

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

8202407

CAHILL, STANLEY PATRICK

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE AND
FEMALE STUDENTS INVOLVED IN MISCONDUCT AT NORTHERN
MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Michigan State University

PH.D. 1981

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ☒.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ☒
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE
AND FEMALE STUDENTS INVOLVED IN MISCONDUCT
AT NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

By

Stanley Patrick Cahill

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1981

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS INVOLVED IN MISCONDUCT AT NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

By

Stanley Patrick Cahill

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether students involved in disciplinary incidents at Northern Michigan University were representative of that campus's general student population. If not, then did these students possess similar demographic, academic, and financial characteristics that tended to distinguish them from the general population of nonoffenders?

Methodology

The sample used in this study consisted of 1,541 disciplinary cases on file in the Dean of Students Office at Northern Michigan University from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978, in which a student was assigned a disciplinary status of probation or greater. In addition, 100 students were randomly selected for each semester from winter, 1972, through winter, 1978, for comparative purposes with the disciplinary population.

Seven variables were selected for use in the study. They were sex, age, college residence, financial aid, curriculum, class standing,

and place of permanent residence. A chi-square statistic and a t-test were used in the analysis of the data.

Major Findings

1. There was a disproportionately higher number of males than females in the offender population.

2. The majority of the offender population was under 21 years of age.

3. Most offenders resided on campus.

4. There was a disproportionately lower number of student offenders receiving financial aid than there was in the general university student population.

5. Student offenders in the curricula of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education were all overrepresented.

6. The number of freshman and sophomore offenders was disproportionately higher than would be expected.

7. Student offenders who were permanent residents of Michigan's upper peninsula were underrepresented, whereas offenders from lower Michigan and out of state were found to be in disproportionately higher numbers than would be expected.

8. Female nonoffenders had significantly higher semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than all the other groups with whom they were compared.

9. Male and female nonoffenders had higher semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than their counterparts in the disciplinary group.

10. Offenders receiving financial aid had significantly lower grade point averages than did nonoffenders also receiving financial aid.

11. Offenders receiving aid had higher grade points than offenders not receiving aid.

Conclusions

1. Male offenders are consistently overrepresented in discipline studies. However, more recent investigations suggest an increase in female participation in college misconduct.

2. A definite relationship appears to exist between poor academic performance and involvement in misconduct.

3. The younger student is more prone to become involved in a disciplinary offense.

4. Students required to live on campus are more susceptible to involvement in disciplinary infractions.

5. Financial aid recipients seem to have a more serious attitude toward college and consequently were less involved in disciplinary infractions than other students.

6. Students who lack a definite career objective are more likely to become involved in incidents of misconduct than are other students.

7. Underclassmen who are not from Michigan's upper peninsula have a greater tendency to become disciplinary offenders because of new group and institutional requirements imposed on their personal style of living by the university.

Recommendations

1. The university's judiciary program coordinator should work with representatives from the various academic colleges to develop a preventive discipline program.

2. A bi-annual review of the residence hall staff training program in regard to discipline should be conducted.

3. A student on academic probation should have his disciplinary record considered before allowing him to continue his academic program.

4. Consideration should be given to a continuing student's disciplinary record before deciding whether he should be granted a financial aid award from the university.

5. A group of students, faculty, and staff should be established to annually review the university's judicial program.

This study is dedicated to the following individuals
without whose support and encouragement none of this
would have been possible:

Lynda Adele Cahill
Meagan Elizabeth Cahill
Kirsten Lynn Cahill
Willis and Margret Conover
Brian Wayne Cahill
Gayle Ann Sullivan
Louis C. Stamatakos

and finally to my parents,

Stanley and Virginia M. Cahill.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	3
Need for the Study	4
Scope of the Study	8
Limitations of the Study	9
Hypotheses and Methodology	10
Definition of Terms	14
Setting	16
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
Summary	39
III. METHODOLOGY	43
General Design of the Study	43
Subjects	48
Collection of the Data	48
Offense Categories	49
Analysis of the Data	50
Hypotheses	52
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	55
Discussion of Chi-Square and Significance Levels	55
Introduction	55
Sex	55
Age	56
College Residence	56
Financial Aid	57
Curriculum	58
Class Standing	58
Permanent Residence	59
Discussion of the T-Test Results	60
Introduction	60
Sex	61

	Page
College Residence	61
Class Standing	62
Curricula	62
Financial Aid	62
Chapter Summary	63
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	67
Overview of the Study	67
Purpose	67
Sample	70
Methodology	71
Hypothesis	71
Major Significant Findings and Discussion	71
Sex	72
Age	74
College Residence	75
Financial Aid	77
Curriculum	79
Class Standing	83
Permanent Residence	85
Comparison With Other Studies	86
Conclusions	88
Recommendations	91
Northern Michigan University	92
Recommendations for Further Research	95
General Recommendations	97
Personal Learning Experience	98
APPENDIX	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY	125

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Selected Demographic Factors of the Student Population of Northern Michigan University, 1977-1978	101
2. Selected Demographic Factors of the Student Offender, Nonoffender, and General University Population at Northern Michigan University, 1977-1978	102
3. Selected Demographic Factors of the Student Offender, Nonoffender, and General University Population at Northern Michigan University, 1977-1978	103
4. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Offenders in Each Violation Category in Regard to the Variable Sex . . .	104
5. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Offenders in Each Violation Category in Regard to the Variable Age . . .	105
6. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Offenders in Each Violation Category in Regard to the Variable College Residence	106
7. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Offenders in Each Violation Category in Regard to the Variable Financial Aid	107
8. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Offenders in Each Violation Category in Regard to the Variable Class Standing	108
9. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Offenders in Each Violation Category in Regard to the Variable Curriculum	109
10. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Offenders in Each Violation Category in Regard to the Variable Permanent Residence	110
11. Chi-Square and Significance Levels for the Independent Variables and Each Offense Category in the Disciplinary Offender Population	111

	Page
12. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Sex and the Dependent Variable of Semester Grade Point Average	112
13. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Sex and the Dependent Variable of Cumulative Grade Point Average	112
14. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Sex and the Dependent Variable of High School Grade Point Average	112
15. A Comparison of Semester, Cumulative, and High School Grade Point Averages of Offender and Nonoffender Groups in Regard to Sex	113
16. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of College Residence and the Dependent Variable of Semester Grade Point Average	114
17. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of College Residence and the Dependent Variable of Cumulative Grade Point Average	114
18. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of College Residence and the Dependent Variable of High School Grade Point Average	114
19. A Comparison of Semester, Cumulative, and High School Grade Point Averages of Offender and Nonoffender Groups in Regard to College Residence	115
20. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Financial Aid and the Dependent Variable of Semester Grade Point Average	116
21. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Financial Aid and the Dependent Variable of Cumulative Grade Point Average	116

	Page
22. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Financial Aid and the Dependent Variable of High School Grade Point Average	116
23. A Comparison of Semester, Cumulative, and High School Grade Point Averages of Offender and Nonoffender Groups in Regard to Financial Aid	117
24. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Class Standing and the Dependent Variable of Semester Grade Point Average	118
25. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Class Standing and the Dependent Variable of Cumulative Grade Point Average	118
26. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Class Standing and the Dependent Variable of High School Grade Point Average	119
27. A Comparison of Semester, Cumulative, and High School Grade Point Averages of Offender and Nonoffender Groups in Regard to Class Standing	120
28. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Curriculum and the Dependent Variable of Semester Grade Point Average	121
29. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Curriculum and the Dependent Variable of Cumulative Grade Point Average	122
30. <u>T</u> -Test Results for the Comparison Between Nonoffenders and Offenders on the Independent Variable of Curriculum and the Dependent Variable of High School Grade Point Average	123
31. A Comparison of Semester, Cumulative, and High School Grade Point Averages of Offender and Nonoffender Groups in Regard to Curriculum Enrolled	124

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Discipline in a college environment is a necessity if students are to grow and develop not only intellectually but also socially and emotionally. To ensure students all the rights and privileges that have been accorded to them by the courts, procedures for the adjudication of infractions of a college's rules and regulations are prevalent on most campuses. However, most of these procedures are reactive rather than proactive in their approach. That is, the individuals charged with implementing the disciplinary system only come into contact with students who have already committed a violation. Little, if anything, is done by the majority of colleges to prevent violations of campus regulations. Mueller concurred:

Unfortunately it is the weakness rather than the strength of preventive work that characterizes the present day campus programs for discipline. . . . The personnel officer must take the lead in launching his own specific educational campaigns. Why he has not done so has been a matter for his own conscience, only when such preventive campaigns become a matter for the conscience of the general professional or personnel workers as a whole, may we expect to see actual progress.¹

Wrenn, apparently agreeing with Mueller, said, "a discipline program should attempt to prevent conditions that cause delinquent

¹Kate Hevner Mueller, "Problems in the Discipline Program," Personnel and Guidance Journal 34 (March 1956): 416.

behavior."² Yeager reported Williamson as saying, "An important approach to the prevention of disciplinary cases is the early identification and counseling of individuals who are likely to become involved in misconduct."³ Osborne, Sanders, and Young supported Williamson's contentions:

One of the basic assumptions of college counseling and guidance programs is that early preventive counseling will reduce the number and seriousness of student personnel adjustment problems and disciplinary offenses. . . . Where it is not possible to give all students the benefit of personal adjustment counseling, the standard operating procedure is to attempt to screen out disciplinary prone students for early individual attention and counseling.⁴

In 1955, Truitt conducted a study of the organization, administration, and operation of student disciplinary programs at ten selected universities. Of his findings, Truitt remarked that "Personnel administrators revealed that the overall function of the discipline program should be preventive and remedial in nature."⁵

Although it has been agreed that preventive programs need to be developed, the incentive to do so appears to be lacking. The only overt practice used by many colleges and universities that could perhaps be considered preventive is the publishing and distribution of their student rules and regulations. It is apparent that at least

²C. Gilbert Wrenn, Student Personnel Work in College (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1951), pp. 472-73.

³Don Cornelius Yeager, "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University" (Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972), p. 16.

⁴Ibid.

⁵John Willard Truitt, "A Study of Student Disciplinary Programs in Ten Selected Universities," Dissertation Abstracts 15 (1955): 1537.

some educators agree on the importance on the preventive aspect of the disciplinary program. However, the reasons for institutions remaining complacent about this issue remain unclear. Student development theorists intimate that, if accepted, the inherent principle on which their philosophy is based can, in and of itself, be a preventive disciplinary measure.⁶ It is not known whether, in developing and implementing a wide variety of student programs, the majority of student personnel administrators believe that these programs will have a positive effect on the prevention and/or reduction of disciplinary problems.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected characteristics of male and female students involved in incidents of misconduct at Northern Michigan University from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978, and who received a penalty of probation, suspension, or expulsion. This time period was chosen for two reasons. First, the data for these years were readily available and second, previous researchers, specifically LeMay,⁷ indicated that a study of disciplinary offenders spanning at least five to six years would be necessary to produce findings of any consequence. Through the examination of the results obtained in this study, the researcher will attempt to determine whether students involved in disciplinary

⁶"A Student Development Point of View of Education" (paper discussed in Education 882, Seminar in College Student Personnel, Michigan State University, Fall Term, 1972, Louis C. Stamatakos, Professor).

⁷Morris LeMay, "College Disciplinary Problems: A Review," Journal of College Student Personnel 9 (May 1968): 184.

incidents are representative of the general student population. If they are not, then do these students possess similar demographic, academic, financial, and racial characteristics that would tend to distinguish them from the population of nonoffenders?

Need for the Study

Before it becomes possible to channel incoming or currently enrolled students for "personal adjustment counseling" or whatever procedures a college chooses to employ in working with disciplinary-prone students, these students must first be identified. Knowledge of a commonality of characteristics that would tend to distinguish these students from others would seem to be a necessity if student personnel administrators are to be perceived as serious in their attempts to reduce disciplinary problems on campus. Investigations of these characteristics would also serve as an overt commitment to the concept of preventive discipline. However, while there has been little substantive research in the general area of discipline, investigations specifically studying the "characteristics of offenders" have been even more rare. Packwood believed that

the small amount of research on discipline is attributed to the fact that the concept and definition of discipline and, therefore, the criteria for judging an individual as a disciplinary case keep changing and the fact that the concept involves several variables which cannot be adequately managed for research purposes, granting that they can even be identified.⁸

Tisdale and Brown offered another perception, that is:

⁸William T. Packwood, College Student Personnel Services (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1977), p. 266.

Although considerable interest has been expressed in students whose conduct brings them before college disciplinary committees, few published articles have presented data concerning these students. The reasons for this paucity are not entirely clear, although possible reluctance on the part of some college administrators to making such information public may be a factor.⁹

Bailey, in an early study, made the following observation on the research on discipline in higher education:

The most striking fact about the literature on discipline is its paucity. There are occasional papers dealing with the philosophy of discipline and the administrative organization for discipline both in theory and in practice. The published case studies are fragmentary and scattered and evaluation studies and accounts of practicable means for preventing disciplinary cases from arising are completely lacking.¹⁰

Bailey, in speculating about the absence of published studies concerning disciplinary cases, attributed the reasons for this as being a reluctance of administrators to acknowledge the existence of misconduct among students, a failure of personnel administrators to realize the value of such studies, and a general lack of interest on the part of investigators to conduct research in this area.¹¹

Gladstein's examination of doctoral research revealed no doctoral dissertations on the topic of discipline prior to 1950, and only ten after that date.¹² Several of the studies that have dealt with

⁹John R. Tisdale and Fredrick G. Brown, "Characteristics of College Misconduct Cases," Journal of College Student Personnel 6 (November 1965): 359.

¹⁰H. W. Bailey, "Disciplinary Procedures," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Walter S. Monroe (New York: Macmillan, 1941), p. 296.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 1330.

¹²G. A. Gladstein, "Doctoral Research in College Student Personnel Work: Past, Present, Future" (speech read at the APGA Convention, Washington, D.C., April 1966).

the characteristics of disciplinary offenders have generally centered on the male student. However, even in this area, research is lacking. Bevilacqua and Dole concurred in stating, "Among the relatively few studies on collegiate discipline, noticeably absent are empirical longitudinal investigations of the characteristics of male students referred for misconduct involving serious offenses of university social regulations."¹³

The research that has been conducted about the characteristics of disciplinary offenders has often been inconclusive due to small samples, time periods covered, or has been inconsistent when compared with the findings of other studies. For example, Packwood cited the findings of some of these studies below to illustrate some of the inconsistencies that do exist in the available research:

Disciplinary difficulties were more likely to involve younger students on campus and those students are disproportionately likely to be male. Disciplined students have been found to have the same scholastic ability as the rest of the student body and to have less scholastic ability; to have lower grade point averages and similar grade point averages. Other studies suggest that the fathers of offenders do not have particular occupational backgrounds; offenders are more likely to get into disciplinary difficulties again, and offenders are more likely to involve fraternity and sorority members.¹⁴

While the preventive aspect of a disciplinary program is certainly important, Bevilacqua and Dole also believed that "in a time when social codes seem to be in transition, knowledge of the offenders' demographic, social, and academic characteristics might assist in

¹³ Joseph P. Bevilacqua and Arthur A. Dole, "Characteristics of Male Disciplinary Students at a Catholic University," Research in Higher Education 3 (1975): 19.

¹⁴ Packwood, College Student Personnel Services, p. 266.

developing appropriate retention programs."¹⁵ To provide the information for personnel administrators that would be necessary for designing appropriate disciplinary prevention and retention programs, a strengthening of descriptive studies of students involved in misconduct is of prime importance. LeMay recommended that a study be completed covering a five- to six-year time span, grouping disciplinary referrals according to the type of offense and by the sex of the offender.¹⁶

Those researchers who have conducted investigations concerning the characteristics of disciplinary offenders have, in a majority of cases, recommended further study in this area. Interest has seemingly waned in this field after a brief burst of enthusiasm in the mid- to late 1960s. Relatively few researchers have seen the necessity to explore this area further. However, it is believed that much can still be learned about the disciplinary offender. Generally, such knowledge could be of vital importance in developing and implementing measures to prevent and/or reduce the number of disciplinary incidents on campus. It could also be of assistance to admissions personnel in their recruiting efforts, beneficial for staff working with new-student orientation, and important for staff-training efforts for campus security personnel, residence hall, and counseling center staff. Specifically, it is felt that a more thorough understanding of the demographic, academic, financial, and racial characteristics of the

¹⁵Bevilacqua and Dole, "Characteristics of Male Disciplinary Students at a Catholic University," p. 19.

¹⁶LeMay, "College Disciplinary Problems: A Review," p. 184.

disciplinary offender at Northern Michigan University can assist the Dean of Students staff in developing preventive disciplinary programs of a pragmatic nature. In so doing, it is believed that perhaps some of those students who might become involved in disciplinary difficulties and, as a consequence of their behavior, be forced to leave campus, can be identified early, perhaps during new-student orientation, and provided with appropriate assistance so that their involvement in a disciplinary incident becomes less likely. In addition, the investigator believes that knowledge of the characteristics of the disciplinary offender can be of value in the training of undergraduate residence hall staff assistants. Such knowledge would enable the staff to possess a more complete understanding of those who are most inclined to violate the university's rules and regulations and thereby provide the staff with an opportunity to channel those individuals into positive developmental experiences.

Scope of the Study

The study will include those cases of reported violations of university rules and regulations on file in the Dean of Students Office for the academic years 1972 through winter semester, 1978. Only those male and female students who received a penalty of warning probation or greater will be considered in the study. Cases on file in the Dean of Students Office were adjudicated by either an Associate or Assistant Dean of Students, a Resident Director, the Residence Hall Judiciary, or the Student-Faculty Judiciary. A survey of the cases revealed that the majority of offenses occurred in the residence

halls and were processed by a Resident Director. Demographic and academic information maintained by the Records Office, financial aid data kept in the Financial Aids Office, the American College Testing (A.C.T.) information filed in the Admissions Office will be used in studying the disciplinary offender. This information will be tabulated, then analyzed by using two statistical techniques: the chi square and the t-test. These tests will be helpful in determining the validity of the research hypothesis for this study.

Limitations of the Study

Of the approximately 1,800 disciplinary cases processed by the Dean of Students Office between the winter semester, 1972, and winter semester, 1978, only those students who were given a disciplinary sanction of warning probation through expulsion were examined. Cases in which the student was found not guilty are not kept on file by the Dean of Students Office but immediately destroyed after the hearing is completed. The investigator did not believe that those students given only a warning, the lightest disciplinary penalty, merited inclusion in the study. Those students accounted for less than 1 percent of the entire disciplined population. When students received only a penalty of Warning, their involvement in a disciplinary infraction was felt to be minimal. Therefore, their impact on this research was believed to be insignificant.

In addition, vocational skill center students enrolled at Northern Michigan University have entrance requirements differing from those of regular academic students. The variables that the

investigator wished to study were not readily available for vocational students. Therefore, any vocational student involved in a disciplinary incident was also excluded from this study. The total disciplined population was composed of less than 1 percent of vocational skill center students.

Variables that were not included in this study, but were found in several others, were marital status; socioeconomic status of the father; method of entry to the college, i.e., directly from high school, a community college, junior college, or from another four-year institution; high school rank; involvement in varsity athletics; membership in a fraternity or sorority; and psychological characteristics. In addition to information being unavailable for some of the above-mentioned variables, the investigator, in reviewing other studies, was not persuaded to believe that many of these variables played an important role in the identification of characteristics of the disciplinary offender.

Hypotheses and Methodology

In choosing to investigate the characteristics of male and female disciplinary offenders, the researcher was attempting to determine if these students possess similar demographic, academic, financial, and racial characteristics that would tend to distinguish them from the population of nonoffenders. In reviewing the research completed on the characteristics of disciplinary offenders, many contradictions seem to exist. These contradictions appeared to be due to any number of factors, among them being size of sample, time period

covered, incomplete or unavailable data, and inherent institutional differences, i.e., size, reputation, public versus private, etc. However, some characteristics have, more often than others, been found to be associated with the disciplinary offender: the offender is young, 18 to 20 years of age, a freshman or sophomore, enrolled in the College of the Arts and Sciences, ranked in the lower half of their high school graduating class, possessing a cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or less, male, an out-of-state resident, and living on campus.

Specifically, the research hypothesis for this study will incorporate the above characteristics in addition to one previously uninvestigated factor: financial aid status of the student offender. Therefore, the research hypothesis that has been developed for this study is:

Students involved in incidents of misconduct will be male, 20 years of age or younger, underclassmen, enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences, possess a semester and cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or less, will be full-time students, live on campus, will not be residents of the upper peninsula of Michigan, and will not be receiving financial aid.

In stating the primary null hypothesis, the investigator believed it necessary and prudent to develop a comprehensive statement without regard to specific offense categories. This hypothesis is as follows:

In relation to each of the selected variables, there are no significant differences between students identified as disciplinary offenders and students in the general campus population at Northern Michigan University.

While the primary null hypothesis is comprehensive in nature, the following sub-null hypotheses were also developed for each offense category.

1. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of General Regulatory Statement.
2. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of Drugs.
3. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of Alcohol.
4. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of Social Violations.

Social Violations include: violation of the residence hall visitation privilege, violation of the residence hall quiet hour policy, personal abuse and harassment, violation of the regulation regarding members of the opposite sex in residence halls, the regulation regarding overnight guests in residence halls, and the university's dress code.

5. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of Physical Violations.

Physical Violations include: destruction of property, disorderly conduct, disruption of judicial hearings, gate crashing, disruptive conduct, noncompliance with official requests from university officials, athletic activities in residence halls, and water, food, and shaving cream fights in residence halls.

6. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of Safety Violations.

Safety violations include: dangerous materials such as combustibles, turning in a false alarm of fire, fireworks, weapons in the residence halls, candles in the residence halls, and electrical appliances that are unauthorized for residence hall use.

7. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of Theft.

Theft includes: removal of food from the cafeteria, fraudulent receipt of goods and services, possession and use of university property, and movement of furniture in the residence halls.

8. There are no significant differences within the selected variables under the offense category of Miscellaneous.

Miscellaneous violations include: academic dishonesty; false testimony at university hearings; lettering; falsification of records and identification; smoking in unauthorized locations on campus; soliciting, selling, and publicizing without proper permission; unauthorized use of sound-amplifying equipment; unauthorized use of the university's name; unauthorized use of antennas in the residence hall; failure to bus your tray in the cafeteria; housing a pet in the residence hall; unauthorized posting of notices; unauthorized room changes in the residence hall; unauthorized removal of screens from a residence hall room; and failure to comply with disciplinary decisions.

The methodology used in this study is similar yet not identical to that used by Yeager. It was believed that the general approach and methodology used by Yeager provided a good basis for a follow-up study. This study, however, goes beyond that completed by Yeager in several aspects, i.e., time period covered, the inclusion of females in the sample, more specific and a greater number of offense categories are used, a greater number of variables are used, and one new variable not appearing in previous descriptive studies concerning the characteristics of the disciplinary offender is also included. The sample consisted of approximately 1,550 disciplinary cases on file in the Dean of Students Office at Northern Michigan University from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978 (a six-year period), in which a student was assigned a penalty of warning probation or greater. Information for the study was obtained from the Student Directory, the Records Office, the Registrar's Office, the Financial Aids Office, and the Dean of Students Office.

A chi-square statistic, used in "testing a hypothesis that a certain proportion of a population exhibits a particular attribute,"¹⁷ and a t-test, used to determine whether two means are significantly different at a selected probability level,¹⁸ were used in the analysis of the data. One hundred students were randomly selected for each semester from winter, 1972, through winter, 1978, for comparison with the disciplinary population.

Definition of Terms

Due to the nature of this study and because of the use of terminology associated with the processing of disciplinary action that may be unfamiliar to the reader, the following working definitions are provided.

Misconduct: A violation of the established rules and regulations of Northern Michigan University.

Student Code: A document formulated through the combined efforts of students, faculty, and administrative personnel to inform all members of the Northern Michigan University community about what is expected of students in regard to their social behavior.

Offense: A violation of the university's student rules and regulations.

Offender: An individual committing a violation of the established university rules and regulations for students.

¹⁷ L. R. Gay, Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1976), p. 202.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 160.

Adjudication: The entire process of due process in handling a disciplinary case from the point of the alleged infraction to the point of a final decision.

Disciplinary case: A specific incident involving one or more alleged violations of regulations.

Discipline population: The total number of students enrolled at Northern Michigan University during the time period covered by the study.

Resident director: The housing administrator responsible for all aspects of the student development program in a residential unit housing from 150 to 375 students. If a student pleads guilty to an incident of misconduct, a resident director can adjudicate the case if it does not subject the student to a penalty of suspension or expulsion.

Residence Hall Judiciary: An officially constituted body whose purpose is to hear all cases in which students plead innocent to alleged infractions of university regulations that do not include suspension or expulsion as maximum penalties.

Student-Faculty Judiciary: An officially constituted body consisting of students, faculty, and administrative personnel whose purpose is to hear all cases in which students plead innocent to alleged infractions of university regulations that include maximum penalties of suspension or expulsion should the individual be found guilty.

Warning probation: A temporary status during which further violations of the Student Code may result in more severe disciplinary

action. Warning probation may not exceed four months but may include additional conditions that are deemed relevant and appropriate to the particular case.

Disciplinary probation: A temporary status during which further violations of the Student Code may result in suspension or expulsion. This penalty may not exceed one year but may include additional conditions which are deemed relevant and appropriate to the particular case.

Suspension: Termination of a student's status as an enrolled student. This penalty may not exceed one year but may include other conditions that apply to the time the disciplinary decision is rendered or to a period following the student's reinstatement.

Expulsion: Termination of a student's status as an enrolled student for an indefinite period of time.

Setting

Northern Michigan University is located on the shores of Lake Superior in Marquette, a city of 24,000 inhabitants. Northern's main campus covers 300 acres, with another 175 acres used for summer research camps. The total student population numbers 9,000, with approximately 7,500 undergraduates and 1,500 graduate students. The student population consists of individuals from practically every state, with several foreign countries also represented. However, most of the students are from the Michigan-Wisconsin geographical area. Approximately 3,400 students reside on Northern's campus. At the end of fall semester, 1977, the mean cumulative grade point average for

all undergraduate students was 2.61. At that same time, the cumulative grade point average for all residence hall students was 2.56. During the 1976-77 academic year, the average A.C.T. score for Northern students was 18.6 compared to a national average of 18.4.

In the following chapters, the investigator will present a review of previous and current literature pertaining to the disciplinary offender, an analysis of the data collected at Northern Michigan University concerning the approximately 3,000 disciplinary offenses that occurred there from 1972 to 1978, and a summary of the findings made in relation to these data. In addition, the conclusions of the investigator based on the findings will be presented. The conclusions will, in conjunction with the information contained in the review of the literature, provide the basis for recommendations to educators and future investigators. In the final chapter, the investigator allows himself the privilege of making speculations and inferences about the study, its meaning, and the learning experience it provided.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The importance of identification and conceptualization of characteristics associated with certain individuals and/or groups has been defined by Magoon and Maxwell and, it is believed, can be appropriately extended to include the disciplinary offender. In 1965, these writers published an article in the Journal of College Student Personnel that discussed, in part, the implications of research whose primary objective was to study selected demographic, academic, and sociological factors of a specific group. Succinctly, they said,

The utility of such material is primarily clinical, i.e., in increasing the amount of information available to an individual in understanding the characteristics of another. The research use of such data is doubly useful, however. It enables conceptualizing common characteristics of large numbers of individuals, and it facilitates the making of more systematic, normative interpretations of the characteristics of any individual or subgroup of individuals.¹

In the following paragraphs, the investigator will elaborate on the importance of including the chosen variables in this study, to discuss a variety of proactive measures that might be implemented based on information obtained from this and similar studies, and to explain the importance of and need for the identification of

characteristics associated with a particular individual and/or group, in this instance, those of the disciplinary offender.

A discussion of the importance of the variables used in this study and to what extent they could be important to student personnel administrators will follow prior to discussing the findings of other researchers who have investigated the characteristics of disciplinary offenders.

Through proper collection and statistical analysis, demographic and general information such as home address, college residence, age, year in school, month of incident, number involved in the incident, the number of incidents in which a student was involved, the semester committed and the offense committed, could permit the researcher to draw inferences about the disciplinary offender. The above-mentioned variables have been used in many of the studies investigating the characteristics of disciplinary offenders, and, in many instances, it has been found that the academic as well as demographic variables do possess a certain correlative significance in predicting the type of student who is likely to become involved in a disciplinary incident. The investigator is of the belief that the use of variables such as a student's financial-aid status and race will also prove to be significant predictors of disciplinary offenders.

The variables used in the present study, while kept in different offices, were relatively easy to obtain and could be gathered prior to the beginning of each academic year for the purpose of identifying students who have a better-than-average probability of becoming involved in a disciplinary incident. Such a proactive measure would

allow student personnel administrators to plan activities such as the following:

1. Disperse disciplinary-prone students throughout a residence hall system, thus preventing, insofar as possible, the probability of a large random grouping of such students in one hall or on one floor. Implementing this suggestion may, in the long run, help residence hall staff to avoid spending an inordinate amount of time on disciplinary problems. The investigator would not encourage the development of a floor, hall, or housing complex in which disciplinary-prone students would be housed since such a living environment could create a self-fulfilling prophesy in regard to these students. It is also felt that no positive results would be obtained from such a living arrangement.

2. Provide training sessions for residence hall staff that place emphasis on certain areas of the conduct code that are more likely to be violated, offer assertiveness training techniques for handling disciplinary situations, discuss community-development techniques and their effectiveness, and require training in basic academic and personal advising techniques.

3. Involve counseling center personnel in the development of preventive discipline programs after predicting the probable nature and size of this population.

4. Develop required new-student orientation sessions for students with characteristics similar to those involved in disciplinary incidents. Such sessions could subtly emphasize the many

opportunities for personal and academic development, thus directing such students toward positive alternative behaviors.

The remainder of this chapter is a survey of the literature discussing the findings and implications of other research studies concerned with the characteristics of disciplinary offenders.

Since the American system of higher education began with the establishment of Harvard College in 1630, college faculties and administrations have been concerned with the housing, health, general welfare, and social control of their students.² Brubacher reported that

Throughout the colonial period and well into the nineteenth century institutions of higher learning had voluminous rules prescribing student conduct to the minimalist detail. Nothing seemed too insignificant on which to legislate, from hours of study and play to the cut of one's clothes and modes of courtesy. Early student disturbances seem to have been due in part to the oppressive spirit engendered by overregulation. Therefore, it was thought to be a great step forward when, toward the end of the nineteenth century, these rules were relaxed and sometimes discarded. The new policy was that if young men were treated like gentlemen they would behave like gentlemen. This optimistic view seemed to work well enough until the late 1950's, when there was an outbreak not only of civil disobedience and violent rioting but also of boorish manners and obscene speech.³

One probable reason for the inordinate number of regulations mentioned by Brubacher was that from the early 1600's throughout most of the 1800's students were, on the average, only 14 years of age. Most were boys whose families could be categorized as "well-to-do."

²Eleanor N. Schetlen, "Disorders, Deans, and Discipline: A Record of Change," Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors 30 (Summer 1967): 169.

³John S. Brubacher, The Courts and Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971), p. 15.

Studies of the characteristics of those involved in "acts of misbehaviors" during this period were either esoteric or nonexistent since there was no specific office (or individual) that was designated as primarily responsible for student behavior and/or the dispensing of penalties until 1869. At that time, Swarthmore opened with a matron to "oversee the conduct and health of the young women."⁴ Prior to this occasion, enforcement of the regulations was a prerogative of the college president, who was authorized to act in loco parentis. However, Schetlen has said that "trustees and, at one time or another, almost everyone connected with the college participated in enforcing regulations."⁵ With so many taking responsibility for the disciplinary process, it was difficult, if not impossible, for any meaningful research regarding the characteristics of disciplinary offenders to be conducted. In fact, it was not until after the early years of this century that theories concerning student misconduct began to appear. As a consequence of such theory development, it was only as recently as 1952 that any systematic research was attempted in the areas of offender characteristics.

Researchers at the University of Minnesota, under the leadership of E. G. Williamson, were interested in the hypothesis that "students that commit misbehaviors are a random sample of students

⁴Schetlen, "Disorders, Deans and Discipline: A Record of Change," p. 169.

⁵Ibid.

in general."⁶ Williamson and his fellow researchers based their hypothesis on the assumption that students undergo certain "transitional readjustments" when moving away from a more simplistic life style to the independent self-sufficiency that is characteristic of a college or university environment.⁷ Records of 1,570 students involved in disciplinary infractions at the University of Minnesota were examined for the academic years 1941-42 through 1947-48. After careful examination of the results, the data revealed: (1) students involved in disciplinary cases over the seven-year period represented less than 2 percent of the total student population of the university; (2) cases involving men occurred more frequently than those involving women, in proportion to the male-female ratio of the student body; (3) more students enrolled in the Arts College were involved in misconduct, while the Graduate School and the College of Agriculture had less than the average number of disciplinary offenders; (4) freshmen, sophomores, and juniors were found in the disciplinary population in slightly, but not significantly, larger numbers than were found in the general student body; (5) students involved in disciplinary cases were average in rank for all freshmen in high school grades and in aptitude test scores; (6) disciplinary cases involving out-of-state students occurred in greater proportion than was true of the general student body; and (7) students residing off campus accounted for more than 70 percent of the cases. Williamson concluded that students

⁶E. G. Williamson, W. Jarve, and Barbara Lagerstadt-Knudson, "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?" Educational and Psychological Measurement 12 (1952): 608.

⁷Ibid.

involved in incidents of misconduct were not significantly different from students in general.⁸

The thoroughness of Williamson's research was not replicated until 17 years later when Caskey and Duvall completed a study of selected characteristics of all disciplinary offenders involving action resulting in probation or suspension at Texas Technological University for a six-year period from 1963-69. Their population consisted of 938 disciplinary cases. The average age of students in the sample was 19.5 years, with a class standing of slightly below sophomore. A majority of the students were males. Mean cumulative grade point average was 1.72; mean semester grade point average was 1.57; and the average class load was 14 hours a semester. The average socioeconomic condition of the students' families was just above the skilled occupational level. The average sanction imposed for the total sample tended toward probation. The researchers also found that more often offenses were committed by individuals rather than groups.⁹

Four of the primary findings of the study were: (1) freshmen had considerably more than their share of disciplinary offenses; (2) the College of Arts and Sciences and Business Administration had 6 percent and 5 percent, respectively, higher rates of disciplinary offenders than their percentage of enrollment would indicate; (3) male

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ O. L. Caskey and Virginia Duvall, "A Study of Selected Characteristics of All Disciplinary Offenders Involving Action Resulting in Probation or Suspension at Texas Tech University for the Six-Year Period 1963-69" (ED 040 473).

students committed only 37 percent of the offenses as individuals, whereas 63 percent of the offenses involving female students were committed by individuals as opposed to a group; and (4) grade point averages of offenders were considerably and consistently lower than the all-campus grade point averages.¹⁰ In addition to the above findings, the researchers indicated several distinct differences between the male and female student offenders. On the average, the males were slightly older than the females: 19.5 versus 19.2, respectively. However, female students had higher grade point averages and enrolled in significantly more semester hours than did the male students. In addition, the two groups were significantly different on all three College Entrance Examination Board scores. Female students scored higher on the math and total scores. Comparison of the male and the female student offenders' CEEB test math and verbal scores with the 1968 entering freshmen's scores indicated that student disciplinary offenders scored only slightly lower than the 1968 entering freshmen.¹¹ There were significantly more group offenses among male students than female. In addition, the socioeconomic scale did not vary significantly between these two groups, both being just above the skilled level. The two groups did, however, differ significantly in regard to the disciplinary sanction imposed; i.e., male students received suspension more often than did female students.¹²

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid.

In a similar yet smaller study, Bevilacqua examined selected measures of demographic, social, and academic characteristics for a male disciplinary population at Villanova University. His hypothesis was similar to Williamson's in that he posed the question of whether there would be significant differences between male disciplinary students, graduate and undergraduate, and a comparison group of Villanova male students in two succeeding graduating classes on selected variables.¹³ The study also examined the ability of these variables to predict membership in either group from one graduating class to the next. There were 32 subjects in the 1964-68 time period and 47 for the 1965-69 time period. An equal number of students, not involved in a disciplinary situation, were selected for the comparison group from the graduating classes of 1968-69. In the class of 1968, Bevilacqua found that graduating disciplinary students tended to be on-campus residents and sons of college graduates. Nongraduating disciplinary students were more likely to have lower grade point averages, were less involved in activities, were sons of white-collar workers and college graduates, and from more nonmanufacturing hometowns than comparison students.¹⁴ In the class of 1969, graduating disciplinary students were more likely to have higher SAT math scores and grade point averages and to be college-prep graduates, athletes, and sons of professional workers than comparison students. Nongraduating disciplinary students were more likely to be campus

¹³Joseph P. Bevilacqua, "Characteristics of Male Disciplinary Students at Villanova University" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972).

¹⁴Ibid.

residents, to have lower grade point averages, higher SAT verbal and comparative reading scores, higher secondary school ranks, to have come from home towns with less manufacturing emphasis, and to have graduated from public secondary schools than comparison students.¹⁵

The findings of Bevilacqua's research differ from those of other studies done in this area. He found no consistent evidence that, as a group, disciplinary referrals were academically or intellectually inferior, younger or less receptive to counseling services than students who were not involved in disciplinary problems.

Yeager also conducted research concerning selected characteristics of male students involved in misconduct. His population consisted of 234 cases of male students involved in misconduct at Arizona State University during the period covering the first and second semesters of the 1967-68 and 1968-69 academic years. The findings of his study indicated that male students in the disciplinary population were characterized by a number of common factors that tended to set them apart from male students in the university population. Students in the disciplinary group were more likely to be under 21 years of age, freshmen, to be enrolled in either the College of Liberal Arts or the College of Business Administration, and to be ranked in the second quarter of their high school graduating class. They tended to have cumulative grade point averages of below 2.00, be out-of-state students, living on campus, and a member of a fraternity. From

¹⁵ Ibid.

the results, Yeager concluded that students in the misconduct group were not representative of the population of the university.¹⁶

Much of the research about disciplinary offenders in the college or university setting was concerned primarily with the male student. However, in 1969 a study was completed by Brousseau at Marquette University that dealt specifically with determining the characteristics and differences among women resident offenders and nonoffenders. Women residents disciplined by one of three judicial boards during the 1967-68 academic year were classified as offenders. A random sample of on-campus female residents was used as the control group. The criteria for comparison consisted of university and demographic variables, grade point averages, and test results of the subjects on the College Entrance Examination Board tests and the Adjective Check List (ACL) test. The findings of Brousseau's study revealed that the discipline subjects as a group, when compared to the nondiscipline group, were younger and financially supported by their parents, came from better economic-educational backgrounds, and tended to rank in the lower three-fourths of their high school graduating class.¹⁷ As a group, the offenders indicated less academic achievement as evidenced by a lower grade point average. However, there was no significant difference in the academic potential of the offenders and the nonoffenders as measured by College Entrance

¹⁶Yeager, "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University."

¹⁷Mary Aline Brousseau, "A Comparison of Disciplined and Non-Disciplined Women Residents, Marquette University, 1967-68" (Ph.D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1969).

Examination Board (CEEB) test scores. On the ACL, disciplined subjects were characterized as having self-concept characteristics of less order and endurance, and needs of succorance, aggression, and abasement.¹⁸

A study whose purpose was to contribute to the basic understanding of the factors involved when certain individuals get themselves in disciplinary situations while others do not was undertaken by Parker at Michigan State University. His population consisted of freshman males enrolled during the fall semester of 1958 who came from the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. The discipline groups consisted of those situations reported to the Dean of Students Office during the fall term. Matriculation data collected were size of the metropolitan area, central-city growth rate, outside-central-city growth rate, parental education level, father's occupation, College Qualification Test scores, Test of Critical Thinking scores, Michigan State University Reading Test scores, and Differential Values Inventory scores. In applying a multiple discriminant function analysis technique to the data, a reading-socioeconomic background function differentiated the groups at a .07 level of significance. The remaining functions resulting from the analysis were of negligible statistical significance.¹⁹

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ O. B. Parker, "An Analysis of Metropolitan Male College Students Involved in Discipline Problems" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964), p. 61.

Wrenn discussed an early study of students involved in disciplinary incidents that was completed by Koepske at the University of Minnesota.²⁰ She found that males were primarily involved in disorderly conduct, whereas females were involved in misconduct. She differentiated between the two categories by defining disorderly conduct to include such violations as fighting or excessive drinking and misconduct as the infraction of numerous dormitory regulations. Wrenn commented that the large number of women misconduct cases was related to the fact that the majority of women involved in such discipline situations lived in dormitories that had a considerable number of regulations. In contrast, approximately 63 percent of the men involved in disciplinary incidents lived off campus or at home. Koepske found that the Cooperative English Test scores for those in the discipline category were significantly lower than those not in this category. This was particularly true in regard to men. There was a marked difference between their English test scores and the test scores for men in general. Since this was true for almost every classification of offense, it was suggested that there may be a language or semantic factor involved in the extent to which students abide by regulations.²¹

The studies in the literature concerning disciplinary offenders generally compared a group of offenders that had been assigned a wide variety of penalties to a control group. However, Schoemer, in his

²⁰C. G. Wrenn, "Student Discipline in a College," Educational and Psychological Measurement 9 (1949): 625-33.

²¹Ibid., p. 625.

research at Indiana University, compared only those students who were suspended to students who had not been previously involved in any misconduct incidents. The purpose of his study was to discover whether students suspended from the university for disciplinary reasons were characterized by common factors in their backgrounds and college records that tended to distinguish them from other students at the university.²² Schoemer had three major thrusts to his research. The first was to survey 273 students suspended during the academic years 1951-52 through 1964-65 and to classify for analysis the types of disciplinary offenses and other appropriate campus characteristics relating to the offenses. The second was an analysis of the academic and intelligence factors of the 141 students suspended during the academic years 1960-61 through 1964-65. The third and final area was an analysis of the various sociological and demographic characteristics of the suspended group. A review of the study's findings indicated that in terms of family background and intellectual aptitude, the suspended student had the same opportunity for success in college as did other students; he compared favorably with nonsuspended students on family composition and socioeconomic level, and intellectual capacity.²³ However, the findings also revealed him to be a rather passive, apathetic individual. He was disinclined to participate in the academic and extracurricular activities available as evidenced by

²²J. R. Schoemer, "An Analysis of Students Suspended From Indiana University for Disciplinary Reasons" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1966), pp. 76-77.

²³Ibid.

his lack of participation in activities and organizations and by the fact that he was not likely to occupy any formal positions of leadership in his peer group. Academically, Schoemer described the typical suspension case at Indiana to be a theft or burglary occurring on campus during the second semester and to be perpetrated by a sophomore on academic probation. The individual was typically a male, 20.8 years of age, and had had a previous disciplinary record. Schoemer also discovered that over one-half of the suspended students returned to the university after their suspension period had passed. Of the remaining group, 20 percent withdrew before graduation, 55 percent graduated, and 25 percent were still attending when he concluded his study. Only one student was suspended a second time.²⁴

In a study completed in the early 1960's at Columbia University, Terrill indicated that disciplinary offenders could most likely be described as 19-year-old females and 20-year-old males. Her study was not specifically concerned with the disciplinary offenders but rather with specific incidents of campus misbehavior and procedures used in disciplinary cases.²⁵

Tisdale and Brown studied the records of 130 students involved in disciplinary incidents during the 1961-62 academic year at Northern Iowa University.²⁶ In analyzing their data, they found that the group consisted of primarily male underclassman students from large cities.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Isabel Terrill, "Disciplining Students in College," Dissertation Abstracts 25 (July 1964): 331.

²⁶Tisdale and Brown, "Characteristics of College Misconduct Cases."

The offenders tended to be freshmen living in fraternity or sorority houses and enrolled in the College of Engineering or Sciences and Humanities. They were also more likely to be in difficulty again and to leave school without graduating.²⁷

An analysis of personality and demographic factors concerning students involved in disciplinary infractions at Central Michigan University was completed by Bealer in a dissertation study at Michigan State University.²⁸ The intent of his study was an attempt to discriminate between offenders and nonoffenders with measures of personality, demographic data, academic majors, curriculum, and their tenure at the university. His population consisted of 92 male and 36 female students who were involved in disciplinary incidents during the 1960-64 academic years at Central Michigan University. The data were analyzed with the multiple discriminant analysis technique. Variables making the largest contribution to the discrimination were: personal educational aspirations and peer parental relationships on the first discriminant function, and rank in class and impulse expression on the second discriminant function for males. For females, it was involvement in extracurricular activities and rank in class on the first discriminant function, and rank in class and religious attendance on the second discriminant function. If an individual's scores were low, he was likely to be involved in misconduct. Conversely, if

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ J. E. Bealer, "An Analysis of Personality and Demographic Factors Concerning Students Involved in Disciplinary Problems" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967).

his scores were high, he was less likely to be involved. Bealer found these relationships to be consistent for both sexes.

In 1967, Kaiser and Britton conducted a discipline study at Kansas State University involving 59 male residence hall disciplinary offenders.²⁹ A control group of the same size was selected for comparative purposes. Thirty different factors were obtained from university records for analysis in the study. A significant difference in intellectual factors was found when the two groups were compared on college and high school grade point averages. The discipline group was found to be lower in both potential and performance. The curriculum chosen also differed significantly between the two groups. Agriculture and engineering were disproportionately represented in the control group, whereas general, biological science, social science, physical education, and participation in varsity athletics were significantly disproportionately represented in the discipline group. The researchers did not find age to be a distinguishing factor between the dormitory-housed predominantly freshmen and sophomores.

Jones, in 1968, completed a study of the characteristics, perceptions, and values of students who were placed on disciplinary probation or suspended at the University of Tennessee during the academic years 1964-65 and 1965-66.³⁰ His control group consisted of

²⁹Herbert E. Kaiser and Gale Britton, "Intellective and Non-Intellective Characteristics of Students Involved in Dormitory Discipline Problems," The Journal of College Student Personnel 8 (November 1967).

³⁰Ronald Evert Jones, "Characteristics, Perceptions, and Values of Students Who Were Placed on Disciplinary Probation or Suspended at the University of Tennessee During the Academic Years of 1964-65 and 1965-66," Dissertation Abstracts, Identification No. 29.8-A/2481.

126 students; 88 were in the probationary group and 14 in the suspended group. The students involved in disciplinary incidents tended to be open, mobile, isolated, less bright (as measured by the high school grade point averages and ACT scores), and freshmen or sophomores.

There were no significant differences in the CCI scores when comparisons were made between:

1. the sample and probation groups:
 - a. enrolled in the college of education,
 - b. from home towns with populations between 100,000 and 250,000, and
 - c. graduating from high schools with graduating classes numbering from 50 to 100;
2. the sample and suspended groups from out of state;
3. the probation and suspended groups with ACT composite scores less than 22; and
4. the suspended, probation, and sample groups in regard to place of residence.³¹

Jones also compared the values of the three groups by again using the CCI scales. He found no significant differences when comparisons were made between:

1. the sample and probation groups:
 - a. the home towns with populations about 25,000,
 - b. graduating from high schools with graduating classes numbering between 50 and 100,
 - c. enrolled in a college of education, and
 - d. enrolled in a college of engineering;
2. the sample and suspended groups:
 - a. not owning automobiles,
 - b. residing in residence halls,
 - c. from out of state, and
 - d. from home towns with populations between 12,000 and 50,000; and
3. the probation and suspended groups:
 - a. residing in residence halls,
 - b. residing off campus, and
 - c. from home towns with populations between 100,000 and 250,000.³²

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

In 1968, Johnson conducted an investigation, the purpose of which was to study differences of educational and personality characteristics between two groups of male college student disciplinary offenders and a random sample of nonoffenders.³³ His control group consisted of 103 male nonoffenders, while his discipline groups consisted of 93 males involved in minor misconduct and 135 males involved in theft and burglary offenses. The time of the study covered a one-year period. Twelve different variables were used in the study. They were: college residence, admission year, age at admission, urban/rural status, academic aptitude test rank, high school rank, course withdrawal, college grade point average, graduation/nongraduation status, and the raw scores as well as "T" scores of the 13 basic scales of the MMPI. Both the single-variable approach and the multivariate approach were used to analyze the variables. The single-variable approach yielded no significant differences among the three criterion groups on: college residence, admission year, age at admission, academic aptitude test rank, high school rank, or college grade point average. He did find that the students defined as "rural" were involved in both minor misconduct and theft and burglary offenses more often than "urban" students. In addition, he found that disciplinary offenders had more course withdrawals than did nonoffenders but graduated from the University of Minnesota more often than did the nonoffenders. The MMPI results showed statistically significant

³³Duane Monroe Johnson, "Educational and Personality Characteristics of Two Groups of College Disciplinary Offenders," Dissertation Abstracts, Identification No. 30/5-A/1867.

differences among the three groups on 8 of the 13 basic scales. He stated that his findings suggested that disciplinary offenders could be identified by means of educational and personality variables and that, further, the groups must be helped and treated in different manners.

Research completed by Filder at the University of South Carolina in 1974 concerned the state of residency of students involved in major discipline offenses during the ten-year period from 1963 to 1973.³⁴ Filder's sample consisted of 346 students found guilty of committing a major offense by the university discipline committee. His results indicated the following:

1. Out-of-state students committed major offenses in greater numbers than would be expected based on the percent of these students and the total male undergraduate population;
2. out-of-state students from the middle atlantic states committed a greater number of discipline offenses than those from the southern states based on the relative percent of all undergraduate male students enrolled at USC from these regions;
3. over half of both out-of-state and in-state offenders were freshmen; and
4. out-of-state offenders graduated almost twice as often in the lower half of their high school class as compared with in-state counterparts.

Filder suggested the following recommendations to the student affairs division at the University of South Carolina:

1. admissions policies relating to out-of-state male students should be periodically reviewed;
2. the incidents of major discipline offenses by out-of-state students should be a matter of continued observation; and

³⁴Paul T. Filder, "Analysis of Students Committing Major Discipline Offenses During the Ten Year Period 1963-73 by State of Residence," ERIC Identification No. ED 082 629.

3. state residences should be considered a research variable in other student studies.

In a study of disciplinary cases at the Illinois Normal School, Bazik and Meyering found that student offenders and nonoffenders tended to have equal ability but that offenders earned lower grades and more males than females became discipline cases. The offenders were younger and were primarily freshmen and sophomores.³⁵

Two researchers from Brigham Young University, Jackson and Clark, conducted an investigation to study students involved in thefts on campus.³⁶ They explained the reasoning for their selectivity in choosing only individuals involved in theft cases as follows:

The administration of disciplinary action has been one of the most difficult areas for workers in student personnel services, and it has been found at many universities, including Brigham Young, that students involved in theft constitute a large proportion of the disciplinary cases. . . . Theft is found to be the most frequent major crime committed in American colleges and universities.³⁷

The purpose of Jackson and Clark's study was to attempt to determine the characteristics of those students apprehended for theft. In so doing, the researchers felt that counseling of students with similar characteristics might help to eliminate or reduce the number of thefts. The study consisted of 120 students involved in thefts between January 1, 1952, and February 1, 1956, at Brigham Young

³⁵Bevilacqua and Dole, "Characteristics of Male Disciplinary Students at a Catholic University," pp. 19-27.

³⁶Karma Rae Jackson and Selby G. Clark, "Thefts Among College Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal 46 (April 1958): 557-62.

³⁷Ibid.

University. The researchers defined theft as larceny, robbery, burglary, embezzlement, and illegal promotional "undertakings." Their null hypothesis was, "Students apprehended for theft do not differ from the general population of students at Brigham Young University in the personal and environmental characteristics selected for analysis." In comparing the theft group with a sample taken from the university population, Jackson and Clark found a significant difference existed in academic achievement as measured by cumulative grade point averages. Students involved in thefts did not achieve as well academically as did members of the sample population. Another interesting but expected finding was that the number of males in the theft group was significantly high. In addition, freshmen and sophomores were found in a disproportionate ratio to their percentage in the general university population.³⁸

Summary

Schoemer reported that there is much conflicting and little conclusive evidence in the literature that would lead one to infer that, in terms of demographic and intelligence factors, academic achievement of suspended students is different than that of those not suspended.³⁹

Williamson, in 1952, found that his sample of discipline students compared favorably with nonoffenders on the aptitude

³⁸Ibid., p. 562.

³⁹Schoemer, "An Analysis of Students Suspended From Indiana University for Disciplinary Reasons," pp. 76-77.

test.⁴⁰ Campbell reported that the main intelligence test score for his "dishonest" group was 1.5 deviations below the mean group as a whole.⁴¹ Schoemer remarked that the mass of conflicting data about students involved in all types of misconduct has caused student personnel faculty to "assume that no differences exist between the suspended and non-suspended student."⁴² While the mass of data concerning the characteristics of the disciplinary offender certainly does seem to be conflicting, some commonalities do emerge. For instance, 11 of the 18 studies reviewed described the disciplinary offender as being a male, less than 21 years old, and a freshman or sophomore. Nine studies found that the disciplinary offender had a grade point average of 2.00 or less or a grade point less than that of the campus's general student population. Five researchers discovered that the offender graduated in the lower half of his graduating high school class; four found he was enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences; another four that he resided on campus; still another four that he was equal in academic ability to his campus's general student population; three found that he was an out-of-state student, whereas another three found that the offender graduated as often as did the nonoffender; two found that the offender was an off-campus resident; two that he was a member of a fraternity; two

⁴⁰Williamson, Jarve, and Lagerstadt-Knudson, "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?" pp. 614-15.

⁴¹J. R. Schoemer, "The College Pushout," Personnel and Guidance Journal 46 (March 1968): 678.

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 677.

that the offender scored lower than the nonoffender on the Cooperative English Test; and two that there was no difference between the offender and his campus's general student population.

A melange of results from the other studies indicated that the disciplinary offender was a full-time student, received an average sanction of probation, was less involved in campus activities than the nonoffender, was an athlete, the son of a white-collar worker, a graduate of a public high school, was passive and apathetic, had a previous disciplinary record, had a low attendance in religious activities, had more course withdrawals than the nonoffender, was from a large urban high school, that male offenders were older than female offenders, female offenders were enrolled in more semester hours than males, there were more offenses committed in groups by males than by females, males were suspended more often than females, the offender was a rural rather than an urban student, and two separate studies found that there were just as many offenders from the Colleges of Business Administration and Engineering as from the College of Arts and Sciences.

While similarities do exist in the studies, conflicting data also abound. It is believed that only two studies, Williamson's and Caskey and Duvall's, covered a time period or a large-enough sample to allow the investigators to draw inferences about their subjects and to have these inferences generalized to other colleges of similar size and with student bodies of similar composition. For the most part, inferences from the other studies could not be generalized as cogently due to small sample size, time period covered, type of

institution in which the research was conducted, i.e., a private Catholic university, number and type of variables used, and the statistical techniques used to assess the findings of the study.

In the almost ten years since the last comprehensive study concerning the characteristics of disciplinary offenders was completed, two new generations of college students have matriculated and, by and large, graduated from many institutions of higher learning. Investigations of disciplinary offenders during these years cannot, in any sense, be described as plentiful. Therefore, it was believed that the time was propitious for an investigation that would encompass a six-year period, over 1,000 students, use a number of variables previously associated with the disciplinary offender, use several new variables, and be completed at an institution felt to be representative of the many four-year institutions so that the results could be generalized more widely than those of many other studies. From the results obtained, it is hoped that a more accurate description of the offender can be developed and that such knowledge can be used for the purpose of reducing disciplinary offenses and/or developing effective preventive disciplinary programs.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

General Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected characteristics of male and female students involved in incidents of misconduct at Northern Michigan University from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978, and who received a subsequent penalty of probation, suspension, or expulsion. Through examination of the results obtained, the researcher attempted to determine whether students involved in disciplinary incidents are representative of the general student population. If they are not, then could these students possess similar demographic, academic, financial, and racial characteristics that would tend to distinguish them from the population of nonoffenders? If it was found that they did share such characteristics, could these findings then prove useful to student personnel administrators in developing and implementing measures to prevent and/or reduce the number of disciplinary incidents on campus? This issue is discussed in Chapter V, where specific recommendations are made regarding the possible reduction or elimination of at least certain types of disciplinary infractions.

The investigator believed that this study lent itself most appropriately to a descriptive research approach. Van Dalen and Meyer explained this type of research in the following manner:

The purpose of descriptive research is to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually, and accurately. Descriptive research is used in the literal sense of describing situations or events. It is the accumulation of a data base that is solely descriptive--it does not necessarily seek or explain relationships, test hypotheses, make predictions, or get at meanings and implications, although research aimed at these more powerful purposes may incorporate descriptive methods. Research authorities, however, are not in agreement on what constitutes "descriptive research" and often broaden the term to include all forms of research except historical and experimental.¹

Fox offered another explanation in stating:

A typical example of an analytical study, one that is usually labeled causal comparative involves the analyzation of characteristics associated with two different groups of subjects. Characteristics which are observed to be closely related to one group but not the other might be presumed to have some causal relationship to the factor on which the groups differ. For example, we might compare one group to another. From this we may discover that one group possesses a particular characteristic in a more marked degree than the other groups. This type of study describes relationships but doesn't attempt to determine why there is a link between variables or whether it's a definite causal link.²

Causal-comparative, or ex post facto, research is another form of descriptive research in which the researcher attempts to determine the cause, or reason, for existing differences in the behavior or status of groups or individuals.³ The basic causal-comparative approach involves starting with an effect and seeking possible causes. Causal-comparative studies attempt to identify cause-effect

¹Stephen Isaac and William B. Michael, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego, Calif.: EDITS Publishers, 1977), p. 18.

²Yeager, "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University," pp. 24-25.

³Gay, Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application, p. 202.

relationships. A difference that exists in causal-comparative groups is that one may have had an experience that the other did not have, or one group may possess a characteristic that the other group does not. In causal-comparative studies, independent variables are variables that cannot be manipulated, should not be manipulated, or simply are not manipulated but could be.⁴ This type of research study can identify relationships but it cannot necessarily determine whether those relationships are causal relationships. Gay stated that "the alleged cause of an observed effect may in fact be the effect, or there may be a third variable which has 'caused' both the identified cause and effect."⁵ Furthermore, he warned that "interpretation of the findings in a causal-comparative study requires considerable caution."⁶ The basic causal-comparative design involves selecting two groups that differ on some independent variable(s) and comparing them on some dependent variable.⁷ The groups may differ in that one group possesses a characteristic that the other does not, or the groups may differ in degree; one group may possess more of a characteristic than the other, or the two groups may have had different kinds of experiences.⁸ The important consideration is to select samples that are

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 203.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

representative of their respective populations and similar with respect to critical variables other than the independent variable.⁹

This study closely replicated the methods and general hypothesis used by Yeager in a similar investigation completed at Arizona State University in 1972.¹⁰ However, four significant differences between the studies were: (1) the time period covered was of greater duration, (2) males and females were included in the study, (3) more specific offense categories were used, and (4) more and different variables were used.

As a consequence of the investigator's interest in student discipline, the literature in the area was examined to determine if a suitable area of investigation existed. Yeager's study on the characteristics of male disciplinary offenders at Arizona State University was found to be particularly interesting. This was especially so since it was discovered that very little research had been conducted on the characteristics of disciplinary offenders. Further examination of the pertinent literature disclosed that two major studies existed covering an extended time period, male and female offenders, and a variety of offense categories: These studies were conducted at institutions whose academic environment and student body permitted generalization of the research findings to other four-year state collegiate institutions. Yeager's study provided what this investigator believed to be a good foundation for further research.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Yeager, "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University," p. 1.

The need for additional research with regard to the characteristics of disciplinary offenders was recommended by Yeager at the conclusion of his study. He, too, felt that early identification of the disciplinary offender could afford an institution the opportunity to develop proactive measures to prevent and/or reduce disciplinary offenses on campus. While his study used only males and covered a relatively short time period, two academic years, it provided the basis for the present, larger study. It was believed that expanding on the scope and depth of Yeager's study would produce results that could be generalized over a wider spectrum of colleges and universities. At present, the majority of studies conducted on the disciplinary offender appear to be relevant only to the institution where the research was conducted.

While Yeager's general hypothesis and method of investigation are also used in this study, an additional statistical test, the t-test, was used to strengthen the analysis of the data. The t-test was used to compare disciplinary offenders of each individual class standing with each of the other class standings on the variables listed. In addition, it was used to compare offenders enrolled in each individual college within the university with offenders of the other colleges on the variables listed. In using such procedures, it was expected that a more complete and accurate description would be obtained of the disciplinary offender.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were obtained from the discipline files maintained in the Dean of Students Office at Northern Michigan University. The study covered a six-year period from winter semester, 1972, through the 1977-78 academic year. During this time, there were 1,800 cases of misconduct reported to the Dean's Office. Of those cases, approximately 1,500 received penalties of warning probation through expulsion. The files in the Dean's Office represented those cases that were adjudicated by either a resident director, assistant dean, the associate dean, the residence hall judiciary, or the student-faculty judiciary. These files contained the majority of the reported cases of misconduct occurring on campus.

Collection of the Data

The following information was contained in the student's conduct file in the Dean of Students Office: type of violation committed, description of the actual incident, the number of individuals involved, student's name, social security number, local address, the decision rendered in the incident, and, where appropriate, the type of penalty and length of time imposed. The variables selected to be studied in this research were similar to those used by many other investigators conducting similar research. Those variables were: sex, age, cumulative grade point average, semester grade point average, college residence, state of residence, year in school, college enrolled, enrollment status, number of students involved in the incident, and action taken. Yeager stated that the above variables

have been recognized by other researchers as being associated with students involved in incidents of misconduct.¹¹

A master list of each student involved in a disciplinary incident and assigned a penalty of warning probation or greater was used in the collection of data for the different variable categories. This list was, of necessity, kept confidential. Additional information from records other than those found in the Dean's Office was also used. Those records included: the Student Directory and records from the Records Office, the Financial Aids Office, and the Registrar's Office concerning cumulative and semester grade point averages, college enrollment and number of hours enrolled, class rank, school session, high school grade point average, financial aid status, and size of high school. The A.C.T. student information file was also used to determine racial background.

Offense Categories

Twenty-seven university regulations and 15 administrative policies form the basis for student behavior that is prohibited by Northern Michigan University. Collectively, these regulations and policies are known as the Student Code. Over the academic years 1971 through 1975, one university regulation and five administrative policies have been deleted from the Student Code. These deletions are noted in the appropriate tables. Each of the regulations and policies was examined in terms of the variables discussed above.

¹¹Ibid., p. 27.

Analysis of the Data

In analyzing the data, a chi-square statistic was one of the two statistical methods used. Van Dalen described the employment of the chi-square in the following manner:

There are many occasions in educational research where the investigator is interested in testing a hypothesis that a certain proportion of the population exhibits a particular attribute. He selects a sample from the population and determines the proportion possessing the attribute and the proportion not possessing the attribute. The significance test is determined in terms of the probability that the observed proportion is a chance departure from the expected proportion. The test of significance is called Chi Square.¹² The formula for this test is as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} \right]$$

It should be noted that the phi statistic, a measure of association, i.e., a measure of strength of relationship, was also used as part of the analysis with the chi-square test.¹³ Phi makes a correction for the fact that the value of chi-square is directly proportional to the number of cases (N) by adjusting the chi-square value. Phi takes on the value of zero when no relationship exists, and the value of +1 when the variables are perfectly related, i.e., all cases fall just on the main or minor diagonal. In addition, another test of association, Cramer's V, is a slightly modified version of phi, which is suitable for larger tables.¹⁴ When phi is

¹²Ibid., p. 29.

¹³Norman H. Nie, C. Hadulai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Stein-Brenner, and Dale Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 222.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 223-24.

calculated for a cross-tabulation table that is not 2×2 , it has no upper limit. Therefore, Cramer's V is used to adjust phi for either the number of rows or the number of columns in the table, depending on which of the two is smaller. V also ranges from 0 to +1 when several nominal categories are involved. Thus, a large value of V merely suggests that a high degree of association exists, without revealing the manner in which the variables are associated.

Another test of significance that was used in analyzing the data was a t -test. The t -test is used to determine whether two means are significantly different at a selected probability level.¹⁵ For a given sample size, the t indicates how often a difference as large or larger ($\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$) would be found when there is no true population difference.¹⁶ The strategy of the t -test is to compare the actual mean difference observed ($\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$) with the difference expected by chance. The t -test involves forming the ratio of these two values. In other words, the numerator for a t -test is the difference between the sample means, \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2 , and the denominator is the chance difference that would be expected if the null hypothesis were true--the standard error of the difference between the means. The t -ratio determines whether the observed difference is slightly larger than a

¹⁵Gay, Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application, pp. 285-86.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ibid.

difference that would be expected by chance.¹⁸ The formula for the t-statistic is as follows:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum X_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sum X_2^2}{n_2} - 2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

Hypotheses

Hypotheses are classified as research hypotheses or statistical hypotheses; research hypotheses are stated in declarative form, and statistical hypotheses are stated in null form. A research hypothesis states an expected relationship or difference between two variables, in other words, "what relationship the researcher expects to verify through the collection and analysis of data."¹⁹ A statistical, or null, hypothesis states that there will be no relationship, or difference, between two variables, and that any relationship found will be a chance relationship, not a true one.²⁰ Statistical, or null, hypotheses are used because they suit statistical techniques that determine whether an observed relationship is probably a chance relationship or probably a true relationship.²¹ The research and null hypotheses developed by the investigator for this study appear in the following paragraphs of this section.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 38.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid.

Even though previous investigators cited in the review of the literature reported results that were contradictory with other studies or inconclusive, much of the evidence collected regarding the characteristics of disciplinary offenders seemed to indicate that they are young, generally 18 or 20 years of age, freshmen or sophomores, enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts, ranked in the lower half of their high school graduating class, possessing a cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or less, male, nonresidents, and living on campus. This, then, is the fundamental premise on which the research hypothesis for this study is based. That hypothesis is that:

Students involved in incidents of misconduct will be male, 20 years of age or younger, underclassmen, enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences, possess a semester and cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or less, live on campus, not reside in the upper peninsula of Michigan, and are not receiving financial aid.

A null hypothesis similar to that used by both Williamson²² and Yeager²³ is again employed in this study. That null hypothesis is that:

In relation to each of the selected variables, there are no significant differences between students identified as disciplinary offenders and students in the general campus population at Northern Michigan University.

The above hypothesis was designed to be comprehensive. It encompassed the population of students involved in misconduct in its entirety, without regard to specific offenses. However, the investigators also believed it to be necessary to examine each offense category more

²²Williamson, Jarve, and Lagerstadt-Knudson, "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?" p. 608.

²³Yeager, "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University," p. 29.

closely. For the sake of brevity, however, the following sub-null hypothesis is proffered for each offense category, i.e.,

There are no significant differences within the selected variables under each offense category.

(Because of the large number of variables and offense categories to be examined, Yeager also found it necessary to employ the sub-null hypothesis technique used in this study.)

As previously mentioned, both a chi-square and a t-statistic were used in testing the above comprehensive and subhypotheses. To determine whether all or part of these hypotheses should be accepted or not accepted, the minimum level of significance used was .05. Significance refers to the predetermined probability of obtaining a difference between a population statistic and a sample statistic--or between two sample statistics--that is a function of chance.²⁴

The level of significance is the probability that a researcher is willing to risk in rejecting the null hypothesis. If the level of significance is set at .05, the null hypothesis will be rejected if the estimated probability (p) of the observations made by the researcher can occur by chance in only five or less of every 100 observations.²⁵ Isaac and Michael said that "in educational research the most commonly used levels of significance are the .05 and the .01 levels."²⁶

²⁴Isaac and Michael, Handbook in Research and Evaluation, p. 335.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Discussion of Chi-Square and Significance Levels

Introduction

In examining the data, the investigator employed two statistical tests to determine whether any significant differences existed between the dependent and independent variables tested. A chi-square test of statistical significance was used to summarize the relationship depicted in Table 11, page 111, of the seven variables being tested. This test, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, helps to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two variables.

Sex

The chi-square analysis performed on the differences between male and female offenders and males and females in the general student population was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 403.31, p < .001$. The analysis revealed that there was a disproportionately higher number of males in the offender population, whereas the number of females in this population was disproportionately lower than expected. Since the chi-square obtained was well beyond the .001 level of significance, the primary null hypothesis was not accepted.

In relation to individual violation categories, it was found that males and females in the offender population were proportionately

represented in seven of the eight categories examined. The eighth category, drugs, revealed that males in the offender population were underrepresented whereas females were overrepresented. The analysis of this category proved to be significant with $\chi^2 (7) = 26.94$, $p < .001$. Therefore, the sub-null hypothesis relating to drugs was not accepted. Since the analysis of the data did not prove significant for the other seven violation categories in relation to the variables of sex, these sub-null hypotheses were accepted.

Age

The analysis comparing age of student offenders and the age of those students found in the general student population yielded significant results, $\chi^2 (1) = 264.15$, $p < .001$. As might be expected, the under-21 disciplinary population was overrepresented, whereas the over-21 disciplinary population was underrepresented. Since the analysis between the age of offenders and students in the general population proved to be significant, the general null hypothesis for this variable was not accepted.

When compared with the variable of age, none of the violation categories was found to be significant. As a consequence, the sub-null hypotheses relating to each of the violation categories were accepted.

College Residence

Student offenders differed significantly from the general university population in terms of on- and off-campus housing, $\chi^2 (1) = 2158.74$, $p < .001$. As a consequence of this analysis, the general

null hypothesis for this variable was not accepted. Offenders living on campus were disproportionately overrepresented in comparison with their expected number. Concomitantly, off-campus offenders were underrepresented in comparison with the number expected in the general population.

When the variable of college residence was compared with each of the violation categories, no significant differences were obtained. Each of the on- and off-campus student offenders was proportionately represented in each of the violation categories. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses relating to the variable of college residence were accepted.

Financial Aid

The chi-square analysis performed on the differences in financial aid frequencies between offenders and students in the general university population was significant, $\chi^2 (1) = 819.41$, $p < .001$. The analysis revealed that there was a disproportionately lower number of students in the offender population receiving financial aid than there was in the general university population. Since the chi-square obtained was well beyond the .001 level of significance, the general null hypothesis in regard to this variable was not accepted.

A comparison of the variable financial aid with each of the violation categories produced no significant differences. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses relating to each of the violation categories were accepted.

Curriculum

The analysis comparing the curriculum of student offenders and the general university population yielded significant results, $\chi^2 (5) = 430.04$, $p < .001$. As a consequence of this finding, the primary null hypothesis relating to curriculum was not accepted. It was found that student offenders in the curricula of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education were all overrepresented, whereas those in Nursing, one- and two-year programs, and the graduate school were underrepresented. Since the preceding result seemed partially attributable to the low representation of graduate students in the offender sample, an additional chi-square analysis was performed which excluded graduate students. The results of this analysis were also significant, $\chi^2 (4) = 174.77$, $p < .001$.

Since the analysis of the data did not prove significant for any of the eight violation categories in relation to the variable, curriculum, the concomitant sub-null hypotheses for these violation categories were accepted.

Class Standing

The chi-square analysis revealed that the class standing frequencies differed significantly between offenders and students in the general university population, indicating a disproportionately high number of freshmen and sophomores in the offender group. Conversely, the numbers of junior, senior, and graduate students were underrepresented. The level of significance in the initial analysis was $\chi^2 (4) = 673.02$, $p < .001$. Since this result, as in the analysis of

curriculum, seemed partially attributable to the low representation of graduate students in the offender sample, an additional chi-square analysis was performed that excluded graduate students. The results of this analysis were also significant, $\chi^2 (3) = 357.72, p < .001$. Therefore, the general null hypothesis relating to this variable was not accepted.

When the variable of class standing was compared with each of the violation categories, no significant differences were obtained. Each class of student offenders was proportionately represented in each of the violation categories. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses relating to the variable of academic class were accepted.

Permanent Residence

The analysis comparing the permanent place of residence for student offenders and the general university population yielded significant results, $\chi^2 (1) = 57.05, p < .001$. The expected frequency of offenders from the upper peninsula of Michigan was 817 compared with the observed frequency of 678. Lower peninsula and out-of-state offenders accounted for an observed frequency of 863 and an expected frequency of only 709. With a chi-square for this variable well beyond the .001 level of probability, the primary null hypothesis was not accepted.

A comparison of the variable permanent residence with each of the violation categories produced no significant differences. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses relating to each of the violation categories were accepted.

Discussion of the T-Test Results

Introduction

In the following paragraphs, the investigator was primarily interested in determining and evaluating the differences between the effects, i.e., sex, class standing, college residence, curriculum, and financial aid status of both the offender and control group, rather than the effects themselves. To make this determination, the most common type of analysis is the comparison of two groups of subjects with the group means used as a basis for comparison. The basic problem that confronted the investigator was to determine whether or not a difference between two samples implies a true difference in the parent population under study. Since it was highly probable that two samples from the same population would be different due to the natural variability in the population, it was clear that a difference in the sample means did not necessarily imply that the populations from which they were drawn actually differed on the characteristic being studied. The goal of the statistical analysis, in this instance the Student's T statistic, was to establish whether or not a difference between two samples was significant. "Significant" here does not mean "important" or of consequence; it is used here to mean "indicative of" or "signifying" a true difference between the two populations. The total number of offenders and nonoffenders used in this analysis was 2,764: 1,541 disciplinary offenders and 1,223 control subjects. To present the next section succinctly, only a summary of the findings in each category is offered.

Sex

The first set of independent variables to be tested included the sex of the offenders and the nonoffenders in relation to the dependent variables of semester grade point average, cumulative grade point average, and high school grade point average.

Female nonoffenders had significantly higher ($p < .05$) semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than all the other groups with whom they were compared. In addition, both male and female nonoffenders had higher semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than their counterparts in the offender group.

Tables 12-14 on page 112 of the appendix illustrate the differences in actual semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages for the variables of sex. An inference could be made, therefore, that male and female disciplinary offenders generally had semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages that were lower than their nondisciplinary counterparts.

College Residence

Off-campus nonoffenders were found to have significantly higher ($p < .05$) semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than either on- or off-campus offenders. Tables 16-18 on page 114 in the appendix illustrate the differences in actual semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages for the two categories of college residence.

Class Standing

In reviewing the data, it was found that freshman and sophomore offenders, respectively, had significantly lower ($p < .05$) semester and cumulative grade point averages in comparison with the other groups being analyzed. Tables 24-26 on pages 118-119 in the appendix illustrate the differences in actual semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages for the four categories of class standing.

Curricula

In regard to semester grade point average, students enrolled in one- and two-year programs had significantly lower ($p < .05$) semester grade point averages than students enrolled in the other five curricula with whom they were compared. Nonoffenders in Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Nursing, and Allied Health, one- and two-year programs, all had significantly higher semester grade point averages than their offender counterparts. This finding was also true for the same five nonoffender groups when compared with offenders on cumulative grade point average. Comparison between offender and nonoffender groups in regard to high school grade point average produced fewer significant results.

Financial Aid

When comparing semester grade point average and the variable of financial aid, it was found that disciplinary offenders receiving financial aid had significantly lower ($p < .05$) semester grade point averages than did their counterparts in the nonoffender group. In

addition, offenders receiving financial aid had significantly higher grade point averages than did offenders not receiving financial aid.

When the results for the analysis of financial aid and cumulative grade point average were examined, it was again found that nonoffenders receiving financial aid had significantly higher grade point averages than did their offender counterparts. Offenders receiving financial aid were also found to have higher grade point averages than offenders not receiving financial aid.

In the final category of high school grade point average, the only major finding was that offenders receiving financial aid had significantly higher high school grade point averages than offenders not receiving financial aid.

Throughout the analysis of semester and cumulative grade point averages, two consistent findings were: (1) offenders receiving financial aid had significantly lower grade point averages than did non-offenders also receiving financial aid, and (2) offenders receiving aid had higher grade point averages than offenders not receiving aid.

Chapter Summary

The chi-square analysis of selected variables for the 1,541 individuals found in the disciplinary-offender population resulted in not accepting the primary null hypothesis. In summarizing the findings for each of the variables, it was found that there was a disproportionately higher number of males than females in the offender population. In addition, when individual offense categories were examined, males were found to be significantly underrepresented in

regard to the regulation concerning drugs, whereas females were over-represented.

The majority of the offender population was under 21 years of age, thus resulting in a significant finding in regard to the variable of age. Such a finding is also consistent with the results of several other studies.¹

Most student offenders were found to reside on campus. Off-campus offenders were underrepresented in comparison with the number expected in the general population.

A clear distinction was found between offenders receiving financial aid and students in the general university population. There was a disproportionately lower number of student offenders receiving financial aid than there was in the general university student population.

When examining the variable, curriculum, it was determined that student offenders in the curricula of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education were all overrepresented, whereas those in Nursing, one- and two-year programs, and the graduate school were underrepresented.

The chi-square analysis of the variable class standing yielded a finding that the number of freshman and sophomore offenders was disproportionately higher than would be expected. Conversely, the number of junior, senior, and graduate students was underrepresented.

¹Yeager, "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University"; and Caskey and Duvall, "A Study of Selected Characteristics of All Disciplinary Offenders Involving Action Resulting in Probation or Suspension at Texas Tech University for the Six Year Period, 1963-1969."

The final variable examined, permanent residence, revealed upon analysis that student offenders who were permanent residents of Michigan's upper peninsula were underrepresented, whereas offenders from lower Michigan and out of state were found to be in disproportionately higher numbers than would normally be expected.

The final analysis completed in this chapter was that of the t-test for the comparison between the nonoffender and offender population of 2,764 on selected independent variables and the dependent variable of semester, cumulative, and high school grade point average. It was found that female nonoffenders had significantly higher ($p < .05$) semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than all the other groups with whom they were compared. In addition, both male and female nonoffenders had higher semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than their counterparts in the disciplinary group.

When t-tests were completed on off-campus nonoffenders, they were found to have had significantly higher ($p < .05$) semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than either on- or off-campus offenders. Freshman and sophomore offenders, respectively, had the lowest semester and cumulative grade point averages when compared with the other groups studied.

In regard to semester grade point average, students enrolled in one- and two-year programs had significantly lower semester grade point averages than students in the other five curricula with whom they were compared. Nonoffenders in all five curricula had significantly higher semester grade point averages than their offender

counterparts. This was also true for the same five nonoffender groups when compared to offenders on cumulative grade point average. Comparisons between offender and nonoffender groups regarding high school grade point average produced fewer significant results. With respect to financial aid, the analysis of semester and cumulative grade point averages of the population under study produced two consistent findings: (1) offenders receiving financial aid had significantly lower grade point averages than did nonoffenders also receiving financial aid, and (2) offenders receiving aid had higher grade points than offenders not receiving aid. In addition, offenders receiving financial aid had significantly higher high school grade point averages than offenders not receiving financial aid.

Throughout this chapter, the results of the analysis conducted on the data indicated that the primary null hypothesis developed in Chapter I should not be accepted. The investigator believes that a cogent body of evidence has been developed to support such a decision.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the previous chapters the investigator stated the purpose of this study and the perceived need for it, presented a review of previous and current literature pertaining to the disciplinary offender, explained the methodology that would be used in analyzing the data collected, and analyzed the data that were collected concerning 1,550 students involved in disciplinary incidents at Northern Michigan University from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978. The investigator will now summarize the findings made in relation to these data. In addition, the conclusions of the investigator, which are based on the major findings, will also be presented. The conclusions will, in conjunction with the information obtained in the review of the literature, provide the basis for recommendations to educators and future investigators. In this chapter, the investigator will also allow himself the privilege of making speculations and inferences about the study, its meaning, and the learning experience it provided.

Overview of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected characteristics of male and female students involved in incidents of misconduct

at Northern Michigan University from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978, and who received a penalty of probation, suspension, or expulsion. Through an examination of the results obtained, the investigator expected to determine whether students involved in disciplinary incidents were representative of the general student population. If they were not, then did these students possess similar demographic, academic, and financial characteristics that would tend to distinguish them from the population of nonoffenders?

While there has been little substantive research in the general area of discipline, investigations specifically studying the "characteristics of offenders" have been even more rare. The research that has been conducted about the characteristics of disciplinary offenders has been inconclusive due to small samples and brief time periods covered, or has been inconsistent when compared with the findings of other studies. To provide the information for student-affairs administrators that would be necessary for designing appropriate disciplinary prevention and retention programs, a strengthening of descriptive studies of students involved in misconduct is of prime importance. Although relatively few researchers have seen the necessity to explore this area further, it is believed that much can still be learned about the disciplinary offender. Generally, such knowledge could be of vital importance in developing and implementing measures to prevent and/or reduce the number of disciplinary incidents on campus. Such knowledge could also be of assistance to admissions personnel in their recruiting efforts, beneficial for staff working with new-student orientation, and important for staff-training efforts

for campus security personnel, residence hall staff, and counseling center staff.

Specifically, it was felt that a more thorough understanding of the demographic, academic, and financial characteristics of the disciplinary offender at Northern Michigan University would assist the Dean of Students staff in developing preventive disciplinary programs of a pragmatic nature. In so doing, it was believed that perhaps some of those students who might become involved in disciplinary difficulties and, as a consequence of their behavior, be forced to leave campus, could be identified early, perhaps during new-student orientation, and directed into special programs so that their involvement in a disciplinary incident would become less likely.

Before initiating any of the preceding research, certain conjectures were made by the investigator regarding what general findings might be produced by this study and how those findings could be used. After examining a number of studies concerned with some aspect of the characteristics of disciplinary offenders, the investigator hypothesized that the findings of this study might tend to show the disciplinary offender at Northern Michigan University as being under 20 years of age, a male, residing on campus, having a permanent out-of-state home address, enrolled in the curriculum of Arts and Sciences, having a class standing of either freshman or sophomore, having a semester and cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or less, and not receiving financial aid. The analyses of the data for this study did produce the above findings. As a consequence, the investigator believed that such findings could be useful in: (1) assisting

the faculty in the Arts and Sciences and Business curricula to develop a pragmatic approach in providing special developmental programs for freshmen and sophomores enrolled in this curriculum; (2) implementing the same pragmatic approach for residence hall students since the majority of these students are freshmen and sophomores; (3) deciding whether a student on academic probation who has consistently failed to maintain a 2.00 cumulative grade point average should also have his disciplinary record considered prior to any decision regarding his continued relationship with the institution; (4) deciding whether a student's disciplinary background should be considered prior to either granting or continuing a financial aid award from the university; and (5) determining whether a student who was conditionally admitted to the university should also be channeled into one of the special developmental programs mentioned above.

The preceding proposals have purposely been limited to five that the investigator believes could be specifically applied to Northern Michigan University. In the recommendation section of this chapter, additional proposals have also been suggested for not only Northern Michigan, but for other colleges and universities, and investigators conducting further research into this particular topic area.

Sample

The sample used in this study consisted of 1,541 disciplinary cases on file in the Dean of Students Office at Northern Michigan University from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978 (a six-year period), in which a student was assigned a warning probation

status or greater. Information for this study was obtained from the Student Directory, the Records Office, the Registrar's Office, the Financial Aids Office, and the Dean of Students Office.

Methodology

A chi-square statistic, used in testing a hypothesis that a certain portion of a population exhibit a particular attribute, and a t-test used to determine whether two means are significantly different at a selected probability level were used in the analysis of the data. One hundred students were randomly selected for each semester from winter semester, 1972, through winter semester, 1978, for comparative purposes with the disciplinary population.

Hypothesis

The research hypothesis that was developed for this study is:

Students involved in incidents of misconduct will be male, 20 years of age or younger, underclassmen, enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences, possess a semester and cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or less, be full-time students, live on campus, and live in a part of Michigan other than the upper peninsula, and not be receiving financial aid.

In stating the primary null hypothesis, the investigator believed it necessary and prudent to develop a comprehensive statement without regard to specific offense category. That hypothesis is:

In relation to each of the selected variables, there are no significant differences between students identified as disciplinary offenders and students in the general campus population at Northern Michigan University.

Major Significant Findings and Discussion

A review of the major significant findings obtained from the analysis of the data will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

At this juncture, the investigator emphasizes that the findings discussed in the following section were believed to be the most significant to this study and the concomitant recommendations. A more complete delineation of all the findings obtained as a result of the statistical analysis can be found in the summary in Chapter IV.

Sex

The chi-square analysis performed on the variable sex yielded significant results at the .001 level. The analysis revealed that there was a disproportionately higher number of males, 1,180, compared with the number of females, 361, in the offender population. In addition, males were significantly underrepresented in the violation category of drugs. The chi-square for this category was $\chi^2 (7) = 26.96$, $p < .001$. The observed number of males was 102 compared with an expected number of 131. The number of females, however, was disproportionately higher than expected, 69 observed compared with 40 expected. The use of drugs by both sexes has continued to increase,¹ and several conjectures are offered as to why the number of females is overrepresented in this violation category. Since experimentation with drugs, particularly marijuana, has become tacitly accepted by society, individuals believe it "safe" to violate this university regulation with little fear of receiving a severe penalty if caught. Drug experimentation could also fall into the category of "social" violations of the type which females are traditionally more likely to become involved. Koepske's research in this area also indicated

¹NBC, "NBC Nightly News," 5 July 1979.

a similar finding.² Drug abuse by female students is one area in which increased educational programming efforts should be directed. The number of males involved in this violation category also indicates that they, too, might benefit from exposure to educational programs regarding drug abuse. While such programming efforts are not seen as a panacea for this problem, providing the opportunity to better understand the effects of the "in vogue" drugs on the body might at least make students more cautious in their experimentation.

When the control and experimental groups were analyzed by using a t-test, it was found that female nonoffenders consistently and significantly ($p < .05$) had higher semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than all the other groups with which they were compared. In addition, both male and female nonoffenders had significantly higher ($p < .05$) semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than their counterparts in the offender group. This finding not only confirms the investigator's hypothesis regarding the grade point averages of disciplinary offenders, but is also consistent with the findings of a majority of other studies reviewed.³ Although not all individuals with low grade point averages can be assumed to have been involved in disciplinary infractions, a definite relationship between poor academic performance and involvement in a

²C. Gilbert Wrenn, Student Personnel Work in College (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1951), pp. 472-73.

³Yeager, "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University"; and Caskey and Duvall, "A Study of Selected Characteristics of All Disciplinary Offenders Involving Action Resulting in Probation or Suspension at Texas Tech University for the Six-Year Period 1963-69."

disciplinary incident does seem to exist. Therefore, perhaps a college or university should consider identifying such poor academic performers as quickly as possible, i.e., through either A.C.T. or S.A.T. scores, or through grade point average after the first semester, in order to provide these students with the appropriate assistance and skills necessary to improve their chances for academic survival.

Concurrently, such academic assistance programs, e.g., study skills, how to prepare for an examination, how to write a term paper, etc., could be developed in conjunction with personal growth development workshops intended to improve a student's overall developmental process. Examples of such workshops would be those concerned with time management, assertiveness, decision making, etc. While involvement in such programs or workshops certainly does not guarantee that a student would not become involved in a disciplinary infraction, it is a concerted attempt at a preventive program that has heretofore been conspicuously missing.

Age

When the age of students in the offender population was compared with the age of students in the general university population, the analysis produced a significant finding, $\chi^2 (1) = 264.15, p < .001$. The under-21 offender population was overrepresented, while the over-21 offender population was underrepresented. Caskey and Duvall, Yeager, and Schoemer obtained similar findings in their research in regard to the age of the disciplinary offender.⁴ Williamson's conjecture

⁴Schoemer, "An Analysis of Students Suspended from Indiana University for Disciplinary Reasons," pp. 76-77.

that new university students proceed through a "transitional readjustment" period upon first entering the college or university environment might well provide at least a partial answer for the higher number of younger students in the discipline population.⁵ In addition, the university's housing regulation requires all freshmen and sophomore students to reside on campus. Consequently, this population lives in a more "controlled environment" where rules and regulations are strictly enforced. Therefore, the probability is greater for freshmen and sophomores to become involved in a disciplinary incident than an upperclassman who is living off campus.

While the primary null hypothesis for the variable, age, was rejected, no significant differences were obtained when this variable was compared with each of the violation categories. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses relating to each of the violation categories were accepted.

Suggestions for reducing the number of disciplinary offenses occurring in this age group are offered in the sections which concern college residence and class standing.

College Residence

When the variable of college residence was analyzed, it was found that student offenders differed significantly from the general university population in terms of on- and off-campus housing. The observed frequency for on-campus offenders was 1,471, with an expected

⁵Williamson et al., "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?" p. 608.

frequency of 585.58. Conversely, the observed frequency of off-campus offenders was 70, with an expected frequency of 955.42. The chi-square obtained was $\chi^2 (1) = 2158.74$, $p < .001$. Therefore, the primary null hypothesis in regard to this variable was not accepted. Additionally, no significant differences were obtained when the variable of college residence was compared with each of the violation categories. Consequently, the sub-null hypotheses related to this variable were accepted.

When the control and experimental groups were analyzed by using a t-test, it was found that both on- and off-campus nonoffenders had significantly higher semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages than their offender counterparts.

The university has placed much emphasis on the on-campus residence hall experience for students during their first two years of college simply because of the tremendous impact that this experience can have on their total growth and development--not only socially, but intellectually and spiritually.⁶ Those students who either move off campus or have always resided off campus are left basically to themselves to become exposed to those types of situations and experiences which are regularly a part of the residence hall experience.

The investigator believes, however, that the residence hall experience can be improved and, as a consequence of such improvement, can have a significant and positive impact in reducing the incidents of student rule violations by residence hall students. It is felt that

⁶Packwood, College Student Personnel Services, p. 266.

the recommendations made earlier in regard to staff training can help to reduce the number of disciplinary incidents in the hall.

While remaining cognizant of the financial necessity to retain a certain percentage of students on campus in order to maintain the occupancy of the residence halls, it is felt that more emphasis could be placed on maximizing student satisfaction with this living environment by permitting students to paint their residence hall rooms and/or corridors, developing student leadership workshops, encouraging student government so that students have more input into decisions affecting their environment, developing more effective social and educational programming, etc. As a consequence of such opportunities, students would hopefully want to reside on campus and would view residence hall living as a positive and not negative experience. If it were possible to foster this attitude to a greater extent, the investigator feels that at least some of the disciplinary problems now being experienced by a number of colleges and universities would decline.

Financial Aid

The chi-square analysis performed on the differences in financial aid frequencies between offenders and students in the general university population was significant: $\chi^2 (1) = 819.41, p < .001$. Examination of the frequency distributions revealed an observed frequency of 300 males in the offender population with financial aid compared with an expected frequency of 909.19 males in the general student population with financial aid. In regard to females, the observed frequency was 123 in the offender population compared with

an expected frequency of 631.81 in the general university population. Since the chi-square obtained was well beyond the .001 level of significance, the primary null hypothesis for this variable was not accepted. When the variable of financial aid was analyzed in regard to each of the violation categories, no significant differences were found. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses relating to each of the violation categories were accepted.

When the control and experimental groups were analyzed by using a t-test, it was found that both offenders and nonoffenders receiving financial aid had significantly higher ($p < .05$) semester and cumulative grade point averages than did the offenders and nonoffenders not receiving financial aid. In addition, nonoffenders receiving financial aid had significantly higher semester and cumulative grade point averages ($p < .05$) than did their offender counterparts.

Since the number of students in the disciplinary population receiving financial aid was well below 50 percent, an inference that the investigator believes could be made would be that financial dependence seems to be associated with a more serious attitude toward college and a greater degree of maturity. Perhaps such dependence also acts as a partial inhibitor against involvement in a disciplinary infraction. Depending on the nature of the incident and the severity of the penalty received, the investigator believes that consideration should be given to whether a potential financial aid recipient who was involved in a disciplinary infraction should be granted an award. A procedure to exclude serious disciplinary offenders from receiving

financial aid funds has not, heretofore, been established at Northern Michigan University. However, an argument could be made that such students have forfeited their privilege of applying for and receiving university financial aid awards to remain in college. In addition, perhaps another condition could be developed stipulating that a financial aid award might be withdrawn should the recipient become involved in any serious disciplinary difficulty. It is believed that such regulations would have a definite impact on the number of student rule infractions.

Curriculum

The next variable analyzed was that of curriculum. The observed frequencies of this variable for the curricula of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education were 730, 333, and 244, respectively. The expected frequencies for these curricula were 601, 200, and 215.7. The next three curricula that were studied were those of Nursing, one- and two-year programs, and the graduate school. Each of the observed frequencies for these curricula, i.e., 109, 40, and 2, were less than their expected frequencies, i.e., 154, 154, and 215.7. The corresponding chi-square obtained in this analysis was $\chi^2 (5) = 430.04$, $p < .001$. Since the preceding result seemed as if it might be partially due to the low representation of graduate students in the offender group, an additional analysis was performed which excluded graduate students. The results of this analysis were also significant, $\chi^2 (4) = 174.77$, $p < .001$. As a consequence of both these findings, the primary null hypothesis relating to curriculum was not accepted. When each of the

eight violation categories was analyzed in relation to this variable, none of the analyses was found to be significant. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses for this variable were accepted.

When the control and experimental groups were analyzed by using a t-test, it was found that nonoffenders in five of the six curricula analyzed had significantly higher ($p < .05$) semester grade point averages than their offender counterparts. The only nonoffender group that had a lower semester grade point average than their respective offender group were those few students enrolled in the graduate school. In regard to cumulative grade point average, four nonoffender groups had significantly higher ($p < .05$) cumulative grade point averages than did the offenders in the respective curricula. The two nonoffender groups that did not were those of one- and two-year programs and the graduate school.

The majority of male and female disciplinary offenders included in this study were enrolled in the curriculum of Arts and Sciences. Many of the other studies reviewed in Chapter II also found this to be the dominant curriculum or college in which disciplinary offenders tended to be enrolled.⁷ A probable cause for the relationship between disciplinary offenders and this particular curriculum at Northern Michigan University might be that students who have not yet declared a major are automatically placed in Arts and Sciences. Generally, students are not required to make a decision about their major field of study until the end of their sophomore year. At that time, they

⁷Caskey and Duvall, "A Study of Selected Characteristics of All Disciplinary Offenders Involving Action Resulting in Probation or Suspension at Texas Tech University for the Six-Year Period 1963-69."

have the option of transferring into another curriculum or remaining in the curriculum of Arts and Sciences. The investigator is of the belief that this is the primary reason why so many disciplinary offenders, not only at Northern Michigan University but also at other colleges and universities, seem to be identified with this curriculum. Individuals enrolled in Arts and Sciences, especially freshmen and sophomores, might tend to be less goal oriented or career oriented than students in other curricula. As a consequence, these students might choose to stay in this curriculum for the lack of a more specific career choice or commitment. Of course, it could also be suggested that such students have chosen to stay within Arts and Sciences because its breadth of curriculum choices is generally broader than those found in Engineering, Business, Education, etc.

A final conjecture by the investigator is that individuals enrolled in Arts and Sciences might also be less conforming to conventional modes of dress, behavior, and thinking than individuals found in other curricula.

The investigator suggests that the above findings could have a real impact on the Arts and Sciences curriculum and those responsible for its implementation. Since this curriculum has been identified as enrolling the highest percentage of disciplinary offenders, it would be more advantageous to the individuals responsible for the campus disciplinary program at Northern Michigan University to work with the faculty and staff of Arts and Sciences to develop alternative program activities in which to involve their students. Such activities could be directed toward required or strongly encouraged

attendance in a specific number of cultural and personal enrichment programs mentioned in the section in which the variable of sex was discussed. Employment of such suggested techniques might be one method to hasten the "transitional readjustment" period spoken of by Williamson et al.⁸

While the curriculum of Arts and Sciences enrolled the majority of disciplinary offenders, the Business curriculum also had a significant percentage of these students. Studies by Caskey and Duvall, Williamson et al., and Yeager produced similar findings in regard to Business students. The investigator recommends that representatives of the faculty and staff in this curriculum also meet with the chief judicial officer from the Dean of Students Office to discuss the development of positive program experiences similar to those suggested for the Arts and Sciences students. Since disciplinary offenders from both the Arts and Sciences and Business curricula were found to have lower grade point averages than their nonoffender counterparts, perhaps one program approach would be to identify marginal academic performers at their time of entry by high school grade point average, A.C.T. or S.A.T. scores and channel these specific individuals into the program mentioned earlier. In addition, these students should also be identified for required tutoring assistance in order to increase their chances for academic success.

⁸Williamson et al., "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?"

Class Standing

The chi-square analysis comparing the class standing of student offenders and students in the general university population yielded significant results, $\chi^2 (4) = 673.02$, $p < .001$. The observed frequencies for freshmen and sophomores, 862 and 420, respectively, were well above their expected frequencies of 508.53 and 292.79. Conversely, observed frequencies for juniors, seniors, and graduate students, 185, 73, and 1, were well below their expected frequencies of 261.97, 261.97, and 215.74.

Since the results obtained for this variable were similar to those obtained when the variable of curriculum was studied, the chi-square analysis was conducted a second time excluding graduate students. The results of this analysis were also significant, $\chi^2 (3) = 357.72$, $p < .001$. Therefore, the primary null hypothesis relating to this variable was not accepted.

When the variable of class standing was compared with each of the violation categories, no significant differences were obtained. Consequently, the sub-null hypotheses relating to this variable were accepted.

A t-test was used to compare the semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages of students in the offender and experimental groups. In using this test it was found that except for seniors, nonoffenders of freshman, sophomore, and junior status all had significantly higher ($p < .05$) grade point averages. All four nonoffender groups had significantly higher ($p < .05$) cumulative grade point averages. In regard to high school grade point average, nonoffender

freshmen, sophomores, and seniors had significantly higher ($p < .05$) grade points while juniors did not.

Freshmen and sophomores have traditionally been found to be the students involved in the majority of disciplinary offenses, and this has also been the finding of the current study. Several reasons offered as a partial explanation for this phenomenon are: (1) the university housing requirement prohibits underclassmen from moving off campus until they are 22 years of age or have reached junior-class standing; (2) the "transitional readjustment period" described by Williamson;⁹ and (3) students who have reached junior, senior, or graduate levels have generally mastered, or at least partially so, many of the developmental vectors spoken of by Chickering.¹⁰ By this time, it is felt that students become more academically serious in regard to their course of study and more closely identified with the major personality characteristics and behavioral expectations of their major field of study. With the prospect of their first full-time job facing them in the very near future, many upperclassmen seem to adopt a more serious attitude toward the occupational and personal goals they hold for themselves. Freshmen and sophomores, however, are generally still experimenting with their values and beliefs and also continuing their search for a major field of study and future career. Until some of this insecurity is rectified, substantial upheaval in

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Arthur W. Chickering, Education and Identity (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972).

their personal and academic lives will continue to remain a real probability.

Permanent Residence

When the variable of place of permanent residence was analyzed for the offender and general university population, the resultant chi-square was significant at the .001 level. There was a disproportionately lower number of offenders from the upper peninsula of Michigan than from the lower peninsula or from out of state. The latter two groups were found to have a disproportionately higher number of offenders than would be expected. Since the findings of this analysis were significant at the .001 level, the primary null hypothesis was not accepted.

After comparing this variable with each of the violation categories, no significant findings were produced. Therefore, the sub-null hypotheses relating to each of the violation categories were accepted.

The above findings are similar to and supported by Williamson et al.'s and Filder's research findings.¹¹ The "transitional readjustment" period mentioned by Williamson et al. has already been discussed as a possible cause of student involvement in disciplinary infractions in several previous sections. It might also be one of the reasons why students attending Northern Michigan University from the lower peninsula or out of state are somewhat more likely to become involved in

¹¹Filder, "Analysis of Students Committing Major Discipline Offenses During the Ten Year Period 1963-73 by State of Residence."

a disciplinary infraction. Williamson et al.'s hypothesis was that "among college students certain disciplinary situations tend to arise out of unfamiliarity with the institution's mores and regulations."¹² However, the residence hall staff can be of tremendous assistance in helping new students to cope with their new living and working environment. Such staff are trained in certain counseling techniques to help them assist students with adjustment problems. Such training is important in order to minimize the problems that could occur if the potential adjustment difficulties of new students were to be ignored.

Comparison With Other Studies

While the previous investigations concerning the characteristics of the disciplinary offender have produced data that are sometimes conflicting from one study to the next, certain commonalities have emerged. Those commonalities were also present when the findings of the current study under investigation were compared with the findings of previous research completed in this area. For instance, 11 of the 18 studies discussed in Chapter II describe the disciplinary offender as being a male, less than 21 years old, and a freshman or sophomore. Nine studies found that the disciplinary offender had a grade point average of 2.00 or less, or a grade point average less than that of the general campus population. Four studies found that he was enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences, while another found that he resided on campus, and three studies revealed that the

¹²Williamson et al., "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?"

offender was an out-of-state student. A melange of results from the other studies reviewed, i.e., Caskey and Duvall and Tisdale and Brown, indicates that the disciplinary offender is also from a large urban high school, has a previous disciplinary record, that there are more offenses committed by males than females, and that males are suspended more often than females.¹³

While the findings of other studies were also discussed in the Review of the Literature chapter, the majority of the above findings were the ones which were consistent with what the investigator found to exist in his current research. A composite description of the disciplinary offender, gleaned from the analysis of the data of this study, would be that he is a male, less than 21 years of age, a freshman, possesses a grade point average of 2.00 or less, is enrolled in the curriculum of Arts and Sciences, resides on campus, has a permanent address either out of state or in the lower peninsula of Michigan, and is not receiving financial aid.

The investigator found that the statistical analyses that were conducted on the data, i.e., chi-square and t-tests, revealed that significant differences at either the .001 or .05 level did exist in relation to each of the selected variables. Therefore, based on the evidence collected, the investigator concluded that the primary null

¹³Caskey and Duvall, "A Study of Selected Characteristics of All Disciplinary Offenders Involving Action Resulting in Probation or Suspension at Texas Tech University for the Six-Year Period 1963-69"; and Tisdale and Brown, "Characteristics of College Misconduct Cases."

hypothesis should not be accepted. The primary null hypothesis stated,

In relation to each of the selected variables, there are no significant differences between students identified as disciplinary offenders and students in the general campus population at Northern Michigan University.

Conclusions

The conclusions offered in the following paragraphs have been developed as a result of the review of the literature found in Chapter II and the analysis of the data found in Chapter IV.

1. As was also found in many of the studies reviewed, gender plays a definite role in the determination of a disciplinary offender. Males are consistently overrepresented in discipline studies with no exception to the current investigation. However, several of the studies reviewed and the investigation herein suggest an increase in female participation in college and university misconduct.

2. A definite relationship appears to exist between poor academic performance and involvement in misconduct. Such a relationship has also been noted by other researchers. This relationship is most readily apparent in the freshman and sophomore years. The investigator believes that perhaps one explanation for such an occurrence could be the "transitional readjustment" period that these individuals experience when leaving home for the first time, coupled with a definite lack of career goals. Furthermore, marginally admitted students who become disciplinary offenders might also tend to account for a portion of the lower-than-average grades of underclassmen even though

these individuals might be goal directed but simply unable to perform academically.

3. The younger student is more prone to become involved in a disciplinary offense. The turbulent, growth-producing freshman and sophomore years are a time of testing and exploring personal boundaries. Consequently, these are the years in which the greatest number of disciplinary offenses occur. Generally, the students involved in these offenses are between the ages of 18 and 20. In addition to the transitional difficulties experienced with the onset of young adulthood, this population is also required to live in a "controlled residence hall environment" where the rules are strictly enforced. Therefore, it does not seem unusual that most disciplinary offenders are underclassmen.

4. College residence plays a particularly significant role in the determination of whether or not a student will become involved in a disciplinary incident. The investigator believes that, and as the analysis of data supports, students residing on campus seem to be much more susceptible to involvement in disciplinary infractions because of their "group" living situation and the rules which are necessary in such a living environment. Those students residing off-campus are less likely to be apprehended committing a violation of the Student Code simply because they have more freedom of movement and are not residing in a more "controlled living situation" such as a residence hall. The university's housing requirement might have a negative impact on some of the students and make them feel, at least initially, less part of the residence-hall community than they would

if they had voluntarily wished to live in this situation. The investigator knows that some students view the residence halls as not really their home or living environment, but as an environment temporarily created for them in which they are "forced" to live by the university. Because of the expression of such attitudes, the investigator is of the belief that these students are less likely to accept residence-hall life and, in fact, contribute to the negative aspects of living in this type of group situation.

5. Evidence was found that suggests that financial dependence seems to be associated with a more serious attitude toward college and that financial aid recipients were less involved in disciplinary infractions than were other students.

6. Students who lack a definite career objective are more likely to become involved in incidents of misconduct than are other students. The college of Arts and Sciences contains the greatest number of disciplinary offenders. However, it is also the largest of the six colleges and the one to which all students with undeclared majors are assigned. After the first two years, students are required to select a major and are then transferred to the college of their choice. With the general lack of direction or career-orientation experience of many students, it is not unusual for a number of "career shifts" during the first two years of college. With a more definite career plan established, it seems as if students would become less involved in misconduct and more concerned with the preparation necessary for their chosen field. Perhaps the onset of a more serious attitude toward one's chosen vocation would be hastened if students

were required to declare a major at the end of their first year rather than their second. The investigator suspects that too much time is allowed for the choosing of a major. The investigator also suspects that those students who have decided on a definite career choice might be less likely to become involved in disciplinary infractions. However, the typical college freshman possesses little knowledge about occupations and his own intellectual abilities, interests, and skills. Deciding on a major is an extremely difficult and risky task. Therefore, if students were required to declare a major at the end of their freshman year, a concomitant responsibility of the university must be accepted, i.e., strengthening of the career-planning programs in the student affairs division and in the various curricula.

7. The investigator believes that the transitional difficulties of students that were mentioned earlier provide, at least to some extent, an explanation as to why some students from Michigan's lower peninsula or from out of state are somewhat more prone to become involved in disciplinary infractions than are area students. Students, particularly new students who face new group and institutional requirements imposed upon their personal style of living, are likely to encounter some transitional difficulties which would involve them in disciplinary situations.

Recommendations

The following recommendations have been divided into three distinct categories: (1) those specific to Northern Michigan University, (2) those that are intended for future researchers investigating

this topic, and (3) those that are general in nature and are not specific to the direct findings of this study.

Northern Michigan University

1. The individual from the Dean of Students Office responsible for the campus judicial program should meet with representatives of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Business during the summer and periodically throughout the year to discuss the development of "positive program experiences," i.e., student leadership and government workshops, which are extra-curricular in nature and aimed at freshmen and sophomores enrolled in this curriculum.

These workshops could be a gradual skill-development process offered to students during their first two years of enrollment. Such experiences could provide them with skills necessary to not only successfully cope with their new environment but to become a more active participant in it. A leadership-development series could be offered which began with some of the simplest skills necessary to be a group member. From that point it could progress to practical group and leader skills, conceptual leadership theories, and then finally evolve to where selected students who have successfully completed this entire two-year experience are now offered the opportunity to instruct freshmen and sophomores who are just beginning this process. Successful completion of the preceding process could also contribute to students' development in terms of the vectors spoken of by Chickering or of the aspect of self-esteem and fulfillment described by Maslow.¹⁴

¹⁴Chickering, Education and Identity; and A. H. Maslow, "Motivation," Handout for Education 250 at Northern Michigan University, Winter 1976.

2. Since the residence halls are where a majority of student rule infractions occur, additional training for the residence hall staff during the fall should be provided in regard to extra-curricular programming and government activities, in an attempt to attract possible disciplinary offenders into "positive developmental experiences."

Residence hall staff have an ideal situation in which they have what could almost be termed a "captive audience" with which to work. Supplemental American College Testing information from the Admissions Office could be made available to residence hall staff that would indicate such things as the extent of a student's involvement in high school, a variety of his skill areas, and where he feels he either wants or needs assistance. This information, coupled with a student's A.C.T. scores and high school grade point average, could help to determine a population at which certain programs, i.e., leadership workshops, student government workshops, social activities, and academic assistance seminars, could be aimed. Involvement in such developmental skill activities might help to prevent a student from becoming involved in activities leading to a disciplinary incident.

3. Prior to deciding whether a student on academic probation should be permitted to continue his academic program, consideration should be given to whether or not he has a disciplinary record and, if he has, how serious it is.

If the disciplinary record was of a serious nature, perhaps the best solution would be to deny the student further enrollment for a specific period of time. During this time, it would be the responsibility of the student to re-examine his goals and, prior to readmittance,

present a justifiable rationale to the Admissions Committee as to why his readmission request should be honored. Included in such a rationale should be an explanation of what steps the student plans to follow in order to improve his academic and disciplinary record. Unless a satisfactory explanation is provided, the student should not be permitted to re-enroll. To permit a student to do so would be to do him a disservice since prior evidence would indicate that he is unable to adequately cope either intellectually or socially in a college or university environment.

4. Before deciding whether a student should be granted a financial aid award from the university, consideration should be given to whether or not he has a disciplinary record, and if he has, how serious it is.

Students who are recognized as disciplinary offenders should be made to realize that there could be consequences to bear other than just a disciplinary sanction for the infraction of a regulation. It is suggested that guidelines for the awarding of financial aid be developed to include a determination as to when, if ever, a student who is currently on a disciplinary status be granted aid. Perhaps students involved in what would be termed minor infractions could still be considered, whereas students involved in more serious types of offenses would not. In either case, a student's disciplinary record should play a role in determining whether a student will be granted financial aid.

5. Students involved in disciplinary infractions should be dispersed throughout the residence hall system, thus preventing,

insofar as possible, a large random grouping of such students in one hall or on one floor.

Housing of a large number of students who were involved in disciplinary infractions in one hall or on one floor of a residence hall could create a potentially chaotic situation for hall staff. Even if staff were given additional training in how to work with such a population, the potential for problems would be great. Therefore, dispersing this population would, most probably, be the most advantageous procedure.

6. Have the individual responsible for the disciplinary program conduct periodic reviews of the penalties received by males and females for similar disciplinary offenses. Such a procedure could help to eliminate and/or reduce any intentional or unintentional penalty discrimination or bias on behalf of the individual(s) imposing a penalty.

7. Academic-assistance programs, e.g., study skills, how to prepare for an examination, how to write a term paper, etc., should be developed in conjunction with personal growth development workshops intended to improve a student's overall developmental process. Examples of such workshops would be those concerned with time management, assertiveness, decision making, etc.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. It is suggested that future researchers using a research format and procedures similar to those followed in this study might want to use an analysis of variance statistic in working with their

data in addition to chi-square and t-tests. The analysis of variance is a technique that separates the variation that is present into independent components; then these components are analyzed in order to test certain hypotheses.¹⁵ A limitation of the t-test technique is that it cannot be used to perform tests on the differences between more than two means. An analysis of variance, however, can be used to test a hypothesis using three or more group means. For instance, in the current study it could be used to test a hypothesis involving sex, class standing, and financial aid. An analysis of variance is a test of the hypothesis that several means are equal. As a consequence of this technique being able to manipulate several variables simultaneously, it is a stronger and more exacting statistical procedure.

2. The investigator would encourage future researchers to consider the variables of race and religious affiliation for analysis. It is believed that these two variables can produce additional useful information in regard to characteristics of the disciplinary offender.

Perhaps these studies, to be most effective, should be conducted at mid-size to large urban colleges and universities where the diversity of ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds of the students would tend to be greater than those found at small colleges and universities or those schools that tend to be out of the "mainstream" of population centers.

3. It is recommended that a survey of a variety of institutions of higher education be conducted to determine what, if any,

¹⁵H. T. Hayslett, Jr., Statistics Made Simple (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1968), p. 158.

successful preventive disciplinary programs have been developed and implemented and to determine what aspects of these programs have applicability to other institutions.

4. It is recommended that a study regarding the impact of disciplinary penalties and their rehabilitative effect on students be conducted to provide educators with a basis for what types of penalties imposed on students by an educational institution tend to be the most effective.

General Recommendations

1. Provide training sessions for residence hall staff in the fall and periodically throughout the year that place emphasis on those areas of their institution's conduct code that are more likely to be violated by freshmen and sophomores during the fall semester. Such sessions could alert staff as to methods of confronting disciplinary infractions, approximate type of infraction, and time in the semester when a majority are likely to occur. In addition, some preventive techniques that might be used to reduce certain problem behaviors could also be discussed. Involvement of the college's counseling center staff and campus security personnel in such sessions should also be encouraged.

2. Offer assertiveness-training techniques to residence hall staff during the fall and periodically throughout the academic year to aid them in handling disciplinary confrontations. It should not be assumed that the paraprofessional members of a residence hall staff have adequate confrontation skills. Assertiveness-training techniques

can be very useful tools in correctly handling disciplinary situations once they occur. In addition, disciplinary infractions that are confronted appropriately might result in the reduction of the overall number of problems because students soon come to realize that unacceptable behavior will not be tolerated.

3. Establish a committee of students, faculty, and staff to conduct an annual review of the institution's rules and regulations for undergraduate and graduate students. The purpose of this review would be to discard antiquated rules, develop new ones when necessary, and modify existing ones, or leave them unchanged. Several benefits that could accrue to not only the students, staff, and faculty but also the institution are: (1) the aforementioned group would have an opportunity for input into institutional decision making that could have a real impact on students; (2) being asked to provide such input could certainly enhance one's self-esteem; and (3) such a committee would give students an opportunity to develop their leadership skills and learn more about institutional decision making.

Personal Learning Experience

The opportunity to conduct research in this particular subject area has provided the investigator with a more thorough understanding of the characteristics of disciplinary offenders, the nature of empirical research, the importance of accurate statistical analysis, and the amount of time, energy, and personal motivation that is necessary to complete such a task. Support and encouragement from the investigator's professional peers, family, and academic advisor

contributed greatly in assisting the investigator to maintain the motivation and attitude necessary to complete this study. It is hoped that a definite contribution has been made to the literature regarding the characteristics of disciplinary offenders. It is further hoped that additional research will be conducted in the area of both preventive disciplinary programming and the characteristics of disciplinary offenders, since it is felt that disciplinary incidents appear to be increasing on many college and university campuses, and staff tend to spend an inordinate amount of their time and energy in dealing with such incidents.

APPENDIX

Table 1.--Selected demographic factors of the student population of Northern Michigan University, 1977-1978.

	Freshman			Sophomore			Junior			Senior			Graduate			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
<u>Geographical Distribution</u>																		
Upper peninsula	670	638	1368	397	437	834	381	385	766	453	359	812	437	585	1022	2338	2464	4802
Lower peninsula	784	645	1429	467	357	824	347	352	699	303	307	610	44	34	78	1945	1695	3640
Michigan total	1454	1343	2797	864	794	1658	728	737	1465	756	666	1422	481	619	1100	4283	4159	8442
Out of state	113	51	164	43	24	67	47	20	67	30	30	60	45	43	88	278	168	446
Foreign & U.S. possession	7	4	11	10	2	12	7	1	8	6	2	8	31	19	50	61	28	89
TOTAL	1574	1398	2972	917	820	1737	782	758	1540	792	698	1490	557	681	1238	4622	4355	8977
<u>Type of Enrollment</u>																		
Returning	322	276	598	757	661	1418	627	623	1250	733	664	1397	333	389	722	2772	2612	5385
First-time freshman	1009	939	1948	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1009	939	1948
Transfer	188	115	303	98	98	196	99	91	190	23	11	34	--	--	--	408	315	723
Readmission	55	68	123	57	60	117	52	44	96	35	22	57	81	121	202	280	315	595
New nontransfer	--	--	--	5	1	6	4	--	4	1	1	2	1	5	6	11	7	18
First-time graduate student	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	142	166	308	142	166	308
TOTAL	1574	1398	2972	917	820	1737	782	758	1540	792	698	1490	557	681	1238	4622	4355	8977
<u>Marital Status</u>																		
Single	1408	1234	2642	804	712	1516	625	642	1267	608	575	1183	187	231	418	3632	3394	7026
Married	166	164	330	113	108	221	157	116	273	184	123	307	370	450	820	990	961	1951
TOTAL	1574	1398	2972	917	820	1737	782	758	1540	792	698	1490	557	681	1238	4622	4355	8977

Table 2.--Selected demographic factors of the student offender, non-offender, and general university population at Northern Michigan University, 1977-1978.

	Offender	Nonoffender	General
<u>Age</u>			
Under 21	1265	725	5619
Over 21	<u>276</u>	<u>498</u>	<u>3358</u>
TOTAL	1541	1223	8977
<u>Residence</u>			
On campus	1471	929	3427
Off campus	<u>70</u>	<u>294</u>	<u>5550</u>
TOTAL	1541	1223	8977
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	1180	361	4622
Female	<u>604</u>	<u>619</u>	<u>4355</u>
TOTAL	1541	1223	8977
<u>Financial Aid</u>			
Aid	423	457	6372
No aid	<u>1118</u>	<u>766</u>	<u>2605</u>
TOTAL	1541	1223	8977

Table 3.--Selected demographic factors of the student offender, non-offender, and general university population at Northern Michigan University, 1977-1978.

	Offender	Nonoffender	General
<u>Curricula</u>			
Arts and Sciences	730	476	3484
Business	333	168	1192
Education	244	328	1271
Nursing/Allied Health	109	178	912
One/two-year programs	123	71	880
Graduate	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1238</u>
TOTAL	1541	1223	8977
<u>Class</u>			
Freshman	862	399	2972
Sophomore	420	262	1737
Junior	185	290	1540
Senior	73	272	1490
Graduate	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1238</u>
TOTAL	1541	1223	8977

Table 4.--Observed and expected frequencies of offenders in each violation category in regard to the variable sex.

Variable	Offense Category								Total
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	
Male	344 (353) ^a	259 (245)	94 (89)	143 (129)	96 (95)	102 (131)	63 (52)	79 (87)	1180
Female	117 (108)	61 (75)	22 (27)	25 (39)	28 (29)	69 (40)	5 (16)	34 (27)	361
TOTAL	461	320	116	168	124	171	68	113	1541

^aNumbers in parentheses designate expected frequency.

Table 5.--Observed and expected frequencies of offenders in each violation category in regard to the variable age.

Variable	Offense Category								Total
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	
Under 21	360 (378) ^a	280 (263)	100 (95)	138 (145)	102 (102)	133 (140)	57 (56)	88 (93)	1265
Over 21	101 (83)	40 (57)	16 (21)	23 (30)	22 (22)	38 (31)	11 (12)	25 (20)	276
TOTAL	461	320	116	168	124	171	68	113	1541

^aNumbers in parentheses designate expected frequency.

Table 6.--Observed and expected frequencies of offenders in each violation category in regard to the variable college residence.

Variable	Offense Category								Total
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	
On campus	451 (440) ^a	302 (306)	114 (111)	145 (155)	124 (124)	166 (163)	60 (64)	109 (109)	1471
Off campus	10 (21)	18 (15)	2 (5)	17 (7)	6 (6)	5 (8)	7 (3)	5 (5)	70
TOTAL	461	320	116	162	130	171	67	114	1541

^aNumbers in parentheses designate expected frequency.

Table 7.--Observed and expected frequencies of offenders in each violation category in regard to the variable financial aid.

Variable	Offense Category								Total
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	
Financial aid	117 (129) ^a	89 (89)	27 (32)	43 (47)	41 (37)	59 (48)	28 (19)	26 (29)	430
No finan- cial aid	344 (332)	231 (231)	89 (84)	125 (121)	93 (97)	112 (123)	40 (49)	77 (74)	1111
TOTAL	461	320	116	168	134	171	68	103	1541

^aNumbers in parentheses designate expected frequency.

Table 8.--Observed and expected frequencies of offenders in each violation category in regard to the variable class standing.

Variable	Offense Category								Total
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	
Freshman	248 (255) ^a	164 (179)	64 (65)	87 (94)	65 (69)	130 (97)	41 (41)	63 (63)	862
Sophomore	131 (124)	89 (87)	39 (32)	49 (46)	41 (34)	27 (47)	14 (20)	30 (31)	420
Junior	49 (53)	55 (37)	8 (13)	20 (20)	10 (14)	9 (20)	11 (9)	17 (13)	179
Senior	27 (27)	12 (17)	5 (6)	12 (9)	8 (6)	5 (9)	8 (4)	3 (6)	80
TOTAL	455	320	116	168	124	171	74	113	1541

^aNumbers in parentheses designate expected frequency.

Table 9.--Observed and expected frequencies of offenders in each violation category in regard to the variable curriculum.

Variable	Offense Category								Total
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	
Arts and Sciences	214 (217) ^a	151 (153)	54 (55)	82 (80)	50 (59)	101 (81)	24 (32)	54 (54)	730
Business	104 (101)	71 (71)	16 (26)	46 (37)	37 (27)	27 (38)	17 (15)	22 (25)	340
Education	85 (74)	60 (52)	23 (19)	24 (27)	14 (20)	16 (28)	9 (11)	17 (18)	248
Nursing	36 (33)	20 (23)	9 (8)	5 (12)	12 (9)	13 (12)	7 (5)	8 (8)	110
One and two year programs	9 (14)	7 (10)	8 (3)	5 (5)	2 (4)	5 (5)	5 (2)	5 (3)	46
Graduate	10 (20)	14 (14)	6 (5)	6 (7)	9 (5)	9 (7)	6 (3)	7 (5)	67
TOTAL	458	323	116	168	124	171	68	113	1541

^aNumbers in parentheses designate expected frequency.

Table 10.--Observed and expected frequencies of offenders in each violation category in regard to the variable permanent residence.

Variable	Offense Category								Total
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	
Upper peninsula	158 (146) ^a	102 (99)	33 (36)	56 (52)	36 (39)	39 (53)	23 (21)	32 (32)	479
Lower peninsula/ out of state	313 (325)	218 (221)	83 (80)	112 (116)	88 (85)	132 (118)	45 (47)	71 (71)	1062
TOTAL	471	320	116	168	124	171	68	103	1541

^aNumbers in parentheses designate expected frequency.

Table 11.--Chi-square and significance levels for the independent variables and each offense category in the disciplinary offender population.

Independent Variables	Offense Category								
	Social Violations	Physical Violations	Safety Violations	Theft	Alcohol	Drugs	General Regulatory Statement	Misc.	Total
Sex	.93 NS	3.54 NS	1.35 NS	6.80 NS	.083 NS	26.94 .001*	10.39 NS	2.39 NS	52.423 .001*
Age	4.60 NS	6.41 NS	1.65 NS	2.19 NS	0.00 NS	1.76 NS	.191 NS	1.34 NS	18.144 .05*
College residence	6.55 NS	.490 NS	2.51 NS	13.60 NS	0.00 NS	1.57 NS	4.40 NS	0.00 NS	60.80 .001*
Financial aid	1.60 NS	0.00 NS	1.18 NS	.531 NS	.538 NS	3.37 NS	5.64 NS	.504 NS	13.38 NS
Class standing	.942 NS	11.42 NS	4.05 NS	1.43 NS	3.26 NS	28.69 NS	5.42 NS	3.05 NS	58.253 .001*
Permanent residence	1.39 NS	.115 NS	.368 NS	.409 NS	.387 NS	5.50 NS	.232 NS	0.00 NS	8.40 NS
Curriculum	9.47 NS	2.88 NS	11.75 NS	7.44 NS	11.67 NS	14.09 NS	8.63 NS	1.815 NS	67.04 .001*

*Indicates significance.

Table 12.--I-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of sex and the dependent variable of semester grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	Male	Female
Male	.000*	.000*
Female	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 13.--I-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of sex and the dependent variable of cumulative grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	Male	Female
Male	.000*	.000*
Female	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 14.--I-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of sex and the dependent variable of high school grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	Male	Female
Male	.000*	.000*
Female	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 15.--A comparison of semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages of offender and nonoffender groups in regard to sex.

Sex	Semester GPA		Cumulative GPA		High School GPA	
	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender
Male	1.92	2.33	1.58	1.99	1.72	1.36
Female	2.02	2.58	1.37	2.18	2.09	2.04

Table 16.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of college residence and the dependent variable of semester grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	On-Campus	Off-Campus
On-campus	.000*	.000*
Off-campus	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 17.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of college residence and the dependent variable of cumulative grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	On-Campus	Off-Campus
On-campus	.000*	.000*
Off-campus	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 18.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of college residence and the dependent variable of high school grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	On-Campus	Off-Campus
On-campus	.000*	.000*
Off-campus	.013*	.004*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 19.--A comparison of semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages of offender and nonoffender groups in regard to college residence.

College Residence	Semester GPA		Cumulative GPA		High School GPA	
	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender
On-campus	1.95	2.30	1.50	1.98	1.83	2.01
Off-campus	1.80	2.46	2.05	2.09	1.27	1.70

Table 20.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of financial aid and the dependent variable of semester grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	Financial Aid	No Financial Aid
Financial aid	.000*	.000*
No financial aid	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 21.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of financial aid and the dependent variable of cumulative grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	Financial Aid	No Financial Aid
Financial aid	.000*	.000*
No financial aid	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 22.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of financial aid and the dependent variable of high school grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders	
	Financial Aid	No Financial Aid
Financial aid	.093	.098
No financial aid	.000*	.062

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 23.--A comparison of semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages of offender and nonoffender groups in regard to financial aid.

Financial Aid	Semester Grade Point Average		Cumulative Grade Point Average		High School Grade Point Average	
	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender
Financial aid	2.02	2.55	1.63	2.26	2.01	1.86
No financial aid	1.91	2.40	1.49	1.98	1.73	1.61

Table 24.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of class standing and the dependent variable of semester grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders			
	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors
Freshmen	.000*	.000*	.013*	.819
Sophomores	.000*	.000*	.000*	.049*
Juniors	.000*	.000*	.000*	.006*
Seniors	.000*	.000*	.003*	.316

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 25.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of class standing and the dependent variable of cumulative grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders			
	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors
Freshmen	.028*	.000*	.000*	.000*
Sophomores	.000*	.000*	.001*	.967
Juniors	.000*	.000*	.004*	.821
Seniors	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 26.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of class standing and the dependent variable of high school grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders			
	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors
Freshmen	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*
Sophomores	.386	.022*	.000*	.000*
Juniors	.000*	.000*	.805	.000*
Seniors	.000*	.000*	.075	.001*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 27.--A comparison of semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages of offender and nonoffender groups in regard to class standing.

Class Standing	Semester GPA		Cumulative GPA		High School GPA	
	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender
Freshmen	1.83	2.32	1.07	1.24	2.06	2.32
Sophomore	2.04	2.52	2.08	2.39	1.74	1.98
Junior	2.10	2.61	2.11	2.36	1.27	1.28
Senior	2.29	2.42	2.38	2.75	.546	1.04

Table 28.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of curriculum and the dependent variable of semester grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders						
	Arts and Sciences	Business	Education	Nursing/Health	One and Two Year Programs	Graduate	Miscellaneous
Arts & Sciences	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.759	.000*
Business	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.001*	.992	.002*
Education	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.725	.000*
Nursing/Health	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.617	.000*
One & two year programs	.005*	.000*	.015*	.003*	.001*	.787	.001*
Graduate	.958	.753	.946	.995	.949	.954	.981
Miscellaneous	.006*	.000*	.010*	.003*	.001*	.670	.001*

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 29.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of curriculum and the dependent variable of cumulative grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders						
	Arts and Sciences	Business	Education	Nursing/Health	One and Two Year Programs	Graduate	Miscellaneous
Arts & Sciences	.000*	.000*	.002*	.000*	.000*	.368	.000*
Business	.000*	.001*	.300	.015*	.000*	.405	.000*
Education	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.314	.000*
Nursing/Health	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.335	.000*
One & two year programs	.550	.563	.420	.634	.062	.497	.002*
Graduate	.688	.688	.574	.686	.888	.895	.967
Miscellaneous	.386	.389	.093	.402	.784	.684	.311

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 30.--T-test results for the comparison between nonoffenders and offenders on the independent variable of curriculum and the dependent variable of high school grade point average.

Nonoffenders	Offenders						
	Arts and Sciences	Business	Education	Nursing/Health	One and Two Year Programs	Graduate	Miscellaneous
Arts & Sciences	.102	.079	.418	.039	.004*	.168	.109
Business	.937	.790	.103	.260	.070	.199	.612
Education	.000*	.000*	.194	.001*	.000*	.139	.001*
Nursing/Health	.058	.092	.002*	.683	.918	.180	.238
One & two year programs	.740	.838	.145	.574	.300	.127	.979
Graduate	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.000*	.059	.000*
Miscellaneous	.290	.333	.069	.749	.992	.191	.443

*Denotes significance beyond the .05 level.

Table 31.--A comparison of semester, cumulative, and high school grade point averages of offender and nonoffender groups in regard to curriculum enrolled.

Curriculum Enrolled	Semester GPA		Cumulative GPA		High School GPA	
	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender	Offender	Nonoffender
Arts & Sciences	1.98	2.39	1.53	2.05	1.81	1.68
Business	1.88	2.41	1.53	1.90	1.83	1.80
Education	2.02	2.46	1.79	2.31	1.60	1.45
Nursing/Health	1.87	2.68	1.54	2.20	1.99	2.06
One and two year programs	1.71	2.35	1.17	1.64	2.08	1.87
Graduate ^a	2.00	1.86	.80	1.00	2.62	0.00 ^b
Miscellaneous	1.80	2.58	.94	1.27	1.87	2.08

^aRepresents only four individuals: two in offender group and two in the nonoffender group.

^bNot reported.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bailey, H. W. "Disciplinary Procedures." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Walter S. Monroe. New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- _____. "Disciplinary Procedures." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Walter S. Monroe. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.
- Gay, L. R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1976.
- Hayslett, H. T., Jr. Statistics Made Simple. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1968.
- Isaac, Stephen, and Michael, William. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego, Calif.: Edits Publishers, 1972.
- Nie, Norman; Hull, H.; Hadulai, C.; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin, and Bent, Dale. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.
- Packwood, William T. College Student Personnel Services. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1977.
- Van Dalen, Deobold, B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.
- Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1951.
- Young, D. Parker. Higher Education: The Law and Student Protest. Athens, Ga.: Institute of Higher Education, Center for Continuing Education, University of Georgia, June 1970.

Periodicals

- Bevilacqua, Joseph P., and Dole, Arthur A. "Characteristics of Male Disciplinary Students at a Catholic University." Research in Higher Education 3 (1975): 19-27.
- Jackson, Karma Rae, and Clark, Selby G. "Thefts Among College Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal 46 (April 1958): 557-62.
- Kaiser, Herbert E., and Britton, Gale. "Intellective and Non-Intellective Characteristics of Students Involved in Dormitory Discipline Problems." The Journal of College Student Personnel 8 (November 1967).
- LeMay, Morris. "College Disciplinary Problems: A Review." Journal of College Student Personnel 9 (May 1968): 184.
- Mueller, Kate Hevner. "Problems in the Discipline Program." Personnel and Guidance Journal 34 (March 1956): 416.
- Schetlen, Eleanor N. "Disorders, Deans and Discipline: A Record of Change." Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors 30 (Summer 1967): 169.
- Schoemer, J. R. "The College Pushout." Personnel and Guidance Journal 46 (March 1968): 678.
- Tisdale, John R., and Brown, Frederick G. "Characteristics of College Misconduct Cases." Journal of College Student Personnel 6 (November 1965): 359.
- Williamson, E. G.; Jarve, W.; and Lagerstadt-Knudson, Barbara. "What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases?" Educational and Psychological Measurement 12 (1952): 608-19.
- Wrenn, C. G. "Student Discipline in a College." Educational and Psychological Measurement 9 (1949): 625-33.

Other Sources

- Bealer, J. E. "An Analysis of Personality and Demographic Factors Concerning Students Involved in Disciplinary Problems." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Bevilacqua, Joseph P. "Characteristics of Male Disciplinary Students at Villanova University." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972.

- Brousseau, Mary Aline. "A Comparison of Disciplined and Non-Disciplined Women Residents, Marquette University, 1967-68." Ph.D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1969.
- Caskey, O. L., and Duvall, Virginia. "A Study of Selected Characteristics of All Disciplinary Offenders Involving Actions Resulting in Probation or Suspension at Texas Tech University for the Six Year Period 1963-69." ED 040 473.
- Filder, Paul T. "Analysis of Students Committing Major Discipline Offenses During the Ten Year Period 1963-1973 by State of Residence." ERIC Identification No. ED 082 629.
- Gladstein, G. A. "Doctoral Research in College Student Personnel Work: Past, Present, Future." Speech read at the A.P.G.A. Convention, Washington, D.C., April 1966.
- Johnson, Duane Monroe. "Educational and Personality Characteristics of Two Groups of College Disciplinary Offenders." Dissertation Abstracts, Identification No. 30/5-A/1867.
- Jones, Ronald Evert. "Characteristics, Perceptions, and Values of Students Who Were Placed on Disciplinary Probation or Suspended at the University of Tennessee During the Academic Years of 1964-65 and 1965-66." Dissertation Abstracts, Identification No. 29/8-A/2481.
- Maslow, A. H. "Motivation." Class handout for Education 250: Leadership Theory and Practice. Northern Michigan University, Winter 1976.
- Parker, O. B. "An Analysis of Metropolitan Male College Students Involved in Discipline Problems." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964.
- Terrill, Isabel. "Disciplining Students in College." Dissertation Abstracts 25 (July 1964): 331.
- Yeager, Don Cornelius. "An Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Male Students Involved in Misconduct at Arizona State University." Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972.