = 20     |      | N = 54      |      | N = 42  |      |
|                 |          |         |          |         |          |         | S          | P    | S           | P    | S       | P    |
| OVERALL         | 1        | 2.32    | 2        | .40     | 2        | .52     | 4.24       | 5.22 | 4.60        | 5.20 | 4.58    | 5.17 |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 1        | 3.21    | 2        | .94     | 2        | .18     | 3.46       | 4.48 | 3.66        | 4.44 | 3.80    | 4.64 |
| DRUG USE        | 1        | 1.28    | 2        | .19     | 2        | .67     | 5.33       | 6.35 | 5.51        | 6.36 | 5.58    | 6.02 |
| MISCHIEF        | 1        | 1.01    | 2        | 1.82    | 2        | .36     | 4.10       | 5.10 | 4.72        | 5.23 | 4.26    | 4.89 |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 1        | 9.83**  | 2        | 1.22    | 2        | .57     | 4.92       | 6.04 | 5.30        | 5.80 | 4.91    | 5.48 |
| DRINKING        | 1        | 3.36    | 2        | .12     | 2        | .24     | 4.93       | 5.73 | 5.26        | 5.65 | 5.18    | 5.49 |
| CHEATING        | 1        | 3.73    | 2        | 1.94    | 2        | .40     | 3.96       | 4.80 | 4.78        | 5.10 | 4.87    | 5.14 |
| THEFT           | 1        | 1.03    | 2        | 1.23    | 2        | .39     | 5.47       | 6.10 | 5.52        | 6.18 | 5.73    | 6.38 |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

df = degrees of freedom

Column 1 = comparisons between student/parent (father) pairs.

Column 2 = comparisons between elementary/high school/college educations.

Column 3 = interaction of student/parent pairs.



The educational levels compared were grade school, high school and college. The results of the comparisons indicate that the significant differences appeared in the father-student group only where the father had an elementary school education. These fathers were the most severe in their attitudes toward student sex offenses, and the children of these fathers were more liberal than the high school group. Since significant differences were found here, Hypothesis II was rejected.

Consideration was given not only to the opinion ratings determined by the educational level of the father but also to opinion ratings determined by the family economic background, Hypothesis III tests this difference.

Hypothesis III. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated family economic background.

As illustrated in Table 5, there were no significant differences in any category under Column 3; however there were significant differences in Column 1 and Column 2 comparisons. Income was divided into five levels: well to do, \$25,000+; prosperous, \$12,000-\$25,000;

average, \$6,000-\$12,000; under average, \$4,000-\$6,000; poor, \$4,000 or under. Mean scores for students and parents by income level are presented in Table 6.

Table 5. F scores resulting from comparisons of student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated family economic background.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score |
| OVERALL         | 4        | 2.50    | 1        | 20.63** | 4        | 1.89    |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 4        | 3.15*   | 1        | 36.78** | 4        | 1.40    |
| DRUG USE        | 4        | 2.50*   | 1        | 10.83** | 4        | 1.78    |
| MISCHIEF        | 4        | 1.66    | 1        | 13.48** | 4        | 0.17    |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 4        | 2.74*   | 1        | 12.66** | 4        | 1.64    |
| DRINKING        | 4        | 0.92    | 1        | 5.81*   | 4        | 1.67    |
| CHEATING        | 4        | 0.55    | 1        | 0.70    | 4        | 1.27    |
| THEFT           | 4        | 1.05    | 1        | 0.87    | 4        | 1.98    |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

df = degrees of freedom.

Column 1 = comparisons between student/parent pairs.

Column 2 = comparisons by family economic background: \$25,000+; \$12-25,000; \$6-12,000; \$4-6,000; \$4,000 or less.

Column 3 = interaction of student/parent pairs.

In the overall category parents and students showed the greatest differences if the family income was \$25,000 or more yearly. At every income level the parents were more conservative than students in the category of GENERAL CONDUCT. While parents and students agreed about DRUG USE at the poor income level, they differed at the high income level by 1.2 points on the seven point opinion scale.

Table 6. Students and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated family economic background.

| Category        | Mean Score |      |             |      |            |      |           |      |                 |      |
|-----------------|------------|------|-------------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|-----------------|------|
|                 | \$25,000+  |      | \$12-25,000 |      | \$6-12,000 |      | \$4-6,000 |      | \$4,000 or less |      |
|                 | N = 92     |      | N = 174     |      | N = 196    |      | N = 18    |      | N = 18          |      |
|                 | S          | P    | S           | P    | S          | P    | S         | P    | S               | P    |
| OVERALL         | 4.16       | 5.14 | 4.56        | 5.32 | 4.64       | 5.27 | 4.88      | 5.12 | 4.80            | 4.87 |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 3.32       | 4.49 | 3.73        | 5.38 | 3.84       | 4.65 | 3.91      | 4.41 | 3.68            | 4.04 |
| DRUG USE        | 4.80       | 6.05 | 4.67        | 6.23 | 5.54       | 6.19 | 6.00      | 6.22 | 5.78            | 5.72 |
| MISCHIEF        | 4.35       | 4.81 | 4.54        | 5.10 | 4.48       | 5.14 | 4.92      | 5.31 | 4.69            | 5.42 |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 4.34       | 5.63 | 5.04        | 5.83 | 5.08       | 5.77 | 5.56      | 5.78 | 5.29            | 5.41 |
| DRINKING        | 4.70       | 5.70 | 4.97        | 5.93 | 5.27       | 5.78 | 5.36      | 5.42 | 5.36            | 5.20 |
| CHEATING        | 4.53       | 5.24 | 4.88        | 5.22 | 4.81       | 5.08 | 5.11      | 5.96 | 5.47            | 5.02 |
| THEFT           | 5.25       | 5.70 | 5.44        | 5.89 | 5.47       | 5.85 | 5.73      | 5.62 | 6.06            | 5.48 |

Nearly the opposite was true in the category of MISCHIEF. In this category students and parents agreed most at the high income level and disagreed most at the low income level.

Although both students and parents were quite conservative in their opinions about sex offenses, parents were the more conservative. Students at the highest income level were the most liberal in opinion and students at the \$4-6,000 level were the most conservative in opinion, making the difference between these two groups 1.2 on the seven point opinion scale.

In the DRINKING category, students were more liberal than parents at all but the very lowest income levels, where parents were more accepting of drinking than were students.

Parents in the two lowest income brackets were more liberal in the THEFT category than were students, while at the higher income levels students were the more liberal. It should be pointed out that while low income parents were more liberal, they still felt that theft was "unacceptable" or "harmful". Students increased in conservatism as the income level declined. Because of significant differences, Hypothesis III was rejected.

Hypothesis IV. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific

categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated degree of church commitment.

The F value for each category of student conduct determined by church commitment is given in Table 7. Null hypothesis IV was rejected because significant differences were found at both the .05 and .01 levels of significance. Church commitment had a definite effect on attitudes. Those who were committed to the church had more conservative attitudes about student conduct. No faculty member gave the response "uncommitted", and the committed faculty gave responses much like those of the committed group of parents. The faculty, however, was slightly less conservative than parents in every category except CHEATING, where faculty was the most conservative of all of the groups.

Other comparisons were also made between or among the groups by adding different variables. Hypothesis V tests one of them.

Hypothesis V. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the students' marital status.

Table 7. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated degree of church commitment.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         | Mean Score         |                   |                    |                   |                  |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | Committed          |                   |                    | Uncommitted       |                  |
|                 |          |         |          |         |          |         | Student<br>N = 227 | Parent<br>N = 173 | Faculty<br>N = 109 | Student<br>N = 68 | Parent<br>N = 21 |
| OVERALL         | 2        | 15.57** | 1        | 38.05** | 1        | .14     | 4.72               | 5.27              | 5.12               | 4.00              | 4.63             |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 2        | 19.72** | 1        | 47.34** | 1        | .79     | 3.91               | 4.63              | 4.33               | 3.11              | 3.83             |
| DRUG USE        | 2        | 16.24** | 1        | 16.80** | 1        | 4.37*   | 5.57               | 6.11              | 6.02               | 4.56              | 5.79             |
| MISCHIEF        | 2        | 16.22** | 1        | .01     | 1        | .05     | 4.56               | 5.03              | 4.81               | 4.54              | 5.07             |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 2        | 11.51** | 1        | 24.15** | 1        | .83     | 5.21               | 5.78              | 5.68               | 4.29              | 5.15             |
| DRINKING        | 2        | 6.79**  | 1        | 45.20** | 1        | .15     | 5.30               | 5.85              | 5.80               | 4.09              | 4.69             |
| CHEATING        | 2        | 4.43*   | 1        | 14.73** | 1        | .01     | 4.99               | 5.22              | 5.41               | 4.38              | 4.64             |
| THEFT           | 2        | 1.95    | 1        | 11.24** | 1        | .63     | 5.54               | 5.86              | 5.77               | 5.22              | 5.35             |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Column 1 = comparisons among students/parents/faculty.

Column 2 = comparisons by the committed/uncommitted groups.

Column 3 = interaction of students/parents/faculty.

The opinions about student conduct as determined by differences in the students' marital status are examined in Table 8. Surprisingly, the results show no significant difference in any category. Students were divided into three categories: Single, engaged and married. The single students numbered 280, engaged 34, and married 37. Although the number of engaged and married students was small, still no significant differences were found; therefore Hypothesis V is accepted.

Table 8. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' marital status.

| Category        | F Score | Mean Score                    |                               |                               |
|-----------------|---------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                 |         | Single<br>Students<br>N = 280 | Engaged<br>Students<br>N = 34 | Married<br>Students<br>N = 37 |
| OVERALL         | 2.08    | 4.51                          | 4.72                          | 4.29                          |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 2.52    | 3.68                          | 3.94                          | 3.47                          |
| DRUG USE        | 1.23    | 5.31                          | 5.38                          | 4.93                          |
| MISCHIEF        | 2.43    | 4.51                          | 4.81                          | 4.30                          |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 0.61    | 4.96                          | 5.02                          | 4.71                          |
| DRINKING        | 1.36    | 4.98                          | 5.32                          | 4.73                          |
| CHEATING        | 1.42    | 4.76                          | 5.05                          | 4.55                          |
| THEFT           | 1.00    | 5.56                          | 5.42                          | 5.27                          |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

The next hypothesis tests opinions determined by the location of the participant's home.

Hypothesis VI. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated geographic home locations.

As illustrated by Table 9, significant differences are indicated in most categories for Columns 1 and 2. In nearly all categories the greatest differences were between students and parents when the family lived in a rural area, a small town with a population up to 10,000, or in a city of 50,000-250,000 population. Mean scores from Table 10 show that parents from these three areas were more conservative than parents from any other area, while students were about the same from these three areas as students living in other areas. Parents living in the larger metropolitan areas were more liberal than students in the categories DRINKING, CHEATING, and THEFT. Since significant differences were found beyond the chance level, Hypothesis VI was rejected.

The next hypothesis considers students only.



Table 9. F scores resulting from comparisons of student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the geographic home location.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score |
| OVERALL         | 6        | 2.85**  | 1        | 59.62** | 6        | .70     |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 6        | 2.15*   | 1        | 99.68** | 6        | .73     |
| DRUG USE        | 6        | 2.29**  | 1        | 29.84** | 6        | .81     |
| MISCHIEF        | 6        | 1.60    | 1        | 25.13** | 6        | .78     |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 6        | 2.48**  | 1        | 35.99** | 6        | .38     |
| DRINKING        | 6        | 2.60**  | 1        | 20.53** | 6        | .55     |
| CHEATING        | 6        | 1.94    | 1        | 2.30    | 6        | 1.43    |
| THEFT           | 6        | 1.74    | 1        | 10.14** | 6        | 1.91    |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Column 1 = comparisons between student/parent pairs.

Column 2 = comparison by geographic location.

Column 3 = interaction of student/parent pairs.

Hypothesis VII. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences stated by students whether they are attending P. U. C. of their own free will, because of family pressure, or for some other reason.

As the findings of Table 11 show, there are significant differences in all categories at the .01 level except in the category MISCHIEF which is significant only at the .05 level.

Table 10. Student and parent subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the geographic home location.

| Category        | Mean Score |      |        |      |        |      |        |      |         |      |        |      |        |      |
|-----------------|------------|------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|---------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
|                 | Area 1     |      | Area 2 |      | Area 3 |      | Area 4 |      | Area 5  |      | Area 6 |      | Area 7 |      |
|                 | N = 16     |      | N = 44 |      | N = 68 |      | N = 80 |      | N = 146 |      | N = 82 |      | N = 86 |      |
|                 | S          | P    | S      | P    | S      | P    | S      | P    | S       | P    | S      | P    | S      | P    |
| OVERALL         | 4.71       | 4.93 | 4.04   | 5.07 | 4.82   | 5.79 | 5.79   | 4.68 | 5.32    | 4.77 | 5.53   | 5.00 | 5.49   | 5.62 |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 3.48       | 4.39 | 3.64   | 4.48 | 3.64   | 3.88 | 3.46   | 4.42 | 3.77    | 4.49 | 3.82   | 4.69 | 3.89   | 4.79 |
| DRUG USE        | 5.09       | 5.50 | 5.40   | 5.72 | 5.46   | 6.51 | 5.11   | 5.99 | 5.17    | 6.21 | 5.73   | 6.38 | 5.51   | 6.19 |
| MISCHIEF        | 4.50       | 4.78 | 4.36   | 4.74 | 4.63   | 5.43 | 4.50   | 4.88 | 4.46    | 5.03 | 4.46   | 5.40 | 4.61   | 5.17 |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 4.47       | 5.16 | 4.88   | 5.35 | 5.04   | 6.13 | 4.75   | 5.51 | 4.92    | 5.70 | 5.13   | 5.84 | 5.13   | 6.06 |
| DRINKING        | 4.84       | 4.69 | 4.55   | 5.20 | 5.09   | 6.19 | 4.88   | 5.73 | 5.14    | 5.83 | 5.13   | 5.80 | 5.22   | 6.02 |
| CHEATING        | 5.08       | 4.43 | 4.65   | 4.53 | 4.69   | 5.42 | 4.63   | 5.10 | 4.68    | 5.23 | 5.06   | 5.25 | 5.11   | 5.30 |
| THEFT           | 5.50       | 5.45 | 5.64   | 5.51 | 5.22   | 5.97 | 5.44   | 5.64 | 5.30    | 5.88 | 5.70   | 5.08 | 5.55   | 5.84 |

Area 1 = City of 1,000,000+.

Area 2 = City of 250,000-1,000,000.

Area 3 = City of 50,000-250,000.

Area 4 = Suburbs of a large city.

Area 5 = Small city of 10,000-50,000.

Area 6 = Small town up to 10,000.

Area 7 = Rural area.

Table 11. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by students attending Pacific Union College of their free will, because of family pressure or for some other reason.

| Category        | F Score | Mean Score           |                           |                                    |
|-----------------|---------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                 |         | Free Will<br>N = 326 | Family Pressure<br>N = 13 | Other<br>(Loss of Credit)<br>N = 9 |
| OVERALL         | 18.50** | 4.48                 | 3.90                      | 2.98                               |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 17.93** | 3.75                 | 2.99                      | 2.28                               |
| DRUG USE        | 17.90** | 5.40                 | 4.00                      | 3.14                               |
| MISCHIEF        | 3.27*   | 4.52                 | 4.90                      | 3.83                               |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 19.07** | 5.04                 | 3.92                      | 2.75                               |
| DRINKING        | 12.06** | 5.08                 | 4.29                      | 2.81                               |
| CHEATING        | 6.08**  | 4.82                 | 4.48                      | 3.40                               |
| THEFT           | 7.89**  | 5.46                 | 5.07                      | 4.36                               |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Students attending P. U. C. because of family pressure were significantly more liberal in their attitudes about student conduct than were students who were attending because they wanted to. Even more liberal were students attending because they would lose credits if they transferred to another school. This latter group on the seven point scale, scored as much as 2.29 points more liberal than did students attending of their free will. Because significant differences were found among the groups, Hypothesis VII was rejected.

The next two hypotheses are similar in nature and are involved directly with the participant's relationship to the church.

Hypothesis VIII. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in stated church attendance patterns.

An examination of the scores in Table 12 relative to opinions determined by differences in church attendance patterns indicate significant differences in all categories of student behavior. These differences are significant at the .01 level in Column 1, while in Column 2 differences are significant only at the .05 level in the GENERAL CONDUCT and DRINKING categories. Differences were found in Column 3 at the .05 level in OVERALL and DRINKING categories and at the .01 level in DRUG USE and SEX OFFENSE categories.

Mean scores in Table 13 show students, parents and faculty attending church regularly were more conservative than students and parents attending occasionally in the categories GENERAL CONDUCT, SEX OFFENSES, DRINKING and THEFT. The occasional attenders were more conservative in the categories DRUG USE, MISCHIEF, and CHEATING.

Table 12. F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by church attendance patterns.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score |
| OVERALL         | 2        | 31.28** | 3        | 2.57    | 4        | 2.87*   |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 2        | 24.24** | 3        | 2.92*   | 4        | 2.02    |
| DRUG USE        | 2        | 29.36** | 3        | 1.01    | 4        | 8.24**  |
| MISCHIEF        | 2        | 9.28**  | 3        | 0.28    | 4        | 1.05    |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 2        | 30.34** | 3        | 2.47    | 4        | 4.86**  |
| DRINKING        | 2        | 17.98** | 3        | 3.32*   | 4        | 2.51*   |
| CHEATING        | 2        | 8.96**  | 3        | 0.92    | 4        | 2.08    |
| THEFT           | 2        | 7.86**  | 3        | 1.22    | 4        | 0.73    |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Column 1 = comparisons among student/parent/faculty groups.

Column 2 = Comparisons by church attendance patterns:  
regular/occasional/seldom/never.

Column 3 = interaction of student/parent/faculty groups.

Students and parents seldom attending church were significantly more liberal in every category than were the regular or occasional church attenders. As a result of significant differences, Hypothesis VIII was rejected.

Hypothesis IX. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in stated church membership.

Table 13. Student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by church attendance patterns.

| Category        | Mean Score   |          |          |             |         |        |             |         |        |            |
|-----------------|--------------|----------|----------|-------------|---------|--------|-------------|---------|--------|------------|
|                 | Regular      |          |          | Occasional  |         |        | Seldom      |         |        | Never      |
|                 | N = 260<br>S | 264<br>P | 125<br>F | N = 67<br>S | 19<br>P | 1<br>F | N = 23<br>S | 12<br>P | 1<br>F | N = 4<br>P |
| OVERALL         | 4.74         | 5.30     | 5.13     | 3.98        | 5.01    | 5.74   | 3.42        | 4.45    | 5.14   | 4.62       |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 3.91         | 4.70     | 4.34     | 3.14        | 4.14    | 5.37   | 2.68        | 3.26    | 4.37   | 4.10       |
| DRUG USE        | 5.61         | 6.12     | 6.01     | 4.56        | 6.30    | 6.75   | 3.54        | 5.85    | 6.25   | 5.81       |
| MISCHIEF        | 4.56         | 5.05     | 4.87     | 4.32        | 5.33    | 5.75   | 4.54        | 5.06    | 4.50   | 5.06       |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 5.25         | 5.79     | 5.68     | 4.25        | 5.49    | 6.14   | 3.32        | 5.42    | 5.14   | 4.93       |
| DRINKING        | 5.35         | 5.88     | 5.81     | 4.15        | 5.36    | 6.00   | 3.16        | 4.60    | 5.75   | 4.50       |
| CHEATING        | 5.00         | 5.19     | 5.44     | 4.26        | 5.06    | 5.40   | 3.66        | 4.55    | 6.00   | 4.45       |
| THEFT           | 5.53         | 5.84     | 5.79     | 5.20        | 5.77    | 5.86   | 4.76        | 5.36    | 6.00   | 5.00       |

Based upon the data presented in Table 14, Hypothesis IX was rejected. Significant differences were observed in Column 1 in all categories except THEFT and significant differences were present in Column 2, in categories OVERALL, GENERAL CONDUCT and DRINKING. Column 3 had significant differences in the OVERALL, GENERAL CONDUCT and THEFT categories.

All faculty are members of the church which reduced non-member comparisons to students and parents. Member parents were more conservative than non-member parents in the OVERALL category. Non-member students were more conservative than member faculty in the MISCHIEF category. In the SEX OFFENSE category, non-member parents were more liberal than member faculty or member parents. Both student and parent non-members were more liberal in attitudes toward DRINKING than were any of the member groups. Non-member students were more severe than member students in regard to THEFT while non-member parents were the most liberal of any group in the THEFT category.

For the next hypothesis, participants were asked to rate themselves as either "mod" or "traditional".

Table 14. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by church membership.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         | Mean Score   |          |          |             |         |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|--------------|----------|----------|-------------|---------|
|                 |          |         |          |         |          |         | Members      |          |          | Non-Members |         |
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | N = 342<br>S | 265<br>P | 127<br>F | N = 13<br>S | 31<br>P |
| OVERALL         | 2        | 10.61** | 1        | 6.43*   | 1        | 5.98*   | 4.50         | 5.33     | 5.14     | 4.49        | 4.65    |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 2        | 9.16**  | 1        | 15.19** | 1        | 9.08*   | 3.70         | 4.70     | 4.35     | 3.57        | 3.69    |
| DRUG USE        | 2        | 11.72** | 1        | 0.83    | 1        | 0.13    | 5.26         | 6.18     | 6.01     | 5.14        | 5.92    |
| MISCHIEF        | 2        | 3.49*   | 1        | 3.41    | 1        | 1.19    | 4.47         | 5.09     | 4.87     | 4.98        | 5.23    |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 2        | 9.28**  | 1        | 1.93    | 1        | 1.63    | 4.91         | 5.84     | 5.68     | 4.89        | 5.31    |
| DRINKING        | 2        | 7.88**  | 1        | 18.54** | 1        | 2.11    | 4.98         | 5.95     | 5.81     | 4.36        | 4.69    |
| CHEATING        | 2        | 8.85**  | 1        | 0.61    | 1        | 2.38    | 4.74         | 5.23     | 5.45     | 4.89        | 4.78    |
| THEFT           | 2        | 1.92    | 1        | 0.72    | 1        | 5.78    | 5.40         | 5.86     | 5.79     | 5.63        | 5.39    |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Column 1 = comparisons among student/parent/faculty groups.

Column 2 = comparisons by member/non-member status.

Column 3 = interaction of student/parent/faculty groups.



Hypothesis X. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by difference in the stated mod or traditional status.

As shown in Table 15, there are significant differences in all categories under Column 1. These differences between the mod and traditional groups are significant at the .05 level in categories MISCHIEF and CHEATING and at the .01 level in all other categories. Under Column 2 significant differences appear at the .01 level in all but the MISCHIEF category. Mod students were more liberal than traditional students in all categories with mean differences ranging on the seven point opinion scale from 1.0 in the DRINKING category to .3 in the MISCHIEF and THEFT categories. On the same scale, mod parents were more liberal in their mean averages from .7 in the DRUG USE category to .5 in THEFT and GENERAL CONDUCT categories. Interestingly, the greatest differences were between mod and traditional faculty members. Traditional faculty were more liberal than mod faculty in the category of MISCHIEF but were more conservative by 1.3 in DRINKING and by 1.2 in SEX OFFENSES categories. Hypothesis X is rejected.

Table 15. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated mod or traditional status.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         | Mean Score   |         |         |              |          |         |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|
|                 |          |         |          |         |          |         | Mod          |         |         | Traditional  |          |         |
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | N = 128<br>S | 28<br>P | 13<br>F | N = 150<br>S | 158<br>P | 81<br>F |
| OVERALL         | 2        | 16.76** | 1        | 34.51** | 2        | .39     | 4.15         | 4.75    | 4.60    | 4.85         | 5.29     | 5.18    |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 2        | 28.45** | 1        | 25.75** | 2        | 1.72    | 3.31         | 4.25    | 3.81    | 4.05         | 4.61     | 4.37    |
| DRUG USE        | 2        | 8.95**  | 1        | 26.04** | 2        | .26     | 4.81         | 5.46    | 5.38    | 5.73         | 6.19     | 6.13    |
| MISCHIEF        | 2        | 3.53*   | 1        | 2.98    | 2        | 1.94    | 4.38         | 4.51    | 4.92    | 4.66         | 5.09     | 4.76    |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 2        | 8.33**  | 1        | 37.78** | 2        | .61     | 4.47         | 5.10    | 4.64    | 5.34         | 5.81     | 5.82    |
| DRINKING        | 2        | 7.24**  | 1        | 35.56** | 2        | .73     | 4.41         | 5.13    | 4.67    | 5.44         | 5.86     | 5.92    |
| CHEATING        | 2        | 3.62*   | 1        | 15.47** | 2        | .39     | 4.45         | 4.58    | 5.11    | 5.14         | 5.25     | 5.47    |
| THEFT           | 2        | 4.79**  | 1        | 9.17**  | 2        | .54     | 5.23         | 5.41    | 5.66    | 5.28         | 5.90     | 5.83    |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Column 1 = comparisons among student/parent/faculty groups.

Column 2 = comparisons by mod/traditional groups.

Column 3 = interaction of student/parent/faculty groups.

Another variable similar to the one just examined is considered in the next hypothesis.

Hypothesis XI. There is no significant difference among student, parent and faculty mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated liberal/conservative status.

Table 16 indicates that there are significant differences at the .01 level in all categories under Column 1 and Column 2 except in the CHEATING category which is significant at the .05 level. Significant differences under Column 3 are recorded at the .05 level in categories GENERAL CONDUCT, DRUG USE and SEX OFFENSES.

Very large differences are present between the liberal and conservative groups. Not only are these differences present when comparing students, parents and faculty, but also when comparing liberal students with conservative students and liberal faculty with conservative faculty. On the seven point opinion scale the difference between liberals and conservatives is almost always at least one full point for faculty, a little less than a point for students and one-half point for parents. Students are the most liberal when comparing liberal students against liberal parents and liberal faculty. When comparing

Table 16. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student, parent and faculty subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the stated liberal or conservative status.

| Category        | Column 1 |         | Column 2 |         | Column 3 |         | Mean Score   |          |         |              |          |         |
|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|
|                 |          |         |          |         |          |         | Liberal      |          |         | Conservative |          |         |
|                 | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | df       | F Score | N = 173<br>S | 153<br>P | 79<br>F | N = 126<br>S | 153<br>P | 79<br>F |
| OVERALL         | 2        | 28.35** | 1        | 85.35** | 2        | 2.47    | 4.14         | 4.86     | 4.31    | 4.93         | 5.39     | 5.33    |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 2        | 42.10** | 1        | 82.26** | 2        | 3.04*   | 3.29         | 4.22     | 3.50    | 4.15         | 4.74     | 4.54    |
| DRUG USE        | 2        | 17.95** | 1        | 45.06** | 2        | 4.05*   | 4.70         | 5.78     | 5.28    | 5.90         | 6.28     | 6.22    |
| MISCHIEF        | 2        | 7.08**  | 1        | 11.28** | 2        | .50     | 4.40         | 4.71     | 4.47    | 4.66         | 5.16     | 4.91    |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 2        | 17.27** | 1        | 64.40** | 2        | 3.13*   | 4.45         | 5.32     | 4.53    | 5.42         | 5.92     | 5.98    |
| DRINKING        | 2        | 10.59** | 1        | 57.75** | 2        | 1.59    | 4.46         | 5.23     | 4.64    | 5.55         | 5.99     | 6.08    |
| CHEATING        | 2        | 3.40*   | 1        | 31.21** | 2        | .28     | 4.46         | 4.76     | 5.16    | 5.16         | 5.32     | 5.55    |
| THEFT           | 2        | 7.47**  | 1        | 37.90** | 2        | 2.51    | 5.26         | 5.55     | 5.10    | 5.62         | 5.97     | 5.96    |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Column 1 = comparisons of student/parent/faculty groups .

Column 2 = comparisons by liberal/conservative groups.

Column 3 = interaction of student/parent/faculty groups.

liberal groups, the faculty means are usually closer to student means than to parent means. When comparing conservative students with conservative parents and conservative faculty, students are again the most liberal; however, in this case, the faculty means are closer to the parent means. In other words, liberal faculty are quite liberal, and conservative faculty are quite conservative. Also conservative students are closer in opinions to conservative parents than are liberal students to liberal parents. This explains the large difference in scores mentioned above between liberal and conservative groups. Because of significant differences, Hypothesis XIII is rejected.

Again, only students are considered in the next hypothesis.

Hypothesis XII. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the students' stated college major.

Students have significant differences of opinion among themselves when compared by college major. These differences were significant at the .05 level in the category MISCHIEF and THEFT and at the .01 level in all other categories. F scores are shown in Table 17 and since they are significant, Hypothesis XII is rejected. No one

Table 17. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' college major.

| Category        | df | F Score | Mean Score                      |                       |               |                |                           |                      |                        |                   |
|-----------------|----|---------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
|                 |    |         | N = 29<br>Behavioral<br>Science | 9<br>Business<br>Adm. | 13<br>History | 21<br>Theology | 11<br>Speech<br>Pathology | 18<br>Office<br>Adm. | 6<br>Home<br>Economics | 5<br>Fine<br>Arts |
| OVERALL         | 34 | 2.89**  | 3.48                            | 4.05                  | 4.20          | 5.00           | 5.04                      | 4.98                 | 4.77                   | 5.17              |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 34 | 3.04**  | 2.70                            | 3.40                  | 3.26          | 4.47           | 4.11                      | 4.14                 | 3.72                   | 4.48              |
| DRUG USE        | 34 | 2.39**  | 3.72                            | 4.86                  | 4.78          | 5.47           | 6.05                      | 5.93                 | 6.08                   | 6.40              |
| MISCHIEF        | 34 | 1.57*   | 3.84                            | 4.52                  | 4.28          | 4.64           | 4.63                      | 4.68                 | 4.91                   | 5.35              |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 34 | 2.71**  | 3.59                            | 3.96                  | 4.56          | 5.32           | 5.58                      | 5.29                 | 5.16                   | 5.71              |
| DRINKING        | 34 | 2.02**  | 3.60                            | 4.13                  | 4.86          | 5.56           | 5.70                      | 5.81                 | 5.21                   | 5.55              |
| CHEATING        | 34 | 1.78**  | 3.87                            | 3.91                  | 4.73          | 5.28           | 5.65                      | 5.31                 | 4.30                   | 4.96              |
| THEFT           | 34 | 1.53*   | 4.76                            | 5.20                  | 5.25          | 5.56           | 5.86                      | 5.83                 | 5.81                   | 5.65              |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

consistent pattern can be reported except for students with the Behavioral Science major. These students were conspicuously the most liberal in all categories. Other students who tended to be liberal had majors in Business and History. The more conservative students were represented with majors in Theology, Speech Pathology, Office Administration, Home Economics and Fine Arts. Mean scores for the majors listed are shown in Table 17.

Freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors make up the groups compared in Hypothesis XIII.

Hypothesis XIII. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by the students' stated class standing.

The opinions about student conduct as determined by differences in the students' class standing are examined in Table 18. The results show no significant differences in any category; therefore Hypothesis XIII is accepted. Means of opinion ratings are very much alike for each class.

Table 18. Subgroup mean scores from the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' class standing.

| Category        | df | F Score | Mean Score         |                     |                  |                   |
|-----------------|----|---------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|
|                 |    |         | N = 72<br>Freshmen | N = 80<br>Sophomore | N = 91<br>Junior | N = 103<br>Senior |
| OVERALL         | 4  | 1.35    | 4.62               | 4.55                | 4.33             | 4.57              |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 4  | .77     | 3.73               | 3.72                | 3.55             | 3.75              |
| DRUG USE        | 4  | 1.53    | 5.41               | 5.22                | 5.05             | 5.46              |
| MISCHIEF        | 4  | 1.36    | 4.56               | 4.66                | 4.33             | 4.54              |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 4  | 1.96    | 5.22               | 4.89                | 4.66             | 5.00              |
| DRINKING        | 4  | 1.53    | 5.28               | 4.96                | 4.72             | 5.07              |
| CHEATING        | 4  | .80     | 4.80               | 4.89                | 4.57             | 4.81              |
| THEFT           | 4  | 1.15    | 5.46               | 5.52                | 5.26             | 5.42              |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.



Hypothesis XIV. There is no significant difference among students' mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by differences in the stated grade point average of the student.

Presented in Table 19 are the analysis of variance F scores for the seven categories of student conduct examined under Hypothesis XIV. Since no significant differences were found Hypothesis XIV is accepted.

Table 19. F scores resulting from comparisons of student subgroup means of opinion ratings on seven specific categories of student conduct when subgroups are determined by the students' stated grade-point average.

| Category        | df | F Score |
|-----------------|----|---------|
| OVERALL         | 23 | .80     |
| GENERAL CONDUCT | 23 | .77     |
| DRUG USE        | 23 | .96     |
| MISCHIEF        | 23 | .88     |
| SEX OFFENSES    | 23 | .89     |
| DRINKING        | 23 | .77     |
| CHEATING        | 23 | .87     |
| THEFT           | 23 | .71     |

\* = F is significant at the .05 level.

\*\* = F is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XV. There is no significant difference between student and parent mean ratings on opinion sub-scales as they pertain to the seven specific categories of student conduct measured by the Opinion Scale on Student Behavior and determined by the student, parent paired combinations.

As indicated in Chapter III, student/parent pairs would be measured by the "t" statistical model. The t scores of these 269 student/parent pairs reveal significant differences at the .01 level for all categories of student conduct. From Hypothesis I, the analysis of variance comparisons between students as a group and parents as a group showed significant differences in all categories of student conduct; therefore it can be stated that differences of opinion exist between students and their individual parents as well as between students as a group and parents as a group.

#### Summary of Findings

Three of the fifteen hypotheses tested, were accepted because no significant differences in opinions about student conduct were found among students as those opinions were determined by marital status, class standing or grade point average. The remaining 12 hypotheses were rejected because significant differences were present among the

groups considered. Opinions about the seven student conduct categories were significant in different degrees depending on which of the 15 variables was the determining factor. The SEX OFFENSES category had significant differences in 12/15 of the variables; GENERAL CONDUCT and DRUG USE 11/15; DRINKING 10/15; MISCHIEF and CHEATING 9/15; THEFT 7/15. Table 20 shows these differences by variable and by category. Differences at the .01 level are represented by two \*\* and differences at the .05 level are represented by one \*.

The variable "father's education" had significant differences only in the SEX OFFENSES category. Other variables with significant differences in only a few categories were "economic background" and "geographic location". The remaining variables had significant differences in most of the seven categories.

Regardless of the religious influence, significant differences of opinion were present among students, parents and faculty as those opinions were related to the seven areas of student conduct used in this study.

Table 20. Summary of significant differences in the seven categories of student conduct as determined by 15 variables.

|  | GENERAL<br>CONDUCT | DRUG<br>USE | MISCHIEF | SEX<br>OFFENSES | DRINKING | CHEATING | THEFT |
|--|--------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------|----------|----------|-------|
| Students, parents<br>and faculty         | **                 | **          | **       | **              | **       | **       | **    |
| Father's education                       |                    |             |          | **              |          |          |       |
| Economic background                      | *                  | *           |          | *               |          |          |       |
| Church commitment                        | **                 | **          | **       | **              | **       | *        |       |
| Marital status                           |                    |             |          |                 |          |          |       |
| Geographic location                      | *                  | *           |          | *               | *        |          |       |
| Free will etc.                           | **                 | **          | *        | **              | **       | **       | **    |
| Church attendance                        | **                 | **          | **       | **              | **       | **       | **    |
| Mod/traditional/<br>liberal/conservative | **                 | **          | **       | **              | **       | *        | **    |
| College major                            | **                 | **          | *        | **              | **       | **       | *     |
| Class standing                           |                    |             |          |                 |          |          |       |
| Grade point average                      |                    |             |          |                 |          |          |       |
| Student parent pairs                     |                    |             |          |                 |          |          |       |

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

During the past several years a noticeable change has taken place in the behavioral attitudes of college and university students. No institution of higher learning has been totally immune to these changes. Although the experience at the state institution is different from that of the private school, each must be responsive to the public that shapes its policy and gives financial support.

Pacific Union College is a private, coeducational, liberal arts college affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist Church and as such it has maintained a strong in loco parentis emphasis. In dealing with students at P.U.C. student personnel administrators have observed that not all of the students seem to agree with some of the behavioral standards maintained by the college. The purpose of this study was to assess divergence of opinion among students, parents and faculty in regard to seven areas of student conduct.

#### Participants

Out of a population of 1,950 enrolled students 1,597 met the criteria for this study. All foreign students and students whose

parents reside overseas were excluded. Using the random number sampling technique, 400 students were selected. One parent of each student and the entire faculty were also included. Student respondents numbered 355 for a 88.7% participation. Parent returns numbered 300 or 75% of the selected group while faculty participation was 128 or 94.8%. From the 935 people selected, 783 or 83.3% actually participated in this study.

### The Instrument

The basic idea, form and name (Opinion Scale on Student Behavior) of the instrument used in the collection of data originated with Schreck (1959). Later the instrument was revised by Wangen (1970). Further revision was required to meet the needs of this study. Questions dealing with behavioral standards of concern to a church related college were included. Also a section to collect demographic information was added. Revisions were made in consultation with a panel of professionally recognized educators at Oregon State University. The instrument included statements about student conduct offenses in general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating and theft. Each offense allowed for rating by participants on a seven-point opinion scale with choices increasing in severity from "generally acceptable" to "intolerable, vicious, demands punishment."

### Collection and Treatment of the Data

The Opinion Scale on Student Behavior was administered to each of the three groups during the Spring term of the 1970-71 academic school year. Information contained on the questionnaires was transferred to IBM cards and analyzed on the Oregon State University CDC 3300 computer. Each of the 15 null hypotheses was tested by the analysis of variance or "t" test statistical models at the .05 and .01 levels of significance.

### Findings

On the basis of the results obtained from the analysis of the data, the following findings were reported as they related to the hypothesis of the study.

Null Hypothesis I was tested to see if differences of opinion existed among students, parents and faculty as those opinions related to the seven categories of student conduct. Hypothesis I was rejected on the basis of significant differences being present at the .01 level in all seven categories of student conduct.

Based on the findings of Chickering (1969), LeMay et al. (1968) and Dennis (1966), as reported in Chapter II, it was not surprising to see that students at Pacific Union College differ with the older generation (parents and faculty) in opinions about student conduct. Parents

and faculty were consistently similar in opinions about student conduct. Like the reports in the literature, the differences were in the direction of greater liberalism on the part of the students. Understandably the faculty group was the most conservative in opinions about cheating; however they were the middle group in every other category, making parents the most consistently conservative group. The reason for the faculty being the middle group could be because they are exposed more to the contemporary thinking by association with the younger generation and by reading the current literature. Also education tends to have a liberalizing influence and the faculty as a group has more education than parents as a group.

The faculty group was dropped from the next comparison because Hypothesis II tested opinions between students and parents as those opinions were determined by the stated educational level of the students' father. The educational levels compared were grade school, high school and college. No significant differences were found in opinions between students and fathers in any category of student conduct except in the category SEX OFFENSES, then the differences were significant only between those fathers who had had an elementary school education, and their children. This group of fathers was the most conservative of the three educational groups and the children of these fathers were more liberal than the high school group. Thus the difference was great enough to be significant. The difference is large



enough to be other than by chance.

The amount of one's education and the amount of one's income have been considered to have a positive correlation. In testing Hypothesis III, parent and student opinions were compared as determined by the amount of the stated family economic background. Income was divided into five levels: Well to do, \$25,000+; prosperous, \$12,000-\$25,000; average, \$6,000-\$12,000; under average, \$4,000-\$6,000; poor, \$4,000 or under.

When comparing just students and parents, differences were significant at the .05 level in the OVERALL, GENERAL CONDUCT, DRUG USE and SEX OFFENSES categories; however when comparing them by income these differences become significant at the .01 level for the above categories plus the MISCHIEF category; DRINKING became significant at the .05 level. In the OVERALL category, students increased in conservatism as income declined until there was virtually no difference between students and parents at the lower income levels. Thus the greatest differences between students and parents was in the upper income levels. This same pattern of difference was true for each category except MISCHIEF where the greatest difference was in the lowest income group. Here both students and parents shifted toward conservatism with the parents making the greatest shift. It is concluded that in general those with the larger incomes are more liberal in attitudes about student conduct. This is

consistent with the findings of Blum (1970) who reported greater acceptance of students' liberal activities among the upper income families.

Even though the amount of family income did make some difference in opinions reported, larger differences occur among the groups when differences are determined by the degree of church commitment. These differences necessitated the rejection of Hypothesis IV. Differences were reported in all categories except THEFT. In this category students, parents and faculty all held similar opinions when comparing the means of each group. However when all of the committed students, parents and faculty were compared as one group against all of the uncommitted as one group, the committed and uncommitted were significantly not alike in all categories except the category MISCHIEF. In this category both the committed and the uncommitted groups agreed.

When interaction comparisons were made between the committed/uncommitted students, parents and faculty, the interaction that made the DRUG USE category significant at the .05 level was that the uncommitted students shifted in the direction of liberalism while the committed students, parents and faculty shifted in the direction of conservatism. These findings disagree with studies reported in Chapter II where Roper Research Associates (1969) found that freshmen, seniors and alumni hold similar views about the use of marijuana

by students.

Contrasted to the large number of significant differences found in the committed/uncommitted groups, was the absence of any significant differences among students as determined by the students' marital status. The absence of difference might be explained by the fact that even though married, students were of the same general age as were the single students and probably had not been married very long. Later, opinions may change about some aspects of student behavior as was suggested by Bell and Buerkle (1961). Because of the absence of significant differences, Hypothesis V was accepted and it is concluded that the marital status of students at Pacific Union College makes no difference as to their opinions about student conduct.

When comparing students and parents by another variable, significant differences again appeared. These differences of opinion, as determined by geographic home location, were examined and Hypothesis VI was rejected. The seven geographic areas considered were 1,000,000+; 250,000-1,000,000; 50,000-250,000; suburbs of metropolitan areas; small city of 10,000; and rural areas.

Interestingly, parents were more liberal than students in categories CHEATING and THEFT when the geographic home location was in either of the two most populated areas. In addition parents were more liberal than students about DRINKING if they lived in the 1,000,000+ city. It should be pointed out that the number of

participants from that area was small. The most conservative group by geographic location was the group of parents living in a city of 50,000-250,000. Next was the group of parents living in the small town up to 10,000 population. For all categories, except the three mentioned above, students were the most liberal regardless of where they lived. The fact that students were pretty much alike agrees with the reports of Chickering (1969), Sanford (1967) and Heath (1968). It is concluded that geographic home location does make a difference and that there is a more liberal attitude among those who live in the large metropolitan areas. It is assumed one's style of life and thinking tends to be more protected and less challenged in the less populated areas and thus a more conservative attitude will be manifested.

Although only 7.3% of the students reported reasons for attending P.U.C. other than their own choice, they definitely had significantly more liberal opinions about student conduct in all seven categories. Reporting on proscriptions, Mizruchi and Perrucci (1969) indicate that when proscriptions are rejected, individuals react to excess. This could be the case here. The 7.3% of the students who would rather be attending school somewhere else, may be rejecting, at least to some degree, the values maintained by the college and thus differ significantly from those attending college of their own free will.

The next area examined had to do with one's relationship to the church. Significant differences were found among students, parents

and faculty when those differences were determined by church attendance patterns. All categories were significant at the .01 level when students, parents and faculty were compared by church attendance. When regular, occasional, seldom and never were compared, each as a separate group, then significant differences were present at the .05 level only in the GENERAL CONDUCT and DRINKING categories. Here students and parents in the seldom and never groups were more liberal than students, parents and faculty in the regular and occasional groups. Interaction significant differences resulted from occasionally attending faculty shifting to the conservative side while in the same categories the occasionally attending student shifted toward the liberal side. It is concluded that individuals who attend church, even if only on an occasional basis, tend to be more conservative in opinions about student conduct than are those who never attend church or attend only seldom. Goode (1970) found that students who use marijuana attend church less than do nonusers. In this study, those attending church were more conservative about DRUG USE than were the seldom or nonattenders.

Church membership was as big a factor in determining significant differences as was church attendance. Students, parents and faculty were not alike except in the THEFT category. Again students were the most liberal when the three groups were compared, but when comparing members as a group and nonmembers as a group, the

nonmember group was significantly more liberal in the categories OVERALL, GENERAL CONDUCT and DRINKING. When interaction among the groups was compared the difference that made the THEFT, GENERAL CONDUCT, and OVERALL categories significant was that in each category nonmember parents were more liberal than nonmember students and member students were more liberal than member parents and faculty. Goldsen (1960) says that during the college years even religious values change. Hypothesis IX was rejected and it is concluded that church members are more conservative in their attitudes about student conduct than are nonmembers. A possible explanation for nonmembers being more liberal, is that some nonmember students attend because they live in the area and not because they have internalized the values of the church. Others enroll because they are attracted to some particular program that the school offers and still others attend because they have previously been students in a Seventh-day Adventist elementary or secondary school and feel comfortable in the system even if they are not members of the church.

For Hypothesis X participants were asked to rate themselves as mod or traditional without any explanation as to the meaning of the words. When considered as a group, those who saw themselves as mod were significantly more liberal than those who saw themselves as traditional in all categories except in the MISCHIEF category where they were the same. One major exception was found in the

mod/traditional faculty group. That exception was that mod faculty were more conservative in attitudes about MISCHIEF than were traditional faculty. The conclusions are then, that participants in this study who saw themselves as mod, generally were significantly more liberal than were the participants who saw themselves as traditional. One reason for this could be that the mod individuals were more "up to date" in their thinking and were questioning some of the moral codes of the college. This point of view at least is consistent with the statements of Kauffman (1966), Zimmerman (1969) and McArthur (1971) who point out that it is not just students values that are changing but also parents, faculty and society at large.

Another variable similar to mod/traditional was considered and that was the variable liberal/conservative. When opinions about student conduct were considered as determined by the liberal/conservative variable, the differences among students, parents and faculty were significant in every category. Also when liberals were considered as one group and conservatives were considered as one group, again differences were significant in every category. When comparing the group times the liberal/conservatives, the interaction that made the GENERAL CONDUCT, DRUG USE and SEX OFFENSES significant was that parents who claimed to be liberal were in fact much more conservative in their opinion about these areas of student conduct than were students or faculty. Thus the difference was great enough to be

significant.

From the report of Long and Foster (1970), as cited in Chapter II, it is known that there is a certain amount of conflict present among students, parents and faculty. Mayhew (1970) says we are living in a much freer society. Even so, differences still persist. It is concluded that those students, parents and faculty who see themselves as conservative are indeed more conservative than those who see themselves as liberal.

In studies by Chickering (1969), Sanford (1967) and Heath (1968), it was implied that students are much alike. This may be so in regard to many things; however, in the area of opinions as determined by college major, significant differences were found in all categories of student conduct. The most liberal group of students was the group majoring in the Behavioral Science areas. This would agree with the findings of Blum (1970) as he found those with majors in the Social Sciences were apt to be users of marijuana. The most conservative groups were those with majors in Theology, Speech Pathology, Office Administration, Home Economics and the Fine Arts. It is understandable why Theology majors would be more conservative. Many of the other academic majors attract individuals who are people oriented or authoritarian by nature. These types tend to be conservative and this may be one explanation. It is concluded that students with different academic majors have significant differences of opinion in regard to



student conduct. This agrees with the report of Lehmann (1965) that students differ in attitudes and values according to the academic major they are pursuing.

Two more variants were introduced but no significant differences were found so Hypothesis XIII and XIV were accepted. They considered opinions as determined by class standing and grade point average. From the studies of Axelrod and Lehmann (1965) and Feldman and Newcomb (1969), differences could have been expected between freshmen and seniors; however all classes were found to be alike. Since Seventh-day Adventist students predominantly stay within the denominational system of education, many of them have been together as schoolmates for several years and have been exposed to the same influences. This may explain why freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors expressed the same opinions about student conduct. Another explanation might be that those students who become more liberal leave P. U. C to attend a less conservative school thus leaving a somewhat unified group of students. Goldsen (1960) found that religious believers were reluctant to tolerate deviation or nonconformity from the group standards. Although the idea is challenged by Gottlib (1965), Holland (1959) observed that different kinds of colleges attract different clientele according to their interests, values, personalities or family backgrounds. These limiting factors tend to produce a fairly homogenous student body. The conclusions are then, that no

significant differences of opinion exist among students as those opinions are determined by the students' class standing or grade point average.

It has already been observed under Hypothesis I that students and parents are not alike in their opinions about student conduct, yet Roper Research (1969) found that 66% of the students agreed with their parents on most things. Also the Flack study (1970) shows that students are more "like" their parents than they are "unlike" them; therefore, it was surprising that significant differences were found in all categories when the 269 pairs of student/parent scores were examined. One explanation for these differences might be that students have rejected their parents values and have adopted their own values. Another description of what is taking place is that even though the differences are significant, students are not as liberal as implied, but rather parents, because of their strong religious beliefs, are extra conservative which causes a gap between them. Nevertheless, it is concluded that students and parents do have significant differences of opinion concerning the seven categories of student conduct examined in this study.

Since Roper Research (1969) found that 66% of the students agreed with their parents on most things, and that 34% disagreed with them, it is also possible that in the present study a small percent of the students disagree with parents and that this group makes enough

difference in the student averages so that significant differences show up in the F scores. An examination of the mean scores in the OVER-ALL category by the different variants reveals that the following numbers of students had low or liberal mean scores: 46 students whose family income level was \$25,000+, 22 students from the city with a population of 250,000-1,000,000, 90 students attending church occasionally or seldom, 51 students with majors in Behavioral Science, Business Administration or History, 68 students who saw themselves as uncommitted, 21 students attending because of some kind of pressure, 128 students who classed themselves as mod, and 173 students who stated that they were liberal. No difference in student mean scores were noted for the variants: educational level, marital status, church membership, and class standing. There was no way of telling how many of the same students were represented in more than one variant; however when interaction was measured among members/non-members, mod/traditional, liberal/conservative and committed/uncommitted one group of 36 students consistently had very liberal mean scores in all seven categories of student conduct. This group of 36 students were members, mod, liberal and uncommitted. Other combinations contributed to low mean scores in certain categories such as 61 students in the MISCHIEF category who were members, mod, liberal and committed or the seven students in the CHEATING category who were members, traditional, conservative

and uncommitted; however only the 36 students mentioned above appeared in all categories. It would appear then that no one variant can be selected to predict students who are at variance with the main body of students.

### Recommendations

As a result of the findings and as a result of observations connected with this study, several recommendations will be made.

Because no significant differences were found in the opinions of students about student behavior, as those opinions were determined by the students stated class standing, it appears possible that most freshmen have already established their opinions before coming to college; therefore, it is recommended that studies be done on the secondary level at two or three Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools frequently attended by Pacific Union College students prior to their college experience. A study at this level would make it possible to pinpoint the years when students form opinions that are divergent with those of their parents.

Since the Adventist school system operates both boarding and nonboarding secondary schools, it is further recommended that studies be done among the students and faculty at both types of schools. It is believed that the secondary boarding schools are much like the college in that students are away from home and live in residence

halls. They are subjected to the same kinds of influences that are found on the college campus. A study at the two types of secondary institutions could reveal which, or if both, were contributing to the change in student opinion.

Pacific Union College is only one of many in the network of senior colleges operated by the Seventh-day Adventist church. It is recommended that this study be repeated at other colleges in the system to see if students, parents and faculty living in different geographic locations will have significant differences of opinions about student behavior. It is recommended that the study be repeated at colleges in the midwest, the south and the eastern areas of the United States. In this way it can be ascertained if the findings of this study are peculiar to Pacific Union College with a western location, or if the same differences of opinion are present among students, parents and faculty within the system in general.

It is recommended that this study be repeated at P.U.C. before the freshmen class sampled, graduates. Even though the same participants might not be included, at least the same class, and many of the same faculty would be sampled. This would give a more longitudinal view to the opinions expressed and it would further show if opinions are remaining the same or if they are changing with the times. Drop-outs should also be included in the longitudinal aspect to determine if former students hold different opinions or if they left

because their opinions were unlike those of the majority at P. U. C.

It is also recommended that this study be replicated at other religious institutions of similar size to Pacific Union College. There are many private religious institutions and it has been expressed that some of them are experiencing problems not unlike those at Pacific Union College. By conducting comparable research studies at other colleges, it could be determined if students, parents and faculty at that college held similar opinions to those students, parents and faculty at P. U. C. It would also allow for comparisons of differences between colleges.

It is recommended that further research be done on those groups of participants that were at variance with the main body of participants to determine if these like-minded groups' needs are being met or if special programs are needed. These studies should include a re-evaluation of the college's behavioral standards to ascertain if the best methods are being used to accomplish the objectives of the college.

Finally, it is recommended that additional research be conducted in those areas of special concern to the church. The findings of this study suggest that some college students do not accept certain tenets of the church. Additional instruments need to be developed in order to show more accurately what tenets of the church are not being accepted, and more importantly, why they are not accepted by college

students. When that is known, plans can be devised to overcome the problem.

In summary the recommendations are: (1) Conduct studies on the secondary level at two or three schools in the Seventh-day Adventist system of education. (2) These studies should be done at both boarding and nonboarding types of schools at the secondary level. (3) Studies should be conducted at S.D.A. colleges with different geographic locations. (4) Longitudinal attitude studies should be conducted at Pacific Union College. These studies should include drop-out students. (5) This study should be replicated at other religious institutions. (6) Further research should be carried out on those like minded students who are at variance with the main body of students. This study should also include a re-evaluation of the college's behavioral standards. (7) Additional research should be done in those areas of special concern to the church in order to learn why some college students do not accept certain church tenets.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, Gordon W. 1967. Attitudes. In: Martin Fishbein (ed.). Attitude theory and measurement. New York, John Wiley & Sons, p. 3-13. 499 p.
- Astin, Alexander W. 1968. The college environment. Washington, D.C. American Council on Education, 187 p.
- Axelrod, Joseph et al. 1969. Search for relevance. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 244 p.
- Barton, Allen. 1969. Measuring the values of individuals. In: Dwight G. Dean (ed.). Dynamic social psychology, New York, Random House, p. 319-367. 620 p.
- Bell, Robert R. and Jack V. Burekle. 1961. Mother and daughter attitudes to premarital sexual behavior. Marriage and Family Living 23(4):390-392.
- Bell, Robert R. and J. B. Claskes. 1970. Premarital sexual experiences among coeds, 1958 and 1968. Journal of Marriage and the Family 32(1):81-84.
- Berry, Margaret. 1967. Campus culture. Journal of College Student Personnel 8(1):3-9.
- Blaine, Graham B., Jr. 1966. College students and moral values. In: Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (eds.). The college and the student, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, p. 372-376. 390 p.
- Blum, Richard H. 1970. Students and drugs. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 399 p.
- Bowers, William J. 1968. Confronting college cheating. In: Charles W. Havice (ed.). Campus values, New York, Charles Scribner Sons, p. 73-87. 183 p.
- Butler, William R. 1965. Student revolt for freedoms. Journal of College Student Personnel 6(6):324-330.



- Cardwell, Jerry D. 1969. The relationship between religious commitment and premarital sexual permissiveness: A five dimensional analysis. *Sociological Analysis* 30(2):72-80.
- Carey, James T. 1968. Marijuana use among the new bohemians. *Journal of Psychedelic Drugs* 2(1):79-92.
- Chickering, Arthur W. 1969. Education and identity. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 367 p.
- Christensen, Harold and Christina F. Gregg. 1970. Changing sex norms in American and Scandinavia. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 32(4):616-627.
- Clanton, Gordon. 1969. Understanding sex in the age of the pill. In: Robert Campbell (ed.). *New morality or no morality*, New York, Bruce Publishing, p. 188-198. 248 p.
- Corry, John A. 1967. U.S. sex revolt? It's mostly talk. *Journal of the National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors* 30(2):63-67.
- Curtis, Jack H. 1970. Drugs and Catholic students. In: Blum and Associates. *Drugs II: students and drugs*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, p. 304-319. 399 p.
- De Coster, David A. 1970. The new morality. *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 11(4):243-247.
- De Fleur, Lois B. and Gerald R. Garrett. 1970. Dimensions of marijuana usage in a land-grant university. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 17(5):468-476.
- Dennis, Lawrence E. 1966. On discovering college students. In: Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (ed.). *The college and the student*, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, p. 1-5. 390 p.
- Diamont, Louis. 1970. Premarital sexual behavior, attitudes and emotional adjustment. Paper read at the Eastern psychological association Philadelphia, April 1969. Abstracted in *College Student Personnel Abstracts* 5(2):198-199.
- Dressel, Paul L. 1965. Factors involved in changing the values of college students. *The Educational Record* 46(2):104-113.

- Dressel, Paul L. and Irvin J. Lehmann. 1965. The impact of higher education on student attitudes, values, and critical thinking abilities. *The Educational Record* 46(3):248-258.
- Edwards, Allen Louis, 1957. *Techniques of attitude scale construction*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 256 p.
- Eells, Kenneth. 1968. Marijuana and LSD: a survey of one college campus. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 15(5):459-467.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara and John Ehrenreich. 1969. *Long march, short spring*. New York, Monthly Review Press, 189 p.
- Feldman, Kenneth and Theodore M. Newcomb. 1969. *The impact of college on students*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 171 p. 2 vol.
- Fendrich, James M. 1969. A study of the association among verbal attitudes, commitment and overt behavior in different experimental situations. In: Dwight G. Dean (ed.). *Dynamic social psychology*, New York, Random House, p. 198-211. 620 p.
- Flacks, Richard. 1970. The roots of student protest. In: Thomas E. Lasswell, John H. Burma, and Sidney H. Aronson (eds.). *Life in society*, Atlanta, Scott, Foresman, p. 238-250. 678 p.
- Freedman, Mervin B. 1967. *The college experience*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 202 p.
- Gallagher, Buell G. 1966. The vanguard of dysphoric generation. In: Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (eds.). *The college and the student*, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, p. 368-371. 390 p.
- Garfield, S. Jeffrey, Helen A. Cohen and Robert M. Roth. 1967. A correlative study of cheating in college students. *The Journal of Educational Research* 61(4):172-173.
- Gergen, M.K., K.J. Gergen and S.J. Morse. 1972. *Correlates of marijuana use among college students*. Unpublished report. Abstracted in *College Student Personnel abstracts* 7(3):402.
- Goldsen, Rose K. et al. 1970. *What college students think*. Princeton, Van Norstrom, 240 p.

- Goode, Erich. 1970. Marijuana smokers. New York, Basic Books, 340 p.
- Gottlieb, David. 1965. College climates and student subcultures. In: Wilbur B. Brookover et al. (eds.). New York, Center for Applied Research in Education, p. 78-99. 118 p.
- Gottlieb, David and Charles Ramsey. 1965. The American adolescent. Homewood, Dorsey Press, 281 p.
- Graham, Billy. 1969. The old immorality. In: Robert Campbell (ed.). New morality or no morality, New York, Bruch Publishing, p. 199-211. 248 p.
- Hadden, Jeffrey K. 1970. The gathering storm in the churches. Garden City, Doubleday, 289 p.
- Hassenger, Robert. 1967. The impact of Catholic colleges. In: Robert Hassenger. The shape of Catholic higher education. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, p. 103-161. 378 p.
- Heath, Douglas H. 1968. Growing up in college. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 326 p.
- Heist, Paul A. 1960. Implications for institutional research of studies on student characteristics. In: Richard Gat and Hall T. Sprague (eds.). College self study: lectures on institutional research, Boulder, The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, p. 37-54. 299 p.
- Hochman, J.S. and N.Q. Brill. 1971. Marijuana and psychosocial adaption. Paper read at the American psychiatric association, Washington, D.C. in May 1971. Abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts 7(1):97.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. 1967. Education, interaction, and social change. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 228 p.
- Holland, John L. 1959. Determinants of college choice. College and University 35(1):11-28.
- Imperi, Lillian L., Herbert D. Kleber and James S. Davie. 1968. Use of hallucinogenic drugs on campus. The Journal of the American Medical Association 204(12):1021-1024.

- Jacob, Philip E. 1957. Changing values in college: an exploratory study of the impact of college teaching. New York, Harper and Brothers, 174 p.
- Jacobson, L.I., S.E. Berger and J. Millham. 1970. Self-esteem, sex differences and the tendency to cheat. Abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts 5(4):494.
- Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman. 1968. The academic revolution. Garden City, Doubleday, 580 p.
- Johnson, Charles D. and John Gormly. 1971. Achievement, sociability and task importance in relation to academic cheating. Psychological Reports 28(1):382.
- Johnson, Richmond E. and Malcom S. Klores. 1968. Attitudes toward cheating as a function of classroom dissatisfaction and peer norms. The Journal of Educational Research 62(2):60-64.
- Kaplin, Robert. 1970. Drug abuse: perspectives on drugs. Dubuque, Wm. Brown, 67 p.
- Kaatz, G.R. and K.E. Davis. 1969. The dynamics of sexual behavior of college students. Paper read at Rocky Mountain psychological association. Abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts 4(2):223-224.
- Katz, Joseph, 1968. Four years of growth, conflict, and compliance. In: Joseph Katz et al. (eds.). No time for youth, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, p. 3-73. 463 p.
- Katz, Joseph. 1969. Changes in drinking behavior and attitudes during college. Abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts 4(2):217-218.
- Kauffman, Joseph F. 1966. The student in higher education. In: Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (eds.). The college and the student, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, p. 141-162. 390 p.
- Keniston, Kenneth. 1969. Heads and seekers: drugs on campus, counter-culture and American society. The American Scholar 38(1):97-112.

- Kiesler, Charles A. 1969. Applying pressure and changing attitudes. *Today's Education* 58(3):66-67.
- King, Francis W. 1969. Marijuana and LSD usage among male college students: prevalence rate, frequency, and self-estimates of future use. *Psychiatry* 32(3):265-276.
- Kinsolving, Arthur. 1965. Morals on the campus. *N.E.A. Journal* 54(4):20-24.
- Kurtz, Ronald S. 1969. Marijuana and LSD on campus. In: Erich Goode (ed.). *Marijuana*, Chicago, Adoline Atherton, p. 113-120. 197 p.
- Lehmann, Irvin J. 1965. American college students and the socialization process. In: Wilbur B. Brookover et al. (eds.). *The college student*. New York, Center for Applied Research in Education, p. 58-77. 118 p.
- Lehmann, Ervin J. 1966. Yardstick for gauging values. *The University College Quarterly* 11(2):21-29.
- LeMay, Morris L. et al. 1968. A study of the attitudes and opinions of parents, faculty and students concerning Oregon State University student services and policies. *Student Personnel Research Report: Number 1*. Oregon State University, 41 p.
- Lerner, Max. 1966. The revolutionary frame of our time. In: Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (ed.). *The college and the student*, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, p. 8-22. 390 p.
- Lief, Harold I. 1969. The sex revolution and adolescents search for identity. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 39(2):193.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Philip G. Altbach. 1967. Student politics and higher education in the United States. In: Lipset, Seymour Martin (ed.). *Student politics*, New York, Basic Books, p. 199-252. 403 p.
- Logan, John A. 1965. The crisis on our campus. *Reader's Digest* 86(514) p. 124.

- Long, Durward and Julian Foster. 1970. Levels of protest. In: Durward Long and Julian Foster (ed.). Protest: student activism in America. New York, William Morrow, p. 81-88. 596 p.
- Lukas, J. Anthony. 1968. Don't shoot-we are your children. New York, Dell, 436 p.
- Mack, Raymond W. 1967. Transforming America. New York, Random House, 199 p.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. 1969. Colleges today and tomorrow. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 255 p.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. 1970. Arrogance on campus. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 155 p.
- McArthur, Charles C. 1971. The movement. In: Graham B. Blaine, Jr. and Charles C. McArthur (ed.). Emotional problems of the student, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, p. 268-305. 388p.
- Messer, Mark. 1969. The predictive value of marijuana use: a note to researchers of student culture. Sociology of Education 42(1):91-97.
- Mirande, Alfred M. 1968. Reference group theory and adolescent sexual behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family 39(3):527-577.
- Mizner, George L., James T. Barter, and Paul H. Werme. 1970. Patterns of drug use among college students: a preliminary report. The American Journal of Psychiatry 127(1):15-24.
- Mizruchi, Ephrain H. and Robert Perrucci. 1969. Norm qualities and differential effects on deviant behavior: an exploratory analysis. In: Dwight G. Dean (ed.). Dynamic social psychology, New York, Random House. p. 271-287. 620 p.
- Masher, Donald L. and Hervert J. Cross. 1971. Sex guilt and pre-marital sexual experience of college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 36(1):27-32.
- Nelson, Erland N.P. 1954. Persistence of attitudes of college students fourteen years later. Psychological Monographs. 68(2): 1-13.

- Newcomb, Theodore M. 1966. Research on student characteristics: current approaches. In: Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph Kauffman (eds.). The college and the student, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, p. 101-116. 390 p.
- Newcomb, Theodore et al. 1967. Persistence and change: Bennington College and its students after twenty-five years. New York, John Wiley and Sons, 292 p.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. 1969. Persistence and regression of changed attitudes: long-range studies. In: Dwight G. Dean (ed.). Dynamic social psychology, New York, Random House, p. 187-197. 620 p.
- Pace, C. Robert. 1962. Implications of differences in campus atmosphere. In: R.L. Sutherland, et al. (eds.). Personality factors on the college campus, Austin, The Hogg Foundation, 242 p.
- Pace, C. Robert. 1966. Prospectives on the student and his college. In: Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (eds.). The college and the student, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, p. 76-100. 390 p.
- Pacific Union College Bulletin 66(2):1971, Angwin, California.
- Peterson, Richard E. 1969. The student left in American higher education. In: Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altbach (eds.). Students in revolt, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, p. 202-231. 561 p.
- Rand, Martin E., William Graf and Charles Thurlow. 1970. Alcohol or marijuana: a follow-up survey at Ethaca college. The Journal of the American College Health Association 18(5):366-367.
- Rand, Martin E., David J. Hammon, and Patricia J. Moscow. 1968. A survey of drug use at Ithaca college. The Journal of the American College Health Association 17(1):43-51.
- Raushenbush, Esther. 1957. Changing values and attitudes on the comput--a look to the future. In: Arthur E. Traxler (ed.). Long range planning for education, Washington, D.C., p. 123-152, 185 p.

- Rogan, Donald L. 1969. Campus apocalypse. New York, Seaburg Press, 154 p.
- Rokeach, Milton. 1968. Beliefs, attitudes and values. A theory of organization and change. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 214 p.
- Roper Research Associates. 1969. Survey of college student opinion. School and Society 93(2320):452-453.
- Rossi, Peter H. and Alice S. Rossi. 1968. Some effects of parochial school education in America. In: Robert R. Bell and Holger R. Stub (eds.). The sociology of education, Homewood, Dorsey Press, p. 53-77. 399 p.
- Rubin, Arlene May. 1972. Sex attitudes of female sex educators. Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International 32(7):4139A.
- Sanford, Nevitt. 1965. Morals on the campus. N.E.A. Journal 54(4):20-24.
- Sanford, Nevitt. 1967. Where colleges fail, a study of the student as a person. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 229 p.
- Sanford, Nevitt and Susan Singer. 1968. Drinking and personality. In: Joseph Katz et al. (eds.). No time for youth, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, p. 348-375. 463 p.
- Schreck, Thomas Calvin. 1959. A study of the acceptability of specified student behavior to students, faculty, and student personnel staff. Doctoral dissertation. Indiana University, 161 numbered leaves.
- Sherif, Carolyn W., Muzafer Sherif and Roger E. Nebergall. 1965. Attitude and attitude change. Philadelphia, W.B. Saunders, 264 p.
- Sherril, David et al. 1971. Cheaters vs noncheaters. A study of attitude and perceptions. A paper read at the Southwestern psychological association at St. Louis April 1970. Abstracted in College Student Personnel Abstracts 6(3):374.
- Smith, Bryan C. 1970. Drug use on a university campus. Journal of the American College Health Association 18(5):360-365.



- Smith, David E. 1970. The new social drug. Inglewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 186 p.
- Thornton, Larry Lee. 1969. Morals, ethics and values: an exploration of student reactions. Doctoral dissertation. University of Southern Mississippi, 145 numbered leaves.
- Thurstone, L.L. 1967. Attitudes can be measured. In: Martin Fishbein (ed.). Attitude theory and measurement, New York, John Wiley and Sons, p. 77-89. 499 p.
- Uhlig, George E. and Barry Howes. 1967. Attitude toward cheating and opportunistic behavior. The Journal of Educational Research 60(0):411-412.
- Walters, Paul A., Jr. 1971. Drugs and adolescence: use and abuse. In: Graham B. Blaine, Jr. and Charles C. McArthur. Emotional problems of the student. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, p. 148-162. 388 p.
- Warren, Brian Martin. 1969. Conformity. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 264 p.
- Warren, Jonathan R. 1968. Student perceptions of college subculture. American Educational Research Journal 5(2):213-232.
- White, Ellen G. 1968. Counsels on education. Mountain View, Pacific Press, 178 p.
- White, Ellen G. 1903. Education. Mountain View, Pacific Press, 321 p.
- White, William F., Alfred W. Zielonka and Eugene L. Gaier. 1967. Personality correlates of cheating among college women under stress if independent--opportunistic behavior. The Journal of Educational Research 61(2):68-70.
- Wolk, Conald J. 1968. Marijuana on the campus: a study at one university. Journal of the American College Health Association 17:144-149.
- Zastrow, Charles H. 1970. Cheating among college graduate students. The Journal of Educational Research 64(4):157-160.

- Zimmerman, Paul D. 1969. Taboos in twilight. In: Robert Campbell (ed.). New morality or no morality, New York, Bruce Publishing, p. 153-168. 248 p.
- Zochert, Donald. 1969. Drugs and your child. In: Robert Campbell (ed.). New morality or no morality, New York, Bruch Publishing, p. 168-177. 248 p.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX I

Opinion Scale on Student Behavior Sent to  
Students, Parents and Faculty

## OPINION SCALE ON STUDENT BEHAVIOR

This questionnaire is completely anonymous and no answer can be traced back to you. Please note that you are to respond as you feel not as you think the church or school feels about an item.

Part I

Please complete the following:

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female

Marital Status: \_\_\_\_\_ Married \_\_\_\_\_ Single \_\_\_\_\_ Engaged

Status: \_\_\_\_\_ Freshman \_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore \_\_\_\_\_ Junior \_\_\_\_\_ Senior \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate

\_\_\_\_\_ College Major \_\_\_\_\_ Current Cumulative GPA

\_\_\_\_\_ Attending PUC of free will \_\_\_\_\_ Family pressure \_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify)

How many years have you spent in each of the following types of schools?

Elem. School 1-8:

High School 9-12:

College 13-16:

Public \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

Public \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

Public \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

Church \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

Church \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

Church \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

Member of SDA church:

Generation Adventists:

\_\_\_\_\_ You \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

\_\_\_\_\_ 1st \_\_\_\_\_ 2nd \_\_\_\_\_ 3rd \_\_\_\_\_ 4th

\_\_\_\_\_ Father \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

\_\_\_\_\_ Mother \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

Does your mother attend church:

a. \_\_\_\_\_ regularly b. \_\_\_\_\_ occasionally c. \_\_\_\_\_ seldom d. \_\_\_\_\_ never

Does your father attend church:

a. \_\_\_\_\_ regularly b. \_\_\_\_\_ occasionally c. \_\_\_\_\_ seldom d. \_\_\_\_\_ never

Do you attend church:

a. \_\_\_\_\_ regularly b. \_\_\_\_\_ occasionally c. \_\_\_\_\_ seldom d. \_\_\_\_\_ never

Please rate yourself as a church member. Check one of each number.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ active \_\_\_\_\_ inactive

2. \_\_\_\_\_ committed \_\_\_\_\_ uncommitted

3. \_\_\_\_\_ mod \_\_\_\_\_ traditional

4. \_\_\_\_\_ liberal \_\_\_\_\_ conservative

-Over-

Whom do you consider the spiritual leader in your family (check one only).

\_\_\_\_\_ father \_\_\_\_\_ mother \_\_\_\_\_ self \_\_\_\_\_ none \_\_\_\_\_ no opinion \_\_\_\_\_ other (specify)

Father's Education: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade School \_\_\_\_\_ High School \_\_\_\_\_ College \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate

|                      |                       |                           |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Father's Employment: | <u>Self-employed</u>  | <u>Employed by others</u> |
|                      | _____ Business        | _____ Business            |
|                      | _____ Medical         | _____ Profession firm     |
|                      | _____ Dental          | _____ Manufacturing       |
|                      | _____ Farming         | _____ Education           |
|                      | _____ Other (specify) | _____ Other (specify)     |

Home Economic Background: (yearly)

\_\_\_\_\_ Very well to do \$25,000 +  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Prosperous \$12,000 - \$25,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Average \$6,000 - \$12,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Somewhat under average \$4,000 - \$6,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Poor \$4,000 or under  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Don't know

This page was omitted  
from the parent and  
faculty copy.

Family lives in metropolitan area of:

\_\_\_\_\_ 1,000,000 +  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 250,000 - 1,000,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 50,000 - 250,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Suburbs of metropolitan area  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Small city of 10,000 - 50,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Small town up to 10,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Rural area

## Part II

1. Below you will find an acceptability scale ranging from generally acceptable to an intolerable offense. This is a scale for rating 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.
2. Note that 1 means that the behavior is generally acceptable to you and 7 is to indicate a vicious, serious offense in your estimation.
3. 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.

| 1                       | 2  | 3   | 4                                    | 5                        | 6   | 7   |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Generally<br>Acceptable | Inadvisable,<br>Occasionally<br>Acceptable | Questionable,<br>Dubious  | Undesirable,<br>Not good<br>Practice | Unacceptable,<br>Harmful | Appalling,<br>Shocking,<br>Demands<br>Reprimand | Intolerable,<br>Vicious,<br>Demands<br>Punishment |
| 1.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Taking library books for personal use without checking them out                 |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 2.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Failing to pay bills due creditors  |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 3.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Disregarding family wishes in general behavior                                  |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 4.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Disregarding school rules in general behavior                                   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 5.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Participating in orderly demonstration on campus                                |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 6.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Writing of "bad" checks   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 7.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Skipping weekend church services  |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 8.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Irreverence in a worship service  |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 9.                      | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Gambling in living quarters   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 10.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Playing cards for fun   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 11.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Drinking Coke   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 12.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Dancing at a public hall  |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 13.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Dancing in a private group  |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 14.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Smoking tobacco   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 15.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Attending general rated movies at a public theater                              |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 16.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Attending public theater to see X rated films                                   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 17.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Watching movies on TV   |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 18.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Holding a reserve book overdue when needed by other students                    |                                      |                          |   |   |
| 19.                     | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                              | Refusal, when asked to give information which would incriminate another student |                                      |                          |   |   |

| Generally Acceptable | Inadvisable, Occasionally Acceptable | Questionable, Dubious  | Undesirable, Not good Practice | Unacceptable, Harmful | Appalling, Shocking, Demands Reprimand | Intolerable, Vicious, Demands Punishment |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 20.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Using marijuana for experimentation  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 21.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Occasional marijuana use   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 22.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Giving drugs to others for experimentation   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 23.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Failing to report someone who is "pushing" marijuana   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 24.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Using firecrackers to create a disturbance within a living group   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 25.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Discarding pop cans or trash on public or private property   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 26.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Creating a disturbance in the dining commons   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 27.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Setting off a fire alarm without proper reason   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 28.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Window peeping   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 29.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Petting public (to the extent that it offends others)  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 30.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Swimming naked with persons of both sexes  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 31.                  | 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 |                                |                       |  |  |
| 32.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Living with a person of the opposite sex with no intention of marrying                                   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 33.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Having premarital sexual relations with engaged fiancée  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 34.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Having premarital sexual relations occasionally  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 35.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Experimentation with alcoholic beverages   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 36.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Occasional drinking of alcoholic beverages   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 37.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Social drinking to the point of feeling good at parties  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 38.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Possession and/or consumption of alcoholic beverages in a residence hall                                 |                                |                       |  |  |
| 39.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Cheating in a game to win  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 40.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Failing to report another student cheating in a final examination  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 41.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Helping a friend in a final examination  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 42.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Copying from another person in an examination  |                                |                       |  |  |
| 43.                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7                        | Buying an authentic copy of a final examination for your own use   |                                |                       |  |  |
| 44.                  | 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   |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Generally<br>Acceptable | Inadvisable,<br>Occasionally<br>Acceptable | Questionable,<br>Dubious | Undesirable,<br>Not good<br>Practice | Unacceptable,<br>Harmful | Appalling,<br>Shocking,<br>Demands<br>Reprimand | Intolerable,<br>Vicious,<br>Demands<br>Punishment |

45. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Taking library books for personal possession
46. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Taking items from residence hall rooms which have been left unlocked
47. 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
48. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Taking books for yourself from a public book shelf or open locker
49. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Keeping property known to be stolen
50. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Wearing clothes of roommate without asking

## APPENDIX II

### Letter to Students Asking Their Participation

This questionnaire is completely anonymous  
and cannot be traced to you.

# PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE

ANGWIN, CALIFORNIA 94508

April 14, 1971



DEAN OF MEN

Dear Student:

You and 399 other PUC students have been randomly selected to help in an important research project.

This research will explore reactions of students, faculty, and parents of students relative to certain moral issues to see what values each group holds about student behavior. The selected values are in regards to general conduct, drug use, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, theft, and mischief.

Obviously the cooperation of all 400 students is needed for the success of this project. Your part in the study will only require the completion of a questionnaire (approximately 15 minutes time) and the addressing of an envelope to your parents. I think you will find the project interesting.

The results of this study will contribute greatly to the understanding of students' expressed beliefs on vital moral issues.

Please come to Irwin Hall chapel on Tuesday, April 20, at 9:30 p.m. to fill out the questionnaire. Please bring a pencil.

Your assistance in this project is appreciated, and I wish to thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,  
*Redacted for Privacy*

Don Coles  
Dean of Men

DC:nb

P.S. If you cannot be at Irwin Chapel on Tuesday, April 20, at 9:30 p.m., please contact me at my office in Newton Hall or call me at 965-7401. Thank you.

### APPENDIX III

#### Instructions to Students for Filling Out the Questionnaire

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Address the stamped envelope to your parents.
  - A. Even numbered questionnaires to your MOTHER.
  - B. Odd numbered questionnaires to your FATHER.  
(The number is in the TOP RIGHT CORNER of the questionnaire.)
2. Fill out your questionnaire and put it in the unstamped envelope. The number on the questionnaire is just for matching with the parents questionnaire. NO record is kept of what number you have --we do not want to know.
3. Sign your name on the card that says you have completed the questionnaire.
4. Drop the questionnaire (in envelope) and card (separately) in the college mail room slot (by library) or leave it at Newton Hall. Drop card and questionnaire on different days if you wish.

THANK YOU

#### APPENDIX IV

Post Card to be Returned by Students  
and Faculty

(front side)

DON COLES-DEAN OF MEN  
PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE  
ANGWIN CA 94508

(back side)

\_\_\_\_\_ I do not care to participate in the project.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have completed the questionnaire and have  
returned it.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NAME

## APPENDIX V

### Letter to Parents Asking Their Participation



## PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE

ANGWIN, CALIFORNIA 94508



DEAN OF MEN

April 14, 1971

Dear Parent of a P.U.C. Student:

You and 399 other parents of P.U.C. students have been randomly selected to help in an important research project at Pacific Union College.

This research will explore reactions of students, faculty, and parents of students relative to certain moral issues to see what values each group holds about student behavior. The selected values are in regards to general conduct, drug use, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, theft, and mischief.

Obviously the cooperation of all 400 parents is needed for the success of this project. Your part in the study will only require the completion of the enclosed, anonymous questionnaire (approximately 15 minutes time) and the return of it and the enclosed post card stating that you have returned the questionnaire (mail separately). The post card is the only method we have of telling whether you completed the questionnaire, since the questionnaire is completely anonymous and cannot be traced to you.

The number in the top, right hand corner of the questionnaire is to indicate which parent fills it out. Odd-numbered questionnaires are to be filled out by the father of the P.U.C. student, and even-numbered questionnaires are to be filled out by the mother of the student. We do not know which number you have. Your son or daughter mailed this questionnaire, so you are assured of anonymity.

The results of this study will contribute greatly to the understanding of parents', students', and faculty members' expressed beliefs on vital moral issues. We would like to compile the results of this project as soon as possible, and beat the increased postage cost, so please return the questionnaire by May 5.

Your assistance in this survey is appreciated, and we wish to thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,  
*Redacted for Privacy*

Don Coles  
Dean of Men

DC:ds  
Enclosure

## APPENDIX VI

Post Card to be Returned by Parents

(front side)

PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE  
ANGWIN, CA. 94508

DON COLES-DEAN OF MEN  
PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE  
ANGWIN CA 94508

(back side)

\_\_\_\_\_ I do not care to participate in the project.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have completed the questionnaire and have  
returned it.

Parent of \_\_\_\_\_  
(Student's name)

Parent's Name \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX VII

### Second Letter with Instructions for Students Asking Their Participation

Dear Student:

I am sorry that you could not be at Irwin Hall to fill out the questionnaire. It is very important for the success of this project that all students chosen complete the questionnaire. We have mailed a like copy to your parents to fill out and now ask that you complete this short task as soon as possible.

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Fill out your questionnaire and put it in the unstamped envelope. The number on the questionnaire is just for matching with the parents' questionnaire. NO record is kept of what number you have -- we do not want to know.
2. Sign your name on the card that says you have completed the questionnaire.
3. Drop the questionnaire (in envelope) and card (separately) in the college mail room slot (by library) or leave it at Newton Hall. Drop card and questionnaire on different days if you wish.

THANK YOU

DON COLES

## APPENDIX VIII

Letter to the Faculty Asking Their Participation

## PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE

ANGWIN, CALIFORNIA 94508

April 14, 1971



DEAN OF MEN

Dear Faculty Member:

The Office of the Dean of Men is conducting a research project here at Pacific Union College and solicits your help as a faculty member.

This research will explore reactions of students, faculty, and parents of students relative to certain moral issues to see what values each group holds about student behavior. The selected values are in regards to general conduct, drug use, sex offenses, drinking, cheating, theft, and mischief.

Obviously the cooperation of all the faculty is needed for the success of this project. Your part in the study will only require the completion of the enclosed, anonymous questionnaire (approximately 15 minutes time). Please return it and the enclosed post card to the College mail room. The post card will tell us that you have completed the questionnaire and yet will assure you complete anonymity on the questionnaire.

The results of this study will contribute greatly to the understanding of parents', students', and faculty members' expressed beliefs on vital moral issues about students' behavior. We would like to compile the results of this project as soon as possible, so please return the questionnaire by May 5.

Your assistance in this survey is appreciated, and we wish to thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

*Redacted for Privacy*

Don Coles  
Dean of Men

DC:nb