

Archives
closed
LD
175
A40k
TH
123

10-1
38

THE DISCIPLINARY PROCESS AT APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND STAFF

A Thesis

by

REBECCA KAY GURGANUS

Submitted to the Graduate School

Appalachian State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 1986

Major Department: Human Development and Psychological Counseling

William Leonard Eury
Appalachian Collection

THE DISCIPLINARY PROCESS AT APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND STAFF

A Thesis

by

Rebecca Kay Gurganus

May 1986

APPROVED BY:

Fred T. Badders

Fred T. Badders
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Glenda T. Hubbard

Glenda T. Hubbard
Member, Thesis Committee

Ben F. Strickland

Ben F. Strickland
Member, Thesis Committee

Fred T. Badders

Fred T. Badders
Chairperson, Department of Human
Development and Psychological Counseling

Joyce V. Lawrence

Joyce V. Lawrence
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Copyright by Rebecca Kay Gurganus 1986
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

THE DISCIPLINARY PROCESS AT APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND STAFF. (May 1986)

Rebecca Kay Gurganus, B. S., East Carolina University

M. A., Appalachian State University

Thesis Chairperson: Fred Badders

Colleges today set out to provide students with a well-rounded education. Discipline has been viewed as a part of that educational process. During the early college days, discipline was essentially a means of authoritative external control over the students. The concept of discipline has shifted towards helping students achieve self-discipline and responsible behavior. At the same time, changes in today's student, society, technology, and legal system have certainly influenced the disciplinary practices of today. Much emphasis in the last few years has centered on fair hearing and due process on behalf of the student.

The majority of colleges have established a student hearing board, modeled after the United States Court System, which hears disciplinary infractions and imposes sanctions. Appalachian State University has a student hearing board known as student court or student judiciary. Cases of disciplinary infractions are referred to student judiciary by

residence hall staff, ASU security, faculty, administrators, and/or an ASU student. The hearing body determines guilt or innocence of an individual based on the hearing and then recommends a sanction based on the individual case as well as precedent.

Concern has been expressed among student development educators that the overemphasis on legality has led to impersonal proceduralism and neglected the student's developmental needs as well as the educational value of discipline. Many questions have been raised concerning the effectiveness of a student court system on the college campus. Measuring the effectiveness of such a disciplinary system, however, is equally difficult because of so many uncontrollable variables.

An opinionnaire describing disciplinary situations which could (or have) occurred on the ASU campus was developed. The opinionnaire gathered the perceptions of a random sample of students, faculty, resident assistants, and resident directors concerning: 1) who is currently adjudicating disciplinary situations on campus; 2) who should be adjudicating each individual situation; and 3) what sanction should ideally be imposed.

The results indicated that the overall perceptions of students, faculty, resident assistants, and resident directors were very similar. For the most part, the highest percentage of each population was not aware of the current procedures for handling discipline cases on campus. In addition, according to perceptions, adjudication of discipline should be granted to differing groups depending on the situation. Finally, the sanctions recommended by the populations were much tougher and severe than are currently handed down.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
History of Discipline	2
<u>In Loco Parentis</u> Theory	4
Contractual Relationship Theory	7
Fiduciary Relationship Theory	8
Current Issues in Discipline	8
Today's Student	11
Discipline Rationale within the Residence Hall	14
Review of Previous Research	16
Method	24
Results and Discussion	27
Conclusion and Recommendations	68
References	76
Appendix A	79
Appendix B	84
Appendix C	89
Appendix D	94
Vita	99

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 1: Streaking (in the nude) through the Library	28
2. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 2: Cheating during an Exam	30
3. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 3: Theft of Neighbor's Watch	32
4. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 4: Drunk and Disorderly Conduct in the Residence Hall	34
5. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 5: Turning in Roommate's Paper for English Assignment	36
6. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 6: Violation of Visitation Hours in Residence Hall	37
7. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 7: Beer Bottle is thrown from Residence Hall Window	39
8. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 8: A Bomb Threat is Called in	41
9. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 9: Student Threatens to Assault another Student with a Knife	43
10. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 10: Furnishing False Information to Financial Aid Office	46
11. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 11: 20-year-old Sophomore Drinking Beer in a Public Area	47
12. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 12: Shoplifting from University Bookstore	49
13. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 13: Smoking Marijuana in Residence Hall	51
14. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 14: Pulling of False Fire Alarm	53

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
15. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 15: Writing Graffiti on Bathroom Walls	55
16. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 16: Fight Breaks out in Classroom	57
17. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 17: Duplication of University Master Key	59
18. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 18: 17 year-old Freshman Drinking Liquor in Lobby	60
19. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 19: Discharging a Fire Extinguisher just "for kicks"	62
20. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 20: Playing a Guitar Loudly in a Residence Hall	64
21. Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 21: Student Threatens Professor with Bodily Harm	66

Introduction

Discipline is viewed as a vital part of education on college campuses today. Discipline is not necessarily a form of punishment for wrongdoing, rather discipline is viewed as a teaching and learning process. Teaching in that students need to be taught self-discipline and responsible behavior to develop into mature citizens of the community (Jones, 1973; Stoops, King-Stoops, 1972). To assume that students possess this knowledge when they enter a university setting is rather presumptuous. After all, self-discipline does not just happen, it has to develop. DeSena (1965) acknowledges that "we place in a unique and unrealistic situation students who are still attempting to acquire status, self-identity, acceptance, and a feeling of belonging" (p. 175). Students must learn to assume responsibility and to discipline themselves.

The educational value of discipline simply cannot be neglected. If the university is indeed concerned with the total development of its students, then discipline must be expanded to meet the needs of today's students. Mash (1971) explains that there are essentially two causes of conflict between students and the institution.

The first is a change in the moral values of today's students. They cannot accept an institution of higher education that attempts to control through rules and regulations their personal appearance, their dating habits, their evening hours, and their private lives in general. The second, which is also a question of changing

values, is the state of society today. Indeed students make demands which appear directed only at the institution, but, on closer examination, one finds that matters which concern them--the abolition of R.O.T.C., black studies programs, federally financed research, and the like--are occasions for protest rather than issues of protest. (p. 148)

Pavela (1983) on the other hand, claims that much of the moral failings of today's student has been misdirected. He wonders why anyone should be surprised at the aimless and self-centered youth of today. He continues by stating:

What should be of greater concern is that those characteristics are no longer effectively challenged in the campus environment, largely because too many educators lack the courage to articulate a code of ethical conduct and have been captivated by therapeutic, legalistic or managerial responses to student behavior. (p. 32)

Just as student discipline is one of the functions of a college, likewise, discipline is not exempt from change. The time has come according to Smith and Kirk (1972) when "the regulation and discipline of student conduct has been forced to give up its traditionally privileged position" (p. 282) and become subject to constitutional rights, meeting the needs of students, and also serving as an educational process.

History of Discipline

As far back as the colonial period (1630 to 1780) discipline was a prevalent concern among the colleges. The colonists' primary concern was with students' "religious, moral, and vocational life" as opposed to their intellectual development (Leonard, 1956, p. 4). It was the responsibility of the college president to deal with student discipline problems since "discipline was considered a part of the moral and

ethical training of students and was used for total behavior control" (Dannells, 1977, p. 232). According to Leonard (1956), the rules regarding conduct were very strict. For example:

Students were forbidden to lie, steal, curse, swear, use obscene language, play at cards or dice, get drunk, frequent inns, associate with any person of bad reputation, commit fornication, fight cocks, call each other nicknames, buy, sell, or exchange anything, or be disrespectful or tardy or disorderly at public worship. (p. 27)

Punishments for misbehavior ranged from confessions to public whippings to expulsion from college (Leonard, 1956; Dannells, 1977).

During the early federal period, 1780 to 1812, the main concern was still on the moral upbringing of the student. However, some of that authority to discipline was delegated to the faculty in addition to the president. Leonard (1956) noted that "the disciplinary problems were ever present and often of a very serious nature" (p. 49). Even during this period the rules were still very strict as Leonard (1956) again recorded

blasphemy, swearing, using indecent or profane language or gestures, singing immodest songs, being habitually indolent, defaming, insulting, or abusing another student, lying, cheating in class, or selling or buying any books or apparel worth more than two dollars without permission were all considered crimes meriting heavy penalties. (p. 56)

It was the years of expansion, 1812 to 1862 that began to produce some changes. Factors which contributed to these changes included the increase in enrollment which made the intimate relationship between the president and students virtually impossible; secondly, the separation of the church and state in higher education led to a reduction in the paternalistic and behavior control approaches as emphasis was directed toward intellectual development. The president began appointing a

disciplinary specialist to handle disciplinary matters. As a result, student-faculty relations improved since the faculty were less involved in the disciplinary process. Finally, the differing aims and objectives of the colleges began to bring together young people with differing cultural backgrounds (Dannells, 1977; Leonard, 1956).

A concentrated emphasis was placed on student self-discipline and self-governance during the years prior to 1900. Concern for the individual student began to develop and disciplinary systems became more democratic. Student input in the disciplinary process was increased as honors systems and student governments were formed (Dannells, 1977). One of the disciplinary issues that developed during this period involved defining the relationship that exists between the student and the institution (Mash, 1971; Cazier, 1973). Out of this issue developed many so-called "theories" of discipline.

In Loco Parentis Theory

Up until the mid-1900's, the courts upheld administrative decisions regarding discipline because the schools were said to be in loco parentis, or standing in place of the parents. The Gott v. Berea College case (1913) illustrates this point. This case involved rules and regulations that the college had made prohibiting students from entering certain eating establishments or amusement places in the local town. Any students found disobeying the regulation were dismissed from school. When the parents of students took the case to court, the court upheld the decision of the college on the opinion that "'As a father may direct his children, those in charge of the college are well within

their rights and powers when they direct students what to eat, where they may go, and what forms of amusement are forbidden'" (quoted in Mash, 1971, p. 150). Essentially, the state courts "had focused their attention on the power and the responsibility of school authorities generally to do as they pleased to maintain strict discipline in the schools" (Jones, 1973, p. 14). This inherent authority was often abused by the college. For example, in 1958 a student at a private university was dismissed for stating atheistic views and at that time the court upheld the decision (Mash, 1971).

However, changes began to take place with the Gault case which was the first reversal of the court regarding the in loco parentis theory. As a result of that case, juveniles in court are now guaranteed the right to notice of charges, counsel, witnesses, and the same due process rights that are accorded to adults (Jones, 1973; Bolmeier, 1976). As Jones (1973) noted, the federal courts were beginning to "examine the issues as they affected the constitutional rights of the individual student" (p. 14). However, it was Dixon v. Alabama (1961) that probably most revolutionized changes within the colleges.

The Dixon v. Alabama case came during the advent of the civil rights movement. In this particular case, students had been participating in civil rights activities. As a result of their participation, they were expelled from the university by the president of the college. Courts now began to view education as property "based on the recognition that education had become increasingly important to the socioeconomic future of students. Deprivation of education or dismissal from college was thereby viewed as the loss of a property

right" (Dannells, 1977, p. 249). Cazier (1973) comments that the major significance of the Dixon case "was not the enunciation of specific due process considerations, but the recognition that public colleges and universities are extensions of government and thereby come under the guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment in the administration of student discipline" (p. 4).

At the same time, Upcraft (1982) notes that a revolution was occurring in the residence halls.

Students began questioning the concept of in loco parentis as a basis for a college-student relationship and successfully killed off most of the rules and regulations they considered offensive to their individual freedom. In residence halls, rules that infringed upon students' privacy in their rooms were eliminated, and freer association of the sexes was permitted, including continuous visiting rights and coeducational residence halls. (p. 4)

Thus, the concept of in loco parentis slowly began to fade. For institutions which continue to operate under the in loco parentis concept, Harms (1970) suggests that "it is conceivable that colleges and universities of the future will be held responsible, as the parent under law, to educate the citizen to his maximum potential in keeping with his station in life" (p. 24). For example, if an institution continues to operate under the in loco parentis concept, then the institution may be held responsible for the "further training and education of the student later in life as he is required to retrain for another occupation due to the obsolescence or phasing out of one for which he prepared" (Harms, 1979, p. 24). For schools which do not want to accept that possible future responsibility, perhaps it is time to "bury the anachronism of an earlier and simpler era" (Harms, 1970, p.24).

Devine and Loesch conducted a study in 1976 regarding "In Loco Parentis and the New Age of Majority: Views of Freshmen and Their Parents." Questionnaires were administered to 128 freshmen and 113 parents during a student orientation session. Results indicated that parents on the one hand wanted the university to act in their place as a parent and yet, on the other hand, they wanted the university to treat their child as an adult. Student responses showed a greater desire for independence and freedom of behavior than the response of their parents. Devine and Loesch (1976) concluded that "students and parents want the university to acknowledge and respect the student's legal rights and independence, yet they also want the university to be highly involved in significant activities in the student's life" (p. 424).

Contractual Relationship Theory

Since the concept of in loco parentis is being rejected by most courts, a popular competitor is the theory of ex contractu, or contract theory (Cazier, 1973). This theory merely defines the relationship between the student and institution as a contractual one. Dannels (1977) explains that "the contract is the statement of conditions in the college's catalogue and other publications which the student agrees to by signing the registration card. The student accepts the rules in order to obtain the education and the degree offered by the institution" (p. 243). This theory is also being rejected by the courts based on the inequality of the relationship. Mash (1971) argues that "certainly those contracts that require a student to consent to arbitrary dismissal for any reason before he enters should not be considered valid" (p.150).

Fiduciary Relationship Theory

The fiduciary relationship views the institution in the capacity of a fiduciary to its students. Mash (1971) defines a fiduciary as one "whose function it is to act for the benefit of another in matters concerning the relationship between them." One of the duties of the fiduciary is to make known all relevant facts in any transaction that may take place. Dannells (1977) explains that the theory "prevents the student from having to prove his or her innocence in disciplinary hearings; it prevents the school from hiding its sources of information . . ." (p. 244). Cazier (1973) mentions one of the finer points of the fiduciary relationship is that it seems to "project the university-student relationship with more accuracy and yet with greater possibilities than other concepts" (p. 14). At the same time, however, the relationship of the institution to the student is still changing. In loco parentis theory has faded, contractual theory is being scrutinized in the courts, and even the fiduciary relationship is on shaky grounds. Currently, there are many issues within the area of discipline that need to be examined.

Current Issues in Discipline

The student personnel point of view toward discipline is cited by DeSena (1965) as a belief:

that the administration of discipline for the sake of punishment alone is not successful in preventing future disciplinary situations from occurring, and is of very little benefit to the student affected. Disciplinary measures should always attempt to help the student develop into a well-adjusted individual able to

maintain his individuality, and at the same time adapt to the needs of the group. (p. 175)

In addition, Mash (1971) cites a study conducted by the New York University School of Law which studied discipline and offered three reasons why a university must promote discipline: (1) to assure that students are achieving their educational objectives, (2) to assure an intellectual and educational atmosphere throughout the university, and (3) to assure safety of welfare and property to all university members.

Our American society is regarded as a highly legalistic one (Mash, 1971) and even in the realm of education, the terms "due process" and "fair hearing" have become fairly commonplace. Carlson and Hubbell (1971) are among those who have expressed concern that perhaps the discipline process has become too formal and legalistic. They state that "these factors have transformed the disciplinary function from a paternalistic but highly personalized system to one which has become legalistic and concerned with the process of adjudication rather than concerned for the individual" (p. 127). Dollar (1969) reminds administrators involved with discipline that they "must not abdicate educational responsibilities in response to pressures to adopt the courtroom model for their own proceedings" (p. 222).

Ostroth and Hill (1978) warn that "in shifting procedural emphases, student affairs professionals risk losing touch with the accused student as a person. It is easy to focus totally on procedures and thus neglect the developmental needs of the student" (p. 33). Pavela (1983) goes even a step further to state that when procedure becomes the central

focus, disciplinarians are essentially avoiding "the demanding task of defending the ethical precepts that support the community's--or the institution's--expectations and standards of behavior" (p. 32). At the same time, Pavela (1983) argues against proceduralism because

proceduralism . . . allows educators who have not defined ethical standards, or who lack the courage to express them, to evade the occasionally painful duty of imposing a just punishment. The campus is then deprived of one of its few remaining ways of offering effective moral and ethical guidelines. (p. 32)

Ostroth and Hill (1978) support the student personnel view of discipline by stating that "the disciplinary hearing must be a growth-producing experience; the student must really learn something" (p. 34). Facilitating growth is at the very core of the student development model and certainly any disciplinary encounter presents itself as a golden opportunity. "The helping approach to discipline aims to promote by assisting the student to deal maturely with questions of personal responsibility" (p. 34). Just as developmental models exist in student development, Ostroth and Hill (1978) propose a developmental model for the disciplinary encounter whereby the model helps students maturely cope with value questions regarding behavior. Next, the model proposes assisting students in understanding causes for their behavior, helping students to accept responsibility for their actions and learning to redirect behavior, and finally to promote thinking in advance to consider possible consequences from behavior.

This model does not overlook due process or a student's right to a fair hearing; instead it means going "beyond the rudiments of fair procedure to explain underlying philosophies and details to the student" (p. 35). Even though many large institutions do have student judicial

committees, Ostroth and Hill (1978) propose post-hearing meetings to round out the entire developmental process.

Stoops and King-Stoops (1972) remind us that "discipline is not only here to stay but is to become more and more sophisticated and indispensable" (p. 11). Dalton and Healy (1984) suggest that "if present trends continue, student conduct issues may increasingly represent one of the most strategic areas for student development intervention" (p. 24).

Today's Student

Discipline codes of today must deal with issues that were unheard of years ago and also must keep up with the changing student of today. Levine (1980) distributed a list of 52 words and phrases to administrators and asked them to describe how students on their campus had changed since 1969-70. Responses indicated that students were more career oriented, better groomed, more concerned with material success, more concerned with self, and more practical.

One of the problems with discipline concerns the social and moral conduct--what is and is not acceptable and by whom. Unfortunately, students of today are caught up in three societies: adult world of their parents, late adolescent world of their comrades, and the scholarly world of college. The problem exists when each society has a differing level of acceptable behavior (Hubbell, 1966).

Based on "Freshman Characteristics and Attitudes" as published in The Chronicle of Higher Education (Jan, 1985), the facts reveal that our students of today are indeed changing. The most significant changes

have taken place in student interest shifting first to "being very well off financially" which reached an all time high of 69.3% in 1983 compared to 43.5% in 1967. Secondly, development of a "meaningful philosophy of life" reached an all time low, 44.1% versus 82.9% in 1967. The last significant change is reflected in a decline of high school grades for the third year.

Walsh and Cowles (1982) point out that today's individual has become a "victim of a social and economic system that has separated him from the traditional sources of community life and responsibility" (p. 3). According to Levine (1980), there are many additional changing factors that cause today's individual to be a "victim". For instance, the divorce rate has doubled in the ten years between 1967-1977 with one out of three marriages ending in divorce. Thus, the number of single-parent families has increased. The proportion of college freshmen whose mothers are full-time housewives dropped to 29% in 1979 compared to 55% ten years earlier.

Levine (1980) continues to report that in 1969 undergraduates were asked what was most essential for them to get out of college and the highest ranking was learning to get along with other people followed by formulating values and goals for their lives. Seven years later, these items fell to third and fourth rank replaced by getting a detailed grasp of a special field and obtaining training and skills for an occupation.

Socially, this is a liberal generation of which "a majority supports expanded roles for women, legalized abortion, and the overturning of prohibitions on homosexual relations. About half favor legalization of marijuana, liberalization of divorce laws, casual (as

distinguished from promiscuous) sexual relationships, and living together before marriage" (Levine, 1980, p. 84-85). Finally, Levine (1980) summarizes today's student as:

- self-concerned and me-oriented
- nonideological
- disenchanted with politics
- moderate in political attitudes
- liberal in social attitudes
- weak in basic skills
- career-oriented
- competitive
- diverse in lifestyles and background
- concerned with personal development (physical and spiritual)
- optimistic about their individual futures
- pessimistic about the future of the country
- interested in material success
- friendly and pleasant
- pragmatic (p. 131)

In regard to discipline, Pavela (1982) comments that in essence our society sends out hidden messages that actually complement the "me generation." For example, on a campus in California, an official noted that students are rarely suspended for cheating or plagiarism because "we like to stress the educational aspects of academic dishonesty and put more emphasis on helping the person understand the behavior" (p. 32). However, Pavela interprets the hidden messages to mean:

- The 'needs' of the individual take precedence over the interests of the community
- No rule is important enough to justify causing discomfort to those who violate it
- Those who engage in prohibited behavior are not fully capable of making moral decisions and are obviously in need of some sort of professional 'treatment'
- The exercise of authority should be disguised by benevolent language in order to avoid confrontations over ethical issues (p. 32)

Pavela (1983) further comments that often colleges try to downplay the "fact that sanctions for student misbehavior should be imposed for

reasons of retribution and deterrence" (p. 32). In applying such sanction, "it teaches that self-control is a necessary part of living in an orderly society" (Pavela, 1983, p.32). In addition, Pavela (1983) further comments that "the imposition of just but unpleasant consequences has the added value of affirming the autonomy and personal accountability of the offender, who, if treated as a responsible adult may begin to act like one" (p. 32).

In, Where Colleges Fail, Sanford (1967) reminds us that

all generations of college students have in common their youth and their developmental status. Typically they have problems of identity and self-esteem. They are idealistic and easily disillusioned They are torn between loyalty to old values and to others newly found. (p. 30)

Since youth of today are influenced by those around them, Pavela (1983) questions how we can criticize the values of the "me generation" without looking within our colleges and universities to see how those values are being tolerated and nurtured.

Discipline Rationale within the Residence Hall

Beder and Rickard (1971) explain that "student personnel staff in residence are caught in the crossfire between the external pressures on the university to control student behavior and student demands for increased freedom over their life outside the classroom" (p. 57). Greenleaf (1969) states that "too often residence hall staff members have been forced in a 'control' role to the extent that they have lost essential rapport with students and their effectiveness as advisors" (p. 65). Shay (1969) concurs in terms of the philosophy behind many

residence hall programs as the philosophy of "organizing and controlling group behavior rather than facilitating freedom of choice" (p. 76).

One of the problems often encountered in residence halls is pointed out by Shay (1969) where "many responsible students become irked when a regulation designed to prevent abuse by a minority restricts their freedom" (p. 77). He further explains that often "residence hall policies attempt to force students to conform to a mold which may no longer be viable" (p. 78).

Even as discipline is changing so must the roles of those who enforce discipline. Greenleaf (1970) states, "We no longer say, 'Do as I say, because I said so.' We must be able to help students see why--as students put it, to see relevance. We must be willing to listen, to change, . . ." (p. 8). In looking towards the future, Smith and Kirk (1971) predict that "rules of all kinds, but especially those involving directed damage at the student, i.e., student conduct regulations, and discipline actions, will have to be justified to an increasing degree. Students will not be satisfied with vague references to 'policy' or 'tradition'" (p. 31).

Beder and Rickard (1971) propose a model whereby the institution's relationship to a residence hall student is that of landlord. This would allow students and staff to focus on quality of interpersonal relations rather than institutional rules and regulations. Social regulations would be developed by the students and would follow civil law as a model. This means direct personal injury becomes basis for legal action. In this process, "a violation will occur not when an individual has broken the dictates of some written code, but when he

feels that his rights have been infringed upon by another person regardless of specific circumstances" (p. 60). The primary advantage would be that the "individual harmed is reacting with another individual rather than an impersonal institution as he would be if the university were to dictate the social rules" (p. 60). A judicial body would serve as arbitrator if needed and sanctions would be effective only if one party refused to abide by arbitration. Beder and Rickard conclude by suggesting that the proposed model "recognizes the need for a structure which balances the regulatory needs of the university with the developmental needs of students" (p. 61).

Review of Previous Research

Dannells (1977) attributes the small amount of research in the area of discipline

to the fact that the concept or definition of discipline and, therefore, the criteria for judging an individual as a disciplinary case keep changing and to the fact that 'the concept involves several variables which cannot be adequately managed for research purposes, granting that they can even be identified.' (p. 265)

In addition, the vast majority of research recorded in the journals was conducted in the sixties and early seventies and few studies in the area have been made since. Much of the emphasis in the last fifteen years has turned towards the procedural and legalistic aspect of discipline with the other aspects being neglected.

For example, in 1984, a national survey was conducted by Steele, Johnson, and Rickard to see how the judicial function at the college level was administered. Part of their objective was to note changes that may have occurred since the Dixon v. Alabama case which

considerably altered the in loco parentis concept that prevailed at most colleges and universities. Chief student affairs officers from private and public schools of varying sizes were surveyed. When asked if changes were needed in their own judicial program, 42% responded that some change (varying from minor to substantial change) was needed. Those institutions wanting to change were concerned "that the judicial system had become overly legalistic. Many schools stated specifically that they were examining policies and procedures to streamline the judicial process and provide more timely, less complicated, less legalistic hearings" (p. 341). Some of the schools were considering the establishment of minor court to deal with minor offenses. Other schools were planning to designate judicial affairs administration specifically for student conduct. In a survey conducted by Ostroth, Armstrong, and Campbell in 1978, the authors found that the "major changes in the past five years include liberalization of rules, more elaborate judicial structures, and standardization of due process procedures" (p. 26).

Because of the overwhelming amount of time spent with disciplinary problems and the legal implications involved, schools are beginning to set up a judicial affairs office (Dalton and Healy, 1984). Some of the benefits in having a judicial affairs office as cited by Steele, Johnson, and Rickard (1984) include the fact that due process and fairness would be ensured in cases, the student affairs staff would have time to become involved in other activities, the school's judicial expertise would be increased while the likelihood of managerial conflict would be decreased, and better enforcement of rules and regulations could be provided. In a study conducted by Ostroth, Armstrong, and

Campbell (1978), however, many deans were still found to play a major role in discipline. When Steele, Johnson, and Rickard (1984) asked the Chief Student Affairs Officer if a judicial office had been established at his school, 88% responded negatively.

To further indicate the lack of current research, Tryon's (1981) study which examined the recurrence of topics published in the Journal of College Student Personnel indicated that in 1974, 3.8% of the articles were related to "student conduct" and thus received a rank ordering of 8.5 in terms of relevance to prevalent issues. Yet, in 1979, only .8% of the articles were related to discipline and the ranking had dropped to 14.33.

During the sixties, numerous studies were conducted to determine the attitudes of students, student personnel workers, faculty, and parents. As Hodinko (1964) stated in a survey he conducted of student opinions, "it is not suggested that student opinion be set up as a standard or norm to be obeyed, but that it should be given careful consideration in the formulation of campus regulations" (p. 217). Prusok (1961) believed that

a knowledge of contemporary student mores, then, would seem valuable not only in providing maximum assistance to the individual student in the disciplinary situation, but also in modifying existing disciplinary programs and institutional regulations to bring them up to date in terms of student mores. (p. 247)

Likewise, Smith and Kirk (1971) contended that "student discipline simply cannot relate to the modern student unless it is refashioned in his terms" (p. 28). This suggests that perhaps the needs of today's students should be re-examined and the disciplinary process suited to fit those needs. Based on these underlying assumptions, attitudinal

studies were conducted in the area of discipline with hopes of producing information that would enable the disciplinary process to be more effective.

Hodinko (1964) used a Student Opinionnaire which consisted of seventeen hypothetical disciplinary situations and asked approximately 500 undergraduate students to indicate one of five disciplinary actions they felt would be appropriate. Students issued the most severe actions in incidents involving theft for material value and cheating involving collusion, while at the same time men were significantly more critical of these acts than were women. On the other hand, the students were not supportive of school policies against alcohol. Older students appeared to be less tolerant of misbehavior as they regarded incidents like setting a false fire alarm, premeditated cheating, and theft of money with more condemnation than younger students.

In a similar study, Prusok (1961) administered a questionnaire based on actual male disciplinary cases to 266 students, nine student personnel workers, and 366 parents. Each respondent was asked to assign a disciplinary action based on a scale from "least" to "most" severe in each situation. Prusok observed there were significant differences between female and male students, female students and female parents, and female students and male parents. In each of these relationships the female students indicated a less punitive attitude.

On the other hand, student personnel workers responded with a more punitive attitude over the entire range of cases than either parents or students. Prusok (1963) noted that these data concerning student personnel workers were unexpected "since our academic colleagues have

grown fond of accusing us of 'coddling' students . . . and since our own philosophical commitments have increasingly stressed re-education rather than punishment as our primary disciplinary concern" (p. 14). Before discussing the implications of these data, Prusok (1963) expanded his original study to include 57 additional student personnel workers from various midwestern institutions. The results indicated that "the new sample of student personnel workers endorsed even more punitive actions than did the local personnel workers, and, hence, were even more disparate with the attitudes of students and parents" (Prusok, 1963, p. 14).

However, in a later study conducted by Hubbell (1966), college student personnel workers were the most lenient in their attitudes regarding discipline. Hubbell (1966) listed ten detailed incidents of misbehavior that had occurred on campus and asked respondents to select one of five possible disciplinary actions to: "(A) 'Please check the one action you think the university actually took,' (B) 'Please check the one action you think ought to have been taken if you had the authority and responsibility'"(p. 261). Respondents included 590 students, 228 parents, 226 full-time faculty, and 221 student personnel workers including the residence hall, counseling, advising, and disciplinary staffs (Hubbell, 1966).

Hubbell (1966) compared the four groups across all cases and found that all four groups differed significantly from each other in estimating the action the university had actually taken. Students thought the university would be the most severe while student personnel workers guessed the university would be the most lenient. In

recommending the appropriate action to be taken, student responses were not the strictest of the four groups "as might have been expected by an armchair understanding of 'peer group severity'" (p. 264). Parents chose the strictest disciplinary action while the student personnel staff were once again most lenient in their own choices of disciplinary action.

In a more recent study, Jenison (1972) surveyed 460 students and 201 faculty using a questionnaire which was a variation of the instrument used by Hodinko (1964). Jenison found that significant differences existed in how students and faculty members would adjudicate disciplinary situations. Faculty generally assigned a more severe action to academic dishonesty than students. Differences existed between student classification with seniors taking the most severe action. Also, students living in a residence hall tended to take more severe action than those who lived off-campus. Significant differences by sex between the faculty existed with the males being much more severe in certain disciplinary situations than were female faculty. In his discussion, Jenison (1972) notes that perhaps there will always be "some dissatisfaction in the academic community with the way persons responsible for discipline adjudicate the various offenses" (p. 293). He further adds that "It is well, though, periodically to assess the perceptions and attitudes of the members of the university community, particularly students, toward behavioral issues to enhance the effectiveness of university officials in helping students make more satisfactory social adjustments" (p. 293).

Concern for the effectiveness of student discipline prompted Dollar (1969) to conduct a study among students who had been involved in the discipline process. In this study, Dollar defined a disciplined student "as one who had received an official reprimand, conduct probation, or suspension from his college" (p. 219). The 217 subjects were asked to respond to statements regarding the college's discipline process on a scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. Consensus was not found on any one statement; however, the weight of response was generally very positive and supportive. Overall, the majority of respondents rated the system as fair and agreed that the hearings were conducted fairly. On the other hand, students rejected stricter measures of discipline as a means for helping the college student.

In a similar study, William and Rhodes (1969) surveyed male students who had received official disciplinary action from the university and a random sample of male and female students who had not been involved in the disciplinary process. Each completed a questionnaire concerning the university disciplinary process. Unexpected results indicated that disciplined males were more positive about the disciplinary process than non-disciplined males. Significant items indicated that students who were more nonacademically satisfied had a more favorable view of the disciplinary process. As William and Rhodes (1969) concluded, "a positive relationship exists between nonacademic satisfaction and favorable attitudes about disciplinary procedures" (p. 393). They further hypothesized "that attitudes about the specific area of disciplinary procedures may be a function of a type of global view of the nonacademic environment, e.g., student criticism

of the disciplinary process may only be an expression of a general, nonacademic discontent" (p. 396). William and Rhodes (1969) also theorize that perhaps disciplined males had a more favorable view of the disciplinary process since they had been directly involved and perhaps had more knowledge of how it worked as opposed to the non-disciplined male.

In an effort to attain an in-depth view of discipline and why individuals may view certain incidents with more severity than others, Biggs and Brown (1977) conducted a study among 391 students at a university. Students were to account for 29 instances of misconduct on the basis of four views: stable choice, variable choice, historic student role, or current campus environment. In addition, students were asked to assign an action for such misconduct ranging from no action to permanently suspending the student. Lastly, students were to indicate whether 12 of those instances were always, sometimes, or never justified. The research revealed that student misconduct which is caused by trait or personal qualities (i.e., blowing up a university building, stealing, assaulting a professor) places a high emphasis on personal responsibility. Whereas, student misconduct caused by environmental factors (i.e., streaking, writing graffiti on the bathroom walls, drinking liquor at sports events, smoking marijuana in a dormitory) places a low emphasis on personal responsibility. Likewise, "the more students attributed the causes of student misconduct to trait causal factors, the more severe are their recommended disciplinary actions." And consequently, "the more students attribute misconduct to trait causal factors, the less acceptable they find the misconduct"

(Biggs and Brown, 1977, p. 107). Furthermore, Biggs and Brown (1977) suggest that perhaps "campus judiciary groups need to develop a heightened awareness of their own theories of causal attribution and how these affect their decision making" (p. 108).

In light of the attitudinal studies that have been conducted it seems that one of the best ways to know the views on a campus is to ask those people involved.

Method

An opinionnaire was developed based on attitudinal studies conducted during the sixties. The opinionnaire (see Appendices A, B, C, and D) consisted of 21 disciplinary situations in which the respondents were told "are typical of a college campus and could (or have) occurred at ASU." Situations described incidents involving cheating, stealing, residence hall rules and regulations, tampering with fire equipment, and miscellaneous incidents. Respondents were instructed to answer three separate questions for each situation: (1) "WHO do you think currently adjudicates (judges or decides) the disciplinary sanction imposed on the student?" (2) "WHO do you think SHOULD adjudicate (judge or decide) the disciplinary situation?" (3) "WHAT disciplinary sanction do you think would be appropriate in each situation?"

With respect to the questions concerning who currently adjudicates and who should adjudicate, respondents were asked to choose one response from the following choices: 1) No action is/should be taken, 2) Student Court, 3) Residence Hall Staff, 4) Academic Administration, 5) ASU Security, 6) Local Law Officials, 7) Student Affairs Administration, or

8) Don't know. A broad representative of eight choices was available for the question of what sanction to impose: A) None, B) Verbal/Written Warning, C) Counseling, D) Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime"), E) Probation, F) Suspension, G) Expulsion, or H) Don't Know.

A random sample of 500 undergraduate students and 75 faculty members received an opinionnaire through the mail. Opinionnaires were distributed to a stratified random sample of 55 Resident Assistants (undergraduate residence life staff who in most situations are responsible for a floor of 30-48 residents) and all seventeen Resident Directors (graduate students responsible for an entire residence hall building). A total of 157 completed opinionnaires were received with an overall return rate of 24%. Student opinionnaires had a return rate of 19% and were representative of 1.16% of the student population with 37 males responding and 58 females. The student responses were proportional to the freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior classes.

Faculty responses yielded a 32% return rate with 19 males and 4 females responding. Resident assistants had a return rate of 44% with 10 males and 15 females. A resident director return rate of 82% yielded 5 male and 9 female opinionnaires.

Each of the respondents received the same opinionnaire (see Appendices A, B, C, and D) consisting of the 21 disciplinary situations; however, demographic information was somewhat different for each population and the opinionnaire was changed accordingly. In addition to sex and classification, students were also asked to identify whether they currently live on-campus or off-campus; how many semesters they have lived in a residence hall at Appalachian State University; and

their current cumulative grade point average. Students, Resident Assistants, and Resident Directors were also asked "Have you ever been charged with any disciplinary violation(s) with formal action taken by: (a) Student Court, (b) Residence Hall Staff, (c) Academic Administration, (d) ASU Security, (e) Local Law Officials, (f) Student Affairs Administrators?" Respondents were to indicate either "yes" or "no" for each question.

Faculty were asked to state their sex; whether they teach primarily 1) undergraduates, 2) graduates, 3) both; are they considered 1) Full time instructor, 2) Full time administrator, 3) Faculty/Administrator; and finally, how many years of employment at ASU. Demographics for the Resident Assistants and Resident Directors included sex, student classification, the number of semesters as a RA/RD, predominate classification of their floor or building (freshman or upperclassman), visitation option of their floor/building, and cumulative grade point average.

Cross-tabulations were computed for students, faculty, resident assistants, and resident directors to determine the modal response of each group. These responses were then compared for each situation and analyzed accordingly. Cross-tabulations were also arranged according to male and female student responses, students who live on-campus or off-campus, and cross-tabulations by the number of semesters a student has lived in the residence hall and the number of years faculty have taught at Appalachian. This investigation was limited by the unequal distribution across the four populations. Consequently, statistical

analysis of significant differences between the four populations was not possible.

Results and Discussion

Situation 1: A student is apprehended while streaking (in the nude) through the library. With respect to "Who currently adjudicates," students (32.6%), faculty (26.1%), and resident directors (21.4%), acknowledged that they "don't know." The highest percentage of resident assistants believed ASU Security would deal with the matter as did a portion of students and resident directors. The majority of resident directors expressed that student court would adjudicate as did the faculty. In response to "Who should adjudicate," opinions were divided among the four groups between ASU Security and student court (as shown in Table 1). When asked "What sanction imposed," students (32.6%), resident assistants (40%), resident directors (42.9%), and faculty (21.7%) agreed that a creative sanction should be imposed. Other faculty members were split between counseling (26.1%) and probation (21.7%).

This suggests that although this situation is not a very serious offense, nonetheless, respondents want some kind of action to be taken. Since the option of creative sanction was merely defined as a sanction designed to "fit the crime," further inferences could be drawn that respondents are not sure what sanction to recommend, yet, certainly feel something should be done. On the other hand, a senior female student commented that she did not view streaking as an infraction of the law. She thought it merely added "some humor to an otherwise tense and

Table 1

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 1: Streaking (in the nude) Through the Library.

Adjudicator	Currently adjudicates				Should adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	2.1	13.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	4.3	0.0	0.0
Student Court	22.1	30.4	40.0	42.9	34.7	34.8	32.0	50.0
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic Administration	3.2	4.3	4.0	0.0	5.3	8.7	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	30.5	17.4	48.0	21.0	36.8	30.4	40.0	14.3
Local Law Officials	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	9.5	8.7	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	4.3	28.0	21.4
Don't Know	32.6	26.1	8.0	21.4	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	0.0	4.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	14.3
No Response	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	5.3	4.3	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	15.8	4.3	12.0	14.3
Counseling	10.5	26.1	4.0	7.1
Creative Sanction	32.6	21.7	40.0	42.9
Probation	20.0	21.7	20.0	21.4
Suspension	4.2	8.7	4.0	7.1
Expulsion	4.2	0.0	4.0	0.0
Don't Know	3.2	0.0	4.0	0.0
Combination Responses	4.2	8.7	12.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

competitive academic atmosphere . . . and if I had a decent tan then I'd be streaking also."

Situation 2: A professor finds a student using unauthorized (cheat) notes during a final exam. Students (47.4%) and resident assistants (72%) both agree that Academic Administration currently handles the situation while faculty (47.8%) and resident directors (57.1%) are correct in stating student court currently deals with the matter. As to "Who should adjudicate," students (66.3%), faculty (47.8%), resident assistants (88%), and resident directors (71.4%) all concur that academic administration should deal with the matter. An additional 26.3% of students and 21.7% of faculty want to leave the matter with student court. When asked "What sanction imposed," a variety of all four groups recommended suspension (as shown in Table 2). The remaining respondents were divided between probation and expulsion.

All four groups indicate that this is a rather serious incident and believe the sanction should be equally serious. A sophomore male student expressed that cheating should be a school policy and should be uniform. Likewise, a senior male resident assistant stated that sanctions for incidents like cheating should be stated "up front and explicitly." This is perhaps indicative that the university needs to take a firmer stand on the issue of cheating on campus. A male faculty member stated that academic dishonesty is "not a topic to be handled by student court." Other faculty members expressed a desire to handle incidents involving cheating within their classroom. Another male faculty member mentioned that academic dishonesty is a rising campus problem and felt the "university should establish and publish a faculty

Table 2

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 2: Cheating during an Exam.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	24.2	47.8	20.0	57.1	26.3	21.7	4.0	14.3
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic Administration	47.4	17.4	72.0	28.6	66.3	47.8	88.0	71.4
ASU Security	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	4.3	8.0	0.0
Don't Know	18.9	21.7	8.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	1.1	8.7	0.0	14.3	2.1	17.4	0.0	7.1
No Response	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	6.3	8.7	0.0	7.1
Counseling	1.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	12.6	8.7	16.0	0.0
Probation	27.4	30.4	8.0	21.4
Suspension	26.3	17.4	52.0	50.0
Expulsion	21.1	17.4	20.0	14.3
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	5.3	13.0	4.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

member's right to judge this unsatisfactory completion of work and automatically award a grade of F in a course." A male senior commented that he has "been amazed at the cheating I have seen in the classroom at ASU. One reason is that student court refuses to expel students for this. Cheating should be automatic expulsion and should be handled through a faculty or administrative board at ASU."

Situation 3: A student living in the residence hall steals his neighbor's watch while his neighbor is in the shower. As shown in Table 3, student, faculty, resident assistant and resident director opinions as to "Who currently adjudicates," are somewhat varied between student court, residence hall staff, and ASU Security. Students (35.8%) think that residence hall staff currently deal with the situation while 50% of the resident directors think it is a matter for student court. When asked the ideal of "Who should adjudicate," responses again vary among the four groups. It is interesting to note, however, that students (28.4%), faculty (39.1%), and resident assistants (28%) believe that local law officials should deal with the matter. These groups want to go beyond campus measures and involve the local law officials. One sophomore female student commented that "local authorities should be more involved with ASU securities [sic] actions concerning theft, assault, or generally more serious crimes." The remaining students (26.3%), faculty (30.4%), and resident assistants (24%) believe ASU security should be involved. The most popular sanction recommended is that of creative sanction. The next option suggested involves suspension. Once again, respondents seem to be indicating that they are really not sure what to do with the offender but something should be

Table 3

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 3: Theft of Neighbor's Watch.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	9.5	26.1	28.0	50.0	10.5	8.7	12.0	42.9
Residence Hall Staff	35.8	26.1	28.0	7.1	23.2	17.4	20.0	14.3
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	20.0	13.0	20.0	14.3	26.3	30.4	24.0	14.3
Local Law Officials	8.4	8.7	12.0	0.0	17.2	5.7	4.5	.6
Student Affairs	2.1	0.0	4.0	7.1	3.2	0.0	4.0	7.1
Don't Know	16.8	21.7	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	3.2	4.3	0.0	21.4	6.3	4.3	8.0	14.3
No Response	3.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	3.2	0.0	12.0	0.0
Counseling	7.4	13.0	8.0	14.3
Creative Sanction	27.4	4.3	32.0	42.9
Probation	15.8	21.7	8.0	14.3
Suspension	21.1	34.8	24.0	7.1
Expulsion	13.7	8.7	8.0	21.4
Don't Know	4.2	4.3	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	6.3	13.0	4.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0

done. Perhaps more respondents recommended involvement by the local law officials to acknowledge the seriousness of the incident and to affirm that indeed the offender has committed a crime.

Situation 4: A student is obviously drunk and is disrupting students in his residence hall. The highest percentage of respondents across all four groups, as shown in Table 4, believe the residence hall staff currently adjudicates. A remaining 42.9% of the resident directors believe that student court currently deals with the situation. The consensus among the groups is that residence life staff should adjudicate. A verbal/written warning is suggested for sanction by 53.7% of the students and 48% of the resident assistants. Obviously, students do not view drunk and disorderly behavior as a very serious violation. Perhaps they feel this is "normal" behavior for a college student and therefore, discipline should be rather mild. As a freshman female student commented,

I'd say that at least 70% of college students drink, whether they are of legal age or not. It's almost a fact of life. However, I do not know who handles these kinds of cases, but whoever does should take this fact into consideration.

The option of creative sanction is offered by 26.1% of the faculty and 50% of the resident directors. Perhaps this is their way of saying that something besides a verbal/written warning should be issued. Creative sanctioning has the golden opportunity of increasing the educational value of discipline. For example, in a situation like this, alcohol awareness issues could be discussed with the student.

Situation 5: A student turns in his research paper for English class and while grading the paper, the professor discovers the student

Table 4

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 4: Drunk and Disorderly Conduct in the Residence Hall.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	5.3	17.4	8.0	42.9	4.2	21.7	4.0	0.0
Residence Hall Staff	60.0	43.5	84.0	50.0	71.6	52.2	60.0	85.7
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	11.6	8.7	4.0	0.0	12.6	21.7	28.0	7.1
Local Law Officials	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.3	4.0	0.0
Don't Know	12.6	21.7	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	4.2	4.3	4.0	7.1	4.2	0.0	4.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	8.4	4.3	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	53.7	13.0	48.0	14.3
Counseling	6.3	21.7	12.0	21.4
Creative Sanction	11.6	26.1	8.0	50.0
Probation	9.5	8.7	20.0	0.0
Suspension	3.2	13.0	0.0	0.0
Expulsion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	6.3	13.0	12.0	14.3
No Response	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

has turned in his roommate's research paper from the prior year.

Faculty (47.8%) believe that student court currently deals with the situation while the remaining groups, students (52.6%), resident assistants (72%), and resident directors (50%), believe that academic administration currently adjudicates. As in the earlier situation involving cheating, respondents indicate that academic administration should deal with the situation (see Table 5). Surprisingly, an additional 34.8% of faculty respond that they believe student court should be dealing with the situation. Considering much of the faculty efforts that have recently been established concerning effective ways of dealing with cheating, it seems that a portion of faculty respondents, however, are content with the student court process.

Sanctions in this situation range from creative sanction recommended by 28% of the resident assistants; probation supported by 32.6% of students, 43.5% of faculty; suspension favored by another 28% of resident assistants and 50% of resident directors. In other words, sanctions recommended in this situation are proportional by group to the prior situation involving cheating during an exam.

Situation 6: Two hours after visitation hours have ended in a residence hall, an RA discovers a male on the female floor. Resident directors (42.9%) indicate that student court currently adjudicates while the remaining highest percentage of respondents in each group believe residence hall staff currently adjudicates. As shown in Table 6, the majority across all groups agree that residence hall staff should adjudicate. Likewise, all groups concur that the sanction should consist of a verbal/written warning. In essence, this is another

Table 5

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 5: Turning in Roommate's Paper for English Assignment.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	11.6	47.8	24.0	28.6	9.5	34.8	8.0	14.3
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Academic Administration	52.6	17.4	72.0	50.0	72.6	39.1	88.0	71.4
ASU Security	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	5.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.5	8.7	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	24.2	21.7	4.0	7.1	2.1	4.3	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	1.1	4.3	0.0	14.3	1.1	13.0	0.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Counseling	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	16.8	4.3	28.0	14.3
Probation	32.6	43.5	20.0	7.1
Suspension	24.2	26.1	28.0	50.0
Expulsion	10.5	8.7	16.0	14.3
Don't Know	1.1	0.0	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	5.3	13.0	8.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 6

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 6: Violation of Visitation Hours in Residence Hall.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	8.4	26.1	20.0	42.9	5.3	21.7	4.0	14.3
Residence Hall Staff	70.5	43.5	76.0	42.9	72.6	52.2	92.0	78.6
Academic Administration	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	3.2	13.0	0.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.3	4.0	0.0
Don't Know	9.5	17.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	1.1	0.0	4.0	14.3	2.1	0.0	0.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	18.9	17.4	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	62.1	34.8	64.0	50.0
Counseling	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	6.3	13.0	4.0	14.3
Probation	11.6	13.0	28.0	21.4
Suspension	1.1	8.7	0.0	0.0
Expulsion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	0.0	4.3	4.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

situation involving what respondents see as an "insignificant" violation. With a sanction like verbal/written warning for violation of visitation hours, the question arises as to whether this policy is being enforced or "overlooked." For a residence life staff member, is it worth the effort to run a member of the opposite sex off the floor at 2:00 in the morning when all they receive is a warning? Possibly, visitation hours in the residence halls compose a policy whose time is close at hand for extinction. Already on this campus, several of the halls have 24-hour visitation and on other North Carolina campuses, 24-hour visitation is common in all residence halls.

Situation 7: A beer bottle is thrown from the fifth floor of a residence hall window. Residence hall staff is believed to currently adjudicate in the situation according to a portion of students, faculty, and resident assistants, as indicated in Table 7. A large portion of resident directors (71.4%) believe that student affairs administration currently deals with the situation.

Opinions vary as to "Who should adjudicate" with students (45.3%) indicating residence hall staff should be the adjudicator, 43.5% of faculty wanting to involve ASU security, 24% of resident assistants leaving the matter to student court, and 64.3% of resident directors and another 28% of resident assistants leaving the matter to student affairs administration. Sanctions likewise vary from verbal/written warning favored by 25.3% of students; creative sanction favored by 21.1% of students and 28.6% of resident directors; probation recommended by another 21.1% of students; 34.8% of faculty and 35.7% of resident directors favoring suspension of violators; and 56% of resident

Table 7

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 7: Beer Bottle is thrown from Residence Hall Window.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	10.5	17.4	28.0	14.3	12.6	17.4	24.0	7.1
Residence Hall Staff	43.2	21.7	28.0	0.0	45.3	21.7	20.0	21.4
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
ASU Security	18.9	26.1	4.0	0.0	27.4	43.5	12.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.7	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	4.2	4.3	28.0	71.4	4.2	8.7	28.0	64.3
Don't Know	17.9	21.7	0.0	7.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	2.1	4.3	8.0	7.1	3.2	0.0	12.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	25.3	13.0	0.0	0.0
Counseling	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	21.1	17.4	4.0	28.6
Probation	21.1	13.0	12.0	7.1
Suspension	17.9	34.8	28.0	35.7
Expulsion	3.5	8.7	56.0	28.6
Don't Know	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	5.3	13.0	0.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

assistants agreeing with 28.5% of resident directors to impose expulsion.

In this situation there are obviously differences in opinion. Students seem to be rather unconcerned about a beer bottle being thrown out the window while resident directors view the situation more severely. At this point, it is probably helpful to clarify three specific university policies known as Administrative Directives. An administrative directive involves 1) tampering with fire equipment, 2) throwing any projectile out of a window, and 3) throwing of snow or iceballs, or other missiles. Any student who violates one of these administrative directives and is positively identified may be automatically evicted from the residence hall or summarily suspended pending a hearing. The hearing process for violations of administrative directives is conducted by the assistant vice-chancellor of student affairs. In the case of recommendation of expulsion by the resident directors and resident assistants, it is possible that based on their knowledge of administrative directives they could be referring to eviction from the residence hall rather than expulsion from the university. The extremes among the groups in recommended sanctions suggest that perhaps the seriousness of throwing objects out the window needs to be communicated to students.

Situation 8: A student calls in a bomb threat to an academic building. The response of "Who currently adjudicates" was mixed between ASU security and local law officials, as shown in Table 8. "Who should adjudicate" received a similar mixture of responses. ASU security should respond according to 47.8% of the faculty, and 28.6% of the

Table 8

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 8: A Bomb Threat is
Called in.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	8.4	4.3	12.0	28.6	8.4	0.0	4.0	14.3
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic Administration	2.1	4.3	4.0	7.1	0.0	8.7	4.0	0.0
ASU Security	40.0	52.2	48.0	50.0	24.2	47.8	8.0	28.6
Local Law Officials	26.3	17.4	20.0	7.1	54.7	34.8	52.0	28.6
Student Affairs	3.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	5.3	4.3	8.0	21.4
Don't Know	12.6	17.4	8.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	8.0	0.0
Combination Responses	4.2	0.0	4.0	7.1	6.3	4.3	16.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Counseling	3.2	4.3	0.0	7.1
Creative Sanction	6.3	0.0	0.0	7.1
Probation	9.5	13.0	4.0	0.0
Suspension	29.5	30.4	32.0	21.4
Expulsion	41.1	47.8	56.0	64.3
Don't Know	2.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
Combination Responses	6.3	4.3	4.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

resident directors. On the other hand, local law officials should respond based on 54.7% of students, 52% of resident assistants, and 28.6% of resident directors. Here again is the dilemma of involving local law officials.

"What sanction imposed" presents a consensus among all four groups that a student should be subject to expulsion or at least suspension. In this situation, it is obvious that what may be a prank to one individual is treated as a serious offense by students, faculty, resident assistants, and resident directors. After all, the highest percentage of respondents in each group recommended expulsion for the offender. There is also speculation that with the rash of bomb threats that were received on this campus last semester, perhaps recommending a harsh sanction is an expression by the respondents that they wish something would be done to put a stop to such pranks. As a junior female student commented,

I think that if some of the punishments were more strict, less crimes would be committed. Everyone knows most things just get a slap on the back of the hand so they do what they want. If they were scared of the consequences things would be different.

Situation 9: A student threatens to assault another student with a knife. With respect to "Who currently adjudicates," the highest percentage of respondents in all four groups concur that ASU security currently deals with the matter, as shown in Table 9. However, students (62.1%), faculty (60.9%), resident assistants (28%), and 21.4% of resident directors believe that local law officials should deal with the matter. Nonetheless, 44% of the resident assistants, 28.6% of resident directors, 34.8% of faculty, and 27.1% of students still attribute

Table 9

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 9: Student Threatens to Assault Another Student with a Knife.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	5.3	4.3	20.0	28.6	4.2	0.0	12.0	21.4
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	8.0	7.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	46.3	43.5	56.0	35.7	22.1	34.8	44.0	28.6
Local Law Officials	18.9	26.1	0.0	7.1	62.1	60.9	28.0	21.4
Student Affairs	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	21.4
Don't Know	22.1	21.7	4.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	2.1	0.0	12.0	21.4	6.3	4.3	16.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Counseling	13.7	8.7	16.0	21.4
Creative Sanction	7.4	4.3	0.0	0.0
Probation	9.5	8.7	12.0	14.3
Suspension	12.6	30.4	32.0	35.7
Expulsion	40.0	34.8	20.0	28.6
Don't Know	2.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
Combination Responses	12.6	8.7	16.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

responsibility to ASU security for adjudication in this situation. When asked "What sanction imposed," 30.4% of faculty, 32% of resident assistants, and 35.7% of resident directors believe that suspension would be appropriate. Students (40%) go a step further to recommend expulsion along with another 34.8% of faculty and 28.6% of resident directors.

When it comes to bodily harm or threat to human life, all four groups consider the situation to be very serious and therefore, recommend severe sanctions. Once again, students and faculty also believe that the local law officials should be involved. Perhaps this is supportive of some of the views that a situation of this severity should not be handled in student court, rather, the case should be handled by "proper authorities." A male faculty member expressed that

Serious crimes should not be addressed on campus first. Examples, assault, battery, rape, sexual assault, major theft. These should be handled in criminal court. The university should address such cases after they have been heard in court and in such serious cases the student should be suspended subject to the outcome of that system. Our present system prejudices the court/legal system.

Frustration at the current system was also expressed by a junior male resident assistant who related an incident whereby a "student, unprovoked, attacks and physically assaults another student to the point where the student who was attacked spends a couple of days in the Watauga County Hospital, the attacker gets off with probation and a \$5.00 fine." Of course, we do not know the circumstances surrounding this specific situation, however, the resident assistant continues by stating his general apathy for the student court system simply because he does not feel justice has prevailed.

Situation 10: A student trying to get a loan from the Financial Aid Office purposely provides false information. The general response of "Who currently adjudicates," was believed to be student affairs administration. A large portion of the remaining respondents from each group indicated that they "don't know" (see Table 10). The question of "Who should adjudicate" still attributes jurisdiction to student affairs administration by 55.8% of students, 47.8% of faculty, 52% of resident assistants, and 35.7% of resident directors. Another 35.7% of resident directors suggest that academic administration should deal with the matter. Recommendations for sanctioning in this situation varied among the groups. Creative sanction was favored by a portion of all four groups as indicated in Table 10. Probation was also recommended as a sanction as was suspension. This situation seems to create uncertainty among the respondents as to exactly what should be done.

Situation 11: A 20-year-old sophomore is drinking a beer in the public area of a residence hall. The highest percentage of respondents in each group believe that residence hall staff currently deals with the situation (see Table 11). In regard to "Who should adjudicate," students (57.9%), faculty (39%), resident assistants (68%), and resident directors (78.6%) all agree that the matter should be left to residence hall staff. The sanctioning recommended was relatively light with 45.3% of the students and 21.7% of the faculty imposing no sanction. Another 40% of students, 30.4% of faculty, 72% of resident assistants, and 50% of resident directors issued only a verbal/written warning. As in an earlier situation, perhaps this is another policy that needs to be called into question. The alcohol policy in essence states that no

Table 10

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 10: Furnishing False Information to Financial Aid Office.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
Student Court	2.1	17.4	0.0	7.1	8.4	13.0	0.0	7.1
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic Administration	15.8	8.7	12.0	14.3	18.9	26.1	20.0	35.7
ASU Security	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	4.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	6.3	4.3	16.0	0.0
Student Affairs	37.9	30.4	56.0	28.6	55.8	47.8	52.0	35.7
Don't Know	33.7	34.8	20.0	42.9	5.3	4.3	4.0	14.3
Combination Responses	1.1	4.3	4.0	7.1	1.1	4.3	4.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	1.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	11.6	8.7	4.0	0.0
Counseling	7.4	13.0	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	28.4	21.7	20.0	28.6
Probation	13.7	21.7	24.0	21.4
Suspension	9.5	17.4	12.0	0.0
Expulsion	5.3	8.7	12.0	7.1
Don't Know	21.1	4.3	24.0	35.7
Combination Responses	2.1	4.3	0.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 11

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 11: 20-year-old Sophomore
Drinking Beer in a Public Area.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	7.4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.3	8.7	4.0	0.0
Student Court	4.2	17.4	20.0	28.6	6.3	13.0	8.0	7.1
Residence Hall Staff	64.2	30.4	76.0	64.3	57.9	39.1	68.0	78.6
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	6.3	17.4	0.0	0.0	5.3	21.7	0.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.3	12.0	7.1
Student Affairs	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	13.7	21.7	0.0	0.0	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	0.0	4.3	4.0	7.1	0.0	4.3	8.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	45.3	21.7	0.0	7.1
Verbal/Written Warning	40.0	30.4	72.0	50.0
Counseling	1.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	3.2	13.0	4.0	7.1
Probation	5.3	17.4	20.0	28.6
Suspension	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Expulsion	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	2.1	4.3	4.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

alcoholic beverages are to be consumed in any public areas on campus. Many students have questioned why such a policy exists in the first place. Obviously, they believe the policy is insignificant, after all, they believe nothing should be done to a student who does drink in the lobby. Also, it can be further assumed that a percentage of the faculty do not support such a policy because they, too, recommend the sanction of no action. Even the residence life staff are not overly concerned about the policy as they believe infractions merit only a verbal/written warning. As a senior male student wrote, "The rules and regulations, while in print, are not worth the paper they were written on because they are not followed." Speculation arises that perhaps this policy may be one whose enforcement is rather slack. If indeed that is a true statement, why even have the policy?

Situation 12: A student shoplifts from the university bookstore.

Once again, the four groups concur believing that ASU security currently deals with the situation as indicated in Table 12. Furthermore, the groups generally believe that ASU security should be the one dealing with the situation. Sanctions range from recommendation of probation by 35.8% of the students and 42.9% of the resident directors. Faculty (26.1%) and resident assistants (36.0%) recommend suspension while another 21.7% of faculty responded with more than one answer to the situation. In essence, all four groups view this incident as relatively serious. The recommendation is that a student should certainly be put on probation or suspended if they are caught shoplifting in the bookstore. This suggests that perhaps students, faculty, resident assistants, and resident directors are simply not tolerant of these

Table 12

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 12: Shoplifting from University Bookstore.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	7.4	8.7	12.0	35.7	12.6	0.0	8.0	21.4
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	52.6	47.8	64.0	50.0	51.6	47.8	44.0	35.7
Local Law Officials	11.6	8.7	0.0	0.0	22.1	39.1	48.0	21.4
Student Affairs	2.1	4.3	4.0	7.1	4.2	8.7	0.0	14.3
Don't Know	20.0	26.1	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	3.2	0.0	4.0	7.1	7.4	4.3	0.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Counseling	6.3	13.0	4.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	25.3	0.0	20.0	35.7
Probation	35.8	17.4	16.0	42.9
Suspension	10.5	26.1	36.0	21.4
Expulsion	6.3	4.3	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	6.3	8.7	20.0	0.0
Combination Responses	5.3	21.7	4.0	0.0
No Response	1.1	4.3	0.0	0.0

actions and feel a student should be heavily sanctioned to "learn a lesson."

Situation 13: A student is smoking marijuana in the residence hall. Residence hall staff are currently adjudicating according to one-fourth of the student and faculty respondents. The remaining groups, as indicated on Table 13, believe ASU security currently adjudicates. "Who should adjudicate" provides similar varied responses. Students are divided in their response with 29.5% favoring local law officials, 28.4% favoring residence hall staff, and 26.3% for ASU security. Faculty, 39.1%, favor residence hall staff while another 34.8% of faculty favor local law officials. Resident directors, 28.6%, and resident assistants, 52%, also favor local law officials in the adjudication process with 21.4% of resident directors siding with ASU security.

In response to recommendations for sanction, quite a diversity exists. A verbal/written warning is supported by 21% of students and a surprising 26.1% of faculty. The recommendation of probation is favored by 22.1% of students and 42.9% of resident directors. A more severe sanction of suspension is suggested by 40% of resident assistants and 21.1% of students; another 32% of resident assistants recommend expulsion. In regard to this situation, there appear to be some real value conflicts. Obviously there are some students who view smoking marijuana as a very minor offense. While at the same time, other students recognize smoking marijuana as grounds for probation or suspension. As one junior male commented, "I feel like there are too many verbal warnings given and not enough probation and expulsion in the residence halls especially with illegal drugs." Likewise, even with the

Table 13

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 13: Smoking Marijuana in Residence Hall.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	7.4	13.0	4.0	35.7	9.5	8.7	0.0	14.3
Residence Hall Staff	27.4	21.7	16.0	14.3	28.4	39.1	0.0	14.3
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	29.5	17.4	68.0	35.7	26.3	8.7	32.0	21.4
Local Law Officials	8.4	13.0	0.0	0.0	29.5	34.8	52.0	28.6
Student Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	14.3
Don't Know	17.9	26.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	5.3	4.3	12.0	14.3	3.2	4.3	16.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	21.1	26.1	0.0	14.3
Counseling	3.2	21.7	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	5.3	4.3	0.0	28.6
Probation	22.1	8.7	16.0	42.9
Suspension	21.1	13.0	40.0	7.1
Expulsion	14.7	8.7	32.0	7.1
Don't Know	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	4.2	13.0	12.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

faculty, there exists a real diversity. Over one-fourth of the faculty recommend only a verbal/written warning. This suggests that these respondents see no problem with smoking marijuana. Another 21% of the faculty suggest counseling as a sanction. This could be interpreted as a "lenient" sanction or as a sanction with a real concern for the individuals who may be subjecting their bodies to substance abuse. On the other hand, resident assistants recommend the most severe sanctions ranging from probation and suspension, to expulsion. While the greatest percentage of resident directors suggest probation, other resident directors recommend a creative sanction or merely a verbal/written warning. One female resident director noted that "the sanctions imposed should be more strict. For example, students caught smoking pot within the residence hall barely get a slap on the wrist from security. If it is a violation of policy it should be treated as such."

Situation 14: A student purposely pulls the fire alarm when there is no fire. Students (30.5%), faculty (30.4%), resident assistants (44%), and resident directors (21.4%) agree that ASU security currently adjudicates in the matter. Another 50% of the resident directors indicate that student affairs administrators adjudicate while 21.7% of faculty think student court deals with the matter. As indicated in Table 14, another 23% of students and 26% of faculty state that they "don't know." Faculty (30.4%) and students (31.6%) still believe that ASU security should deal with the situation while other students, faculty, and resident assistants believe local law officials should be involved. Resident directors (57.1%) maintain that student affairs administrators should adjudicate. Sanctioning begins with students and

Table 14

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 14: Pulling of False Fire Alarm.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	9.5	21.7	16.0	21.4	18.9	13.0	12.0	7.1
Residence Hall Staff	15.8	4.3	8.0	0.0	10.5	4.3	4.0	0.0
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	30.5	30.4	44.0	21.4	31.6	30.4	20.0	14.3
Local Law Officials	11.6	13.0	0.0	0.0	27.4	39.1	32.0	7.1
Student Affairs	3.2	0.0	12.0	50.0	6.3	4.3	12.0	57.1
Don't Know	23.2	26.1	4.0	0.0	2.1	4.3	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	3.2	0.0	16.0	7.1	3.2	4.3	20.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Counseling	4.2	4.3	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	15.8	13.0	8.0	7.1
Probation	21.1	17.4	8.0	0.0
Suspension	27.4	39.1	32.0	35.7
Expulsion	20.0	17.4	48.0	50.0
Don't Know	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	4.2	8.7	4.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

faculty recommending suspension, followed closely by expulsion and probation. Resident assistants and resident directors suggest expulsion, followed closely by suspension. Here again, expulsion could possibly be interpreted as eviction from the residence hall rather than expulsion from the university. Setting off a false fire alarm is a violation of an administrative directive and the student can be subject to automatic eviction or summarily suspended. In any case, all four groups recognize this situation as a very serious offense.

Situation 15: A student is found writing graffiti on the bathroom walls. This situation was not real clear in terms of location; however, most respondents seemed to refer to the incident as if it had occurred in a residence hall. Faculty (34.8%) believe that student court currently adjudicates in the situation while 36.8% of students, 68% of resident assistants, and 42.9% of resident directors agree that residence hall staff currently adjudicates. Faculty (30.4%) still think student court should deal with the situation while 51.6% of students, 26.1% of faculty, 64% of resident assistants and 57.1% of resident directors favor residence hall staff dealing with the situation. As indicated in Table 15, the recommendation for a creative sanction is the general consensus of all four groups. Faculty even suggest no sanction be imposed while another portion of students merely suggest a verbal/written warning. A senior female student commented that she did not view writing on the bathroom walls as an infraction. She further confesses that "I have on occasion written some philosophic ditty on the stalls." This is another situation where the recommendation of a creative sanction indicates that something should be done but the

Table 15

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 15: Writing Graffiti on Bathroom Walls.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	7.4	0.0	4.0	7.1	9.5	8.7	0.0	7.1
Student Court	9.5	34.8	20.0	28.6	21.1	30.4	12.0	14.3
Residence Hall Staff	36.8	17.4	68.0	42.9	51.6	26.1	64.0	57.1
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	4.2	8.7	0.0	7.1	3.2	13.0	8.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	4.3	4.0	0.0
Don't Know	33.7	34.8	8.0	7.1	9.5	4.3	8.0	7.1
Combination Responses	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	4.0	14.3
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	12.6	21.0	0.0	7.1
Verbal/Written Warning	34.7	13.0	28.0	0.0
Counseling	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	41.1	26.1	48.0	78.6
Probation	4.2	17.4	12.0	0.0
Suspension	0.0	13.0	8.0	0.0
Expulsion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	4.2	0.0	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	0.0	4.3	4.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

respondents are not sure what. Some comments suggested that as a creative sanction, perhaps students could do community service on the campus. For instance, work with the grounds crew in cleaning up the campus or spend a day with a housekeeper and help him with his job.

Situation 16: A fight between two students breaks out in the classroom. The majority of students (28.4%) and faculty (30.4%), as shown in Table 16, state that they "don't know" who currently deals with the situation. Another 25.3% of students, 21.7% of faculty, 24% of resident assistants, and 35.7% of resident directors think ASU security currently adjudicates. Academic administration is thought to handle the situation by 21.1% of students and 20% of the resident assistants. With regard to "Who should adjudicate," 34.7% of students, 21.7% of faculty, 44% of resident assistants, and 50% of resident directors think that ASU security should deal with the situation. Another 26.1% of the faculty feel that academic administration should be the one to adjudicate. Sanctioning varies from 26.1% of the faculty who suggest counseling to 26.3% of students and 21.7% of faculty who recommend creative sanction. The remaining 21.1% of students, 32% of resident assistants, and 42.9% of resident directors recommend probation. A puzzling note is that the situation states the fight occurs in a classroom, yet, faculty recommend mere counseling for those involved. Once again, creative sanction is a popular choice. Perhaps the perspective of the disciplinary process is already shifting. Realizing that if students have a fight and are suspended, then, the university more or less severs the relationship with the student. The concept of creative sanctioning, however, leaves

Table 16

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 16: Fight Breaks out
in Classroom.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	13.7	21.7	16.0	28.6	23.2	17.4	8.0	21.4
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1
Academic Administration	21.1	17.4	20.0	14.3	18.9	26.1	20.0	0.0
ASU Security	25.3	21.7	24.0	35.7	34.7	21.7	44.0	50.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	13.0	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	3.2	4.3	16.0	0.0	7.4	8.7	20.0	7.1
Don't Know	28.4	30.4	16.0	0.0	6.3	8.7	4.0	7.1
Combination Responses	3.2	0.0	8.0	14.3	5.3	4.3	4.0	7.1
No Response	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	6.3	4.3	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	20.0	8.7	8.0	14.3
Counseling	9.5	26.1	16.0	7.1
Creative Sanction	26.3	21.7	12.0	7.1
Probation	21.1	17.4	32.0	42.9
Suspension	6.3	13.0	12.0	14.3
Expulsion	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	4.2	0.0	8.0	7.1
Combination Responses	4.2	4.3	12.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

room to work with the students and to help them understand their behavior and why it is unacceptable.

Situation 17: A student duplicates a university master key without permission. A portion of faculty and students believe ASU security adjudicates while a portion of resident assistants and resident directors attribute adjudication to student affairs administration (see Table 17). Students (41.1%) and faculty (47.8%) agree that ASU security should adjudicate in this situation; 42.9% of resident directors think it is a matter for local law officials; and 44% of resident assistants want to give the responsibility to student affairs administration. In this situation, students recommend suspension followed by probation while faculty and resident assistants suggest probation. Resident directors are really divided on this issue by recommending expulsion, creative sanction, probation, and suspension. In this situation, all four groups regard this incident as fairly serious.

Situation 18: A 17-year-old freshman is drinking liquor in the lobby of a residence hall. Resident directors indicate that student court currently adjudicates while the highest percentage of students, faculty, and resident assistants believe residence hall staff currently adjudicates. All four groups, as shown in Table 18, agree that residence hall staff should adjudicate. Students (43.2%), faculty (21.7%), resident assistants (44%), and resident directors (35.7%) recommend a sanction of verbal/written warning. Faculty (21.7%) also suggest counseling and 35.7% of resident directors recommend probation.

This situation presents two policy violations. First of all, the student is underage and secondly, the student is drinking in the lobby.

Table 17

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 17: Duplication of University Master Key.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	9.5	13.0	12.0	21.4	18.9	0.0	16.0	7.1
Residence Hall Staff	5.3	0.0	8.0	14.3	5.3	0.0	4.0	14.3
Academic Administration	7.4	0.0	8.0	0.0	11.6	13.0	8.0	0.0
ASU Security	37.9	39.1	8.0	14.3	41.1	47.8	4.0	7.1
Local Law Officials	1.1	4.3	4.0	0.0	9.5	21.7	12.0	0.0
Student Affairs	4.2	13.0	28.0	21.4	8.4	13.0	44.0	42.9
Don't Know	30.5	26.1	32.0	21.4	2.1	0.0	12.0	14.3
Combination Responses	1.1	0.0	0.0	7.1	3.2	4.3	0.0	14.3
No Response	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	5.3	8.7	0.0	0.0
Counseling	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	18.9	4.3	12.0	21.4
Probation	23.2	39.1	24.0	21.4
Suspension	25.3	26.1	20.0	21.4
Expulsion	16.8	13.0	32.0	28.6
Don't Know	6.3	4.3	8.0	7.1
Combination Responses	1.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 18

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 18: 17 year-old Freshman
Drinking Liquor in Lobby.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	4.3	0.0	0.0
Student Court	6.3	21.7	24.0	57.1	6.3	21.7	12.0	28.6
Residence Hall Staff	54.7	26.1	68.0	35.7	55.8	30.4	56.0	50.0
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	11.6	17.4	0.0	0.0	10.5	21.7	8.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	13.0	16.0	7.1
Student Affairs	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	17.9	26.1	4.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	4.0	0.0
Combination Responses	1.1	4.3	4.0	7.1	3.2	4.3	4.0	14.3
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	10.5	8.7	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	43.2	26.1	44.0	35.7
Counseling	8.4	21.7	4.0	7.1
Creative Sanction	10.5	13.0	4.0	7.1
Probation	13.7	13.0	24.0	35.7
Suspension	6.3	8.7	12.0	0.0
Expulsion	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	4.2	4.3	12.0	14.3
No Response	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0

But obviously, underage drinking is not viewed as a very serious incident at all. In a prior incident, drinking in the lobby was also perceived as no serious matter. This is an area of real concern, however. The state law sets the legal drinking age and, therefore, when a student is drinking underage, a violation of the general statute of North Carolina occurs. The drinking age which increases this fall will only serve to complicate matters. Students have already expressed that drinking is a "fact of life." When a student's values (as well as faculty, resident assistants, resident directors) conflict with the legal system, enforcement is certainly more difficult. Much emphasis on college campuses has been directed towards alcohol education and alcohol awareness programs. The task at hand, however, seems to indicate a need to downplay the importance of alcohol in a student's life. In a study conducted by Levine (1980) students indicated that drinking was their number one way of having fun. It has been further noted that drinking has often been a contributory factor in incidents of disciplinary infractions. Therefore, the importance of discipline in relation to alcohol is particularly significant. Students must learn their limits and exhibit self-control accordingly.

Situation 19: Just 'for kicks,' a student discharges a fire extinguisher in a residence hall. Students, faculty, and resident assistants concur that residence life staff currently adjudicates. However, resident directors believe student affairs administrators currently adjudicate. With respect to "Who should adjudicate", as shown in Table 19, students, faculty, and resident assistants believe adjudication should be left to residence life staff. Resident directors

Table 19

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 19: Discharging a Fire Extinguisher Just "for Kicks."

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	9.5	13.0	28.0	21.4	17.9	8.7	8.0	21.4
Residence Hall Staff	49.5	43.5	44.0	14.3	42.1	52.2	44.0	0.0
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	15.8	4.3	8.0	0.0	24.2	13.0	20.0	7.1
Local Law Officials	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.7	16.0	0.0
Student Affairs	1.1	4.3	8.0	57.1	2.1	8.7	4.0	57.1
Don't Know	17.9	21.7	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	1.1	4.3	12.0	7.1	7.4	8.7	8.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	18.9	17.4	4.0	0.0
Counseling	5.3	8.7	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	30.5	30.4	12.0	21.4
Probation	25.3	21.7	20.0	14.3
Suspension	11.6	17.4	24.0	21.4
Expulsion	1.1	0.0	28.0	35.7
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1
Combination Responses	7.4	4.3	12.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

(57%), however, still believe responsibility belongs to student affairs administration. Once again, discharging a fire extinguisher is a violation of an administrative directive. This explains the differing opinions of residents directors compared to students and faculty. Faculty and students hold similar views in this situation regarding sanctioning. Students (30.5%) and faculty (30.4%) suggest creative sanction while another 25.3% of students, 21.7% of faculty, and 20% of resident assistants recommend probation. Resident directors (35.7%) and resident assistants (28%) suggest expulsion with another 24% of resident assistants supporting suspension. The residence life staff tend to be more harsh in the recommendation of their sanction. This may be explained, however, by the fact that the staff live in a residence hall and probably are more likely to realize the importance of having a fire extinguisher that works. As a sophomore male student noted "discharging a fire extinguisher is 'damaging' (rendering useless) property. At no time can we afford to be without that extinguisher. Like a good insurance policy, you cannot afford to be without it."

Situation 20: A student insists on playing his electric guitar very loudly at 9:30 on a Wednesday night in his residence hall room. As shown in Table 20, the consensus of all four groups is that the residence hall staff currently adjudicates in this situation. Likewise, all groups concur that the residence hall staff should be the one who adjudicates. Sanctioning varies from 66.3% of students, 34.8% of faculty, 52% of resident assistants, and 28.6% of resident directors suggesting verbal/written warning. Another 57% of resident directors and 21.7% of faculty recommend a creative sanction. In this case, the

Table 20

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 20: Playing a Guitar Loudly in a Residence Hall.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0
Student Court	2.1	17.4	20.0	42.9	6.3	17.4	4.0	14.3
Residence Hall Staff	77.9	52.2	80.0	50.0	83.2	56.5	76.0	78.6
Academic Administration	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ASU Security	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0	3.2	13.0	12.0	0.0
Local Law Officials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Affairs	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.3	4.0	0.0
Don't Know	9.5	17.4	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	1.1	0.0	0.0	7.1	2.1	4.3	4.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	10.5	4.3	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	66.3	34.8	52.0	28.6
Counseling	1.1	13.0	0.0	0.0
Creative Sanction	9.5	21.7	8.0	57.1
Probation	6.3	17.4	24.0	7.1
Suspension	3.2	0.0	8.0	0.0
Expulsion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Combination Responses	3.2	8.7	8.0	7.1
No Response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

issue of noise is regarded as another "insignificant" situation particularly by students, faculty, and resident assistants. Perhaps, resident directors are suggesting creative sanction as a means of working with the student to understand how his actions are affecting others.

Situation 21: A student threatens a professor with bodily harm. Students, faculty, resident assistants, and a portion of resident directors cite ASU security as currently adjudicating. Another 20% of resident assistants and 28.6% of resident directors feel the academic administration is involved while 30.4% of faculty and 20% of resident assistants state that they "don't know." In this situation, "Who should adjudicate" receives a mixed response, as shown in Table 21, between local law officials and ASU security. Resident Directors (21.4%) and students (20%) recommend a lesser sanction of probation while another 20% of the students and 28.6% of resident directors suggest suspension. In addition, 24.2% of students, 39.1% of faculty, and 28% of resident assistants recommend the sanction of expulsion. Once again, in an incident involving the threat of bodily harm, all groups consider this a very serious situation with serious consequences recommended.

Student data: Male and Female responses. Examining student data by male and female in response to the question "What sanction imposed," there were a few differences which deserve to be noted. In situation two, where the professor finds a student cheating during final exam, 29.7% of the males favored suspension as sanction with another 24.3% of the males favoring expulsion. In contrast, 36.2% of the females recommended suspension. In another case where the beer bottle was

Table 21

Responses in Relative Percent to Situation 21: Student Threatens Professor with Bodily Harm.

Adjudicator	Currently Adjudicates				Should Adjudicate			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
No Action	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Student Court	7.4	8.7	8.0	7.1	18.9	0.0	4.0	7.1
Residence Hall Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Academic Administration	6.3	8.7	20.0	28.6	9.5	13.0	20.0	21.4
ASU Security	36.8	30.4	28.0	21.4	30.5	34.8	28.0	21.4
Local Law Officials	10.5	4.3	12.0	14.3	22.1	30.4	28.0	21.4
Student Affairs	5.3	8.7	8.0	7.1	7.4	13.0	16.0	7.1
Don't Know	26.3	30.4	20.0	14.3	4.2	0.0	0.0	14.3
Combination Responses	2.1	4.3	4.0	7.1	6.3	8.7	4.0	7.1
No Response	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Sanction	Sanction Imposed			
	Stu.	Fac.	R.A.	R.D.
None	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Verbal/Written Warning	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Counseling	14.7	13.0	20.0	7.1
Creative Sanction	8.4	4.3	4.0	7.1
Probation	20.0	13.0	16.0	21.4
Suspension	20.0	17.4	16.0	28.6
Expulsion	24.2	39.1	28.0	14.3
Don't Know	2.1	0.0	8.0	7.1
Combination Responses	4.2	13.0	8.0	14.3
No Response	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

thrown out the window, 27% of the males suggested suspension followed by 21.6% of males suggesting creative sanction. Females, however, thought the incident should receive a verbal/written warning (32.8%) followed by a recommendation for probation (24.1%).

Males recommended expulsion (56.8%) for the incident involving a bomb threat, while females suggested a sanction of suspension (36.2%). The issue of marijuana was somewhat reversed with males recommending a verbal/written warning (27%) or probation (24.3%) while females suggested suspension (27.6%) followed by probation (20.7%). Incidents involving purposely pulling a fire alarm when there is no fire was favored by males to receive suspension (32.4%) or expulsion (29.7%) with females suggesting probation (25.9%) or suspension (24.1%).

In the matter of duplicating a university master key, males favored creative sanction (27%) or expulsion (21.6%). Females, however, suggested suspension (32.8%) or probation (25.9%). Finally, in the situation where the student threatens a professor, males favored expulsion (32.4%), suspension (18.9%), and then probation (16.2%) whereas females suggested probation (22.4%), suspension (20.7%), and then expulsion (19%).

Other demographic data. Faculty who responded to the opinionnaire indicated they had been at Appalachian State University: one to three years, 4; four to six years, 2; seven to nine years, 4; ten to fifteen years, 5; sixteen to twenty years, 7; and over 21 years, 1. The distribution was too broad for any comparisons. Cross tabulations on how many semesters students had lived in the residence hall revealed no real differences among respondents.

Only three respondents answered affirmatively to demographic information that was requested of students, resident assistants and resident directors inquiring if they had ever been charged with any disciplinary violations in which formal action had been taken. However, according to statistics compiled by the ASU Student Judiciary, less than one percent of the student body is ever formally charged for violating student law. Therefore, those three respondents are representative of the population.

Conclusion and Recommendations

A general overview of the modal distribution of responses to each of the situations with respect to the first question, "Who currently adjudicates," presents some interesting findings. Each of the situations presented on the opinionnaire (see Appendices A, B, C, and D) falls within the jurisdiction of student court to adjudicate on the campus of Appalachian State University. For clarification purposes, a student does have a right to be heard by an administrative hearing board if he so chooses instead of going through the judiciary process. Also, violation of the administrative directives may be subject to an immediate hearing with the assistant vice-chancellor of student affairs. The highest percentage of student responses in each of the 21 situations did not choose student court as an option for currently adjudicating the situation. This finding should certainly raise some questions. One female sophomore commented that "Students should be informed who handles each situation so when the situation comes up we can report them to proper authority." Currently, the Appalachian State University Judicial

Code is published in legal format in The Mountaineer handbook. These handbooks are made available to students each year. Unfortunately, the majority of students evidently have not read the handbook or simply do not understand how student court operates on this campus. Perhaps a handbook specifically designed for student conduct at Appalachian State University could be produced in a simple format so that the students could easily understand the process. To develop confidence in the student court system, perhaps publishing cases anonymously in The Appalachian would be helpful. Weisinger (1980) states that publishing cases also helps set and advertise expectations of behavior and, in addition, serves as a deterrent to inappropriate behavior.

Surprisingly, faculty seemed to have a broader knowledge of the concept of student court than students or resident assistants. In seven different situations, the highest percentage of faculty believed that student court was responsible for adjudicating the sanction. Many faculty did comment, however, that they did not feel student court should handle serious crimes nor cases of academic dishonesty. One male instructor pointed out that "'Nearness' of the adjudicator to the 'crime' is very important even if justice is not always done. Immediacy is important." Even though faculty are aware of the system, court history at ASU has shown that very few referrals are ever sent to student court by faculty especially regarding academic dishonesty. Perhaps it would be to the advantage of students and faculty to have a separate hearing board for cases of academic dishonesty. A firm policy could be developed stating the university's stand regarding academic standards. A definite advantage would be a) professors could see

immediate results and have a chance for input and b) sanctions within the realm of academics could be utilized (i.e., if a student is not suspended then he/she may fail the course for the semester). If professors knew there was an academic policy that the university strongly supported and stood behind, then, in all probability, professors would be more willing to use the system. This in turn would promote a high ethical and moral standard with respect to academics.

Resident directors appeared to have the largest knowledge of the involvement of student court in adjudicating situations. This could be attributed to the direct involvement that several of the resident directors have when referring disciplinary actions from the residence hall. Also, in three of the situations (a beer bottle being thrown out a window, a fire extinguisher being discharged, and an intentional false fire alarm) the highest percentage of resident directors indicated that student affairs administration currently adjudicates; and, in light of the administrative directives, this would be correct. One female resident director commented that she was not opposed to student court, however, "my perceptions of how students at ASU perceive it, is 'a joke,' 'a tap on the hand' not very serious. Perhaps if sanctions were geared towards actions students would grow and learn and perhaps take the process more seriously." A male resident director noted that he felt

student court has way too much power over resident hall incidents. It is ridiculous for an RA to write someone up for something, and then have to go to student court and get abused by someone playing 'public defender.' The job of RA/RD is rough enough without having to mess with student court.

As an alternative, the male resident director suggests that the Residence Life Office have more authority in disciplinary incidents that occur in the residence hall. He suggests someone from the Residence Life Office serve as judge (for example, an area coordinator) and decide on a suitable punishment to fit the action. "This way the system would move much faster."

Surprisingly, resident assistants acknowledged the involvement of student court in only three situations (based on the highest percentage response for each situation). Considering resident assistants are trained in how the "system" works, their responses seemed a bit off track. Perhaps a more intensive training session is needed to educate the resident assistant in the process. Afterall, the resident assistant is a valuable source of information for residents on his/her floor and if the resident assistant does not understand the system--how can students be expected to know what goes on?

On the other hand, perhaps the resident assistants were trying to find alternatives to the present system. One male senior who has been a resident assistant for three semesters summed up many of the resident assistant responses by stating that

I think the idea of student court is a good one. And the idea for the residence hall staffs to work with the student court. But from my dealing and experiences with this pseudo-court structure, I feel that either the sanctions imposed, and/or the people that are involved in student court should be re-evaluated. As it stands, the student court system is totally useless, especially to the residence life staffs. It is our basic recourse in disciplinary actions to refer cases to student court . . . most RAs won't refer some violations because they feel that it is a waste of their time to go through the court procedure just to have the person given a slap on the wrist and 9 times out of 10 that's exactly what it is.

Another third semester male senior resident assistant shares similar comments. He states that he has served on student senate and therefore feels he knows the student court system fairly well.

Referring to student court, he further comments

Many cases they hear should be handled through faculty and local authorities. Too many warnings and probations are being given out which do little or nothing. From my own experience, I refuse to send anything to student court. There have been several cases where it was appropriate. The offenders laugh at student court and think of it as not more than a slap on the hand (they are right).

A sixth semester male senior resident assistant also pointed out that, generally, resident assistants do not refer students to student court until an incident has occurred several times and the student has been warned. Therefore, he concludes, "when a referral occurs it is justified and the student has previously been warned." He suggests that residence life staff should be able to put residents on probation for less serious offenses that occur in the residence hall "so that if the students are finally referred a more strict sanction should be imposed."

For the most part, it is somewhat distressing to hear so many negative criticisms coming from the residence life staff, however, these people are on the front line and have to live with and deal with irresponsible residents on a daily basis. The general dissatisfaction with the disciplinary process from so many residence life staff needs to be taken into consideration and a viable alternative considered.

Perhaps authority does need to be granted to residence life professionals to adjudicate discipline in minor infractions of residence hall policy. To complement the current system, a residence life person could meet with the individual after the court case and discuss in more

depth the student's behavior. Of course, one of the problems in residence hall discipline is connecting the sanction to the behavior. Generally several days, weeks, or even months may pass before a student goes to student court. By then, there is no direct correlation between the student's behavior and the sanction. Perhaps a Residence Hall Council could be formed to hear minor violations within the residence hall. Instead of just a formal proceeding to determine guilt or innocence, emphasis could be shifted to dealing with the student's behavior. The student needs to examine why the behavior was unacceptable or inappropriate and also to realize how the behavior affected others. A definite advantage is that the residence hall staff would be working closely with the individual. Staff would be able to offer support and encouragement in maintaining appropriate behavior. Also, staff would need to undergo extensive training in the educational process of discipline. Staff could be trained in focusing on positive behaviors and promoting self-discipline in their residents. Having the authority to deal with incidents in the residence hall would enable the educational process to become more complete. Another option could be the establishment of a Judicial Affairs Office on campus. Such an office would be able to devote time to individuals involved in disciplinary infractions and thus replace a portion of the proceduralism currently involved with student court.

Overall, the general perceptions with regard to "Who should adjudicate" seem to indicate that situations involving the residence hall should be adjudicated by the residence hall staff, situations involving academics (cheating, fight in classroom) should be adjudicated

by the academic administration, and "legal" situations should be adjudicated by either ASU Security or local law officials. This pattern among ASU Security and local law officials causes some concern. Most respondents were wanting to increase the involvement of local law officials instead of ASU Security. Perhaps this implies that students, faculty, resident assistants, and resident directors want situations such as theft, assault, bomb threats, and use of marijuana to be treated as regular criminal/civil offenses. At the same time, problems occur when students are heard through both student court and "uptown" court. Are the students that serve on student court as qualified as the "professionals" to decide whether a student is guilty or innocent? Is this a matter that should be left to the local law officials?

The views among students, faculty, resident assistants, and resident directors concerning adjudication and sanctions in disciplinary situations were surprisingly consistent even among the groups. With regard to the imposition of sanctions, overall, the sanctions recommended for particular situations are for the most part much tougher than currently handed down from the university. For example, the situation involving calling in a bomb threat received a consensus among all four groups that such student should be expelled. A recent case at ASU, however, involved a student calling in a bomb threat. The student was found guilty and merely placed on probation.

In looking at the judicial system, it is important to note that the preamble to the ASU Judicial code reads

The University Judicial System exists to promote justice and fairness, to encourage responsibility, and to protect the rights of the individual and the university community. It is a vital part of

the educational process of Appalachian State University. (The Mountaineer, 1985, p. 36)

The emphasis centers on justice and fairness and the rights of the individual. The system is truly legalistic and affords the accused even more rights than are specified in the U. S. Constitution. But the question remains, is the student learning and growing from the judicial process experience? Is the student learning to be more self-disciplined and to develop into a mature individual? Unfortunately, these questions are not easily answered. Nonetheless, examining some of the needs and concerns mentioned throughout this paper may help gain a broader perspective of the entire disciplinary process and may focus on some of the prevalent needs on the campus of Appalachian State University.

References

- Beder, H. W., & Rickard, S. T. (1971). Residence hall regulations and staff roles: A substitute model for in loco parentis. NASPA Journal, 9, 57-61.
- Biggs, D. A., & Brown, J. M. (1977). Student causal attributions and disciplining university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 105-109.
- Bolmeier, E. C. (1976). Legality of student disciplinary practices. Charlottesville, VA: Michie Company.
- Carlson, J. M., & Hubbell, R. N. (1971). One more time: The future of college student discipline. NASPA Journal, 9, 127-133.
- Cazier, S. (1973). Student discipline systems in higher education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Dalton, J. C., & Healy, M. A. (1984). Using values education activities to confront student conduct issues. NASPA Journal, 22, 19-25.
- Dannells, M. (1977). Discipline. In W. T. Packwood, T. K. Miller, and C. A. Parker (Eds.). College Student Personnel Services. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- De Sena, P. A. (1965). Constructive discipline through student courts. Journal of College Student Personnel, 6, 175-179.
- Devine, H. R., & Loesch, L. C. (1976). In loco parentis and the new age of majority: The views of freshmen and their parents. Journal of College Student Personnel, 17, 420-425.
- Dollar, R. J. (1969). Disciplined college students' opinions of the discipline process. Journal of College Student Personnel, 10, 219-222.
- Greenleaf, E. A. (1969). Residence halls 1970's. NASPA Journal, 7, 65-71.
- Greenleaf, E. A. (1970). Residence hall staff--a new role emerging? Indiana: Indiana University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 132 445).

- Harms, H. E. (1970). The concept of in loco parentis in higher education. Gainesville, FL: Institute of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 042 421).
- Hodinko, B. A. (1964). A study of student opinion regarding collegiate discipline situations. Journal of College Student Personnel, 5, 217-219, 225.
- Hubbell, R. N. (1966). Varying perceptions of alleged misbehavior and resultant disciplinary action. Journal of College Student Personnel, 7, 260-265.
- Jenison, L. M. (1972). Attitudes of students and faculty toward selected disciplinary situations. NASPA Journal, 9, 291-294.
- Jones, J. W. (1973). Discipline crisis in schools. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.
- Leonard, E. A. (1956). Origins of personnel services in American higher education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Levine, A. (1980). When dreams and heroes died. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mash, D. J. (1971). Student discipline in higher education: A collision course with the courts? NASPA Journal, 8, 148-155.
- Mountaineer Student Handbook. (1985-1986). Boone, NC: Office of Student Publications.
- Ostroth, D. D., Armstrong, M. R., & Campbell, T. J. (1978). A nationwide survey of judicial systems in large institutions of higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 19, 21-27.
- Ostroth, D. D., & Hill, D. E. (1978). The helping relationship in student discipline. NASPA Journal, 16, 33-39.
- Pavela, G. (1983, January 26). Sanctions for student misbehavior: Let the punishment fit the crime. Chronicle of Higher Education, 32.
- Prusok, R. E. (1961). Student, student personnel worker, and parent attitudes toward student discipline. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 40, 247-253.
- Prosok, R. E. (1963). An investigation of attitudes toward student discipline. Journal of College Student Personnel, 5, 12-19.
- Sanford, N. (1967). Where colleges fail. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Shay, J. E. (1969). Freedom and privacy in student residences. NASPA Journal, 7, 76-80.

- Smith, G. P., & Kirk, H. P. (1971). Student discipline for tomorrow. NASPA Journal, 9, 28-31.
- Smith, G. P., & Kirk, H. P. (1972). Student discipline in transition. NASPA Journal, 9, 276-282.
- Steele, B. H., Johnson, D. H., & Rickard, S. T. (1984). Managing the judicial function in student affairs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 337-342.
- Stoops, E., & King-Stoops, J. (1972). Discipline or disaster? Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Tryon, G. S. (1981). Changes in the subject areas addressed by the Journal of College Student Personnel over a five-year period. Journal of College Student Personnel, 22, 440-442.
- Upcraft, M. L. (1982). Residence hall assistants in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Walsh, K. & Cowles, M. (1982). Developmental discipline. Birmingham: Religious Education Press.
- Weisinger, R. (1980). Advertising judicial decisions. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 177.
- Williams, G. D., & Rhodes, J. A. (1969). Satisfaction with the environment and attitudes toward the disciplinary process. Journal of College Student Personnel, 10, 391-396.

APPENDIX A

Student Cover Letter and Opinionnaire

March 10, 1986

Dear Student,

In conjunction with the office of Student Affairs, the following survey is being conducted. You are among five percent of the ASU student population which has been randomly selected to participate in this research. The purpose of this research is to gather YOUR opinions on the disciplinary process at Appalachian State University. This is YOUR opportunity to express your OWN views on the matter of discipline on campus.

The attached opinionnaire presents a variety of situations that are typical of a college campus and could (or have) occurred at ASU. From the choices on the next page, you are simply asked to respond to each situation by:

- 1) WHO do you think currently adjudicates (judges or decides) the disciplinary sanction imposed on the student?
- 2) WHO do you think SHOULD adjudicate (judge or decide) the disciplinary sanction?
- 3) WHAT disciplinary sanction do you think would be appropriate in each situation?

Since you are part of a select group on campus to participate in this research, please take a few moments to complete the attached opinionnaire. YOUR perceptions and opinions on what is currently happening at ASU and what YOU would like to see happen are important! At the same time, it should be noted that your response will be tabulated with the other ASU student views and opinions thereby insuring that your own response remains anonymous.

After completing the opinionnaire, place it in the enclosed return envelope and drop it in the campus mail box at the university post office. Responses NEED to be returned by March 21 so please complete YOURS today!

Sincerely,

Kay Gurganus
Graduate Student

ASU OPINIONNAIRE

RECTIONS: Using the scales listed below, choose ONE response for EACH of the following questions:

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
. A student is apprehended while streaking (in the nude) through the library.	_____	_____	_____
. A professor finds a student using unauthorized (cheat) notes during a final exam.	_____	_____	_____
. A student living in the residence hall steals his neighbor's watch while his neighbor is in the shower.	_____	_____	_____
. A student is obviously drunk and is disrupting students in his residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
. A student turns in his research paper for English class and while grading the paper, the professor discovers the student has turned in his roommate's research paper from the prior year.	_____	_____	_____
. Two hours after visitation hours have ended in a residence hall, an RA discovers a male on the female floor.	_____	_____	_____
. A beer bottle is thrown from the fifth floor of a residence hall window.	_____	_____	_____

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
3. A student calls in a bomb threat to an academic building.	_____	_____	_____
9. A student threatens to assault another student with a knife.	_____	_____	_____
10. A student trying to get a loan from the Financial Aid Office purposely provides false information.	_____	_____	_____
11. A 20-year old sophomore is drinking a beer in the public area of a residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
12. A student shoplifts from the university bookstore.	_____	_____	_____
13. A student is smoking marijuana in the residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
14. A student purposely pulls the fire alarm when there is no fire.	_____	_____	_____
15. A student is found writing graffiti on the bathroom walls.	_____	_____	_____
16. A fight between two students breaks out in the classroom.	_____	_____	_____
17. A student duplicates a university master key without permission.	_____	_____	_____
18. A 17-year old freshman is drinking liquor in the lobby of a residence hall.	_____	_____	_____

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
19. Just "for kicks", a student discharges a fire extinguisher in a residence hall .	_____	_____	_____
20. A student insists on playing his electric guitar very loudly at 9:30 on a Wednesday night in his residence hall room.	_____	_____	_____
21. A student threatens a professor with bodily harm.	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR COMPARATIVE PURPOSES. CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE.

22. Sex: Male Female
23. Classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate
24. Place of Current Residence: On-Campus Off-Campus
25. Including this semester, how many semesters have you lived in the residence hall while at Appalachian State University?
- 0 1-2 3-4 5-6 7 or more
26. Current cumulative grade point average:
- below 1.5 1.5-1.99 2.0-2.49 2.5-2.99 3.0-3.49 3.5-4.0
27. Have you ever been charged with any disciplinary violation(s) with formal action taken by:
- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|----|
| a. Student Court | yes | no |
| b. Residence Hall Staff | yes | no |
| c. Academic Administration | yes | no |
| d. ASU Security | yes | no |
| e. Local Law Officials | yes | no |
| f. Student Affairs Administrators | yes | no |

Comments or suggestions may be written on the back of this page.

APPENDIX B

Faculty Cover Letter and Opinionnaire

March 11, 1986

Dear Faculty:

In conjunction with the office of Student Affairs, the following survey is being conducted. The purpose of this research is to gather YOUR opinions on the disciplinary process at Appalachian State University. You have been randomly selected to participate in this research; therefore, please take advantage of this opportunity to express YOUR views on the matter of discipline on campus.

The attached opinionnaire presents a variety of situations that are typical of a college campus and could (or have) occurred at ASU. From the choices on the next page, you are simply asked to respond to each situation by:

- 1) WHO do you think currently adjudicates (judges or decides) the disciplinary sanction imposed on the student?
- 2) WHO do you think SHOULD adjudicate (judge or decide) the disciplinary sanction?
- 3) WHAT disciplinary sanction do you think would be appropriate in each situation?

Since you are part of a select group on campus to participate in this research, YOUR perceptions and opinions on what is currently happening at ASU and what YOU would like to see happen are important!! At the same time, it should be noted that your response will be tabulated with fellow faculty thereby insuring that your own response remains anonymous.

After completing the opinionnaire, place it in the enclosed return envelope and send via campus mail. Responses NEED to be returned by March 21 so please complete YOURS today!!

Sincerely,

Kay Gurganus
Graduate Student

ASU OPINIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Using the scales listed below, choose **ONE** response for **EACH** of the 86 following questions:

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
1. A student is apprehended while streaking (in the nude) through the library.	_____	_____	_____
2. A professor finds a student using unauthorized (cheat) notes during a final exam.	_____	_____	_____
3. A student living in the residence hall steals his neighbor's watch while his neighbor is in the shower.	_____	_____	_____
4. A student is obviously drunk and is disrupting students in his residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
5. A student turns in his research paper for English class and while grading the paper, the professor discovers the student has turned in his roommate's research paper from the prior year.	_____	_____	_____
6. Two hours after visitation hours have ended in a residence hall, an RA discovers a male on the female floor.	_____	_____	_____
7. A beer bottle is thrown from the fifth floor of a residence hall window.	_____	_____	_____

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
8. A student calls in a bomb threat to an academic building.	_____	_____	_____
9. A student threatens to assault another student with a knife.	_____	_____	_____
10. A student trying to get a loan from the Financial Aid Office purposely provides false information.	_____	_____	_____
11. A 20-year old sophomore is drinking a beer in the public area of a residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
12. A student shoplifts from the university bookstore.	_____	_____	_____
13. A student is smoking marijuana in the residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
14. A student purposely pulls the fire alarm when there is no fire.	_____	_____	_____
15. A student is found writing graffiti on the bathroom walls.	_____	_____	_____
16. A fight between two students breaks out in the classroom.	_____	_____	_____
17. A student duplicates a university master key without permission.	_____	_____	_____
18. A 17-year old freshman is drinking liquor in the lobby of a residence hall.	_____	_____	_____

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
19. Just "for kicks", a student discharges a fire extinguisher in a residence hall .	_____	_____	_____
20. A student insists on playing his electric guitar very loudly at 9:30 on a Wednesday night in his residence hall room.	_____	_____	_____
21. A student threatens a professor with bodily harm.	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR COMPARATIVE PURPOSES. CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE.

2. Sex: Male Female
3. Do you teach primarily: 1) undergraduates 2) graduates 3) both
4. Are you considered:
 - 1) Full time instructor 2) Full time administrator 3) Faculty/Administrator
5. How many years have you been employed at ASU:

1-3	4-6	7-9	10-15	16-20	21+
-----	-----	-----	-------	-------	-----

Comments or suggestions may be written on the back of this page.

APPENDIX C

Resident Assistant Cover Letter and Opinionnaire

March 11, 1986

Dear Resident Assistant:

In conjunction with the office of Student Affairs, the following survey is being conducted. The purpose of this research is to gather YOUR opinions on the disciplinary process at Appalachian State University. As a Resident Assistant, part of your job entails confronting and/or enforcing disciplinary problems; therefore, this is YOUR opportunity to express your OWN views on the matter of discipline on campus.

The attached opinionnaire presents a variety of situations that are typical of a college campus and could (or have) occurred at ASU. From the choices on the next page, you are simply asked to respond to each situation by:

- 1) WHO do you think currently adjudicates (judges or decides) the disciplinary sanction imposed on the student?
- 2) WHO do you think SHOULD adjudicate (judge or decide) the disciplinary sanction?
- 3) WHAT disciplinary sanction do you think would be appropriate in each situation?

You are among the random sample of RAs who have been selected to participate in this study, please take a few moments to complete the attached opinionnaire. Your perceptions and opinions on what is currently happening at ASU and what YOU would like to see happen are important!! At the same time, it should be noted that your response will be tabulated with fellow RAs thereby insuring that your own response remains anonymous.

After completing the opinionnaire please return it to the Office of Residence Life (place in the Doughton mailbox) or using the return envelope, drop it in the campus mail box at the university post office. Responses NEED to be returned by March 21 so please complete YOURS today!!

Sincerely,

Kay Gurganus
Graduate Student
(and Doughton RD)

ASU OPINIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Using the scales listed below, choose ONE response for EACH of the following questions:

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
1. A student is apprehended while streaking (in the nude) through the library.	_____	_____	_____
2. A professor finds a student using unauthorized (cheat) notes during a final exam.	_____	_____	_____
3. A student living in the residence hall steals his neighbor's watch while his neighbor is in the shower.	_____	_____	_____
4. A student is obviously drunk and is disrupting students in his residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
5. A student turns in his research paper for English class and while grading the paper, the professor discovers the student has turned in his roommate's research paper from the prior year.	_____	_____	_____
6. Two hours after visitation hours have ended in a residence hall, an RA discovers a male on the female floor.	_____	_____	_____
7. A beer bottle is thrown from the fifth floor of a residence hall window.	_____	_____	_____

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
3. A student calls in a bomb threat to an academic building.	_____	_____	_____
9. A student threatens to assault another student with a knife.	_____	_____	_____
10. A student trying to get a loan from the Financial Aid Office purposely provides false information.	_____	_____	_____
11. A 20-year old sophomore is drinking a beer in the public area of a residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
12. A student shoplifts from the university bookstore.	_____	_____	_____
13. A student is smoking marijuana in the residence hall.	_____	_____	_____
14. A student purposely pulls the fire alarm when there is no fire.	_____	_____	_____
15. A student is found writing graffiti on the bathroom walls.	_____	_____	_____
16. A fight between two students breaks out in the classroom.	_____	_____	_____
17. A student duplicates a university master key without permission.	_____	_____	_____
18. A 17-year old freshman is drinking liquor in the lobby of a residence hall.	_____	_____	_____

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
19. Just "for kicks", a student discharges a fire extinguisher in a residence hall .	_____	_____	_____
20. A student insists on playing his electric guitar very loudly at 9:30 on a Wednesday night in his residence hall room.	_____	_____	_____
21. A student threatens a professor with bodily harm.	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR COMPARATIVE PURPOSES. CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE.

2. Sex: Male Female
3. Classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate
4. How many semesters have you been an RA: 1 2 3 4 5 6+
5. Is your floor predominantly: 1) freshman 2) upperclassmen 3) other
6. Is your floor: 1) A option 2) B option 3) C option
7. Current cumulative grade point average:

below 1.5 1.5-1.99 2.0-2.49 2.5-2.99 3.0-3.49 3.5-4.0
7. Have you ever been charged with any disciplinary violation(s) with formal action taken by:

a. Student Court	yes	no
b. Residence Hall Staff	yes	no
c. Academic Administration	yes	no
d. ASU Security	yes	no
e. Local Law Officials	yes	no
f. Student Affairs Administrators	yes	no

Comments or suggestions may be written on the back of this page.

APPENDIX D

Resident Director Cover Letter and Opinionnaire

March 11, 1986

Dear

In conjunction with the office of Student Affairs, the following survey is being conducted. The purpose of this research is to gather YOUR opinions on the disciplinary process at Appalachian State University. As a Resident Director, part of your job entails confronting and/or enforcing disciplinary problems; therefore, this is YOUR opportunity to express your OWN views on the matter of discipline on campus.

The attached opinionnaire presents a variety of situations that are typical of a college campus and could (or have) occurred at ASU. From the choices on the next page, you are simply asked to respond to each situation by:

- 1) WHO do you think currently adjudicates (judges or decides) the disciplinary sanction imposed on the student?
- 2) WHO do you think SHOULD adjudicate (judge or decide) the disciplinary sanction?
- 3) WHAT disciplinary sanction do you think would be appropriate in each situation?

Your perceptions and opinions on what is currently happening at ASU and what YOU would like to see happen are important (especially from the RD perspective). At the same time, it should be noted that your response will be tabulated with fellow RDs thereby insuring that your own response remains anonymous.

Please take a few moments to complete the opinionnaire. Your response is a necessary part of the research!! A random sample of RAs have also been chosen to participate in this research, please distribute their envelopes and encourage them to complete the opinionnaire and return it!! Thanks in advance for your cooperation!!! You can return your completed opinionnaire to my box--responses NEED to be returned by March 21 so please help me get them back in.

Sincerely,

Kay Gurganus
Graduate Student
(and fellow RD)

ASU OPINIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Using the scales listed below, choose ONE response for EACH of the following questions:

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
--	--	--

A student is apprehended while streaking (in the nude) through the library.

A professor finds a student using unauthorized (cheat) notes during a final exam.

A student living in the residence hall steals his neighbor's watch while his neighbor is in the shower.

A student is obviously drunk and is disrupting students in his residence hall.

A student turns in his research paper for English class and while grading the paper, the professor discovers the student has turned in his roommate's research paper from the prior year.

Two hours after visitation hours have ended in a residence hall, an RA discovers a male on the female floor.

A beer bottle is thrown from the fifth floor of a residence hall window.

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
8 Don't Know	H Don't Know

Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
--	--	--

A student calls in a bomb threat to an academic building.

A student threatens to assault another student with a knife.

A student trying to get a loan from the Financial Aid Office purposely provides false information.

A 20-year old sophomore is drinking a beer in the public area of a residence hall.

A student shoplifts from the university bookstore.

A student is smoking marijuana in the residence hall.

A student purposely pulls the fire alarm when there is no fire.

A student is found writing graffiti on the bathroom walls.

A fight between two students breaks out in the classroom.

A student duplicates a university master key without permission.

A 17-year old freshman is drinking liquor in the lobby of a residence hall.

- 1) WHO do you feel currently adjudicates sanction?
- 2) Who do you feel SHOULD adjudicate sanction?
- 3) WHAT sanction do you feel should be imposed?

WHO ADJUDICATES (JUDGES, DECIDES) SANCTION?	WHAT SANCTION SHOULD BE IMPOSED?
1 No Action Is/Should Be Taken	A None
2 Student Court	B Verbal/Written Warning
3 Residence Hall Staff	C Counseling
4 Academic Administration	D Creative Sanction (designed to "fit the crime")
5 ASU Security	E Probation
6 Local Law Officials	F Suspension
7 Student Affairs Administration	G Expulsion
B Don't Know	H Don't Know

	Question #1 Who Currently Adjudicates?	Question #2 Who Should Adjudicate?	Question #3 What Sanction Imposed?
19. Just "for kicks", a student discharges a fire extinguisher in a residence hall .	_____	_____	_____
20. A student insists on playing his electric guitar very loudly at 9:30 on a Wednesday night in his residence hall room.	_____	_____	_____
21. A student threatens a professor with bodily harm.	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION FOR COMPARATIVE PURPOSES. CIRCLE CORRECT RESPONSE.

Sex: Male Female

Classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate

How many semesters have you been an RD: 1 2 3 4 5 6+

Is your current building predominantly: 1) freshman 2) upperclassmen

Is your current building: 1) A option 2) B option 3) C option

Current cumulative grade point average:

 below 2.0 2.0-2.49 2.5-2.99 3.0-3.49 3.5-4.0

Have you ever been charged with any disciplinary violation(s) with formal action taken by:

a. Student Court	yes	no
b. Residence Hall Staff	yes	no
c. Academic Administration	yes	no
d. ASU Security	yes	no
e. Local Law Officials	yes	no
f. Student Affairs Administrators	yes	no

VITA

Rebecca Kay Gurganus was born in Washington, North Carolina, on January 19, 1962. She attended grade schools in that city and graduated from Washington High School in June of 1979. The following fall she entered East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, where she received a Bachelor of Science in May 1983. She majored in Business Administration with a concentration in Management and received a double minor in Office Administration. She was involved with the residence life program at East Carolina University and in the fall of 1983 accepted a full time Resident Director position at Wingate College, Wingate, North Carolina.

In the summer of 1984 she entered Appalachian State University and began work on a Master's degree. During her studies at Appalachian State University she was awarded a graduate assistantship as a Resident Director. She plans to graduate from the Department of Human Development and Psychological Counseling with a concentration in Student Development in May 1986.

The author is a member of the North Carolina Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors and also the North Carolina Association of Counseling and Development.

Miss Gurganus' permanent address is 109 Hodges Road, Washington, North Carolina. On May 31 of this year, she will marry Tony Godwin of Rockingham, North Carolina.