

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 100

24

HE 001 469

AUTHOR LeMay, Morris Lee
TITLE An Investigation of the Effects of Vocational, Supportive, and Directive Counseling on the Academic Recovery and Recidivist and Attrition Rates of Male College Students Referred for Disciplinary Offenses. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Univ., Corvallis.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BF-8-I-034
PUB DATE Jan 70
GRANT OEG-9-8-080034-0074 (010)
NOTE 32p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.70
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, *College Students, *Counseling, *Counseling Effectiveness, *Discipline Policy, Discipline Problems, *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the feasibility of specialized individual counseling as a practical method of assisting male college students referred to the Dean of Students for official disciplinary action and to discern what type of technique of counseling offered the best hope for rehabilitation. The major objectives were to see if the academic achievement, attrition rate, and the disciplinary recidivist rate of these students would be affected by special attention and counseling techniques. Group A were provided with confidential vocational and personal counseling; Group B with supportive counseling; Group C with directive counseling; Group D with no counseling but a brief discussion of the offense; and Group E with disciplinary action by student judicial boards in the residence halls. Students were assigned at random to the first 4 groups. Findings indicated that at the end of the experimental period and the follow-up period there were no significant differences among the GPA means of the group, nor were there significant differences in attrition rates or later disciplinary referrals. Because of the changing nature of the college scene and the demise of the concept in loco parentis, these attempts at working with disciplinary problems have become obsolete and the problems are now generally handled by student disciplinary boards. (AF)

ED038100

**An Investigation of the Effects of Vocational,
Supportive, and Directive Counseling on the
Academic Recovery and Recidivist and Attrition
Rates of Male College Students Referred for
Disciplinary Offenses**

**Project No. 8-I-034
Grant No. OEG-9-8-080034-0074(010)**

Morris Lee LeMay

January 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY

HE 001 469
EH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	1
Background	1
Related Research	12
Rationale	14
II. METHOD	15
Experimental Design	15
Hypotheses	17
III. RESULTS	18
Pre-treatment Scholastic Performance	18
Attrition Rate	19
Recidivist Rate	20
Post-treatment Academic Performance	20
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	21
Summary	21
Conclusions	22
Discussion	22
Recommendations	23
V. REFERENCES	25
APPENDICES	28

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Recidivist rate of male college students 1966-67.	2
2 Number of male disciplinary <u>Ss</u> referred (N) and the number and per cent of recidivists (R) for each year 1960-1967.	3
3 The number of male college <u>Ss</u> referred for disciplinary reasons and the number graduated.	4
4 The number of male disciplinary <u>Ss</u> who were graduated (f) and the hypothetical or expected number (h).	5
5 College class and disciplinary classification.	7
6 The high school and college GPA and the SAT verbal and math means for each group.	18
7 Type of disciplinary offense and the number from each group.	19
8 Attrition rate of the students in each group.	19
9 OSU accumulative and term grade-point averages of each of the groups.	21
<u>Appendix</u> <u>Table</u>	
A Disciplinary charges.	28
10 Distribution of sample by major field, college class and treatment group N=146.	29

I. Introduction

A. Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the feasibility of specialized individual counseling as a practical method of assisting male college students referred to the Office of the Dean of Students for official disciplinary action and to discern what type or technique of counseling offered the best hope for "rehabilitation."

The major objectives were to see if the academic achievement, the college attrition rate, and the disciplinary recidivist rate of male college students referred for disciplinary problems would be affected by the special attention and counseling techniques, as follows: (a) confidential vocational-personal counseling in a certified counseling center; (b) supportive counseling by a disciplinary counselor; (c) directive counseling, designed as an authoritarian, advice-giving session by a member of the staff of the Dean of Students; and (d) no counseling--only a brief discussion of the offense.

B. Background

Institutions of higher learning find it necessary to deal with students whose failure to conform to rules and standards calls for disciplinary action. Every college personnel worker, regardless of where he works on the campus, is in some way involved in the decision-making, administration, or counseling of the disciplinary referrals. In the past emphasis has been on the counseling and rehabilitation of disciplinary referrals.

Williamson and Foley (1949) stated "...the main purpose of disciplinary counseling is to alleviate the cause of misbehavior so that these causes will no longer operate, so that it will no longer be necessary for the student to offend society. The purpose is to cure and not to punish." Later, Williamson (1955) stressed the rehabilitation of disciplinary referrals and indicated that the rehabilitation must consist of straightforward therapy in which the individual finds substitute channels for his repressed feelings of aggression and disappointment. However, counseling theories for rehabilitation of the disciplinary referrals have been based upon a rather "directive" counseling technique originally established for clients who voluntarily came for vocational and/or personal-social counseling in a university counseling center. This technique of counseling was developed and issued before an adequate body of knowledge concerning the disciplinary referrals was established and has not been tested.

Recent research has disputed Williamson's (1952) statement that: "Students who commit misbehaviors are a random sampling of students in general." Studies by LeMay (1968b), LeMay and Murphy (1967b), Nyman and LeMay (1967a), Tisdale and Brown (1965), Schoemer (1968), and Work (1969) have presented data which implied that the disciplinary referrals have different goals, needs, backgrounds, problems, and forces operating on them than the non-referred student or the student who comes voluntarily for counseling. Thus, it was felt

that more specialized counseling techniques for the disciplinary referrals should be established and tested.

The need for some attempt to formalize specialized counseling techniques becomes obvious when the disciplinary population for the years 1960-67 at Oregon State University (OSU) are examined carefully. These data were partially reported in studies by LeMay (1968b), LeMay and Murphy (1967) and Nyman and LeMay (1967) who found that the disciplinary Ss were not representative of the non-referred student. Strong evidence of academic underachievement was found especially among the freshman disciplinary Ss. The out-of-state disciplinary Ss were over-represented as were upperclassmen who had transferred to the University from other institutions--indicating a need for counseling concerning local expectancies and institutional requirements.

1. Recidivist Rate: The most obvious indications that the traditional manner of handling of disciplinary Ss are the recidivist and attrition rates of the men referred for college misconduct at OSU. Of the Ss referred during each academic year of the 1960-67 period, 13 to 18 per cent had more than one disciplinary referral during the year in which they were referred. A second type of recidivist was referred more than one time during his college career with the offenses occurring during different years. When both types of disciplinary recidivism are combined, the results become alarmingly high.

Presented in Table 1 are the data concerning the recidivist rate of the disciplinary Ss referred during the 1966-67 academic year. There were 29 individuals referred two times and two individuals who were each referred three times during the 1966-67 academic year. Thus, there were 317 cases or offenses handled in 1966-67 but only 284 individuals were included in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Recidivist Rate of Male College Students 1966-67

Class	Referred	Recidivist	
		No.	%
Freshman	118	12	10
Sophomore	96	24	25
Junior	42	21	50
Senior	28	11	39
Total	284	68	24

A majority of the recidivists had at least one offense in the "Alcohol Misconduct" category. A total of 38 of the 68 recidivists had at least one referral for Alcohol Misconduct.

It was of interest to note that more than one-third of the juniors and seniors had previous disciplinary action taken against them. Another unique characteristic of these two classes was the high percentage of transfer students. The majority, 58% of the junior class Ss and 68% of the senior class Ss, were either transfer students or had one or more disciplinary referrals prior to 1966-67.

The Ss with two referrals during the 1966-67 academic year make up smaller percentages of the recidivists. Many of the second offenses by freshmen and sophomores appeared to be "exit-offenses" --an offense committed just prior to withdrawing from the University or at the end of the term they had been suspended for academic deficiency.

The data presented in Table 2 include the combined recidivist rates for the Ss referred during the period 1960 through 1967.

TABLE 2

Number of Male Disciplinary Ss Referred (N) and the Number and Per cent of Recidivists (R) for Each Year 1960-1967

Class	1960-61		1961-62		1962-63		1963-64	
	N	R(%)	N	R(%)	N	R(%)	N	R(%)
Freshman	78	17(22)	94	17(18)	62	11(17)	81	14(17)
Sophomore	42	9(21)	57	21(37)	66	14(21)	68	15(22)
Junior	21	6(28)	19	5(26)	32	9(28)	47	10(21)
Senior	29	12(41)	20	7(35)	17	6(35)	33	8(24)

Class	1964-65		1965-66		1966-67	
	N	R(%)	N	R(%)	N	R(%)
Freshman	112	15(13)	163	25(15)	118	13(11)
Sophomore	80	20(25)	79	24(30)	96	24(25)
Junior	55	15(27)	49	18(38)	42	21(50)
Senior	40	13(33)	26	9(35)	28	11(39)

Caution must be used in the interpretation of Table 2. For example, the freshman Ss referred during 1960-61 included 17 recidivists. Only one of the 17 repeated during the 1960-61 academic year. The other 16 Ss had offenses during their sophomore, junior, and/or senior years and each was necessarily included in the table a

second time. In general, Table 2 includes only a very small number of Ss who had two offenses during a single year. The 1966-67 totals include both types of recidivists since accurate recidivist records were kept for that year.

It should be noted that only a small number of disciplinary Ss in Table 2 had more than two disciplinary offenses. A total of 30 Ss had three referrals and only five Ss were referred four times.

2. Attrition Rate: The number of disciplinary Ss, in each college class, on whom official action was taken for each of the seven years are shown in Table 3. The number and per cent graduated are also presented.

TABLE 3
The Number of Male College Ss Referred for
Disciplinary Reasons and the Number Graduated*

Year	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior	
	Ref	Grad	Ref	Grad	Ref	Grad	Ref	Grad
1960-61	78	27(34%)	42	21(50%)	21	16(76%)	29	25(86%)
1961-62	94	29(31%)	57	28(49%)	19	12(63%)	20	18(90%)
1962-63	62	19(31%)	66	32(48%)	32	23(72%)	17	14(82%)
1963-64	81	13(16%)	68	19(28%)	47	28(60%)	33	32(97%)
1964-65	112	-	80	10(13%)	55	24(44%)	40	35(88%)
1965-66	163	-	79	-	49	12(24%)	26	17(65%)
1966-67	118	-	96	-	42	-	28	5(18%)

*Data gathered June 1967

The data presented in Table 3 indicate that attrition is especially heavy for the freshman disciplinary Ss. Only 14 to 17 per cent of the freshman Ss graduated in four years. Usually another 10 to 15 per cent graduated during the fifth year and smaller percentages graduated during the sixth year. Only 34 per cent of the Ss who were referred as freshmen in 1960-61 were able to graduate after the seven-year interval. The data indicate that roughly one-half of the disciplinary Ss who were referred during their sophomore year will eventually graduate from the local institution. Higher percentages of Ss referred as juniors and seniors will eventually graduate.

Table 4 presents the observed frequency of graduation of disciplinary Ss and the hypothetical or expected frequency of graduation, as derived from the systematic samples of the student body.

Statistical comparisons were made by the chi square technique.

TABLE 4

The Number of Male Disciplinary Ss Who Were Graduated (f)
and the Hypothetical or Expected Number (h)
(Data gathered June 1967)

Year	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior	
	f	h	f	h	f	h	f	h
1960-61	27	39.0	23*	33.9	16	17.8	25	26.3
1961-62	29**	51.2	28**	46.6	12	16.9	18	18.8
1962-63	19	28.8	32	44.6	23	26.1	14	17.0
1963-64	13	18.2	19**	36.7	28	39.9	32	31.4
1964-65			10**	33.8	24**	41.3	35	36.7
1965-66					12**	25.4	17	19.8
1966-67							5*	18.2

*p<.05

**p<.01

The data generally indicate that Ss referred during either their junior or senior years eventually graduate in numbers that are not significantly different from the expected numbers. However, the juniors and seniors do not graduate as soon as expected. After the fifth or sixth year that the disciplinary Ss are enrolled, the number graduating rises, approaches the expected number, and is no longer statistically significant. According to this pattern, which was consistent, the per cent of graduates among the senior disciplinary Ss referred in 1966-67 will probably rise from 18 per cent to close to 90 per cent in two more years. The differences between the junior Ss of 1964-65 and 1965-66 and their expected frequencies will probably diminish during the next two years and no longer be significant.

The data, concerning the Ss who received disciplinary suspensions from the University, were analyzed to study the effects of suspension on rates of graduation. All Ss who were suspended were eligible to return to the University after one or two terms. When the data presented in Table 4 were adjusted to exclude the Ss who had been suspended, only slight changes were necessary. The differences found to be significant in Table 4 were also significant when the suspended Ss were excluded. Thus, when observed on a yearly basis by college class, the suspension of students does not appear to affect the over-all graduation rates.

The rates of graduation of the groups of Ss referred during their freshman year was significantly lower than the expected frequencies for only one of the years under study. Probably the reason the differences for all four years were not statistically significant was the high attrition rate for freshmen in the University student body. Studies have consistently shown that the withdrawal rate of students in general is very heavy during or at the end of the freshman year (Irvine, 1966). Thus, despite the data in Table 3 which shows higher numbers of freshman referrals and lower percentages of eventual graduates, the data in Table 4 indicate that freshman disciplinary Ss will eventually graduate in numbers which will not be significantly lower than their expected frequencies.

The sophomore Ss, however, did not graduate in the expected numbers. Roughly 50 per cent of the sophomore disciplinary Ss eventually graduated. For the samples of sophomores in the University male student body, the expected frequency eventually approaches 80 per cent.

Disciplinary Ss who are referred during their junior or senior years do eventually graduate in numbers not significantly different than expected. However, these Ss require longer periods of time to complete graduation requirements and are more likely to have had a previous disciplinary record.

In general, one must conclude that the effects of discipline and disciplinary counseling are not reflected in a positive manner by the academic attrition and recidivist rates of the misconduct referrals. A high per cent of the freshmen who do become upperclassmen become involved in later episodes of disciplinary difficulty. A sophomore referral has only a fifty-fifty chance of completing the requirements of graduation. While the junior and senior referrals have better odds, they will require more time to graduate.

3. School Representation: The data, for the 1960-67 period, were analyzed to determine the contribution of each School of the University to the disciplinary population. The representation of the various Schools in the disciplinary group was significantly different from their proportion in the University population, as indicated by chi square beyond the .001 level of probability.

The Ss enrolled in the Schools of Agriculture and Forestry were under-represented in the disciplinary population while Ss enrolled in the School of Business and Technology and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences were over-represented. The number of Ss enrolled in the Schools of Education, Engineering, Pharmacy, and Science did not exceed their expected frequencies.

Generally, these findings were in agreement with Williamson, Jorve, and Lagerstedt-Knudson (1952) who found that the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts contributed an over-representation of referrals while students enrolled in Agriculture and Forestry were under-represented.

4. College Class: When the data were analyzed according to college class, the freshman class was found to be over-represented during each of the seven years under study. The senior and junior classes were under-represented during four of the seven years and for the total period. The sophomores did not significantly exceed their expected frequency during any of the seven years.

Included in Table 5 are data concerning the total OSU male undergraduate enrollment, by college class, and the disciplinary Ss for the period 1960-67.

TABLE 5
College Class and Disciplinary Classification

College Class	Total University Male Undergraduate Population (1960-67)		Disciplinary Male Undergraduate Population (1960-67)	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Freshman	12,464	29.8	708	42.8
Sophomore	11,176	26.8	488	29.5
Junior	9,208	22.0	265	16.0
Senior	8,922	21.4	193	11.7
Total	41,770	100.0	1,654	100.0

5. Scholastic Aptitude and Achievement: Comparisons of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) verbal and math scores and the high school grade-point average (GPA) of the disciplinary Ss were made on a yearly basis for the freshman classes of 1964-67. This was necessary due to incomplete data available for the academic years of 1960-61, 1961-62, 1962-63. The sophomore, junior, and senior classes were not analyzed since they contained each year a high percentage of Ss who had transferred to the University from other institutions and were not required to report such information upon matriculation.

A general analysis of the data for all referred freshmen during the four-year period indicated that the freshman disciplinary Ss had lower SAT verbal scores than systematic samples of non-referred freshman males. The differences were not significant on a yearly basis however, and appeared to be related to the proportion of Minor Misconduct and Alcohol Misconduct referrals in the total freshman group.

For the same four-year period, the mean high school cumulative GPA was significantly lower for the disciplinary Ss than for the non-referred sample of freshmen. The differences were significant on a yearly basis for each of the four years.

Comparisons were made for the four-year period in terms of the college cumulative GPA at the end of the academic year during which the Ss were referred. The mean GPA of the freshman disciplinary Ss was slightly less than 2.0 (on a 4.0 scale) for three of the years and was 1.97 for the total four-year period. This was significantly lower ($z=2.56$, $p<.01$) than the sample of non-referred freshmen. The mean GPA of the freshman Ss was also significantly lower than each of the sophomore, junior, and senior means.

In summary, the freshmen Ss tended to have lower grade-point averages and lower SAT verbal scores than non-referred freshmen.

One may generalize that the freshman Ss were not representative of the non-referred freshmen with respect to scholastic aptitude and achievement. This finding is not in complete agreement with Williamson *et al.* They found no significant differences on aptitude and achievement for their total group; however, the basic pattern was similar to the one in the present study.

6. State and Non-State Residence: The data were analyzed to determine whether the disciplinary population was representative of the University population with respect to geographic origin. Each student enrolled in the University was classified by the Admissions Office as a resident or a non-resident upon enrollment. The total disciplinary population for 1960-67 revealed differences which were significant (chi square beyond 0.001) indicating that the out-of-state students were over-represented in the disciplinary group.

This observation was consistent with the study by Williamson *et al.*, who found that non-residents made up 22.5 per cent of the disciplinary population. For the present study, a total of 30 per cent of the Ss were non-residents. A trend was observed which indicated a slight annual increase in the percentage of non-residents in the present study.

7. Transfer Students: Referred Ss who had transferred to the University from other institutions comprised 16.6 per cent of the total disciplinary population. This was significantly lower than the expected frequency (chi square 5.09 $p<.05$). However, transfer students were found to be over-represented in the group of junior and senior disciplinary referrals.

Taking the 1966-67 academic year as an example, 29 per cent of the junior Ss and 39 per cent of the senior disciplinary Ss were transfer students. Generally, a majority of these transfer students were experiencing academic difficulty when referred.

8. Type of University Residence: The data were analyzed to determine if the place of residence of the Ss was associated with disciplinary referral.

Because of fluctuation in the data from year to year, it was difficult to generalize. However, Ss who resided in residence halls constituted 45 per cent of the disciplinary population. Only 26 per cent of the University male undergraduates reside in residence

halls, indicating that residence hall referrals are vastly out of proportion to their expected frequency. Slightly over 28 per cent of the disciplinary Ss resided in fraternity housing. This was significantly higher than the expected number for fraternity house residents. Disciplinary Ss living in cooperatives were under-represented.

Due to the lack of accurate information available, there was no way to obtain the expected frequencies of students living in apartments, rooming houses, and with their parents. All such students were combined into an "off-campus" category which was under-represented in the disciplinary population.

In interpreting these data, it should be emphasized that only those disciplinary cases which were reported to the Office of the Dean of Students were included. As emphasized by Williamson et al., it is possible that the statistics for students living with parents or relatives may be restricted by a tendency on the part of parents to handle the situation without reporting to the Dean's office. Such a factor could be operative also in the case of the manager of apartment houses and rooming houses.

The high percentage of disciplinary Ss residing in the residence halls was consistent with the heavy concentration of freshmen in the disciplinary population. Freshmen under 21 years of age have been required to reside in University housing, thus, the majority of the total residence hall population are freshmen.

9. Alcohol Misconduct: Since "Alcohol Misconduct" was (and still is) consistently one of the largest of the established disciplinary categories used on the local campus, it was felt that a review of some of the characteristics of the students involved would be of interest and of value.

There is some indication that a high percentage of college students in general use alcohol at some point during their college career (Straus and Bacon, 1953). Probably the majority of the students at OSU have also consumed alcohol at one time or another. Those students included in the present description, however, are probably a selected or "screened" group of those students who have consumed alcohol.

The screening process begins when civil or campus police or other persons in authority make a decision to refer or not to refer a student to the Office of the Dean of Students. The student is further screened by the University officials when they decide whether an official University discipline action must be taken.

Usually students will be able to drink in moderation without being referred for disciplinary action. The referred students in the present study were more "extreme" cases and were usually connected with an aggressive act such as property damage, verbal abuse of police or citizens, or general disruptive behavior. A few were referred for becoming extremely ill in a public place as a result of excessive consumption of alcohol. Such cases were usually referred

for official University action while many other students who were able to exert only slightly more control were merely sent to their residences by the authorities. The final screening is conducted by the University officials who must decide if any action is necessary. When a student is referred, the action taken by the University usually consists of No Action, Warning, or Probation. The present study was concerned with male undergraduates who received either an official Warning or Probation.

There is some evidence that these Ss differ from non-referred students. Papers by LeMay and Murphy (1967) and Nyman and LeMay (1967) presented a study of a small group of the students referred for Alcoholic Misconduct during one academic term of 1964-65. LeMay and Murphy administered the MMPI to 70 undergraduate college students who received disciplinary action during the spring term. Controls matched for age, school, and college class were compared to the referred students. The Alcohol Misconduct (N=23) group and Disorderly Conduct group differed significantly from their matched controls on the 4 (Pd) and 9 (Ma) scales. Using the same samples, Nyman and LeMay scored the subscales of the Pd and Ma scales and found the Alcohol Misconduct group subject to more authority conflict than their peers and concluded that they had an "inflated ego" which is hurt rather easily.

Data were available on 169 University students referred specifically for Alcohol Misconduct during the 1966-67 academic year. Eliminated from the sample were three graduate students, four foreign students, 18 female students, and 31 male undergraduate students on whom no disciplinary action was taken. Thus, 113 Ss were included in the final analyses.

It should also be emphasized that among the students charged, during 1966-67, with offenses other than Alcohol Misconduct were individuals charged with "more serious" infractions who were also drinking at the time. There were also some who might have been drinking when an offense such as theft or fighting was committed and the authorities had no knowledge of the alcohol.

The control groups were established from registration lists for the 1966-67 fall term. Separate 10 per cent systematic samples were drawn from male freshman students (N=176) and male sophomore students (N=181). Comparison of the means of the SAT verbal and math scores, high school GPA and college GPA were made between the control groups and the freshman and sophomore Ss handled for Alcohol Misconduct. Frequencies and proportions in the total disciplinary group under study were compared with corresponding data for the male University student body as a whole on college class, home state, college residence, and fraternity membership. Differences were considered significant when $p < .05$.

Freshmen were significantly over-represented among those charged with alcohol misconduct ($F=54$, $h=32.7$, $\chi^2=13.75$). Differences between sophomores and juniors and their expected frequencies were not statistically significant. The senior class was signifi-

cantly under-represented ($F=6$, $h=23.7$, $\chi^2=13.24$).

The School of Business and Technology ($N=28$) and School of Humanities and Social Sciences ($N=24$) were significantly over-represented. The Schools of Agriculture ($N=4$) and Education ($N=1$) were under-represented. Those enrolled in the Schools of Forestry ($N=4$), Engineering ($N=20$), Pharmacy ($N=3$), and Science ($N=29$) did not exceed their expected frequencies. These data, however, must be considered only in a general sense. The N 's were small in several Schools, and it was found that more than one-third of the S s changed majors and Schools during 1966-67. Almost one-third had previously changed Schools.

The number of out-of-state students ($N=34$) was significantly larger than their expected frequency. Those living in residence halls ($N=72$) were significantly over-represented and fraternity members ($N=23$) significantly under-represented.

The specific acts occasioning referral were spread unevenly over the academic year: 35 in the fall term, 30 in the winter term, and 55 in the spring term.

The over-all recidivist rate, which includes disciplinary referrals for offenses other than alcohol misconduct, was of interest: 14 of the 113 students were referred more than once during 1966-67, and 10 had been referred for disciplinary action prior to 1966-67. One freshman, two sophomores, one junior and one senior had been referred on three occasions each, and one sophomore had been referred four times.

Test scores and data on academic achievement were analyzed according to college class. The freshmen's mean high school and college GPAs (on a 4.0 scale) were 2.74 and 1.97, significantly lower than the control means (2.99 and 2.24). The SAT verbal and mathematics scores did not differ significantly. Thus, the freshmen had a history of academic difficulty extending at least through high school and the first year of college. Thirteen of the freshmen had been suspended for academic deficiency and another 27 had been on academic probation for at least one of the three terms in 1966-67.

Among the sophomores, the differences between subjects and controls were not significant on the SAT verbal or mathematics scores. There were no differences on either the high school or college GPAs, but this was deceptive since seven were suspended for academic deficiency during 1966-67.

Seven of the 15 juniors and four of the six seniors were transfer students. The data concerning these students were not analyzed because students who transfer to the University from other institutions are not required to report SAT scores and high school GPAs. Five of the juniors were on academic probation during the year and one was suspended for academic deficiency. No seniors were placed on academic probation or suspended in 1966-67. However, only

one completed the requirements for graduation by the end of the spring term.

In summary, the 113 students disciplined for alcohol misconduct in 1966-67 constituted only a small proportion of the total male undergraduate population of 7228. Probably subtle screening by town and campus authorities referred only selected students for University disciplinary action.

There is some indication of an "academic screening" process in effect also. The academic problems of the freshmen who were referred for alcohol misconduct suggest strongly that most will not become upperclassmen. The SAT scores and GPAs indicated upperclassmen should probably be considered separately from freshmen in future studies. The sophomore disciplinary referrals were apparently more capable students who were experiencing a relatively higher degree of academic success, and were more similar to controls, juniors and seniors than to freshman disciplinary referrals.

C. Related Research

At the time this investigation was undertaken a search of the literature for studies in the area of discipline and misconduct on the college campus had been conducted and, later, published (LeMay, 1968). Even though the area of college discipline has been a problem and a concern for many years, there was and is a paucity of material in the literature to indicate the nature and extent of the problem, the theories and techniques used, or the effectiveness of the disciplinary procedures. Only major points of several studies are included in this review.

The "immoderate" use of alcohol by undergraduates appears to be a common problem on most campuses although few articles were found on the specific problem of disciplinary referrals. Tisdale and Brown (1965) mentioned that a high percentage of disciplinary referrals for misuse of alcohol were sophomore fraternity members. The LeMay and Murphy (1967), Nyman and LeMay (1967) and LeMay (1968) articles concerning alcohol misconduct have been reported elsewhere in this paper. Minowitz (1966), Munter (1966), and Wolf (1966) felt that while student addiction is rare, students do seek in alcohol facilitation of social relationships and relief from anxiety. Straus and Bacon (1953) reported a survey of drinking customs and attitudes among college students conducted in 1949-51. Park (1958), using a problem-drinking scale which he developed from a factor analysis of data collected by Straus and Bacon, found that problem-drinking was associated with deviation from the occupational male role, and with ambivalence in role orientation. Park's evidence that college problem-drinking is apparently related to role deviation and ambivalence was pursued by Williams (1965) in a self-concept study of 64 students from four fraternities in New England men's colleges. Using Park's problem-drinking measure and an adjective check list, Williams compared the college sample to a sample of alcoholics. Williams concluded that problem-drinking is associated with self-concept and real-self--ideal-self correspondence. The problem-drinkers were similar to the alco-

holic sample in their tendency to endorse adjectives suggestive of neurosis.

Clark (1964) found MMPI pattern differences in troubled sections of male residence halls when compared to students in quieter sections of the residence halls. Elton and Rose (1967) investigated disciplinary problems in residence halls. Male freshman students living in a university residence hall were categorized into two disciplinary groups and one non-disciplinary group. The head residents nominated 45 students in each of the three categories. These categories were defined as: repeat reprimands, single reprimands, and non-reprimands. The Omnibus Personality Inventory scores of authors concluded that reprimanded students have ability, were less conforming and less able to adapt their impulse controls to the demands of the environment.

Cummins (1966) investigated the scores on the Inventory of Beliefs, Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, and the Differential Values Inventory which were taken during the freshman year of 95 male and 49 female students referred for misconduct during their college career. No significant differences were found between the male offenders and their controls. However, it was found that the female offenders had lower traditional values than their controls. Jackson and Clark (1958) found differences on MMPI scores between a group of college students involved in theft and a matched control group on the 4 (Pd) and 9 (Ma) scales at the .001 level and on the 8 (Sc) scale at the .05 level. Osborne, Sanders, and Young (1956) used the MMPI in a study of 41 freshman females involved in two or more offenses during their first year on a college campus. A matched control group was used and MMPI scores on scales 6 (Pa), 7 (Pt), 8 (Sc) and 9 (Ma) were elevated for the problem group beyond the .05 level of confidence. The authors concluded that college women disciplinary offenders are more inclined to have a distorted outlook on life and react to everyday problems in unusual ways. They tend to approach problems with animation which may lead to antisocial or irrational manic behavior. They also have a tendency to be sensitive and to feel that they are unduly controlled, limited, and mistreated by others. A later study by Cummins and Lindblade (1967) found that disciplinary males appeared to have more traditional value orientations than disciplinary females while no such difference was shown between male and female non-offenders. The authors felt that there was some selectivity involved in referring women to the Deans's office that does not occur in referring men. The question was raised by the authors of the possibility that women who break rules and are caught have veered further from traditional values than men who do the same. In any case this study does tend to support the need for careful control of the variable of sex in research concerning disciplinary referrals. Work (1969) reported data concerning CPI raw score means of a sample of male college students who had been involved in disciplinary incidents. These were compared to means of a sample of residence hall floor advisors matched on the basis of age and ability. Statistically-significant differences were found between the two groups in all four classes of scales. The most striking differences occurred on the Class 2 scales of socialization, maturity, and responsibility and for the Ac (achievement via conformance) and Ai (achievement via

independence) of the Class 3 measures of achievement potential and intellectual efficiency.

Schoemer (1968) presented data concerning 141 students who had been suspended from college for disciplinary reasons. He reported that in terms of family background and intellectual aptitude, the suspended student had the same opportunity for success in college as did other students and compared favorably with non-suspended students in family composition and socio-economic level, and in intellectual capacity. He concluded that the suspended students were rather passive, apathetic individuals who rarely engaged in high school or college extracurricular activities and who had a history of low achievement.

D. Rationale

The rationale undergirding the study is derived from the general counseling literature and the literature concerning disciplinary counseling (Williamson, 1949, 1955).

It was assumed that individual counseling can be effectively used to increase academic achievement and to promote personal adjustment. Considerable research has been reported on the effects of counseling; however, while these studies in the main have been positive, they have not been concerned with non-voluntary clients. (For studies concerning general counseling see LeMay and Weigle (1965), LeMay (1967), and LeMay and Christensen (1967).

Despite the accumulation of knowledge of both general counseling methods and specific techniques for changing human behavior, we still have much to learn about effective specific methods. Williamson's theory of the fusion of discipline and counseling in the educative process has not been tested. His thesis is that discipline must be infused with counseling.

Discipline as punishment is no corrective of misbehavior unless it is a part or a consequence of a counseling relationship. Alone, punishment is repressive and growth arresting. With counseling, it can become educative, corrective, and growth producing. (Williamson, 1955, p. 75).

From another point of view, almost the same thing may be said using the language of psychiatry and psychoanalysis. (See Abrahamson, 1960, Chapter XIII, Rebuilding and Rehabilitating the Offender). All antisocial behavior is only a deviation from, or an exaggeration of, the norm, rather than a completely different phenomenon. Thus, behavior is different in degree, not in type. The aim of rehabilitation is to bring out and develop any constructive tendencies and talents that the offender possesses. Rehabilitation may necessitate non-voluntary participation on the part of the client since many of them commit offenses because of unconscious guilt feelings which lead them to strive for punishment. Discipline without treatment fulfills this very aim; thus, the disciplinary official who does not counsel is unwittingly aiding the offender to obtain

gratification for his unhealthy needs.

II. Method

A. Experimental Design

The setting for this study was Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, a state-supported co-educational institution with a male undergraduate enrollment of 7,390 during the experimental period. The instructional emphasis is on science and technology with the two largest schools being the School of Science and the School of Engineering. The University calendar has three regular terms which extend from late September to June, with a full summer term of eight to eleven weeks.

All male misconduct referrals who were reported to the Office of the Dean of Students during the terms before the experimental period were seen in the usual manner as follows: The individual students were contacted by mail or telephone by the Assistant Dean of Students and asked to establish an appointment; the student and the Assistant Dean usually met for approximately 30-40 minutes during which time the offense was discussed and, in the majority of the cases, plans and problems of the student were discussed.

During the experimental period (Winter and Spring Terms), each student who was referred was assigned a chronological number in the order of his referral. The numbers had previously been randomly assigned to one of the four following treatment groups:

Group A: Disciplinary referrals who were randomly assigned to this group were contacted in the usual manner by the secretary of the Assistant Dean of Students. A letter was sent to the student asking him to make an appointment within the next few days. The Assistant Dean then met with each individual to discuss briefly the offense and to refer the student to the OSU Counseling Center for vocational, academic, and/or personal-social counseling.

Each student was given a Counseling Center referral slip, on which was written the name of the Counselor he would meet. On each referral slip was an indication that the usual \$7.50 testing fee had been waived.

No pressure was exerted by the Assistant Dean to force the student to go to the Counseling Center. The services of the Center were described and an attempt was made in each case to indicate how the services could possibly be of benefit to the individual. The confidential nature of the Counseling Center was mentioned in each case and the student was told that the Assistant Dean would not receive a report from the Counselor concerning the counseling sessions.

The student was then told that he would very soon receive a letter from the Dean of Men stating that he had received either an official University Warning or Disciplinary Probation. There was no further contact between the individual and anyone within the

Office of the Dean of Students after this meeting (unless the student was referred at a later date for another offense).

Students were assigned to a specific counselor from a list of the Ph.D.-level Counselors on duty. Assignments were made on a rotating basis.

If and/or when the referred student contacted the Counseling Center, the Counselor was in complete charge and had the freedom to handle the case in any manner which he felt would be the most beneficial to the client.

Group B: The students who were randomly assigned to this group were contacted in the usual manner by the Assistant Dean. The offense was discussed very briefly and the student received "supportive counseling" for two periods of at least 30 minutes each. Supportive Counseling is defined as follows:

The disciplinary Counselor encouraged the expression of attitudes, feelings, and opinions concerning the school, residence halls, other people on campus, parents and/or about the student himself and gave support when indicated. The Counselor always spoke in positive terms toward and about the student, emphasizing the strong points of the student. The Counselor attempted to give recognition to any feelings of distress or guilt, accent them, give reassurance, and worked toward sympathetic and empathetic understanding.

The professional background and training of the disciplinary Counselor lends itself to this type of approach. The Counselor worked for three years as a Counselor in a juvenile court under the close supervision of psychiatric social worker (MSW, ACSW) who stressed this type of counseling for a high percentage of the juvenile cases. The disciplinary Counselor also functioned as a Counselor in the OSU Counseling Center for a two-year period prior to serving as the disciplinary Counselor and has a doctorate in Counseling Psychology.

Group C: The students who were randomly assigned to this group were contacted in the usual manner by the Assistant Dean of Students. The offense was discussed briefly and thoroughly and the student received "directive counseling" for two periods of at least 30 minutes each. Directive Counseling was defined for this study as follows:

The disciplinary Counselor at all times remained an authority figure. The Counselor attempted no special effort to relieve the anxiety and guilt feelings of the student other than to tell of the official University action which would be issued. The Counselor discussed the "correct" and the "socially acceptable" behavior expected by the University and the School in which the student was enrolled.

Physically, there were differences between the settings of this type of counseling sessions and Group B. For the

students in Group C, the Counselor was behind his desk and the student seated across the desk from the authority figure. In Group B (Supportive Counseling), the Counselor and the student sat facing each other away from the desk or beside the desk.

Group D: The students who were randomly assigned to this group were contacted in the usual manner by the Assistant Dean of Students. The offense was discussed briefly and the student was then dismissed.

Group E: The students referred for disciplinary reasons who were included in this group were handled by residence hall judicial boards for offenses which occurred within the residence halls.

Generally students committing offenses within the halls receive Hall Warning or Hall Probation on their first offenses. Such action is taken by the student judicial board of the floor on which the student resides or by the student judicial board of the Hall in which the student is a resident. No report of the incident is made to the Office of the Dean of Students.

On the second offense (and occasionally for a more serious first offense) the action taken by one of these student judicial boards usually will be Official University Warning or Official University Probation. In cases of this nature, a report of the incident is sent to the Office of the Dean of Students. The Dean of Men then will usually write an official letter to the student stating that a residence hall judicial board has recommended either Official University Warning or Probation and that the Dean concurs with the decision. The student is not seen by any of the staff within the Office of the Dean of Students and receives no counseling from that office.

B. Hypotheses

The general aims of the study were to decrease the dropout rate of male college students referred for disciplinary difficulty who were potentially capable of academic success and to implement a plan for "rehabilitation."

Specific objectives of the study were to test the effects of confidential vocational-personal counseling, supportive counseling, directive counseling, and no counseling.

There is some evidence that when clients are forced to see a counselor, desirable outcomes do occur (Arbuckle and Boy, 1961; Beier, 1952; Snoxell, 1960). These data, however, do not lend themselves to the formulation of specific hypotheses for the present study. Thus, the hypotheses were presented in the null form, as follows:

1. There will be no differences between the five groups at the end of the two-term experimental period on GPA, attrition rate, and recidivist rate.
2. There will be no difference between the five

groups at the end of the following academic year on GPA, attrition rate, and recidivist rate.

III. Results

A. Pre-treatment Scholastic Performance

Because the basic criterion used in the experiment was the students' academic success, the similarity of academic aptitude of the students in each group is essential. Table 6 is a summary of the SAT group means and high school GPA of the groups. Accumulative college GPA taken at the close of the term preceding the experimental period was used as a measure of pre-treatment scholastic performance and is included in the table.

TABLE 6
The High School and College GPA and the SAT
Verbal and Math Means for Each Group

	Groups				
	A	B	C	D	E
SAT-V	503	491	497	512	543
SAT-M	546	555	554	541	560
HS-GPA	2.89	2.92	2.91	3.01	2.90
Coll-GPA	2.22	2.29	2.23	2.29	2.38

As can be seen from Table 6, Group E, the residence hall judicial board referrals, had significantly higher means for the SAT-V, SAT-M, and College GPA.

Group E also differed from the other groups in the type of offense committed. As can be observed in Table 7, Group E included a relatively high number of individuals who received official university disciplinary action for "Minor Misconduct." Descriptions of each disciplinary category are included in the Appendix. There were no differences among the groups for the variables of age, college class, OSU school, education of parents, and socio-economic level.

TABLE 7
Type of Disciplinary Offense and the
Number from Each Group

	Groups					Total
	A	B	C	D	E	
Alcohol	7	7	5	6	18	43
Theft	13	12	14	13	2	54
Disorderly Conduct	3	3	3	4	3	16
Minor Misconduct	2	2	2	1	13	20
Miscellaneous	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13</u>
	27	28	26	27	38	146

Omitted from Table 7 and from the study are all female and foreign-born male students. Also omitted are 42 male students who were referred for disciplinary reasons but who were not guilty and/or received no official disciplinary action. A total of 17 students were not included in the study since their disciplinary involvement occurred during the last two weeks (final exam week) of the last term of the experimental period. It was felt that these students should not be included since there was not sufficient time to make proper contact with them and the conditions of the study could not be followed.

B. Attrition Rate

Included in Table 8 are the numbers of students enrolled at OSU from each of the groups during the period under study.

TABLE 8
Attrition Rate of the Students in Each Group

	Groups		
	N ^A (%)	N ^B (%)	N ^C (%)
End of Experimental Period	27 (100)	28 (100)	26 (100)
Fall	13 (48)	18 (64)	19 (73)
Winter	11 (40)	15 (61)	15 (58)
Spring	11 (40)	16 (57)	17 (65)
Graduated	1 (37)	5 (69)	5 (61)*
Fall	9	14	11

*Includes both the Graduated and Fall totals

(Table 8 cont.)

	D		E		Total	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
End of Experimental Period	27	(100)	38	(100)	146	(100)
Fall	19	(70)	24	(63)	93	(64)
Winter	20	(74)	20	(53)	83	(57)
Spring	18	(67)	18	(47)	80	(55)
Graduated	4	(56)	4	(53)	19	(55)*
Fall	11		16		61	

*Includes both the Graduated and Fall totals

Attrition was especially heavy for Group A, the Counseling Center clients. Only 13 of the original 27 (48%) Group A students, compared to 64% for the total disciplinary groups, returned to OSU the term after the experimental period ended. Only 10 (37%) Group A students either had graduated or were enrolled at the end of the follow-up period, compared to 55% for the total disciplinary group.

These differences, while not statistically significant are highly interesting and remain a mystery. The number of academic suspensions (two) for the students in Group A appears not to be the reason for the high percentage of dropouts.

C. Recidivist Rate

No significant differences were found among the groups concerning the number of repeated referrals to the Office of the Dean of Students. Group A, the Counseling Center referrals, included three students who later were involved in disciplinary difficulty and one who was suspended from school for disciplinary reasons. Group B included four recidivists and one student who was later suspended. Group C included five repeaters and one who was suspended. Group D included three who had later offenses and seven from Group E were referred later. All disciplinary suspensions were for a period of two terms.

D. Post-treatment Academic Performance

Included in Table 9 is the College GPA of each of the groups. The first GPA is the accumulative GPA taken at the end of the experimental period.

TABLE 9
OSU Accumulative and Term Grade-Point Averages
of Each of the Groups

	Groups				
	A	B	C	D	E
End of Experi- mental Period	2.24	2.22	2.26	2.27	2.30
Fall	2.46	2.36	2.15	2.42	2.40
Winter	2.78	2.59	2.44	2.47	2.40
Spring	2.83	2.49	2.57	2.82	2.51
Fall	2.67	2.33	2.64	2.66	2.57

It is of interest to note that the mean College GPA for Group E, the residence hall referrals, was significantly higher prior to the experimental period (see Table 6). At the end of the experimental period (i.e., the period during which these students were in disciplinary difficulty) there were no differences among the means of the groups.

Group A, the Counseling Center clients, had the highest mean GPA (and the smallest N) at the end of each of the terms of the follow-up period. However, the differences among the groups were not significant at the end of any of the terms except for the term immediately following the experimental period. For that term, Group C, containing the students who received directive counseling, had a mean of 2.15 and accounts for the significant differences.

IV. Summary, Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations

A. Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the feasibility of specialized individual counseling as a practical method of assisting male college students referred to the Office of the Dean of Students for official disciplinary action and to discern what type or technique of counseling offered the best hope for rehabilitation.

The major objectives were to see if the academic achievement, attrition rate, and the disciplinary recidivist rate of the male college students referred for disciplinary problems would be affected by the special attention and counseling techniques, as follows: Group A, confidential vocational-personal counseling in a certified Counseling Center; Group B, supportive counseling by a disciplinary counselor; Group C, directive counseling, designed as an authoritarian, advice-giving session by a member of the staff of the Dean of Students; and Group D, no counseling--only a brief discussion of the offense.

Group E included students who were not seen in the Office of the Dean of Students but who had official disciplinary actions taken against them by student judicial boards in the residence halls.

B. Conclusions

There were no differences among the groups on the variables of age, college class, socio-economic information, and high school GPA prior to the experimental period. Group E had higher means for SAT-V, SAT-M, and college GPA.

At the end of the experimental period, there were no differences among the means of the groups on college GPA. The college GPA mean of Group E had dropped and the standard deviation had increased.

At the end of the follow-up period, only 37% of the students in Group A had graduated or were still enrolled in OSU. This was not significant but was considerably lower than the percentages for the other groups which ranged from 53% to 69%.

There were no significant differences among the groups concerning the number of later disciplinary referrals.

At the end of the follow-up period, there were no significant differences among the GPA means of the groups. Group A consistently maintained a higher actual mean GPA at the end of each academic term during the follow-up period. These differences reached significance only at the end of the first term after the experimental period. This supports the feelings of most researchers that counseling studies should be followed up for more than one term to more completely evaluate treatment effects.

C. Discussion

This attempt at a practical means of working with disciplinary referrals became obsolete by the time it was completed. The changing nature of the college scene and the demise of the concept of in loco parentis probably have negated any practical value of this study and future studies of this type.

Most universities, including Oregon State University, have now established student disciplinary boards which handle virtually all disciplinary referrals and have thus decreased the emphasis on disciplinary counseling and rehabilitation. The disciplinary counselor is slowly being replaced by an attorney or someone well versed in legal rather than counseling concepts.

Some writers in the field, usually influenced by Bakken (1967), fear that abandoning the counseling approach to discipline will cause college discipline to become punitive rather than educative. However, no data is available which indicates that university discipline is, in fact, either more educative or less punitive than that of civil authority.

The present study did not clearly show that any of the "educative treatments" offered by the Office of the Dean of Students were any more successful than the peer-group judicial boards (Group E) which handled disciplinary cases in the residence halls. The finding that at the end of the experimental period the mean GPA of Group E had decreased and the differences among the groups were no longer significant is highly interesting but less than conclusive. The student boards may be more objective and less personal than a dean since the boards often have only information concerning the offense and rarely have access to information concerning the student's past offenses, academic record, and family background. Also, the student boards are probably highly successful in certain types of cases. The peer pressure probably facilitates individual growth in the areas of adaptation to the needs of the group. However, the results of this study raise questions concerning the effect of the peer-group committees on the referred student.

It is doubtful that an appearance before a student board would help the individual to understand the motivations and behavioral patterns which underlie his social conflict, or "assist him in acquiring that personal growth and integration which facilitates the development of a more socially satisfactory and personally satisfying personality structure" (Williamson and Foley, 1949). However, an appearance before a student board would help the student "face and gain insight into the consequences of his delinquent behavior" (Williamson and Foley, 1949).

The appearance before a peer-group judicial board is often a traumatic experience for a student. Whether or not it is any more traumatic than being called before an official in the Dean's office cannot yet be stated but this writer would suspect so. This feeling is based on some local experience during a brief period when students had a choice of disciplinary boards.

During the fall term of 1966 the disciplinary committee which had the power to suspend students was being phased out. The committee consisted of the Dean of Students, the Dean of Men, and the Dean of the School in which the student was enrolled. The new committee, which was also in effect fall term 1966, consisted of five students and four faculty members. Thus, during the fall term 1966 the student involved in a case serious enough that suspension was to be considered was given the option of appearing before either of the two committees. Only one student of the nine referrals chose the student-faculty committee. These data, of course, concern only a small select group of students but lend some support to the concept and would be an interesting subject for future study.

D. Recommendations

About the only remaining possibility for future studies orientated toward the counseling of disciplinary referrals lies in the residence halls. The residence hall staff - the Head Resident, the Floor Advisors, and/or the elected officers--are usually undergraduate or young graduate students and are the individuals who have the bulk of the actual contact with students in disciplinary difficulties.

At several of the larger institutions, counselors from the Counseling Center actually have office hours within the residence halls. Thus, it would be relatively easy to replicate all or parts of present study using residence halls as treatment groups.

V. References

- Abrahamson, D. The psychology of crime. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960.
- Bakken, C. J. Legal aspects of in loco parentis. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8, 234-236.
- Callis, R. Educational aspects of in loco parentis. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8, 231-233.
- Clark, D. L. Exploring behavior in the men's residence halls using the MMPI. Personnel Guidance Journal, 1964, 43, 249-251.
- Cummins, E. J. Are disciplinary students different? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 624-627.
- Cummins, E. J., and Lindblade, Z. G. Sex-Based differences among student disciplinary offenders. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 81-85.
- Elton, C. F., & Rose, Harriett A. Personality characteristics: their relevance in disciplinary cases. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 431-435.
- Gometz, L., & Parker, C. A. Disciplinary Counseling: A contradiction? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 46, 437-443.
- Irvine, D. W. Graduation and withdrawal: an eight-year follow-up. College and University, 1965, 41, 32-40.
- Jackson, Karma R., and Clark, S. G. Theft among college students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 36, 557-562.
- Minowitz, O. Student drink problems. College Student Personnel Abstracts, 1966, 1, 157. (Abstract)
- Munter, P. K. The college community and alcohol. College Student Personnel Abstracts, 1966, 1, 193. (Abstract)
- LeMay, M. L., and Weigle, R. Group counseling with high and low ability groups. Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 59, 429. (Research brief).
- LeMay, M. L. Group counseling with college students: a review. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8, 286-295.

- LeMay, M. L., and Murphy, T. A. MMPI patterns of students referred for disciplinary reasons. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8, 85-89.
- LeMay, M. L. College disciplinary problems: a review of the literature. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9, 180-189. (a)
- LeMay, M. L. Birth order and college misconduct. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1968, 24, 167-169. (b)
- LeMay, M. L. College disciplinary referral for drinking. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1968, 29, 939-942. (c)
- LeMay, M. L., and Christensen, O. C. The uncontrollable nature of control groups. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 63-67.
- Nyman, A. J., and LeMay, M. L. Differentiation of disciplinary offenses with the Pd and Ma sub-scales. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 99-100.
- Osborne, R. T., Sanders, W. B., and Young, R. M. MMPI patterns of college disciplinary cases. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1956, 3, 52-56.
- Park, P. M. Problem drinking and social orientation. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University, 1958.
- Schoemer, J. R. The college pushout. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 46, 677-680.
- Snoxell, L. F. Counseling reluctant and recalcitrant students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1960, 2, 16-20.
- Straus, R., and Bacon, S. D. Drinking in college. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Tisdale, J. R. and Brown, F. G. Characteristics of college misconduct cases. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1965, 6, 359-366.
- Williams, A. F. Self-Concepts of college problem drinkers. I. A. comparison with alcoholics. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1965, 26, 586-594.
- Williamson, E. G. Preventive aspects of disciplinary counseling. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1956, 16, 68-87.

- Williamson, E. G. Student personnel services in college and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Williamson, E. G. The fusion of discipline and counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1955, 34, 74-79.
- Williamson, E. G. and Foley, J. D. Counseling and discipline. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949.
- Williamson, E. G., Jove, W. and Lagerstadt-Knudson, Barbara. What kinds of college students become disciplinary cases? Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1952, 12, 608-619.
- Wolf, I. Youth and alcohol. College Student Personnel Abstracts, 1966, 1, 194. (Abstract)
- Work, G. G. CPI patterns of college male disciplinary cases and a comparison group. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1969, 10, 223-226.

APPENDIX A

Disciplinary Charges

1. Alcohol Misconduct

- a. minor in possession
- b. public intoxication

2. Theft

- a. theft of state property
- b. theft of property of a member of the academic community
- c. shoplifting

3. Disorderly Conduct

- a. destruction of property
- b. assault and battery
- c. threats against persons or property

4. Minor Misconduct

- a. violation of residence hall regulations
- b. inter-personal relationships (with no loss of self-control)

5. Miscellaneous

- a. falsification of records
- b. academic dishonesty
- c. misuse of privileges
- d. practical joke resulting in damages to individual or state property

Table 10

Distribution of sample by major field,
college class and treatment group N=146

	Groups				
	A	B	C	D	E
<hr/>					
<u>Major Field</u>					
Agriculture	2	1	2	2	4
Business and Technology	6	7	6	4	5
Education	2	0	2	2	3
Engineering	4	8	5	6	7
Forestry	1	1	0	2	3
Humanities and Social Sciences	4	4	5	5	7
Pharmacy	1	1	0	1	0
Science	7	6	6	5	9
<u>College Class</u>					
Freshman	12	14	11	11	25
Sophomore	11	9	9	9	8
Junior	3	4	5	7	3
Senior	1	1	1	0	2