

## CRIMINOLOGY STUDENT'S DISCIPLINE

**Angelo T. Layson, MSCJ**

Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology, Sagay City, Philippines

### ABSTRACT

*Student's develop to become responsible and respectful. This study is about disciplinary problem among 45 respondents of the Criminology students who had disciplinary records in their respective schools in the first semester Academic Calendar 2014 -2015. Descriptive designs were used and purposive sampling was applied to the actual fifteen Criminology students from each school. Self-made instruments were used to find out the factors associated with discipline while records from the Discipline Office were accessed to find out the prevalent disciplinary problems of the participants. Factors associated to the discipline of the Criminology students were school environment, home environment, and peer groups. The results of this study showed that the prevalent disciplinary problem among 45 Criminology students are fraternity, teacher's instructions, haircut. The school environment and the home environment are very strong factors associated with the discipline of the Criminology students. The respondent who graduated in the public school is less discipline when it comes to home environment and peer groups on the other hand respondents who graduated in private school is well discipline on both variables.*

*Key words: discipline, Criminology students, Home environment, School environment, Peer factor.*

### INTRODUCTION

Student's discipline is an important factor to provide an ideal place for learning wherein students will not only acquire knowledge and skills within the four walls of the classroom but also on the campus where they get to observe, interact, and find belongingness as they pursue higher levels of learning according to Chu, Abella,Paurin (2013).

According to Gaustad (2014), school discipline has two main goals: (1) ensure the safety of staff and students, and (2) create an environment conducive to learning.

Nakpoda (2010) stated that students are priceless assets and most essential elements in education. It is absolutely necessary to direct students to exhibit acceptable attitude and behaviour within and outside the school.

Siegel, (2015) the school environment is just but a contributing factor to how students behave. School contribute to criminality when they label problem youths and set them apart from conventional society

According to Sheldon & Epstein (2002)suggest that creating more connections and greater cooperation among the school, family, and community contexts may be one way for schools to improve student behaviour and school discipline..

Siegel, (2015) it should also be considered that the peers or the students wherein an individual gets to interact also contributes how he behaves and reacts to certain situations. The peer group has powerful effect on human conduct and can have a dramatic influence on decision making and behaviour choices. But importantly the kind of environment at home also fosters discipline in the student. There is abundant evidence that parenting factors, such as the ability to communicate and to provide proper discipline, may play a critical role in determining whether people misbehave as children and even later as adults.

Brantlinger et al (1991) research indicates that schools too often emphasize. The punitive measures to manage student behaviour. This over emphasis occurs disproportionately with males, minority students, and students from low-income home.

From among the various students in every academic program, the Criminology students as future law enforcers of this country is expected to demonstrate discipline as part of their conduct and their training. As future law enforcement officer, they should be role models of student discipline. However, young as they are they may be tempted to react to school situations the other way. It is then worth knowing what are the disciplinary problems committed by Criminology students and the factors that are concomitant to their discipline.

### Statements of the Problem

1. What is the profile of the participants in terms of?
  - a. age;
  - b. sex;
  - c. religion;
  - d. type of secondary school graduated;
  - e. student's academic status; and
  - f. socio economic status?
2. What are the prevalent disciplinary problems of the Criminology students in three schools?
3. What are the factors associated with discipline among Criminology students when grouped as to variable?
  - a. School Environment
  - b. Home Environment
  - c. Peer Groups
4. Is there a significant difference in the prevalent disciplinary problems of the Criminology students in three schools when grouped as to?

5. Is there a significant difference in the factors associated with discipline among Criminology student?

### **Hypotheses**

1. There is no significant difference in the prevalent disciplinary problems of the Criminology students in three schools when grouped as to:
2. There is no significant difference in the factors associated with discipline among Criminology students when grouped as to:

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents the research design, the participants, measures, procedures and the statistical tools used in treating the data of this study.

#### **Research Design**

This study used the descriptive method in finding out the Criminology student's discipline problems and the factors associated with discipline among the Criminology students of College A (City College), College B SUC), and College C(Private). Descriptive research is used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena to describe "what exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. The methods involved range from the survey which describes the status quo, the correlation study which investigates the relationship between variables, to developmental studies which seek to determine changes over time.

#### **Respondents**

The respondents of this study were the forty-five Criminology students from College A (City College), College B SUC), and College C (Private). There were fifteen participants from each school. The actual respondents were obtained by accessing the records of every Discipline Office of the three schools. They were Criminology students with disciplinary records in their respective school. Since the actual number of Criminology students with records of discipline are less than one hundred, all were taken as participants. For the survey, purposive sampling was used. Purposive sampling according to Paller - Calmorin (2010), is a non-scientific sampling designed on selecting the individuals as samples according to the purpose of the researcher as his controls. An individual is chosen as part of a sample due to good evidence that he is a representative of the total population.

#### **Measures**

This study used a five-point Likert-type scale self-made questionnaire to find out the factors associated with discipline among the Criminology students of College A (City College), College B SUC), and College C (Private). The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of the profile of the participants and the second part contained indicator statements to find out the factors. There were three factors described in the thirty indicator statements. For

the school environment, there were ten positive indicator statements; for the home environment, five positive indicator statements, and five negative indicator statements; for the peer group, there is only one positive indicator statement and nine negative indicator statements. The response choices were 5 - Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 - Uncertain, 2 – Disagree, and 1 - Strongly Disagree. The interpretations of the scores used were as follows:

### **For the indicator statements indicating positive factors**

#### **Scores Verbal Interpretation**

4.01 – 5.00	very strong associated positive factor
3.01 – 4.00	Strong associated positive factor
2.01 – 3.00	moderately associated positive factor
1.01 – 2.00	slightly associated positive factor
0.00 – 1.00	not an associated positive factor

### **For the indicator statements indicating negative factors**

#### **Scores Verbal Interpretation**

4.01 – 5.00	Very strong associated negative factor
3.01 – 4.00	Strong associated negative factor
2.01 – 3.00	moderately associated negative factor
1.01 – 2.00	slightly associated negative factor
0.00 – 1.00	not an associated negative factor

To establish the validity of the questionnaire the researcher used the Good and Scates research evaluation form. The instrument was given to a research professor, Criminology instructor, and a professor with a background in research. They were asked to rate the relevance of the items in relation to the research problem and the consistency of the grammar.

The reliability of the instrument was established by conducting a one-shot survey to the ten Criminology students of La Carlota City. Like the participants of this study, they have discipline records in their school. The Cronbach's Alpha of 0.73 established the reliability of the instrument.

### **Procedures**

1. The researcher presented the proposed instrument of the study to the members of the thesis panel for corrections and suggestions.
2. Before the administration of the instrument to the participants, the researcher established the validity and the reliability of the questionnaire.
3. For the actual survey, the researcher sent a letter to the deans or program heads of the Criminology Department. Upon obtaining the approval to conduct the study, the researcher informed the participants of the set the time and place of the survey.

4. The researcher in coordination with the Criminology department explained to the participants the nature and importance of the study and gave them instructions in answering the instrument.
5. The participants were given enough time to answer and after which the researcher gathered the questionnaire for statistical treatment.
6. For the records of the prevalent discipline problems of the Criminology students who were the participants of this study, the researcher asked permission from the school Discipline Officer to access the records to find out those Criminology students who had disciplinary records.

### Data Analysis

The following statistical tools were used in treating the data:

1. For the problem number 1 the respondent the frequency was used.
2. For the problem number 2 the mean was used.
3. To determine the significant differences in the responses of the participants the Mann-Whitney U test was used.

## RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

**Table 1**

**The Profile of the Participants**

Stratification Variables	Categories	Schools			Frequency, f	Percent, %
		College A (City College) (n=15)	College B (SUC) (n=15)	College C (Private) (n=15)		
Age (in years)	19 and below	6	8	9	23	51
	20 and above	9	7	6	22	49
Sex	Male	12	11	13	36	80
	Female	3	4	2	9	20
Religion	Catholic	14	12	11	37	82
	Non-Catholic	1	3	4	8	18
Secondary School Graduated From	Public	12	15	14	41	91
	Private	3	0	1	4	9
Socio-Economic Status	Below P10,000	10	11	9	30	67
	P10,000 - Above	5	4	6	15	33
Students Status	Regular	14	9	10	33	73
	Irregular	1	6	5	12	27

The participants when grouped as to age, 51% are 19 years old and below while 49% are 20 years old and above. When the participants are grouped as to sex, 80% or 36 are males while 20% or 9 are females. When grouped as to religion, 82% or 37 participants are Catholic, while 18% or 8 are Non-Catholic the participants when grouped as to secondary schools graduated from, 91% or 41 came from public schools, and 9% or 4 came from private schools

When grouped as to socio-economic status 67% or 30 had a family income of below P10, 000 while 33% or 15 had a family income of P10, 000 above. As to student's status, 73% or 33 of the participants are regular students of their respective schools and 27% or 12 are irregular students.

## Inferential Results

**Table 2**

**Difference in the Prevalent Disciplinary Problems of the Criminology Students in Three Schools**

Prevalent Problems	n	Schools			$\chi^2$	df	p-value	Phi Coefficient	Interpretation
		College A (City College) (n=15)	College B (SUC) (n=15)	College C (Private) (n=15)					
Non-Wearing of School Uniform	25	2	11	12	36.28	$8 \times 10^{-5}$	0.898	Significant	
Fraternity	7	7	0	0					
Non-Wearing of School ID	6	0	4	2					
Classroom Policy	5	5	0	0					
Haircut Violations	2	1	0	1					
Total	45	15	15	15					

Statistics: Chi-Square Test for Relatedness or Independence/Phi coefficient.

\*Data were analyzed using the Mega Stat Microsoft Excel Add-Ins.

Significant, if  $p \leq \alpha = 0.05$  (Two-Tailed)

For the significant difference in the prevalent disciplinary problems of the Criminology students in the three schools, showed that the degree of freedom which is 8, the p-value of 1.56

which is greater than the alpha value of 0.05 with the coefficient of 0.898 indicated that there is a significant difference in the prevalent problems which are the Non-Wearing of School Uniform, Fraternity, Non-Wearing of School ID, Teacher's Instructions, and Haircut Violations.

The results on the difference in the Factor Associated with Discipline among Criminology Students, when grouped as to age, showed nonsignificance in the factors school environment, home environment and in the nine negative indicators for the peer group. Their p-values are greater than the alpha value of 0.05 thus they are not significant. The hypothesis postulated earlier in the study is accepted that there is no significant difference in the factor associated with the discipline among Criminology students when grouped as to age in the factors school environment, home environment and peer groups (nine negative indicator statements). However the p-value of the only positive statement in the factor peer groups is lesser than the alpha level of 0.05, thus there is a significant difference. The hypothesis, in this case, is rejected.

**Table 3**

**Factors Associated with Discipline among Criminology Students according to School Graduated From**

Factors		Statistic	School Graduated From	
			Public (n=41)	Private (n=4)
School Environment	Positive (+)	Mean	4.19	4.43
		Description	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
		Verbal Interpretation	Very strong associated positive factor	Very strong associated positive factor
Home Environment	Positive (+)	Mean	4.20	4.50
		Description	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
		Verbal Interpretation	Very strong associated positive factor	Very strong associated positive factor
	Negative (-)	Mean	2.68	3.79
		Description	<b>Uncertain</b>	<b>Agree</b>
		Verbal Interpretation	Moderately associated negative factor	Strong associated negative factor
Peer Groups	Positive (+)	Mean	3.76	4.75
		Description	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
		Verbal Interpretation	Strong associated Positive factor	Very strong associated positive factor
	Negative (-)	Mean	2.33	3.31
		Description	<b>Uncertain</b>	<b>Agree</b>
		Verbal Interpretation	Moderately associated negative factor	Strong associated negative factor

When grouped as to secondary school graduated from, both students who came from the public and private strongly agree that the school environment is a very strong associated positive factor in their discipline with the mean scores of 4.19 and 4.43 respectively. Both groups also strongly agree that the five indicator statements in the home environment are very strong associated positive factor with the mean score of 4.20 and 4.50 respectively while in the remaining five indicator statements those who came from public schools said that it is moderately associated negative factor with a mean score of 2.68 while those who came from private said that it is a strong associated negative factor with a mean score of 3.79. In the factor

peer groups, those who came from public schools said that the only positive indicator statement is a strong associated factor while those who came from private said that it is a very strong associated positive factor with mean scores of 3.76 and 4.75 respectively. For the nine negative indicator statements, those who came from public schools said that it is moderately associated negative factor with a mean score of 2.33 and those who came from private said that it is a strong associated negative factor with the mean score of 3.31.

Table 5

**Difference in the Factor Associated with Discipline among Criminology Students as to Type of Secondary School Graduated.**

Factors		Secondary School Graduated	n	Sum of Ranks	Z-score, corrected for ties	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) p-value	Interpretation
School Environment	Positive (+)	Public	41	928.0	-0.61	0.5413	Not Significant
		Private	4	107.0			
Home Environment	Positive (+)	Public	41	933.0	-0.40	0.6905	Not Significant
	Negative (-)	Private	4	102.0			
Peer Groups	Positive (+)	Public	41	893.5	-1.98	0.0478	Significant
	Negative (-)	Private	4	141.5			
Peer Groups	Positive (+)	Public	41	895.0	-1.99	0.0462	Significant
	Negative (-)	Private	4	140.0			
Peer Groups	Positive (+)	Public	41	904.0	-1.62	0.1048	Not Significant
	Negative (-)	Private	4	131.0			

The results on the difference in the factor associated with discipline among Criminology Students when grouped as to secondary school graduated showed non-significance in the factors school environment, home environment (five positive statements) and peer group (nine negative indicator statements). Their p-values are greater than the alpha value of 0.05 thus they are not significant. There is no significant difference in the factor associated with the discipline among Criminology students when grouped as to secondary school graduated in the factors school environment, home environment ( five positive statements) and peer group(nine negative indicator statements) Thus, the hypothesis stated in the study is accepted. However, there is a significant difference in the five negative indicator statements of the factor home environment and one positive indicator statement of peer groups. The p-value is lesser than the alpha level of 0.05, there is a significant difference in this area, and thus the hypothesis advanced for this factor is rejected.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the result, the conclusion was as follows:

The prevalent disciplinary problem among the 45 Criminology students is the non-wearing of school uniforms. The non-wearing of school ID, fraternity, teacher's instructions, and haircut are also prevalent problems among the Criminology students of the three schools.

The school environment and the home environment are very strong factors associated with the discipline of the Criminology students. The peer pressure is a moderate factor associated with the discipline of the 45 Criminology students. There is a significant difference in the prevalent disciplinary problems of the Criminology students when grouped as to schools.

There is no significant difference in the factors associated with the discipline of the Criminology students when grouped as to age, sex, religion, student's academic status secondary school graduated from, and socio-economic status.

The respondent who graduated in the public school is less discipline when it comes to home environment and peer groups on the other hand respondents who graduated in private school is well discipline on both variables.

### **Recommendation**

1. The schools may design a program as a way to provide students with a consistent and fair plan of what will happen if they misbehave. The program will also re-orient the students of the school policies that concern them the most.
2. It is recommended to invite the participation of the parents of the students who had a disciplinary problem in school to participate in corrective activities that concern their child. This parent involvement encourages strengthen of relationship as well as letting the parents understand the importance of obeying the school policy which was violated by the youth.
3. The guidance personnel and the disciplined personnel should conduct a yearly values formation gathering and tapping organizations that promote teenager values and responsibility.
4. It is recommended that guidance personnel should make a follow-up and track the activities of those students who violated the fraternity policy of the school. This is a way to ensure that they are no longer connected with any fraternity in the area.
5. Revised the rules and regulations on student activities with the consultation of the parents, otherwise, abolish this fraternity and sorority since this organization is not conform with the RA 8049 or Anti-Hazing Law

**REFERENCES**

- Chu,C.,Abella,I.S.&Paurini,S.(2013).Educational practices that benefit Pacific learners in tertiary education. Ako Aotearoa, National Centre for Tertiary Teaching Excellence. New Zealand
- Linkona, K., (2004). Teaching Respect and Responsibility. Online Journal of the International Child and Youth Care Network (Cyc-Net) – Issn 1605-7406.New York
- Siegel,L.J.(2013).Criminology Theories, Patterns And Typologies. (12th Ed)
- Cameron, M. and Sheppard, S.M. (2006). School Discipline and Social Work Practice:
- Gaustad, J. (2014). School Discipline. Source ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
- Manebog, J. (2011). The Committee on Student Discipline And Evaluation (CSDE) In Philippine Schools.
- Paler-Calmorin, L. (2010).Research and Statistics. National Book Store, Mandaluyong City, Philippines.
- Brantlinger, 1991; McFadden, Marsh, Price, & Hwang, 1992; Moore & Cooper, 1984; S. Shaw & Braden, 1990).