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CHAPTER I

A DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

Prominent authorities in modern American higher education are beginning to demand an "Age of Renaissance" with respect to the philosophical obligation of more dynamically integrating the student housing program into the total academic community. This viable request is based upon the plea for a more productive relationship between the individual student and his campus environment.1 It has been only since the 1920's that the educational potential of student housing has been considered seriously. Strozier captured the impact potential of student housing if a renaissance occurs in this vital area of American higher education when he stated:

If the proper recognition of the importance of student housing to higher education ever becomes a universal reality, it will mark not only the greatest change in student personnel administration in the history of higher education in America, but also will represent a basic change in American educational philosophy as well.2

---


Factors Affecting the Purpose of the Study

The quality of education provided by our nation's institutions of higher learning is coming increasingly under the scrutiny of its educational leaders. Student housing represents one of the vital areas in education presently under the scrutiny of American educators. As a result of this focal attention, colleges and universities have been encouraged to re-examine the educational potentialities of their respective student housing programs. Representative forces which have contributed to the need for a thorough re-examination of traditionally accepted educational practices have been suggested by Shaffer and Ferber when they stated:

... hordes of prospective new students, the demand for higher academic standards, the shock of expanding budgets, the incredible growth of scientific and technological knowledge, the application of research in the behavioral sciences to the educational process, and the enlarging role of universities in world affairs. ... ³

Within this framework of forces, the modern American student is beginning to demand more from his college experience than the (1) mere acquisition of facts, (2) limited social and cultural experiences, and (3) austere human

relationships within the academic community, viz., with faculty, administrators, alumni, and other students.  

Purposes of the Study

The purposes for conducting this study on the future role of student housing are as follows:

1. To study the expressed ideals of leading student housing authorities as to the most applicable fusion of "living" and "learning" with regard to the undergraduate residence hall environment.

2. To construct a Student Housing Inventory for distribution to chief housing officers at selected four-year institutions of higher learning.

3. To determine the current status of undergraduate men's residence hall programs in relation to physical facilities, programming, staffing, and financing.

4. To determine the perceptions of chief housing officers about future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions in relation to physical facilities, programming, staffing, and financing.

5. To determine the significance of several types of independent variables as they relate to chief housing

---

officers' perceptions of future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with regard to physical facilities, programming, staffing, and financing.

6. To make recommendations, based upon the findings of the study, for implementing an "educationally oriented," in contrast to a "shelter oriented," student housing program.

Assumptions of the Study

This study is based upon the following fundamental assumptions:

1. That a study of the educational role of student housing is needed critically in order to encourage American higher education to implement its new political, economic, and social role in a modern twentieth century American society.

2. That the "educative ideals" expressed in the student housing literature are far ahead of the current student housing situation at most American colleges and universities.

3. That the university may be conceptualized as a social system which responds to multifarious exogenous and endogenous stresses and strains.⁵

4. That a small campus environment may be as impersonal as the large campus environment.

5. That the student housing program must be integrated more fully into the total academic community to make its optimum educative potentialities realized.

6. That if student housing programs are going to progress in a more educative direction, chief housing officers and their respective staffs must evaluate continuously their existing procedures and become less skeptical of new, dynamic, and viable approaches for attaining an educational role for student housing in modern American higher education.

Definitions of Terms

**Educationally oriented student housing program.**—A student housing program which is based upon the two assumptions that learning is a total process and that the residence hall environment exerts a strong influence upon the intellectual, social, and cultural development of the student. As a result of this potential influence, all components of the residence hall organization—program, staff, physical facilities, finances—have been designed to provide the student with a living experience which is integrated fully with the educational goals of the total campus environment.

**Shelter oriented student housing program.**—A housing program which is concerned primarily with the provision of student sleeping and eating facilities. Representative characteristics of this type of student housing program
include the following: (1) The strict adherence to the most efficient, in contrast to the most effective, means of accommodating students. (2) The present housing organization—program, staff, physical facilities, finances—is in need of only minor revisions. (3) The architect, student, and faculty member have a limited role in choosing the type of residence hall living arrangement.

The shelter oriented student housing program is perceived to be a peripheral concern of the college or university and thus is not integrated fully with the educational goals of the total campus environment.

**Bachelor's degree level of educational background.**—An awarded basic degree in any field of study from a four-year institution of higher learning.

**Master's degree level of educational background.**—An awarded advanced degree by a four-year institution of higher learning in any field of study which describes a plateau between the bachelor's degree and the doctorate degree.

**Doctorate degree level of educational background.**—An awarded advanced degree by a four-year institution of higher learning in any field of study which denotes either a doctorate degree of philosophy or a doctorate degree of education.

**Student personnel type of educational background.**—A type of educational background which may be characterized by
academic degrees from four-year institutions of higher learning and experience in such areas as psychology, guidance, sociology, and student personnel administration.

**Educational administration type of educational background.**—A type of educational background which may be characterized by academic degrees from four-year institutions of higher learning and experience in such fields as public school administration, college and/or university administration, and curriculum administration.

**Business type of educational background.**—A type of educational background which may be characterized by academic degrees from four-year institutions of higher learning, and experience in such areas as accounting, economics, industrial administration, and hotel management.

"Other" type of educational background.**—A miscellaneous category of educational backgrounds which is perceived to have limited applicability relating to the position of chief housing officer at four-year institutions of higher learning. Representative examples include backgrounds in French, German, elementary education, vocational agriculture, animal husbandry, and theatrics.

**Professional organizations.**—Any type of organization which promotes the educational advancement of academicians through the publication of national or regional journals and/or the holding of annual conventions for its respective members.
Published research on student housing.---Research which has appeared in book form or in national or regional educational journals written by chief housing officers on student housing.

Undergraduate men's residence hall program.---A term used to describe the totality of the undergraduate men's residence hall program. This totality implies interaction among the programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing factors of student housing.

Programming factor.---Statements on the Student Housing Inventory which pertain to the student's role and the afforded opportunities provided by the undergraduate men's residence hall system. Representative program areas include room assignments, student government, student counseling, communications, cultural and instructional programs.

Physical facilities factor.---Statements on the Student Housing Inventory which portray the student's physical environment with respect to the undergraduate men's residence hall program. Major emphases of the physical facilities factor include the arrangement of student rooms, study areas, dining facilities, and the general architectural design of residence hall facilities.

Staffing factor.---Statements on the Student Housing Inventory which pertain to the role and function of the administrative, management, and student personnel staffs with regard to the undergraduate men's residence hall program.
Financing factor.—Statements on the Student Housing Inventory which are designed primarily to obtain an overview of the various types of financial bases upon which undergraduate men's residence halls are built.

Chief housing officer.—The official of an educational institution who is charged with the direct responsibility for the total operation of the student housing program. According to the type and size of the institution, the chief housing officer generally has an administrative line relationship with the chief student personnel administrator and/or the chief university business administrator.

Public controlled institution.—Any type of four-year institution which is supported and controlled by the state, and administers primarily to the educational needs of the surrounding populace.

Privately controlled institution.—The following two types of four-year institutions are considered to be controlled privately: (1) Any type of institution connected with a religious denomination ranging from a present and complete degree of control to a past historical association. (2) Any type of institution under the control of a governing board which is independent of public governmental agencies except for charter or statutory limitations.6

Procedures Used in Making the Study

Construction of the Student Housing Inventory.—Reflecting upon the literature in student housing, a Student Housing Inventory was constructed for fulfilling the purposes of the study. This inventory consists of one hundred and sixteen statements which are purported to be indicative of either an "educationally oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall program or a "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall program. These statements have been dispersed throughout the inventory and are designed to cluster around the four major factors of programming, staffing, physical facilities, and financing.

An attempt at construct validity for the Student Housing Inventory has been accomplished through the distribution of the inventory to "educationally oriented" student housing personnel and "managerially oriented" student housing personnel on The Ohio State University campus. These persons gave their respective assessments of the applicability of the statements for measuring what they purport to measure. Based upon these assessments and impressions gleaned from the current student housing literature, a code was devised for scoring Sections II and III of the Student Housing Inventory. Whereas Column I of the inventory gives an indication

of present student housing conditions, Column II yields perceptions of future desirable conditions. Under each of the four factors (programming, staffing, physical facilities, financing), respective statements have been assigned an "E" (educationally oriented) rating or an "S" (shelter oriented) rating. "Weights" for all of the "E" and "S" statements in Column II have been assigned as follows: (a) Highly Desirable = 5; (b) Moderately Desirable = 4; (c) Desirable = 3; (d) Moderately Undesirable = 2; and (e) Highly Undesirable = 1.

For this study, the .05 level of confidence will be considered as significant. This level of confidence was chosen to minimize type I and type II errors. The required statistics for the study have been performed at The Ohio State University Research Center by the MR-90 Program on the 7094 computer. Because of the nature of the MR-90 Program,

Statistical consultants chose the MR-90 Program because of its flexibility and subsequent capacity for performing the required computations for this study. The MR-90 Program consists of a series of regression and correlation computations designed primarily to give information concerning the nature and extent of relationships between two or more variables. Principal output items of the MR-90 Program are as follows: (1) the estimated standard deviation of the parent population of each of the variables in the analyses; (2) the covariance and the coefficient of correlation between each of the variables in the analyses; (3) the coefficients associated with each independent variables; (4) the coefficient of multiple correlation; and (5) the confidence limits for the regression and correlation estimates.

statistical consultants advised that only one hundred and sixty-eight fully completed inventories be considered for statistical computations.

Sample for the study.—For the purpose of this study, institutions of higher learning had to meet the following criteria: (1) a member of the association of American College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO), (2) a four-year college or university, (3) a coed or all male student population, and (4) be located within the United States. Thus, excluded from the study were institutions not members of ACUHO, institutions with two-year programs only, those outside the United States, and those for women only.

The size of institutions for this study is based upon the number of full-time resident students according to data within the publication Fall Enrollment in Higher Education.9 The selected institutions were divided arbitrarily into the following size categories: (a) 0-2,000; (b) 2,001-4,000; (c) 4,001-10,000; (d) 10,001-20,000, and (e) 20,001-above.

The type of control (public or private) for the selected institutions has been determined from information listed in the publication Comparative Guide to American Colleges.10

---


The sample institutions have been divided into nine geographical regions which have been designated as the "Association of College and University Housing Officers Regional Districts." The states which are included in each geographical region are listed in Appendix A.

Table 1 has been included to provide a summary of the number of institutions eligible to participate in this study. This table should be read both horizontally and vertically to attain a perspective of these institutions according to type of control, size, and geographical location.

Distribution of the Student Housing Inventory.—A "Student Housing Inventory Packet" was mailed to the 317 sample institutions included in this study. The packet included the following materials: (1) a personally addressed letter to the chief housing officer requesting his cooperation in the study, (2) a letter of endorsement from Dr. H. C. Riker, Chairman of the Research and Information Committee of ACUHO, (3) a copy of the Student Housing Inventory, and (4) a postage-paid, self-addressed, return envelope for the inventory. This packet was mailed to the institutions on November 26, 1967, with a return date of December 15, 1967. An identical packet, with the substitution of a personally

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Public Controlled Institutions</th>
<th>ACUHO Regional Districts</th>
<th>Total by Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-10,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by Region</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Private Controlled Institutions</th>
<th>ACUHO Regional Districts</th>
<th>Total by Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 +</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by Region</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals by Region for both Types of Institutions | 59 | 29 | 21 | 52 | 31 | 36 | 22 | 21 | 46 | 317 |
addressed "follow-up" letter to the chief housing officer, was mailed to non-respondent institutions on December 30, 1967, with a return date of January 12, 1968. As a result of these two attempts, a total of 210 usable inventories were returned. Twenty-five other inventories were returned with letters of explanation concerning various reasons for not participating in this nationwide study. Thus, the overall rate of return for the study was 66 per cent.

A copy of the initial "Student Housing Inventory Packet" and the devised code for scoring the inventory have been placed in Appendix A.

Table 2 provides a summary of the 210 participating institutions. This table should be read both horizontally and vertically to obtain a perspective of these institutions as to type of control, size, and geographical location.

From the data presented in Table 1 and Table 2, further preliminary analysis of the participating institutions is possible. Three tables have been placed in Appendix A to provide a summary of the percentage of participating institutions according to type of control, size, and geographical location respectively.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study are as follows:

1. The consideration of only the men's undergraduate university owned residence hall program. The rationale for
### TABLE 2

**TYPE OF CONTROL, SIZE, AND GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Public Controlled Institutions</th>
<th>ACUHO Regional Districts</th>
<th>Total by Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-10,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by Region</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Private Controlled Institutions</th>
<th>ACUHO Regional Districts</th>
<th>Total by Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-10,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by Region</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total (by Region for both Types of Institutions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this limitation is that different conditions exist within the women's undergraduate university residence hall program.

2. Because of the magnitude of the study, only major themes or trends have been discerned from the data. Important details and underlying factors may have been overshadowed by this type of approach.

3. The Student Housing Inventory is the innovation of this writer and is in need of further refinement to insure more fully that it measures what it purports to measure. As in all other studies, the results, conclusions, and recommendations from this study are limited by the instrument constructed for the research.

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses which have been tested for this study are listed as follows:

There is a positive correlation between "educationally oriented" (hereafter "E" scores) scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the programming factor.
B. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the financing factor.

There is a positive correlation between "shelter oriented" (hereafter "S" scores) scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the financing factor.

There is a negative correlation between the "E" scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall
conditions (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the financing factor.

There is no significant difference between the educational levels of chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.
There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II programming factor "E" scores.
B. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II financing factor "E" scores.

There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.
D. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.

There is no significant difference between the educational levels of chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.

There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.
B. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II staffing factor "S" scores.
D. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II financing factor "S" scores.

There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

This dissertation is divided into four interdependent chapters. Chapter I provides a complete description of the study in relation to its purposes, assumptions, definitions of terms, methodology, limitations, and hypotheses. An extensive review of the student housing literature is presented
in Chapter II. Findings of the study are the major concern of Chapter III. A summary of the study with conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter IV to complete the organization of this dissertation.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Historical Perspective

Residence halls in American higher education have been influenced significantly by educational philosophies which began hundreds of years ago on foreign soils. Cowley has asserted that housing became important "chiefly because thousands of vagantes, or wandering students, flocked to the seats of learning at Bologna and Paris and Oxford."¹ By the middle of the thirteenth century, enrollment at these institutions had risen to 10,000, 30,000, and 3,000 respectively. Because of extremely poor housing facilities, students began to organize themselves into "mutual welfare" groups. At Bologna, "socii" were established in order to provide democratic and self-governing eating and living arrangements known as hospicia or hostels. These types of accommodations were the actual beginnings of student housing; however, university controlled housing was still in the future.²


The "socii" plan was adopted in student living groups known as "paedagogies" at Paris, and "colleges" at Oxford. However, with the beginning of publicly endowed student living facilities, these universities began to assert more authority over the living conditions. Thus, "in the course of two centuries the houses which students had established on their own initiative had passed entirely from their control into the hands of the university authorities."\(^3\)

The Reformation and the French Revolution greatly altered the structure of university housing in Europe. A subsuming example occurred in 1809, when no provision was made for constructing student housing at the University of Berlin. However, England, relatively insulated from both the Reformation and the Revolution, continued to use the "college" system which had been inherited from Paris.\(^4\)

The founding of America witnessed the British precedent of providing for student housing. Messer has described the American modifications of the British philosophy when he stated:

British housing had basic educational purposes but American modification of the housing philosophy brought about the belief that housing was only the physical matter of providing shelter for the students. Secondary to the belief of concerning the

---

\(^3\)Cowley, "History of Student Residential Housing," p. 706.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 707.
necessity to provide shelter, was the idea that residence housing should bring about a degree of supervision of the student's daily life so that he could study with more facility. This factor of supervision of the student's life brought about tight student discipline and control.\(^5\)

Consequently, the faculty member living in the dormitory became the students' natural enemy. In 1850, President Tappan of the University of Michigan aptly expressed the increasing American sentiment toward dormitories of the period when he asserted:

> The dormitory system is objectionable in itself. By withdrawing young men from the influence of domestic circles and separating them from the community, they are often led to contract evil habits and are prone to fall into disorderly conduct. The difficulties of maintaining discipline are equally increased. It is a mere remnant of the monkish cloisters of the middle ages, still retained in England, indeed, but banished from the universities of Germany.\(^6\)

Interestingly, no state university in America which was founded in the nineteenth century had dormitory accommodations. However, the pendulum of twentieth century student housing in American higher education was ready to swing in a more educational direction. Cowley has characterized this

---


rejuvenation while listing the following historical events:

. . . the Hadley protest at Yale, the establishment of dormitories at Chicago, the efforts of Wilson at Princeton, the Lowell program at Harvard, the residential philosophy of the eastern women's colleges, the work of the deans of women and finally the hue and cry for more student life from students and alumni. 7

To summarize, the history of student housing may be termed as vacillating from periods of importance to periods of peripheral concern. European student housing initially arose to meet the crisis of increasing student enrollments and was influenced subsequently by the Reformation and the French Revolution. Analogously, American student housing has vacillated while striving to reach an applicable compromise between the German and the English philosophies of student housing. Historically, the American synthesis may be perceived as providing students with physical shelter and only since the 1920's has the educational potential of the residence hall been considered seriously.

Purposes of Student Housing

In order to understand more fully the purposes of student housing, we must expand our conceptual framework to include (1) discernible national trends which have direct implications for American higher education, and (2) the primary objectives of higher education.

The first national trend involves demographic changes which will cause university populations to expand and become more heterogeneous. Indicative of this trend is the "rural-to-urban" population shift in America. Related statistics compiled by the editors of *College and University Business* indicate that in 1965 "almost 43 percent of the students pursuing higher education in this country were enrolled by only 6 percent of the institutions of higher education."\(^8\)

Technological advances which ultimately will require student preparation for the acquisition of ever-changing knowledge is another discernible trend. Equalitarianism, by which the university increasingly will be expected to provide educational opportunities, and internationalism, for a new perspective of the world, conclude these broad societal trends which will be undoubtedly major factors influencing our American educational system.\(^9\)

American higher education is an important instrument employed by the populace for the ultimate realization of such basic principles as liberty, equal opportunity, and common welfare. From these principles are derived the objectives of higher education which are based upon four

---

\(^8\)Harold W. Herman, "Where the Students Were: Enrollment Dispersion 1965," *College and University Business*, XVI, No. 3 (1966), 60.

major aims. Riker has summarized these aims as follows:

... to preserve and improve the American way of life.

... to stimulate the individual to grow so that he may better develop his particular abilities.

... to foster development toward better human relationships.

... to develop an environment for growth.\(^{10}\)

Within this framework is the university and its residence hall program. While cognizant of the fact that other important forces contribute to the university environment, purposes of the residence hall program will be explored through the use of applicable student housing literature.

Two common characteristics of the purposes of residence hall programs are their generality and their inclusiveness. Hayes, one of the earliest writers on this topic, has stated that residence halls should provide students with personal safety and physical surroundings; proper living, academic study, and administrative activities; formal and informal social experiences.\(^{11}\)

Lloyd-Jones and Smith have expressed the belief that most educators desire optimum physical, emotional, moral,


social, and mental development in college and university students. These educators are beginning to recognize the opportunities that a well organized housing program affords for attaining these worthy goals. They conclude by stating that a meaningful student housing program provides institutions of higher learning with an excellent method for shaping the experiences and influences that stimulate a student's total development.\footnote{12}

The Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions has asserted that administrative attitudes toward the student housing program reflect the prevailing educational philosophy held by the respective institutions of higher learning. If the function of the university is to educate the student's mind apart from his body, the residence hall program would not be of concern to administrators unless it interfered with the student's academic work. However, if a college education means the totality of the student's growth processes, then experiences provided by the residence hall program would be an integral part of higher education.\footnote{13}


In 1947, Hayes endorsed the beliefs held by the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions while listing seven basic goals of residence hall administration as: (1) education for social graces, (2) education for vocational understanding, (3) education in group loyalty, (4) education in value judgment, (5) education in group living, (6) education in civic and governmental responsibility, and (7) education in self understanding.\(^\text{14}\)

Borreson has suggested five propositions to define the educational use of student living units on college and university campuses when he stated:

First, the living unit is a display case of social-psychological mechanism, the dynamics and behavior integrated badly or not at all with the educational techniques and objectives used in the counselor's office and the classroom.

Second, if the basic abstractions and concepts of general education are to result in meaningful and consistent behavior, they must be derived from and applied to the immediate experience of the individual student. More experience is available in the dynamics of the residential living situation than in any other reasonably controlled frame of reference available at a college level.

Third, real educational use of the living unit demands broad positive educational objectives and rigorous criticism and validation of the techniques used to achieve these objectives. Currently only limited use is made of environmental manipulation as an aspect of therapy, and this is almost invariably phrased negatively. Removal from an adverse environment rather than positive educational manipulation is the rule of present practice.

Fourth, if the potential of previous propositions is to be realized, I naturally conclude that educational control over living units is essential.

Fifth, without closer working relationships between the instructional and student personnel staffs, these educational potentials will never be fulfilled.15

Dammen has quoted Halverson to provide additional reasons for the necessity of viewing the residence hall program as an inextricable part of the university's educational environment. Halverson explained these reasons when he stated:

Personally I can see little or no justification for the university's going into the room and boarding business. But there is much justification in bettering housing and living conditions, in giving students the protection and security of a well-conceived system where living in the halls will be an educational experience and privilege, a system which stresses the social values of living together, of getting the other fellow's viewpoint, of learning to get along with one another and to respect another's opinions. . . . All these experiences are cultural and educational and to us worthwhile.16

Wilson has stated that the residence hall is a part of the total educational endeavor and is a curriculum set up to provide specific learning experiences which the student learns by doing.17 A vital part of Wilson's "curriculum" idea is inculcated by Strang's conceptualization of the residence

---


17 Margaret M. Wilson, "Dynamics of a Residence Hall Program," Occupations, XXIX, No. 2 (1950), 118.
hall as a "laboratory of living" which offers a unique opportunity for learning. Through this experience she believes that the student develops understanding of individual and group dynamics which are characteristic of the modern world. Interestingly, Strang has supported her beliefs by noting that the student spends approximately four-fifths of his time outside the classroom and at least one-third of his time in his housing facility.  

Williamson has described the generally accepted purposes of residence halls as behavior control, sanitation, financial investment, recreation, and cultivated living. However, these purposes are thought to be secondary to the accomplishment of the more pervading purpose of attaining educational objectives within the residence hall. The following criteria for recognizing these educational goals within a residence hall are suggested by Williamson when he stated:

When we have established in our college residences the expectation on the part of the students that they will come from classrooms to residences to discuss informally and casually, as they wish, the things that they have heard discussed in the classroom, then we will have provided an organic integration of the residences into the academic program of the college.  

Mueller has perceived the major objectives of residence halls as providing for (1) physical accommodations,


(2) promotion of academic learning, and (3) opportunities for personal development which encompass the two minor objectives of (a) good public relations and (b) the supervision and control of students. However, she stated that the objective of the promotion of academic learning which was most closely related to the primary institutional goal existed only in the chance, informal, cross-fertilization of ideas through student discussions.20

Based upon the use of pamphlets, brochures, questionnaires, and interviews, Riker has expressed the belief that certain assumptions must be made before the purposes of a residence hall program can be stated adequately. These assumptions are described as follows: (1) that the residence hall is a part of the college plant which is designed to process its students, (2) that the process is learning by interaction within an environment, and (3) that the residence hall must have educational purposes to stimulate the student's development toward better human relationships. Using these assumptions as an applicable rationale, Riker has listed seven basic purposes for residence halls as (1) instructional support, (2) development of the individual, (3) experience in group living, (4) provision of a homelike atmosphere conducive to academic pursuits, (5) satisfaction

of physical needs, (6) supervision of conduct, and (7) support for the college.\textsuperscript{21}

This representative literature relating to the purposes of residence halls has illustrated the emergence of university student housing as more than physical shelter accommodations. Consequently, residence halls must be so designed to contribute to the academic, social, and personal education of the student. In accepting anything less than this, residence halls would be sacrificing many of their greatest potential benefits to students.

**Theoretical Framework**

Based upon the assumption that the purposes of residence halls is a direct reflection upon the educational philosophy of a particular university, we shall develop a theoretical framework which is rampant with direct implications for the educative role of student housing in modern American higher education.

Initially, our theory conceptualizes the world as a social system which is subject to multifarious exogenous and endogenous stresses and strains. Within this social system there are numerous subsystems which may be conceptualized, in turn, as social institutions. The social institution of education consists of such representative subsystems as the university, the college, and the high school. Within these

\[\text{\textsuperscript{21}}\text{Riker, Planning Functional College Housing, pp. 48-49.}\]
subsystem, there are such interacting sub-subsystems as faculty, students, and administrators. Thus, an exogenous or endogenous induced change in any portion of the social structure (as the student housing program) will affect the entire system (as the university subsystem).\textsuperscript{22}

A recurring controversy among social scientists, philosophers, and laymen is the proper relationship between the individual and the group. On the one hand is the "individualistic approach" which advocates that the individual is the proper unit for analysis when attempting to interpret any aspect of human behavior. On the other hand, there are those who argue for the supremacy of the group. Hall believes "their major point is that man cannot be understood and does not act outside of the context of a group or groups."\textsuperscript{23} In the middle of the continuum is the position which emphasizes the interrelationship of the individual and the group without giving priority to either. By citing empirical studies, Hall synthesizes some results which have relevance for our purposes. First, while the individual and the group may be separated for analytical purposes, a view of total reality


suggests that they are inseparable. In the most rudimentary sense, the individual cannot be understood fully outside of the context of the groups in which he claims physical and/or psychological membership. Also, just as there are individual differences with each group, there are differences between groups.

A second conclusion by Hall is that a residence hall program, no matter how ingenious, is effective only to the extent that it has the support and confidence of the existing and emergent informal structures. This informal structure is a major determinant of group members' behavior and has the capability of reinforcing or detracting from the goals of the residence hall program. Similarly, counselors may be either accepted into or rejected by the informal group structure. Obviously, their inclusion should facilitate the residence hall program while their exclusion would limit their effectiveness.24

In reference to a factor of strong influence on all living things, Sinnott speaks "of the 'contagion of intimacy,' meaning what is most intimate to us is apt to be most contagious. An organism adapts itself to its environment; we 'soak up' that which surrounds us."25 Eddy has concluded that one of the most unfortunate mistakes in some

24Ibid., pp. 65-69.
universities is (1) the failure to realize the full potential of the contagion process, (2) the failure to deal with the student as he is and where he is found, and (3) the tendency to leave to tradition or chance all variables except the purely academic. Effective contagion, Eddy further concluded, "is the result of unity in common goals, a communicated tradition to which all phases of campus life make their particular contribution."26

New national and international pressures of a complex twentieth century society increasingly place a demand upon the American university to produce persons who can deal effectively with the vital issues of the times. Subsequently, needs of future students will be more than ever before intellectual in nature. Krutch elaborated upon this critical concern when he stated:

The continuance of this civilization never has, and does not now require, that final conclusions should be reached; only that the discourse should indeed go on; that what it accomplishes by its going on is not the definitive solution of any problem, but the preservation of the state of mind in which an awareness that the problems are real is never absent for long.27

Krutch's comments could provide a basis for the primary emphasis of residence halls, i.e., to become the centers of


discourse for the campus. The current lack of this discourse represents an expression of educational and economic forces peculiar to the nineteenth century. However, there is no feasible reason to perpetuate these shortcomings during the last half of the twentieth century.

We may now observe some of the environmental dynamics which operate within the subsystem of the university. Smith uniquely described the elusive concept of a college environment when he asserted:

> Any college worthy of the name will have a spiritual life of its own which makes of it more than an assemblage of teachers, students, and buildings. At best it will have an atmosphere which is felt to be different from other environments the moment one steps into it and which acts as a powerful developing force upon all who live within it. Such an atmosphere will be like mist in the sense that one cannot put one's finger on it, but no one should be able to stay in it long without becoming thoroughly soaked.28

For the purposes of this study, the most vital functioning component of the university environment is the student culture. According to Trow, we are able to distinguish four broad patterns of orientation toward college which give content and meaning to the informal relations of students. The collegiate subculture is characterized by the world of football, fraternities, and dates. This orientation is not hostile to the university but resists any serious demands emanating from the faculty for involvement with

---

issues and ideas. Students of the vocational subculture largely perceive their college experience as being "off the job training" leading to a diploma. If the symbol for the collegiates is the fraternity weekend, the vocationals' symbol is the placement office.

The essence of the academic subculture is its identification with intellectual concerns of the serious faculty members. These students talk about their courses outside their classes and let the world of ideas and knowledge reach them in ways that neither of the foregoing types do.

Rather aggressive behavior characterizes the nonconformist subculture. These students pursue an identity, not as a by-product, but as the primary aim of their education. Their symbols are a distinctive style, dress, speech, and attitude which represent the identity they seek.29

Newcomb has used a perceptual context to explain the theoretical basis for assuming that the peer group has considerable influence upon the individual student when he stated:

People respond to a situation not necessarily as it 'really' is but as they perceive it to be. And they perceive all but the simplest situations . . . not as they have been pre-ordained, by their physiological make up, to perceive them but as they have

learned to do so. The matter of learning to perceive . . . is a very complex one indeed, but nearly all psychologists would agree that such habits are learned as a result of the successes and failures that follow from actions based upon 'right' and 'wrong' ways of perceiving situations. . . .

Groups have power over their members because the same processes of interaction which result in members' amiable feelings toward each other also result, simultaneously, in their adopting norms which enable them to aim at "success" rather than "failure."

It is apparent that the following three kinds of actors may be listed as contributors to the formation of these student peer groups: (1) pre-college acquaintances, (2) propinquity, and (3) similarity of attitudes and interests. Also, there are at least four discernible conditions which facilitate the student peer groups' influence upon their members' attitudes. No one of them is an essential condition but a majority appear to exist when marked effects are noted. Group size is the first facilitating condition. The formal peer group should not be so large that most of its members cannot recognize each other, nor should it be so small as to discourage the spontaneity so often characteristic of congenial subgroups. The relative homogeneity of age, sex, social class, and religion also contributes to

effective peer group influence. The fact that existing homogeneity of attitudes is so important to group solidarity has implications for both conservatism and liberalism. The relative communicative and physical isolation from groups having divergent norms is the third condition. Fourth is the importance to individual members of the group supported attitudes. Newcomb further explained this fourth condition when he stated:

Other things being equal, the greater the importance to them of the attitudes for which the group stands the greater is the solidarity of the group, regardless of whether the sense of importance preceded or has been engendered by group membership.31

American higher education must face the challenge of understanding the "how, when, and why" of peer group influence in order that its effects may be used to complement the academic environment of the university. Concomitantly, the campus environmental influence has been suggested many times as a key factor in understanding the total educational process. Representative approaches for assessing the environmental influences on university campuses can be illustrated by referring briefly to the following studies. Jacob concluded that students were affected much more by classroom instruction when it was reinforced by the "campus atmosphere."32 Freedman suggested that the student subculture

31Ibid., p. 481.

contains the primary educational force on the university campus. Thistlewaite, using the College Characteristics Index with National Merit Scholarship students, reported that the college environment is an important determinant of the student's motivation to seek advanced intellectual training. In conclusion, Eddy has asserted:

. . . the college's best contribution to character is a direct product of the proper, balanced emphasis on learning. . . . the environment, therefore, must reflect this commitment to learning as the raison d'être of all that happens on the college campus and to the college student.

To summarize, our theoretical framework has conceptualized the university as a subsystem, viewed the effects of "contagion," and observed pertinent environmental dynamics which occur on the university campus. These salient theoretical perspectives have been presented to provide an applicable basis for the initiation of a more educative role for student housing within the total campus environment.

Rationales for Combining "Living" and "Learning"

An increasing number of America's leading educators are developing feasible rationales as to the "why" and "how"

---


35 Eddy, Jr., The College Influence on Student Character, p. 138.
residence halls should become centers of learning.

Initially, Riker has provided a definition of the residence hall when he asserted:

The residence hall is a great deal more than brick and concrete; it is people and their activities. It is life, energy, and growth. To be successfully planned and operated the hall must be understood, not as a series of unrelated parts, but as a totality. Within this totality, the various parts continually interact, each affecting and being affected by the others.36

Next, Sanford has stated:

... when they (students) live apart, geographically or psychologically, from the academic centers of the college they may actually acquire a culture that is in many respects in opposition to the intellectual climate that the faculty would like to introduce them to. We must find ways to bring the intellectual life of the college into the establishments where students live. We must create campus-wide student-faculty or faculty-student communities in which the social needs of students, far from being suppressed, are brought into the service of the intellectual aims of the college.37

Williamson also has expressed his beliefs in the following manner:

... I am convinced that residences can serve most fruitfully educational purposes of significance in higher education. And I am equally convinced that these purposes will be served only when we reappraise our present uses of residences and reorient our expectations to explicit and significant academic content and objectives.38

36Riker, Planning Functional College Housing, p. 66.
Brunson has outlined considerations which should be viewed by American higher education if it is to progress toward a more productive fusion of "living and learning" within the university residence hall. First, the educational objectives of our universities should be studied to determine how the residence halls can contribute more effectively to the realization of these objectives. A study of this nature should involve all the components of the academic community. Next should be considered the best physical structure of residence halls which will meet the particular needs of the institution. Staffing should provide skilled, intelligent, sound, and evocative educational leadership. In summary, she noted that one can expect resistance to change, but bold experimental steps must be taken in order to achieve the necessary fusion between "living" and "learning." 39

Hand has asserted "a student's adjustment to society, his scholarship, his attitudes, and his mental and physical health are as a whole largely determined by where and how he lives." 40

Hannah, President of Michigan State University, while attending a conference on the "cluster college concept" in


California, offered a subsuming rationale for the living-learning program when he stated:

... it is to bring students together in the smallest groups that are economically feasible, eliminate the artificiality of the single-sex society, provide convenient opportunities for students to meet and talk with their teachers, establish a learning environment in the student's home life, and finally, so relate the learning experience and the living experience that they will reinforce each other. If learning becomes a habit of life, perhaps it will be prolonged beyond the college years. 41

"Living-Learning Centers"

As stated previously, 42 large universities are becoming the major centers of American higher education today. An unnecessary result of this largeness has been the incorporation of impersonalization, "IBM-ism," and "mass education" techniques into their campus environments. Striving to compete with increasing enrollments, which in 1960 housed one million students, and by 1970, will have to provide accommodations for at least another million, is one central reason for these unfavorable developments on many university campuses. 43


42Herman, "Where Students Were," p. 60.

Realizing the seriousness of the situation, American educators are beginning to analyze the functional applicability of the small college residential systems which are prototypes of the Oxbridge tradition. However, most of these educators are wary of transplanting the residential college idea intact, but since they agree with the principle, Farmer has stated:

... many have found it practical to graft selected cuttings from the English stock onto their own residential systems. The resulting housing programs are as varied as the colleges themselves. Yet the hybrid retains an essential similarity. All try to build a residential community that narrows the gap between teacher and student, classroom and living room. And all try to reap a richer yield from the huge investment in housing by creating a living climate that is also hospitable to learning.44

One approach to reducing the effective size of an institution without a reduction of its absolute enrollment, is to create distinctive smaller communities within the larger organization. Fundamentally, these communities would include students and faculty who would have a sense of identity. More specifically, Trow believes these students and faculty must "share interests and commitments which can be supported and furthered, rather than diluted and discouraged through the ordinary on-going relations of the members of the community."45

44 Educational Facilities Laboratories, p. 105.
By continuing his description of these communities, Trow has provided an excellent conceptualization of the "Living-Learning Center" as he stated:

Such communities cannot be called into being by proclamation; they have to have structural definition and support, formal membership, physical place for meetings and working, and insulation against distracting and competitive interests and appeals. They must be small enough to allow members to know one another personally and as wholes; they must be stable enough to allow patterns of sentiment, identification, interaction and intellectual support to develop; they must be reasonably homogeneous with respect to the values and interests represented so that members can center their relationships around these shared and developing interests, rather than, as in the institutions of the collegiate, around the static interests of the youth culture which comprise the lowest common denominator of student life. In short, these have to be genuine intellectual communities, rooted in residence halls and groups of departments, or in some other combination of structured interactions and shared intellectual interests. 46

From a more objective perspective, Riker has viewed these future "living-learning centers" as having the essential elements of programs, staff, and physical facilities. These elements are extremely interdependent, and, consequently, each is largely dependent on the others for its effectiveness. However, a common current problem in student housing has been the separate development of these elements often at different times by different people. Seemingly, a logical solution regarding program and staff decisions is that they should be completed before the physical facilities

46 Ibid., pp. 122-123.
are planned. The same planners should be responsible for
decisions regarding financing, the fourth essential element
of effective living-learning centers.\(^{47}\)

Through the use of applicable literature, these four
elements of programming, staffing, physical facilities, and
financing will be explored for the dual purpose of providing
an overview of the multifaceted dimensions of future living-
learning centers and exploring present student housing
conditions.

Programming.—Riker has delineated the major program
areas of the future living-learning centers as follows:
(1) assignment programs, (2) student government programs,
(3) residence counseling programs, (4) communication pro-
grams, and (5) cultural and instructional programs.\(^{48}\)

The assignment of students to rooms and residence
halls may be the most significant educational program pro-
vided by the living-learning centers. Through assignment
programs, the housing staff has the potential to create a
social structure capable of making a substantial impact on
individual students. Little is known presently about the
creation of this social structure within the student resi-
dential communities. As concluded previously, Trow\(^{49}\)

\(^{47}\)Harold C. Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers
(Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Associ-

\(^{48}\)Ibid., pp. 11-18.

\(^{49}\)Trow, "The Campus Viewed as a Culture," pp. 122-123.
believes that these student communities must include faculty and staff with appropriately arranged group size, physical identity, and similarity of values and interests.

Current literature may be cited to support many conflicting points of view concerning the effects of student assignment programs.

In a study at the University of California, Berkeley campus, Nasatir concluded that similarity of interests can be of primary importance to the individual and to the group in which he is associated in the residence hall. Nasatir classified students in six residence halls as "academic" if they enrolled in the university to gain a basic education, and "non-academic" if their goals were essentially vocational. He observed that the highest failure rate occurred among the non-academic students housed in a residence unit classified as academic. Thus, Nasatir's study is representative of the following underlying assumption of an effective assignment program: the provision of a residential atmosphere conducive to academic success. 50

DeCoster, in an exploratory study at the University of Florida, attempted to define what constituted a more desirable living plan for high-ability students than was provided through random room assignments; and, to construct a residential community that would promote an interest in learning.

and provide an atmosphere conducive to academic achievement for students of various abilities. Using freshmen who qualified for the University's honor program, DeCoster divided his sample into four groups for study of withdrawal rates and academic performance during the first trimester of the 1963-64 and 1964-65 academic years. Group I consisted of students living with high-ability students; group II consisted of students living without the presence of high-ability students; group III had high-ability students living in close proximity to one another; and group IV had high-ability students randomly assigned to residence halls.

Because of the limited numbers in these respective groups, DeCoster perceived the following conclusions to be tentative impressions requiring further study when he stated:

High-ability students seem to have better academic success when living in close proximity with other high-ability students.

High-ability students seem to affect negatively the academic success of other students living in the same residence unit.51

In a study at the University of Kentucky, Elton and Bate used a sample of entering freshmen to compare roommates enrolled in similar academic programs with roommates enrolled in different academic programs. Independent variables for the study were seven personality factors, an aptitude score,

high school grade average, and the first semester college grade average of the roommate. Ability and personality factors accounted for the variability among these criterion groups of 1962 and 1963 entering freshmen.

Two major conclusions of this study stand in contradiction to the previously mentioned studies on room assignment procedures. Elton and Bate concluded that housing students with similarity of educational major does not influence first semester college achievement. Also, the first semester college grade average of a student is an ineffectual predictor of the academic achievement of his roommate.\(^2\)

Projects that are well organized by cooperative staff-student leadership appear to be a major indicator of successful student government programs. Thompson illustrated this point in her study on residence halls to determine possible ways they might contribute to the educational program of the institution. It was shown that the effectiveness index of a program decreased as the percentage of student responsibility decreased.

Another element of success for the student government program was believed to be the continuity of personnel and program. For example, student officers should be elected in the spring preceding their term of office to permit

training and pre-project planning for the fall quarter.\textsuperscript{53}

Future living-learning centers and current residence hall systems have a unique challenge in the area of orientation programs. As Riker aptly expressed:

\begin{quote}
... the basic purpose of orientation is to introduce students into the academic life as quickly as possible, and the most important first impression housing can give is the feeling that each person is important himself and that learning is the business at hand.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

Ideally, class reading assignments could be distributed during the first day of registration for the purposes of encouraging students to study and implying what is expected. Another idea would be to conduct sessions on such topics as "How to Study," and "How to Take a Test." Regardless of the approach, however, successful orientation programs are based upon advance preparation and appropriate timing.

One aspect of the orientation program is that of the relationship of the university to its students. It has become traditional in American higher education to conceive this relationship as that of \textit{in loco parentis}. The authority most often cited for this doctrine is the 1913 Kentucky Supreme Court case of Gott v. Berea College in which the court ruling stated in part:

\begin{quote}
... college authorities stand \textit{in loco parentis} concerning the physical and moral welfare and mental
\end{quote}


training of the pupils, and we are unable to see why to that end they may not make any rule or regulation for the government or betterment of their pupils that a parent could for the same purpose. ... 

Bakken has stated that the legal principle of in loco parentis applies to practically every aspect of the college student's life. However, the three basic areas of application are in housing, student activities, and discipline. In relation to student housing, Bakken makes the point that in loco parentis is on a sound legal basis as far as minors are concerned, but colleges and universities should be apprehensive about applying these same rules to adult students. 

Strickland, after a thorough analysis of in loco parentis, concluded that a university cannot have the exact and identical relationship with its students that parents have with their children. The doctrine is believed to be at best only a partial analogy to describe the relationship. 

Brady has rejected both the doctrines of in loco parentis and of contractual relationship as the rationale for the relationship that a college should have with its students. In their place, he has attempted to formulate and


57 D. A. Strickland, "In Loco Parentis—Legal Mots and Student Morals," Journal of College Student Personnel, VI, No. 6 (1965), 339-340.
describe the desired relationship as an educational one. Brady elaborates by stating that the mission the college is authorized to perform is education, and, therefore, the relationship between a college and its students must be of an educational nature. Whatever operational procedures and regulations that a college wishes to adopt that can be justified as aiding and abetting the education of students must be considered as proper. Any correspondence that this educational relationship may have to the nature and functions of a political democracy, courts of law, and social institutions, such as the family, are to be considered purely correlational and not causal. 58

Thus, Brady would advocate a student housing orientation program which would forget about being substitute parents and begin practicing education in a most real and challenging sense of the word.

Residence counseling programs should be designed to assist both individuals and groups within the living-learning centers. The level of such programs ranges from advising and consulting to short-term problem solving. To achieve its greatest effectiveness, the staff must identify correctly with both the formal and informal student community leadership structure. Concomitantly, this effectiveness will

require the reduction of staff-student ratios and the maximum of student-staff associations.\(^\text{59}\)

Communication programs provide for excellent coordination within the living-learning center. In addition to bringing the faculty and housing staff into a more profitable relationship concerning students, it disseminates pertinent information by the use of bulletin boards, news sheets, radio stations, and amplification systems. At its optimum, a communications enable the staff to attain maximum benefit from all programs with minimum effort spent toward correcting mistakes.\(^\text{60}\)

Thus far, Riker has described programs primarily designed to facilitate desirable conditions for learning. But additional cultural and instructional programs are required within living-learning centers to complement and reinforce the formal curriculum. These programs have been described by Riker when he stated:

\[\ldots\text{these programs help make more accessible the storehouse of knowledge on the campus, to refine tastes acquired by intellectual training, and to stimulate interest in learning for its own sake.}\]^\text{61}

At this juncture it is appropriate to note Stark's effort toward dividing such cultural and instructional programs into two series of categories. The first series


\(^60\)Ibid., pp. 15-16.

\(^61\)Ibid., p. 16.
concerns the following sources of responsibility for such programs: (1) faculty, (b) student government, (c) graduate residence counselors, and (d) off-campus experts. Content of the program comprises the following second series of categories: (1) artistic, (2) social issues, (3) scientific, (4) literary, (5) religious, (6) political, (7) economic, (8) comparative cultures, (9) foreign languages, and (10) communications. All of these program combinations are realistic for student housing programs in relation to financial expenditures, planning, and physical facilities. \(^{62}\)

Riker suggests various approaches to implementing many of Stark's program categories. The manner in which good music may be introduced into living-learning centers will be used as a representative illustration. First, it can be assumed that the center has an appropriate room equipped for music listening. Next, quality of the musician, informality of the setting, and student readiness must be considered in planning musical programs for the residents. One feasible approach is the incorporation of a short recorded program in the lobby or lounge after the evening meal. Such programs could be given also by student, faculty, or community groups who all represent continuous sources of "live" entertainment.

\(^{62}\)M. Stark, "These Programs Make Education at Home in the Residence Hall," *College and University Business*, XXXIII, No. 5 (1962), 69-70.
If asked, many prominent visiting musicians might be glad to meet informally with students after their scheduled campus concerts.63

Wilson summarized these thoughts concerning the various bases upon which effective residence hall programming is built when she stated:

... a program derives its effectiveness from being built and administered on a foundation of genuine belief in the individual, (his) abilities, (his) inherent rights, and a belief in the democratic way of life as these things are translated into action. It is the process that is basic to a successful program, a process based on sound educational philosophy. The methods used, the procedure followed, the techniques involved create the kind of student-staff relationships that will exist. All of them combined determine group morale and spirit. High esprit de corps is that intangible state out of which is created a program that is vital, mobile, educational, and student-determined and supported.64

Staffing.—One of the most critical problems facing living-learning centers is the acquisition and subsequent applicable training of staff who will be qualified to extend the teaching function into the residential setting. The shortage of qualified applicants for these housing positions may be attributed to confusion of the role of student housing, competitive research assistantships in other fields, and/or extensive time demands made upon housing staffs.65

63 Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers, p. 17.
64 Margaret Wilson, "Dynamics of a Residence Hall Program," Occupations, XXIX, No. 2 (1950), 124.
65 Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers, p. 19.
Kilbourn described our present state of confusion in relation to the role of student housing on the campus and who will administer student housing policies when he metaphorically stated:

Somewhat like a fast growing teenager on his way to the dinner table, student housing is emerging on the campus scene with considerable speed and force. Housing administrators, similar to frustrated parents, are finding it increasingly difficult to handle the young 'Goliath.' His role within the university family is not clearly defined. In some situations the housing child has come of age and is expected to behave as an adult, in others, he is treated like an irresponsible youth. In one institution he is assigned objectives beyond his capabilities and at another he is ignored in areas in which he can function effectively. . . . The situation is further confused because we are not in agreement as to who should take responsibility for the youthful giant.66

In order to establish a more educative role for student housing, American higher education should accept three major concepts. The first is that top-level administrators should recognize and assist in implementing the educative role of the housing staff. Next, the goals of student housing must be interlocked with both classroom objectives and the general objectives of the university. Third, interests of the student personnel staff and the business staff must be coordinated effectively.67

While concurring with these concepts, Riker has

67Ibid., p. 9.
described the role of three major types of staff for living-learning centers when he stated:

The administrative staff is responsible for general supervision; the management staff, for financial, clerical, housekeeping, maintenance, and feeding operations; and the personnel staff, for programs related to student life.68

The chief administrative officer for living-learning centers should demonstrate an educational emphasis through his leadership and organizational direction. Riker further believed "he should understand educational philosophy, methods, and programming. He should have general knowledge in the areas of management, planning, financing, and building design and construction."69

The function of the management staff of living-learning centers is inevitably educational as Riker has asserted:

... the quality of their work affects the success of the institution. ... If office procedures are efficient, if public areas are clean and tidy, if budgets permit the orderly renovation or replacement of facilities and equipment, if menus are varied and food well prepared, if routine operations run so smoothly they fade into the background, then students can work and learn in a favorable environment.70

Food service operations within living-learning centers will be used to illustrate the educative potentialities of the management staff. For example, the term payment for

68Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers, p. 19.
69Ibid., p. 21.
70Ibid., p. 22.
meals offers the student the advantage of a balanced diet, and offers the management the opportunity for economic food purchasing and preparation. Because students easily tire of daily eating at the same place, attention should be given to menu planning, food preparation, food displays, and dining room environment. With regard to dining room environment Riker has stated:

... room size, lighting, carpeting, acoustics, decoration and color, air-conditioning, and music should all receive careful consideration. For variety, large dining rooms can be subdivided, each subdivision having a different decorating plan.71

In Riker's national survey of 77 educational institutions; 35 reported joint management for housing and food service operations, 34 reported separate management, and eight used catering services. It would appear that if food services are located within living-learning centers, joint management is a necessity to insure coordination of effort in accomplishing the goal of facilitating student development.72

The student personnel staff within living-learning centers is another area of consideration. This staff has the primary responsibility for insuring the successful operation of housing units as learning centers. Members of the personnel staff are involved with the varied but related activities of counseling, program planning and development, supervision,

71Ibid., p. 24.
72Ibid., p. 24.
and research. These staff members perform in such roles as "motivators, initiators, and consultants," and should not be confined to an office but should make themselves readily available for student interaction.73

One of the staff organizational patterns for living-learning centers will illustrate the principle that student and staff proximity is an important variable in developing mutual confidence and trust. The three levels of this pattern are the coordinating level, the supervisory or intermediate level, and the direct contact level. The coordinating level is represented by a professional educator who may be a faculty member or a student personnel worker. The supervisory level of this pattern consists of part-time staff members who generally are mature graduate students. Selected or elected residential living group leaders compose the third, or direct contact level of organization.74

To summarize, these three interdependent administrative, management, and student personnel staffs should be discernible increasingly within living-learning centers. A major point is they should be organized under the authority of an academic dean to be integrated more fully into the total university environment. Within this framework, and through close coordination among all staff members, the role of

73Ibid., p. 25.
74Ibid., pp. 28-29.
student housing may approach more fully the fundamental philosophy on which living-learning centers are based, viz., the importance of the individual student.75

From these projections into the future, we will return to the current situation for exploration into student housing staff patterns of organization and representative resultant issues which must be resolved to achieve the more educative role for student housing as exemplified by living-learning centers.

While there is much diversity among current student housing patterns of organization, three major types seem to prevail. Riker has described these as divided organization, single-line organization, and centralized organization. Based upon his research, Riker found the divided pattern to be most common. In this situation, responsibility is distributed usually among the business officer, the dean of students, or the dean of men and the dean of women.

In the second type, single-line organization, complete responsibility for student housing is in the office of either the chief business officer or the chief personnel officer.

The third pattern, centralized organization, has a housing officer who is directly responsible for the operation of all functions of the residence halls. At the policy-

75Ibid., pp. 19-30.
making level this officer may have a dual responsibility to the chief business officer and the chief student personnel administrator. 76

A 1953 survey by Riker of various aspects of student housing at 238 colleges and universities indicated the following distribution as to patterns of organization: (1) divided, 186; (2) single-line, 27; (3) centralized, 17; and (4) other, 8. Preferences for each type of pattern were as follows: (1) divided, 140; (2) single-line, 23; (3) centralized, 65; and (4) other, 6. These figures suggest a possible future change toward the centralized type of organization. 77

Bacon, in a 1966 questionnaire study, gathered responses from 242 chief housing officers which related to the organizational structure of the student housing office. Representative findings were as follows: (1) 98 per cent of the institutions had residence halls on campus; (2) 58 per cent of the total number of residence halls students (excluding married students) were housed in halls of 1,000-5,000 capacity; (3) 30 per cent of the directors of residence halls were responsible administratively to the chief business officer, 32 per cent to the dean of students, and 19 per cent had joint responsibility to both of the above; and (4) 43 per

76 Riker, Planning Functional College Housing, pp. 177-178.
77 Ibid., p. 178.
cent of food service directors were responsible administratively to the business manager or treasurer, 28 per cent to the directors of residence halls. 78

A major issue in the current student housing literature is how an institution can achieve the most applicable synthesis between the business and personnel aspects of the housing program.

Lloyd-Jones and Smith have lamented that too often "he who controls the budget, controls the situation," 79 and consequently feel it most essential that there be a recognition of personnel purposes in the pattern of organization for student housing.

Strozier has asserted that it is less difficult to eliminate the intangible personal benefits from the budget than the amount of food, light, heat, or maintenance. In this manner, business officials often exert more control over the educational activities of the residence hall program than they should. Also, if student housing is to be considered as a central part of the educational program of the institution it should not be placed completely under the direction of the business office. If the student housing program has an educative purpose, Strozier concluded that it

78 Paul A. Bacon, "How Colleges Organize Housing," College and University Business, XL, No. 4 (1966), 76-78.
must be placed firmly in the grasp of those who see it as such and who are competent to administer it.  

Albright has argued that if university housing is essentially for the student's welfare even the business aspects should be organized under the dean of students. He doubted that any pattern could be implemented which would eliminate all conflict between the business and personnel areas. Albright concluded that the personality factor in housing administration is underestimated and the solution to this issue lies in meaningful staff communication.

Feder and others have expressed the belief that residence halls should be self-sustaining, contribute to the effectiveness of the classroom, and be administered through close cooperation of both the business and personnel staffs. They felt cooperative budget planning could be achieved by establishing clear-cut relationships, functions, and responsibilities.

In relation to another representative issue in student housing, it is apparent from the literature that neither the

80Stozier, et al., Housing of Students, pp. 26-27.


director of housing nor the residence hall director has title, role, or status which can be perceived clearly within the academic community.

In an attempt to isolate problems of responsibility within residence halls, Crane conducted a survey of the administrative practices in 43 moderately sized colleges and universities. He suggested that the officer in charge of the hall could be represented by the title of "Residence Director." These officers were responsible to a "Director of Residence Halls" in 41 per cent of the cases and to a student personnel worker, either a dean of men or dean of students, in 52 per cent of the cases. The Director of Residence Halls had faculty status in 36 per cent of the surveyed institutions. He had administrative status at 34 per cent of the schools and staff status at 20 per cent. Therefore, Crane concluded that the Director of Housing appears to be a member of the business staff in 54 per cent of the cases and of the student personnel staff in 36 per cent. The remaining group was unclassifiable or maintained joint responsibility in both areas. From these, and other applicable data, Crane further believed the major characteristic of residence hall operations was the even distribution between business and student personnel responsibilities.83

---

Phillips scathingly expressed her belief that the professional status of the residence hall director has by no means been established. To a large extent, his performance has been based upon speculative philosophy rather than empirical research. Furthermore, she asserted, the literature in this field is still hypothetical and very inconclusive. However, through careful research she believed a more solid foundation could be established for achieving true professional status for the head resident's position.

This portion of the discussion is concluded by accepting the plea of Phillips for more careful research into the professional role of the housing staff. Initially, the educative contributions of the administrative, maintenance, and personnel staffs within living-learning centers were reviewed. Next, current staff patterns of organization for student housing and representative resultant issues which must be solved were presented. Kilbourn summarized necessary conditions for an "educationally oriented" student housing program as he asserted:

When the importance of housing is recognized and its functions defined; when housing policy is consistently related to the instructional program; and when clearly described working relationships exist among those persons and agencies concerned with the

---

business and personnel aspects of housing; then, and only then, will housing make its maximum contribution. ⁸⁵

Physical facilities.—To provide contrast with the physical facilities of living-learning centers, certain representative illustrations of "past" residence hall conditions should be presented. Jencks and Riesman have stated satirically that:

... at the average cost of roughly $4,000 per student, the typical student residence joins two students, two beds, two bureaus, two desks, two straight chairs, and 200 square feet of floor in an effort to produce enlightenment. ⁸⁶

Farmer has elaborated by observing that the typical room described by Jencks and Riesman was:

... one of hundreds of identical cells strung along endless corridors which reverberate with the rhythm of footsteps, the ringing of telephones, and the rush of water from the modern plumbing. The focal point of the cell block is the gang toilet where the floor residents meet for a daily lesson in togetherness. Finishes and furnishings, in and out of student rooms, are so pointedly durable they virtually dare the students to damage them. The vast formal lobby downstairs is decorated to the last potted palm in a style that would do credit to any third-rate hotel. The student rarely uses it. ... He does use the basement recreation room because ... the ping-pong tables are big enough to spread books and papers on, and his desk is not. There are no books in the dormitory outside the student's room. ... There are no paintings except

---


the portrait of the president which graces the lobby—unless, of course, the student has accepted the dare to damage the walls and has tacked up a print or two in his own room. 87

A glimpse of how students describe their personal living quarters in terms of their own vernacular can be another subtle way of appraising the effects of physical facilities. Whether it is "Greenbrier," "The Barracks," "Snob Hill," "Pneumonia Gulch," or "The Cage" reveals not only the prevailing student morale but also is indicative of the status of residence halls within the total academic community. 88

Ideally, physical facilities for living-learning centers are planned through careful coordination of housing, staff, program purposes, architectural consultants, and financial advisers. However, a myriad of problems must be worked through successfully to achieve the most applicable educative consensus among these variables affecting the design of living-learning physical facilities.

From an architectural viewpoint, Pickering has asserted the most common problem is that "educational administrators don't tell their architects what they want from a building, ______

87Educational Facilities Laboratories, Bricks and Mortarboards, p. 101.

in terms of the institution's own objectives." In order for the architect to contribute most successfully to the campus student housing planning committee, this type of information must be considered as a basic prerequisite.

Similarly, Stade, a design specialist for university buildings, has expressed thoughts on what he strives to learn before attempting preliminary sketches when he stated:

Essentially: What do people want and what do they need? What are their aspirations and what are their requirements? All architectural planning must begin with people—administrators, teachers, students, alumni, and other financial supporters, maintenance personnel, everyone who will walk the campus and use the buildings.

Riker and Lopez have suggested a university master plan which delineates appropriate building sites, desirable building relationships, and general directions for expansion to insure a more systematic approach for institutional growth and development. The master plan would appear to be a major consideration for the campus housing architect who is striving to integrate his plans more fully into institutional objectives.


90 Harold W. Herman, "Effective Architect Probes Before He Pencils," College and University Business, XLI, No. 5 (1966), 45.

From the master plans, once the general location of a living-learning center is established, the architect first must make a careful analysis of the soil composition to determine whether it should be retained or replaced by a "man-made" terrain. Once the site has been established, an appropriate design must be considered which best relates to the surrounding buildings. Obata believed "the harmony to other buildings must be in terms of scale, proportion and materials, and in recognition of the fact that the spaces between buildings are as important as the spaces within."\(^{92}\) However, these considerations will lose their educative potential if the program description of the building has not been committed to writing and solemnly agreed upon by all concerned.

From an architectural and educational perspective, most persons would agree that a basic core around which residence halls should be constructed is that of the student room. This room should be a "castle," in which the student can be himself while surrounded by facilities conducive to study. For instance, the amount of visible space within the room contributes to the student's feelings of freedom or restraint. One hundred square feet per student is a desirable average in a "double" room designed for sleeping and

\(^{92}\)Gyo Obata, "All About Residence Halls and Things You Need to Know to Design Them," College and University Business, XXXIII, No. 4 (1962), 58.
studying. Space, combined with such other factors as illumination, color, and ventilation should facilitate the student's sense of well being and balance. 93

To place the student room in the proper perspective of living-learning centers, Riker has elaborated upon the vital importance of appropriately designed physical facilities as he stated:

For the individual student, physical facilities related to his learning are his room, space for study, and such equipment as book collections, technological aids, and visual aids. For student groups, the most important facilities are those that help in the sharing of information and exchange of ideas among students who want to learn and teachers who want to teach. In fact, the facilities affecting group life—and particularly the subunit in which student rooms are grouped—may make or break the educational effectiveness of the housing unit as a whole. 94

Using Riker's premises as applicable background, we will view the role of physical facilities in living-learning centers with regard to (1) grouping student rooms, (2) providing study spaces, and (3) using community facilities.

The suite plan is one effective way of grouping rooms within living-learning centers. This plan places six to eight students in rooms (single or double) situated around a common sitting room or along a short corridor with an adjacent sitting room. Based upon mutual consent and respect, this sitting room may be used for any number of such activities as

93Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers, p. 31.
94Ibid., p. 32.
study, recreation, and discussion. The distinct advantage of the suite is that it provides a living situation which most students can handle effectively. Through this experience in group living, the student's room within the suite provides him with a solid base from which to interact with the multifaceted university environment.

A common bath or small connecting baths generally characterize the suite plan. Two advantages of the latter arrangement are lower costs when students are given bathroom cleaning responsibilities, and more adaptability for special conference meetings.95

As previously noted, the student room should be the focal point for studying. However, additional study rooms should be constructed within living-learning centers to provide personal study privacy and also opportunities for group discussion of classroom assignments. These special study spaces should be small in size but large enough to accommodate from 10 to 20 per cent of the residence hall capacity. Riker further described these special study spaces when he stated:

The physical features of these study rooms include subdued color of finish materials, strong illumination, adequate ventilation, and such equipment as a study table, combination study-lounge chairs, and a blackboard.96

95Ibid., pp. 32-33.
96Ibid., p. 33.
Living-learning centers need an effectively designed library facility which will contain mutually (faculty and students) selected reference books and leisure reading materials. This residence library should serve as the "hub" of the living-learning center and be coordinated closely with the main campus library. Two further sources of enrichment can emanate from this residence library, viz., the dissemination of records and print collections. Records may be checked out for use in the music-listening room while prints are borrowed for hanging in student rooms.97

As living-learning centers are planned increasingly for the future, they will be equipped with technological and visual aids for implementing the educational programs assigned to them. For example, centrally located television rooms will expand the usefulness of housing units for group discussions following closed-circuit television lectures. It is apparent that certain prerequisites are necessary if living-learning centers are to make the best use of these future technological and visual aids. Among the prerequisites are the following: (1) the coordination of instructional and residential programs, (2) the arrangement of space within the residence hall prior to building, and (3) the allocation of staff time for planning a learning aids program.98

97Ibid., p. 34.
98Ibid., pp. 34-35.
Since first impressions are often lasting ones, the lobby of living-learning centers should convey immediately that this is a place in which students live, work, and play. Imaginative use of illumination and color schemes can create an encompassing feeling of serenity. This type of atmosphere may be implemented readily by attractive show cases, wall decorations, and student displays. Typically, the lobby of living-learning centers also includes an information desk, bulletin boards, mail boxes, desk-to-room communications, elevators, drinking fountains, public telephones and restrooms. It is important that the lobby be designed to serve as a focal point with direct access to the various types of community rooms surrounding it. For example, partial visibility of the residence library from the lobby greatly assists in the establishment of a living-learning climate within the center.99

As previously stated, dining room facilities have much educative potential. We must remain cognizant of the fact that the dining atmosphere has the capability of generating high group morale and giving direction and purpose to the student community. Similarly, dining rooms may be used as valuable adjuncts to the provision of multipurpose social-recreational-class-meeting rooms within the living-learning centers. Ideally, the design of these multipurpose rooms

99Ibid., p. 35.
should include folding partitions to insure the greatest possible flexibility. They also need to be equipped for recorded music, motion pictures, and public speaking. The daytime use of these rooms for classes become more feasible if faculty offices are located within the same general area. Finally, common service facilities—laundry rooms, parking spaces, outdoor recreational areas—conclude this exploration into the community facilities of living-learning centers.¹⁰⁰

The food service programs at Sacramento State College and the University of Massachusetts may be used to illustrate present attempts to integrate the "dining experience" with the "living-experience."

By cooperating with the art department at Sacramento State College, the director of food services now can boast of a student dining building with fifteen attractive and colorful murals which are the subjects of much discussion and admiration. Three of these murals depict ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Roman meal rituals. The painters of these murals are either advanced art students or master's candidates, who, for the price of a few dozen eggs used for egg tempera, have given the food services department a beautiful and interesting building. Similarly, these students have provided a "Maya" painting in all the strong, striking colors of a

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 35-37.
Mexican mural for a large wall in the faculty fining room.101

The new "South Commons" at the University of Massachusetts was designed to do more than feed "X" number of students in a given time space. The architecture of this unique facility "reflects an integration of the simple need to provide an eating place and the often ignored or unexpressed need for a building that students will warm to and accept as part of their living environment."102

The Commons is used before, during, and after dining. Tables are small, thus creating an atmosphere of personal warmth. The dining areas are made pleasant to the student's eye by the use of dark oak woodwork, incandescent lighting, folding partitions, and well planned entrance and exit traffic patterns.

This new dining building is integrated fully with the residence halls which it services. Numerous types of programs and discussions that promote greater student involvement with his education are conducted within the commons by these respective students.102

A recent study of the residence hall program at Berkeley by Van der Ryn, professor of architecture-Berkeley, 

---

101Ursula Stanton, "Food Service and Art Department Work to Brighten Dining Areas," *College and University Business*, XL, No. 1 (1966), 62.

102Jack Belck, "Sociability was Planned into Dining Commons," *College and University Business*, XXXVIII, No. 4 (1965), 73-75.
will be used to conclude this discussion relating to the
effects of physical facilities upon students. It is believed
that the methodology used and the findings of this study have
applicability for both large multiversities and small expand-
ing institutions.

Environmental analysis by using observations, inter-
views, questionnaires, activity logs, and literature research
was performed by Van der Ryn's staff to focus upon the
qualitative aspects of student housing design. Thus, the
emphasis was on the user affected by the design process,
 viz., the student. The major components of the residence
hall system studied were the student's personal, social,
study, dining, and intellectual environments. Design pro-
posals based upon the findings of this unique study were made
for the planning of future campuses. A summary is believed
inappropriate due to the uniqueness of this study, and, as
a result, comments have been extracted to provide a glimpse
of present student housing conditions as perceived by
Van der Ryn when he stated:

... This is the modern institutional dilemma. How
can human values be respected while processing and
providing services for masses of people?. . . 103

... Since decisions about student housing tend to
be made by the business office rather than by
academic planners, there is a strong temptation to
make student housing serve administrative rather
than educational objectives. . . . 104

... Large 'lounge' spaces have been rationalized by
housing administrators as necessary for 'group pro-
grams.' . . . 105
Each subculture tends to operate on different overlapping orbits and on different life schedules. The dorm serves the needs of the collegiate and vocationally oriented students better than the needs of the non-conformist or academically oriented student.

Mass facilities which house only a very homogeneous group result in poor communication among diverse interests, destroying the integrity of the campus community.

No one has measured the psychic stress or the effect on student well-being or academic performance caused by the strain of living in close quarters.

we conclude that in the double occupancy situation, roommates try to create their own territory; they try to escape each other's field of visions; they seek spacial isolation while sleeping.

The trend in student housing is away from movable furniture and towards built-in furnishings. This is unfortunate.

many precedents for college housing administration and planning are derived from hotel management.

It is senseless to talk about optimum group size unless functions and goals of the group can be clearly spelled out.

We believe that the social-groupings concept is misleading. A rigidly planned hierarchy of social groupings encourages a static-clique-ridden social structure.

Space for people to get together in must be integrated with reasons for people being there.

Largeness and formality of furniture arrangements are the most commonly cited lounge characteristics discouraging causal small group size.

Investigation revealed four types of study behavior in addition to the intense individual variety. These can be characterized as follows: A. Casual study . . . B) Waiting-for-something-to-happen-study.
C) Small group study. . . D) Intense study out of the room. . . .

. . . The practice of planning and financing student housing as a closed system in isolation from campus or community facilities is uneconomical. . . .

. . . We have discovered five distinct eating patterns. Traditional dining hall designs meet none of them adequately. Each has implications for different physical elements of the program: (1) Gorge and go . . . , (2) Casual dining . . . , (3) Intimate conversation with friends . . . , (4) Solitary meals while reading . . . , (5) Snacking. . . .

. . . Mass institutional feeding is disliked by students because of its impersonality, fixed times, rushed atmosphere and poor food, lack of variety. They prefer a variety of eating places close by and linked to other services. . . .

. . . Of all the issues facing housing administrators in the last decade, the notion that housing can play a part in the overlapping of academic and non-academic lives have caused more comment, generated more articles, and produced fewer physical results. Among housing planners the issue has become cliche. . . .

. . . It is too early to evaluate the effectiveness of most of the living and learning programs. The idea of creating close communities of teachers and students by building academic and housing environments where they can work together in small groups is a promising one. It is most promising when initiated by students themselves. . . .

. . . Where student residence is viewed largely as a student territory, academic functions on the residence hall are unlikely to be taken seriously by faculty. . . .

. . . The irony of the present situation on many campuses is that traditional in loco parentis rules tend to force the institution, parents, and students into roles that none of them willingly accept. . . .

. . . Buildings designed with control in mind will tend to perpetuate anachronistic rules— or the buildings themselves will meet early obsolescence. . . .
design problem lies in reconciling various public images of how students should live. . . . 124

Similarly, comments have been extracted to provide a glimpse of possible future campus environmental conditions as perceived by Van der Ryn when he stated:

. . . The idea of a campus spacially segregated from its surroundings and divided into zones such as teaching facilities . . . , faculty offices, student housing, campus services and administration, causes much of the impersonality and dysfunction on large campuses. . . . 125

. . . Our proposal focuses on one aspect of this problem: creating a campus core that belongs to the entire community. The typical campus segregates itself from surrounding 'non-academic' activities. Around its edges spring up enterprises that cater to the campus community and create its particular character: book stores, coffee shops, . . . . We propose that this pattern be rationalized so that the campus mall becomes a logical meeting place for the campus community. The mall absorbs the functions of student union, faculty club, residence hall lounges, dining rooms, seminar rooms, and theatres. Housing, teaching, and research facilities feed into the mall. . . . at each end of the mall and linked to the surrounding community are major activity generators such as the library and parking structures. . . . 126

Financing.—As perceived by Riker, financing is the final interdependent element of living-learning centers. It is apparent that this element is also in critical need of further research in order that it might contribute more

103-124 Sim Van der Ryn and Murray Silverstein, Dorms at Berkeley: An Environmental Analysis (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1967), pp. 24; 24; 26; 27; 28; 32; 34; 36; 36; 41; 42; 42; 44; 50; 52; 56-58; 60; 61; 61-62; 62; 65.

125-126 Ibid., pp. 70; 71.
fully to the educational role of university student housing. Basic issues concerning construction and operation must be clarified and resolved before real progress can be made in the area of financial planning.

Focal questions concerning financial planning for present and future student housing facilities include the following: (1) What is economical housing? (2) Who pays the housing bill? (3) Can construction dollars be stretched? and (4) What does the housing equation mean?^{127}

Economical housing may be described as the acquisition of sufficient funds to build properly, in contrast to initiating a "get-by" housing project. We undoubtedly "reap" what we "sow" in student housing, and with effective "sowing," the "harvest" will yield such fruits as low maintenance costs, long life expectancies for buildings, and invaluable flexibility of component units.^{128}

Three typical answers to the question of "What costs are included in the housing bill?" are given by Riker when he stated:

\[\ldots\text{first, annual costs for operating the housing unit; second, annual operating costs plus amortization costs (principal and interest payments on indebtedness plus the accumulation of required reserves); and third, all of these costs plus those for housing educational programs and supporting staff.}^{129}\]  

127Riker, *College Housing as Learning Centers*, pp. 41-46.
128Ibid., pp. 41-42.
129Ibid., p. 42.
However, there has been considerable concurrence on the idea that educational cost categories should not be charged against the housing income. But, in the case of financing living-learning centers, there is justification to charge the costs of educational programs and staff against general institutional funds, while at the same time, these centers are receiving heavy assessments for housekeeping-maintenance costs.

Another vital perspective of student housing finance is the capability of students to afford more educative housing conditions. However, many of the following steps are being taken to decrease the financial burdens upon students: (1) acquisition of state and national scholarships, (2) university assistantships, (3) cooperative housing arrangements, and (4) year-round residence hall operations.\(^{130}\)

"Can construction dollars be stretched?" is Riker's next question for consideration.

Rothenstein has approached this question by explaining an industrial technique known as "system building." Used extensively in Europe and in selected areas of California, system building is, in effect, the application of industrial techniques to building construction. This process involves complete integration of all building elements (structure, mechanical work, assemblies, and

\(^{130}\text{Ibid., pp. 42-43.}\)
components) into a single over-all system which lends itself to fully programmed mechanized production. Greater building quality, increased construction speed and financial savings are the major assets of this new systems approach to educational construction projects. 131

The housing cost equation may be written as financing plus construction plus operation equals room rates. The Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has prepared an equation which delineates housing cost elements as follows:

\[
\text{Annual Rent Charge per Student} = \frac{(1.25)(a) + b}{.9}
\]

The 1.25 factor represents a debt coverage specifically required by the agency for the College Housing Loan Program; (a) is the annual cost of the construction loan per student as determined by the project cost per student, the interest rate, and the repayment period; (b) is the annual operation cost per student; and .9 covers an annual 10 per cent vacancy loss. 132

According to the United States Office of Education, the major source for housing construction is revenue bonds. In 1959-1960, these bonds financed 69.6 per cent and 64.2 per cent of the housing facilities at public and private institutions respectively. The majority of these bonds were


132 Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers, p. 44.
purchased by the H.H.F.A., a fact which is indicative of the major role played by the College Housing Loan Program in the national expansion of university housing.\(^{133}\)

A 1966 report on the current status of the H.H.F.A. loan program revealed that application demands for college housing loans were far in excess of available funds. For example, the effective unmet demands measured by preliminary application amounts on the cut-off date of January 31, 1966, was approximately 400 million dollars. If the applications had been allowed to continue for the remaining five months of the 1966 fiscal year, it was estimated that the unmet demands would have been exceeded 800 million dollars on June 30, 1966.\(^{134}\)

The final answers to Riker's inquiry about stretching construction dollars appear to lie within the realm of further analysis of such representative elements as construction time, labor, materials, and equipment. This type of analysis is considered beyond the scope of this presentation.

We conclude our discussion on this element of student housing by noting Kilbourn's five basic types of residence


\(^{134}\)Harold W. Herman, "Requests for College Housing Loans Outrun Funds," College and University Business, XL, No. 3 (1966), 69.
hall financing as follows: (1) governmental appropriations, (2) gifts and grants, (3) revenue bonds, (4) federal loans, and (5) a combination of these sources.135

The four major interdependent elements of student housing from both a current and future perspective have now been reviewed. This type of literature review was chosen to emphasize the need for a more "educationally oriented" student housing program in contrast to a "shelter oriented" approach. Many of Riker's outstanding suggestions for integrating the living and learning experience presently lie dormant and wait for an "Age of Renaissance" within the area of student housing.

It would be naive to conclude from this presentation that the "living-learning center" represents the only type of "educationally oriented" student housing program. However, it is a major premise of this study that the theories, principles, and procedures upon which living-learning centers are based have direct applicability to student housing programs at all types and sizes of colleges and universities. It is believed that these institutions would do well to listen carefully once again to Farmer's concluding cogent remarks:

... many have found it practical to graft selected cuttings from the English stock onto their residential systems. The resulting housing programs are as

---

varied as the colleges themselves. Yet the hybrid retains an essential similarity. All try to build a residential community that narrows the gap between teacher and student, classroom and living room. And all try to reap a richer yield from the huge investment in housing by creating a living climate that is also hospitable to learning.\textsuperscript{136}

By challenging institutions of higher learning to integrate their respective student housing programs more fully into the total academic endeavor, the review of related literature is concluded.

Initially, the historical origins of American student housing were viewed and it was concluded that only since the 1920's had the educational potentialities of residence hall living been considered seriously. Next, noted authorities expressed their viewpoints concerning purposes of student housing. Their subsuming plea was for a more productive role for this vital area of the campus environment.

Theoretical perspectives from various vantage points were presented to form a framework in which this study could be placed. Such concepts as the subsystem, "contagion of intimacy," peer groups, campus environment, and subcultures were emphasized as major foci of this framework.

After rationales for combining "living" and "learning" were presented, four interdependent elements of student housing were discussed through the use of applicable

\par \textsuperscript{136}Educational Facilities Laboratories, \textit{Bricks and Mortarboards}, p. 105.
literature. These elements of programming, staffing, physical facilities, and financing were reviewed from both a current and future perspective to emphasize the need for a more educative role of student housing on twentieth century American college and university campuses.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

As indicated previously, the central purpose of this study is to assess the future role of the undergraduate men's residence hall program as perceived by chief housing officers at selected four-year institutions of higher learning. To achieve this purpose, a Student Housing Inventory has been distributed to chief housing officers at 317 ACUHO member institutions. Through statistical procedures, assessment has been made of the relationship between various chief housing officer background variables and statements which are purported to be indicative of an "educationally oriented" and a "shelter oriented" student housing program. These statements are based upon current student housing literature and are designed to cluster around the four factors of programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

Table 3 has been included to provide a summary of the institutions by type, size, and geographical location which have been considered for the statistical computations of the study. Similarly, Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 provide a descriptive summary of the data from these institutions for Section I of the Student Housing Inventory. These data are believed to be
reflective of the 210 inventories which were received from the total 317 sample institutions.

**TABLE 3**

**TYPE OF CONTROL, SIZE, AND GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF SAMPLE INSTITUTIONS USED FOR STATISTICAL COMPUTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Control</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-10,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACUHO Regional Districts</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4
LEVEL AND TYPE OF CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Educational Background</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Educational Background</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5
MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, PUBLISHED RESEARCH ON STUDENT HOUSING, AND RANK OF CHIEF HOUSING OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership in Professional Organization</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Research on Student Housing</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of Above</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6

**TYPE OF ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Orientation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Initiated</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding C.H.O.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P., Student Affairs or Dean of Students</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P., Business Affairs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7

**PATTERN OF ORGANIZATION FOR THE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT HOUSING PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of Organization</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Chief University Student Personnel Administrator</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Chief University Business Administrator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Both of Above</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the realization of a possible combination in excess of one hundred hypotheses for this study, the writer, upon the advice of his major professor, made the decision to analyze only the statistical findings for the following hypotheses:

There is a positive correlation between "educationally oriented" (hereafter "E" scores) scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the financing factor.

There is a positive correlation between "shelter oriented" (hereafter "S" scores) scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.
A. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the financing factor.

There is a negative correlation between the "E" scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the financing factor.

There is no significant difference between the educational levels of chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in the relation to
undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.

There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.
C. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II financing factor "E" scores.
There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.

There is no significant difference between the educational levels of chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.
B. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.

There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.
There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II financing factor "S" scores.

There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.
A. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.

Statistical data for the unanalyzed hypotheses have been placed in Appendix B.

As indicated by the hypotheses to be analyzed, various types of combinations between the "educationally oriented" and "shelter oriented" scores will be analyzed initially to assess the direction and degree of these relationships.

Next, hypotheses which pertain only to the "E" scores in Column II of the Student Housing Inventory will be analyzed statistically. Herein lies one major thesis of this study. The basis for this thesis is that student housing literature implies repeatedly an "educationally oriented" student housing program contributes more fully to the total development of the student than a "shelter oriented" student housing program. The thesis is that chief housing officer perceptions of future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "E" inventory
statements have direct implications for assessing the type of future role for student housing at these respective institutions of higher learning. Thus, each "E" statement hypothesis will strive to assess the type of future role for student housing as it is reflected by the interaction of (1) various types of chief housing officer background variables, and (2) chief housing officers' perceptions of future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions.

With the foregoing as an appropriate introduction, the format for this chapter on findings will adhere generally to the following guidelines: (1) statement of the hypothesis and sub-hypotheses to be tested, (2) table presentation of the applicable data, and (3) discussion of the data.

I. There is a positive correlation between "educationally oriented" (hereafter "E" scores) scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.
C. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "E" scores are correlated positively with column II "E" scores with respect to the financing factor.

TABLE 8

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN "E" SCORES FOR COLUMN I AND COLUMN II BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>Column II</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progm.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Progm.</td>
<td>0.4072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Fac.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Phy. Fac.</td>
<td>0.2821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Staff.</td>
<td>0.3821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finan.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Finan.</td>
<td>0.4286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in Table 8, sub-hypotheses A, B, C, and D can be accepted. These correlation coefficients imply there is a positive relationship between present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "E" scores for programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing. The degree of this relationship appears greatest with regard to the financing, programming, staffing, and physical facilities factors respectively.

The general hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between "E" scores for present undergraduate men's
residence hall conditions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory is accepted with regard to direction and varying degrees of relationship between each of the respective factors.

II. There is a positive correlation between "shelter oriented" (hereafter "S" scores) scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "S" scores are correlated positively with column II "S" scores with respect to the financing factor.
TABLE 9

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN "S" SCORES FOR COLUMN I AND COLUMN II BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column I x Column II</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progm. x Progm.</td>
<td>0.3351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Fac. x Phy. Fac.</td>
<td>0.2620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff. x Staff.</td>
<td>0.6189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finan. x Finan.</td>
<td>-0.3070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in Table 9, sub-hypotheses A, B, and C can be accepted and sub-hypothesis D is rejected. These findings imply there is a positive relationship between present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "S" scores for the programming, physical facilities, and staffing factors.

Concerning the financing factor, the data reveal a negative correlation between present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "S" scores. Whereas this finding stands in contradiction to all other data in Table 9, no further interpretation is deemed feasible.
The general hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between "S" scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "S" scores is accepted with regard to direction and varying degrees of relationship for the programming, physical facilities, and staffing factors. The general hypothesis is rejected with regard to the financing factor.

III. There is a negative correlation between the "E" scores for present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column I) and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the programming factor.

B. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the physical facilities factor.

C. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the staffing factor.

D. Column I "E" scores are correlated negatively with column II "S" scores with respect to the financing factor.
TABLE 10
CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN COLUMN I "E" SCORES AND COLUMN II "S" SCORES BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column I &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
<th>Column II &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progm. x</td>
<td>Progm.</td>
<td>-0.0388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Fac. x</td>
<td>Phy. Fac.</td>
<td>-0.0882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff. x</td>
<td>Staff.</td>
<td>0.0445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finan. x</td>
<td>Finan.</td>
<td>-0.2811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total x</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-0.0392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in Table 10, one can accept sub-hypotheses A, B, and D, and reject sub-hypothesis C. These findings imply there is a negative relationship between present "educationally oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive "shelter oriented" conditions as future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the programming, physical facilities, and financing factors.

The data further reveal there is a positive correlation between column I "E" scores and column II "S" scores for the staffing factor. This finding implies there is a positive relationship between present staffing "E" statements and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable
undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the staff "S" statements. Whereas this finding stands in contradiction to all other data in Table 10, no further interpretation is deemed feasible.

IV. There is no significant difference between the educational levels of chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing "E" scores.
TABLE 11
MEAN "E" SCORES OF CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER LEVELS OF EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Educational Background</th>
<th>Mean &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors (N=46)</td>
<td>3.8782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (N=87)</td>
<td>4.0793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate (N=33)</td>
<td>4.1090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"F" Test for Level of Educational Background

|                           | 3.119* | 3.5772* | 3.2018* | 0.1567 |

*p < .05; 2,163 d.f.

By applying the "F" test with the .05 level of confidence, the data in Table 11 reveal that sub-hypotheses A, B, and C can be rejected and sub-hypothesis D is accepted. The level of educational background for chief housing officers, appears to make a significant difference as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions with regard to the programming, physical facilities, and staffing factors of undergraduate men's residence halls. More specifically, these chief housing officers would favor such conditions as faculty tutoring for students, faculty office spaces, and short range research by the student personnel staff for their respective undergraduate men's residence hall programs.
Observation of the data in Table 11 also reveals that for the three statistically significant factors of programming, physical facilities, and staffing, the mean scores increase directly with the level of educational background. Thus, chief housing officers with bachelor degrees tend to perceive "E" statements as being somewhat less desirable than the chief housing officers with doctoral degrees.

The general hypothesis that there is no significant difference between chief housing officer levels of educational background and column II "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory can be accepted only partially. The programming, physical facilities, and staffing factors were significant at the .05 level of confidence, whereas the financing factor was not significant at the same level of confidence. No interpretation for the financing factor is deemed feasible since the mean scores for chief housing officers at all three levels of educational background were extremely consistent.

V. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.
A. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.

TABLE 12

MEAN "E" SCORES FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Educational Background</th>
<th>Mean &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel (N=66)</td>
<td>4.1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration (N=23)</td>
<td>4.0696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (N=47)</td>
<td>3.9511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (N=27)</td>
<td>3.7704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"F" Test for Type of Educational Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5.0318*</th>
<th>5.6325*</th>
<th>3.3215*</th>
<th>2.9071</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*p < .05; 3,162 d.f.
For the data in Table 12, the "F" test at the .05 level of confidence reveals that sub-hypotheses A, B, and C can be rejected and sub-hypothesis D is accepted. These findings imply that the type of educational background makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions with regard to the "E" scores on the programming, physical facilities, and staffing factors. These chief housing officers would favor such conditions as student sponsored discussions on any topic, recreational rooms with folding partitions, and longitudinal research projects for their respective undergraduate men's residence hall programs.

Observation of the data in Table 12 further reveals for the three statistically significant factors of programming, physical facilities, and staffing, the mean scores for chief housing officers with student personnel and educational administration backgrounds are generally higher than the mean scores for chief housing officers with business and miscellaneous backgrounds. Thus, chief housing officers with student personnel and educational administration backgrounds tend to perceive the "educationally oriented" statements as being somewhat more desirable than the chief housing officers with business and miscellaneous educational backgrounds.

The data for the financial factor were not significant at the .05 level of confidence and do not adhere to any systematic pattern. However, it should be noted that chief
housing officers with miscellaneous "other" educational backgrounds had the lowest mean scores in comparison with any other type of chief housing officer educational background. These low mean scores conceivably imply chief housing officers with miscellaneous "other" educational backgrounds have less regard for the "E" financial statements than do chief housing officers with other types of educational backgrounds.

The general hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory can be accepted only partially. The programming, physical facilities, and staffing factors were significant at the .05 level of confidence whereas the financial factor was not statistically significant at the same level of confidence.

VI. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.
A. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II physical facilities factor "E" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II financing factor "E" scores.

**TABLE 13**

MEAN "E" SCORES FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership in Professional Organizations</th>
<th>Mean &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (N=149)</td>
<td>4.0523</td>
<td>4.0006</td>
<td>3.8194</td>
<td>3.6966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (N=17)</td>
<td>3.8294</td>
<td>3.9411</td>
<td>3.6823</td>
<td>3.4176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"t" Test for Membership in Professional Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;t&quot; Test for Membership in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>1.8318*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; 165 d.f.
The "t" test at the .05 level of confidence for the data in Table 13 allows one to accept sub-hypotheses B and C and reject sub-hypotheses A and D. These findings imply that membership in professional organizations makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with regard to the "E" scores on the programming and financing factors.

For the programming factor, mean scores of chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations are noticeably higher than chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations. This finding implies the former group of chief housing officers perceive such conditions as student vocational counseling, programs for recognition of student scholarship, and student "living groups" for residence halls as being more desirable than the latter group of chief housing officers.

Similarly, the mean scores for the financing factor are higher for chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations. This finding implies these chief housing officers perceive such conditions as financially self-liquidating residence halls and public financial statements as being more desirable than chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations.

Although not significant statistically, mean scores of chief housing officers for the physical facilities and staffing
factors adhere to a similar pattern of higher scores for chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations. It would appear these two factors lend support to the statistically significant programming and financing factors.

The general hypothesis that there is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to the column II "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory can be accepted only partially. The programming and financing factor were significant at the .05 level of confidence whereas the physical facilities and staffing factors were not significant at the same level of confidence.

VII. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the programming factor "E" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "E" scores.
C. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the staffing factor "E" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the financing factor "E" scores.

**TABLE 14**

MEAN "E" SCORES FOR THE PATTERN OF ORGANIZATION OF UNDERGRADUATE MEN'S RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMS BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of Organization</th>
<th>Chief Housing Officer</th>
<th>Mean &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0380</td>
<td>4.0050</td>
<td>3.8030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Chief Business Administrator (N=17)</td>
<td>4.029</td>
<td>3.9235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Both of Above (N=49)</td>
<td>4.0040</td>
<td>3.9979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"F" Test for Pattern of Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1040</td>
<td>0.1956</td>
<td>0.3569</td>
<td>0.9321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05; 2,164 d.f.

For the data in Table 14, the "F" test reveals there is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "E" scores on the Student
Housing Inventory. Thus, the general hypothesis and sub-hypotheses A, B, C, and D can be accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

Realizing the data in Table 14 is not significant statistically, only limited inferences will be projected. Initially, it is believed chief housing officers, regardless of institutional pattern of organization for student housing, tend to propagate their own philosophies of student housing. The generally high mean "E" scores by chief housing officers are felt to be reflective of a desire for an "educationally oriented" role for student housing.

Next, hypotheses which pertain only to the "S" scores in column II of the Student Housing Inventory will be presented. Herein lies another major thesis of this study. The basis for this thesis is current student housing literature repeatedly implies that a "shelter oriented" student housing program is not contributing fully to the educational environment of a college or university. The thesis is that chief housing officer perceptions of future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the "S" inventory statements have inverse implications for assessing the type of future role for student housing at these respective institutions of higher learning. Thus, each "S" statement hypothesis will strive to assess the type of future role for student housing as it is reflected by the interaction
of (1) various types of chief housing officer background variables, and (2) chief housing officers' perceptions of future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions.

VIII. There is no significant difference between the educational levels of chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the levels of educational background of chief housing officers and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.
TABLE 15
MEAN "S" SCORES FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER LEVELS OF EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Educational Background</th>
<th>Mean &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors (N=46)</td>
<td>2.1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (N=87)</td>
<td>2.0862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate (N=33)</td>
<td>1.9303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"F" Test for Level of Educational Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; 2,163 d.f.

The "F" test at the .05 level of confidence for the data in Table 15 allows one to reject sub-hypotheses B and C and accept sub-hypotheses A and D. These findings imply the level of educational background makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive "S" statements with respect to the physical facilities and staffing factors. These chief housing officers would perceive such conditions as one large recreational room within the residence hall and "managerially oriented" residence hall directors as being undesirable. By perceiving such future conditions as undesirable, the chief housing officers are believed to be rejecting the idea of a future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall program.
Further observation of the data reveal an inverse relationship between the level of educational background for chief housing officers and the mean scores for the two statistically significant factors of physical facilities and staffing. This finding is believed to imply that the higher educational background level of chief housing officers enable them to realize more fully the undesirable aspects of a future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall program.

For the programming factor, which was not significant statistically at the .05 level of confidence, a similar interpretation may be suggested because of the inverse relationship between the mean "S" scores and the level of chief housing officer educational background. However, the financing factor appears to be independent with regard to the level of chief housing officer educational background.

The general hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the educational levels of chief housing officers and column II "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory can be accepted only partially. The physical facilities and staffing factors were significant at the .05 level of confidence, whereas the programming and financing factors were insignificant at the same level of confidence.
IX. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the type of educational background for chief housing officers and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

The "F" test at the .05 level of confidence for the data in Table 16 reveals that sub-hypotheses A, B, and D can be accepted and sub-hypothesis C can be rejected. These findings imply that the type of educational background makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the staffing factor. These chief housing officers would perceive such conditions as extensive purchasing responsibilities by residence hall
TABLE 16
MEAN "S" SCORES FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Educational Background</th>
<th>Mean &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel (N=66)</td>
<td>2.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration (N=23)</td>
<td>2.0826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (N=27)</td>
<td>2.0296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"F" Test for Type of Educational Background
2.1962 0.1543 2.7719* 2.5472
*p<.05; 3,162 d.f.

directors and maid service for student rooms as being undesirable. By perceiving such representative future staffing conditions as undesirable, it is believed these chief housing officers are indicating their objections to a future "shelter oriented" role for the undergraduate men's residence hall program.

Further analysis of the data in Table 16 reveals chief housing officers with educational administration and business backgrounds have the highest mean scores with regard to the statistically significant staffing factor. This finding
implies these chief housing officers have somewhat less
ability for perceiving the "S" staffing statements as repre-
senting unfavorable undergraduate men's residence hall con-
ditions than do chief housing officers with student personnel
and miscellaneous "other" educational backgrounds.

For the factors of programming, physical facilities,
and financing, which were not significant statistically,
chief housing officers for the four types of educational
backgrounds generally displayed low "S" scores (2.0045-
2.0296) for the programming factor, higher "S" scores
(2.6106-2.6852) for the physical facilities factor, and in-
termediate "S" scores (2.2130-2.5741) for the financing fac-
tor. Because these factors were not significant statisti-
cally, no interpretation is deemed feasible for this portion
of the data.

The general hypothesis that there is no significant
difference between the type of educational background for
chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive
column II "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory can be
accepted only partially. The programming, physical facili-
ties, and financing factors were not significant statisti-
cally at the .05 level of confidence whereas the staffing
factor was significant at the same level of confidence.
X. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations with respect to column II financing factor "S" scores.
The "t" test at the .05 level of confidence for the data in Table 17 reveals the general hypothesis and sub-hypotheses A, B, C, and D can be accepted. These findings imply there is no significant difference between chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations and chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations as to the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions with respect to the "S" statements on the programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing factors.

Remaining cognizant of the data in Table 17 indicating no statistical significance, the prerogative has been taken to suggest possible interpretations for each factor.
For the programming factor, chief housing officers who belong to professional organizations have higher mean scores than chief housing officers who do not belong to professional organizations. This type of difference suggests that membership in professional organizations somewhat biases the perceptions of chief housing officers with respect to recognizing future "shelter oriented" programming conditions.

For the physical facilities and staffing factors, chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations have lower mean scores than chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations. This type of difference suggests that membership in professional organizations facilitates chief housing officer recognition of "shelter oriented" physical facilities and staffing conditions.

Because of the consistency of the financial factor mean scores between chief housing officers who hold and do not hold membership in professional organizations, no inference from the data will be made.

XI. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.
A. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the programming factor "S" scores.

B. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the physical facilities factor "S" scores.

C. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the staffing factor "S" scores.

D. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and column II with respect to the financing factor "S" scores.

TABLE 18
MEAN "S" SCORES FOR THE PATTERN OF ORGANIZATION OF UNDERGRADUATE MEN'S RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMS BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of Organization</th>
<th>Chief Housing Officer Mean &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Chief Student Personnel Administrator (N=100)</td>
<td>2.0070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Chief Business Administrator (N=17)</td>
<td>2.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Both of Above (N=49)</td>
<td>2.1816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"F" Test for Pattern of Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.1018*</th>
<th>0.5656</th>
<th>8.1471*</th>
<th>2.0063</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*p&lt;.15; 2,164 d.f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The "F" test at the .05 level of confidence for the data in Table 18 allows one to accept sub-hypotheses B and D and to reject sub-hypotheses A and C. These findings imply that the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program is related significantly to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to the programming and staffing factors.

For the programming factor, chief housing officer mean "S" scores with regard to the pattern of organization are ranked from high to low as (1) under a combination of the chief student personnel administrator and the chief business administrator, (2) under the chief business administrator, and (3) under the chief student personnel administrator. This finding would appear to indicate organization under the chief student personnel administrator enables chief housing officers to perceive "shelter oriented" conditions from a somewhat more clear perspective than chief housing officers under the other two patterns of organization. Further statistical analysis would be required to support or negate this interpretation of the data.

Concomitantly, the data in Table 18 for the statistically significant staffing factor reveal chief housing officers who are organized under a chief student personnel administrator have lower mean scores than chief housing officers
under the other two patterns of organization. Dependent upon further statistical analysis, it would appear that chief housing officers organized under a chief student administrator have a more clear perception of the "S" staffing statements than chief housing officers organized under the other two patterns.

For the two factors of physical facilities and financing which were not statistically significant, it should be noted that chief housing officers organized under chief business administrators have the lowest mean scores. This pattern of scores is in direct contrast to the previous interpretation for the statistically significant programming and staffing factors. Because of the data not being significant at the .05 level of confidence, no further interpretation is deemed feasible.

The general hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program and the way in which chief housing officers perceive column II "S" statements on the Student Housing Inventory can be accepted only partially. The institution's pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program was significant at the .05 level of confidence for the programming and staffing factors whereas the institution's pattern of organization was not significant for the physical facilities and financing factors at the identical level of confidence.
All of the hypotheses that were to be analyzed have been presented. Initially, hypotheses were designed to assess the relationship between present undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which chief housing officers perceived future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions in general. Other hypotheses assessed the relationship between chief housing officer background variables and the way in which they perceived future "educationally oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions in general. Similarly, the latter group of hypotheses were designed to determine the relationship between chief housing officer background variables and the way in which they perceived future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions in general.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the study.--This study was designed to assess the future role of the undergraduate men's residence hall program as it is perceived by chief housing officers at selected four-year institutions of higher learning. To fulfill this purpose, a Student Housing Inventory was constructed to determine the relationship between various types of chief housing officer background variables and statements which are purported to be indicative of an "educationally oriented" and a "shelter oriented" student housing program. These statements were gleaned from current student housing literature and were designed to cluster around the four major factors of programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

The sample for the study was 317 ACUHO member four-year institutions. These institutions were divided by public or private control, by five size categories, and by nine ACUHO regional districts. The overall rate of return for the study was 66 per cent.

The statistical computations for the study were performed at The Ohio State University Research Center by the
MR-90 Program on the 7094 computer. One hundred and sixty-eight fully completed inventories were selected for these computations. Initially, correlation coefficients were performed to determine the degree and direction of relationships between "educationally oriented" and "shelter oriented" statements on the Student Housing Inventory. Analyses of variance tests and "t" tests were performed for the "educationally oriented" hypotheses to assess the relationship between chief housing officer background variables and their perceptions of future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions. Identical statistics were computed for the "shelter oriented" hypotheses to determine the relationship between chief housing officer background variables and their perceptions of future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions.

Summary of related literature.—The review of related literature initially revealed that British student housing philosophy was based upon educational purposes whereas the American modification incorporated the belief that housing was only the physical matter of providing shelter and strict control over student activities. As a result, it has been only since the 1920's that American colleges and universities have considered seriously the educational potential of the undergraduate student housing program.

Representative literature relating to the purposes of residence halls illustrated the desire of student housing
authorities for American institutions of higher learning to provide residence hall students with more than mere physical shelter accommodations. Consequently, residence halls must be designed to contribute to the academic, social, and personal development of the student. To accept anything less than this goal, residence halls would be sacrificing many of their greatest potential benefits to students.

Various foci of analysis were used to construct a theoretical framework for the student. This framework was based upon the premise that an exogenous or endogenous induced change in any portion of the social structure (as the student housing program) would affect the entire system (as the university subsystem). The concepts of "contagion of intimacy," environment, student sub-cultures, and peer group influences were major foci of the theoretical framework. These salient perspectives provided appropriate bases for integrating the student housing program more fully into the total educational environment of the college or university.

Concomitantly, the literature revealed that leading American educators are developing feasible rationales as to the "why" and "how" residence halls should become centers of discourse on the campus. One viable approach for combining "living" and "learning" within the residence hall situation was the "living-learning center." As a result, the four major elements of these centers (programming, physical
facilities, staffing, financing) were reviewed for the dual purpose of providing an overview of the multifaceted dimensions of future living-learning centers and exploring present student housing conditions. This type of literature review was chosen to emphasize the need for a more "educationally oriented" student housing program in contrast to a "shelter oriented" approach. Many outstanding suggestions for integrating the living and learning experience presently appear to lie dormant and wait for an "Age of Renaissance" within the area of undergraduate student housing.

Conclusions of the study.—The analysis of the data from this study suggests the following conclusions concerning the relationship between background variables of chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable undergraduate men's residence hall conditions.

1. There is a positive relationship between present "educationally oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which the institution's chief housing officer perceives future "educationally oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

2. There is a positive relationship between present "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which the institution's chief housing officer perceives future "shelter oriented" undergraduate
men's residence hall conditions with respect to programming, physical facilities, and staffing.

3. There is a negative relationship between present "educationally oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions and the way in which the institution's chief housing officer perceives future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to programming, physical facilities, and financing.

4. The level of educational background makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "educationally oriented" conditions with regard to the programming, physical facilities, and staffing of undergraduate men's residence halls. Chief housing officers become more "educationally oriented" as their level of educational background advances from the bachelor's degree toward the doctoral degree.

5. The type of educational background makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "educationally oriented" conditions with regard to programming, physical facilities and staffing of undergraduate men's residence halls. In relation to these factors, chief housing officers with student personnel and educational administration backgrounds tend to be more "educationally oriented" than chief housing officers with business and miscellaneous educational backgrounds.
6. Membership in professional organizations makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "educationally oriented" conditions with regard to the programming and financing of undergraduate men's residence halls. In relation to these factors, chief housing officers who hold membership in professional organizations tend to be more "educationally oriented" than chief housing officers who do not hold membership in professional organizations.

7. There is no significant difference between the institution's pattern of organization for undergraduate student housing and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "educationally oriented" conditions in relation to the programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing of undergraduate men's residence halls.

8. The level of educational background makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to physical facilities and staffing. In relation to these factors, chief housing officers appear to perceive more clearly future "shelter oriented" conditions as their level of educational background progresses from the bachelor's toward the doctoral degree.

9. The type of educational background makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing
officers perceive future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to staffing. Chief housing officers with educational administration and business backgrounds tend to have less ability for perceiving "shelter oriented" staffing conditions than do chief housing officers with student personnel and miscellaneous educational backgrounds.

10. Membership in professional organizations makes no significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "shelter oriented" conditions with regard to programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing of undergraduate men's residence halls. However, the data would lend support to the hypothesis that membership in professional organizations enables chief housing officers to perceive more clearly future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to physical facilities and staffing.

11. The pattern of organization for the undergraduate men's residence hall program makes a significant difference as to the way in which chief housing officers perceive future "shelter oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall conditions with respect to programming and staffing. In relation to these factors, chief housing officers who are organized under a chief student personnel administrator tend to perceive future "shelter oriented" conditions more clearly than
do chief housing officers under a chief business administrator or a combination of the chief student personnel administrator and the chief business administrator.

Recommendations.—Based upon the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made for colleges and universities concerned with implementing a more "educationally oriented" role for their future undergraduate men's residence hall program. These recommendations are believed relevant for all types and sizes of four-year educational institutions.

1. Institutions of higher learning should strive to obtain chief housing officers with the highest possible level of educational backgrounds. Whereas the type of educational background is extremely important, it appears that chief housing officers with doctoral degrees generally have greater ability for grasping the dynamics of an "educationally oriented" undergraduate men's residence hall program.

2. More chief housing officers with doctoral degrees in the areas of student personnel and/or educational administration should be sought by institutions of higher learning.

3. Membership and active participation in professional organizations by chief housing officers should be expected by their respective institutions of higher learning.
4. The undergraduate men's residence hall program should be organized under a chief student personnel administrator to whom the chief housing officer would be responsible. The chief student personnel administrator should have a close liaison staff relationship with the chief business administrator. If the position of chief student personnel administrator does not exist, the chief housing officer should be responsible for the entire operation of the undergraduate men's residence hall program. This alternative also implies a close liaison staff relationship with the chief business administrator.

5. Chief housing officers should be responsible for the conducting and subsequent publication of research related to their respective student housing programs. This research would be used vigorously as the basis for improving present student housing conditions.

6. Chief housing officers should have faculty status and feel qualified to lead student discussion classes on such topics as "The Dynamics of Personal and Social Development of the College Student" and "The Future Role of Student Housing on American College and University Campuses."
APPENDIX A
ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY HOUSING OFFICERS
REGIONAL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION 1:</th>
<th>REGION 2:</th>
<th>REGION 3:</th>
<th>REGION 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION 5:</th>
<th>REGION 6:</th>
<th>REGION 7:</th>
<th>REGION 8:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGION 9:

Washington
Oregon
California
Nevada
Idaho
Montana
Alaska
Hawaii
This is a personal letter to request your cooperation in obtaining data for my doctoral dissertation which is under the direction of Dr. Collins W. Burnett, Professor of Higher Education, The Ohio State University.

Your name and institution were selected for this nationwide study from the 1967 Directory for the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO). As you will note in the attached letter, the Research & Information Committee of ACUHO (Dr. H. C. Riker, Chairman) has endorsed this research project on undergraduate student housing.

As CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER for your institution of higher learning, please complete and return the enclosed Student Housing Inventory at your earliest convenience with a DEADLINE DATE OF DECEMBER 15, 1967. In return for your courtesy, I will send you a summary of the results of this study when it has been completed.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and I will look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Charlie E. Cloaninger, Jr.
November 6, 1967

Mr. Charlie E. Cloaninger, Jr.
F. 0. Box 110 Steeb Hall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Cloaninger:

I am pleased to advise you that the Research and Information Committee has approved your study proposal entitled "The Role of the Undergraduate Men's Residence Hall Program as Perceived by Chief Housing Officers at Selected Four-Year Institutions of Higher Learning." The Committee is most interested in your project and feels that it will make a unique contribution to our knowledge of student housing programs.

May I extend best wishes for the successful completion of your work.

Sincerely,

H. C. Riker, Chairman
Research & Information Committee

HCR/1h
STUDENT HOUSING INVENTORY

SECTION I

Instructions: Section I consists of "Chief Housing Officer" background data and the pattern of organization for your undergraduate men's residence hall program. Answer all items as indicated and use the reverse of this page if extra space is needed.

Name ____________________________ Institution ____________________________
( not to be used in study) ( not to be used in study) ( not to be used in study)

Educational Experience:
Institution __________________________________ Degree(s) Awarded ____________________________
( not to be used in study) ( not to be used in study) ( not to be used in study)
( not to be used in study) ( not to be used in study) ( not to be used in study)

Professional Organizations:
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

Published Research on Student Housing:
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

Rank: (check one)
- faculty status
- administrative status
- other ____________________________
( explain briefly)

Present Type of Orientation Program for the Chief Housing Officer: (check all applicable responses)
- none
- first to hold position -- self initiated orientation
- orientation by preceding chief housing officer
- orientation by V. P., Student Affairs or Dean of Students
- orientation by V. P., Business Affairs
- other ____________________________
( explain briefly)

Pattern of Organization for your Undergraduate Men's Residence Hall Program: (check one)
- under chief university student personnel administrator - e.g., Dean of Students or V. P., Student Affairs
- under chief university business administrator - e.g., V. P., Business Affairs
- under both - the chief student personnel administrator and the chief business administrator
- other ____________________________
( explain briefly)

Continued...
SECTION II

Instructions: Section II consists of statements concerning possible conditions within undergraduate men's residence halls. Indicate by a ✓ in the first column (Have) only those statements which characterize present conditions within your undergraduate men's residence halls. Indicate in the second column (HD...HU) by a ✓ the way in which you perceive all statements as indicative of desirable future conditions within undergraduate men's residence halls in general.

Legend:
HD = Highly Desirable
MD = Moderately Desirable
D = Desirable
MU = Moderately Undesirable
HU = Highly Undesirable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN I</th>
<th>COLUMN II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Have)</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty academic tutoring for students</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty office spaces</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student personnel administrators as residence hall directors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student sponsored discussions on any topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Residence hall libraries – 200 volumes or more</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Business administrators as residence hall directors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Residence hall directors collect student rental fees</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Orientation program for new students</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. One large recreational room</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Doctoral candidate students as residence hall directors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. &quot;How to study programs&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Recreational rooms with folding partitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Masters candidate students live on residence hall floors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sculpture displays</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Managerial personnel as residence hall directors</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Both double &amp; single rooms on long corridors (&gt;20 rms) with central baths</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Art exhibits</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Maid service for student rooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Both double &amp; single rooms on short corridors (&lt;20 rms) with central baths</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Student responsibility for room cleanliness</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Custodial staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Double rooms have 100 sq. ft./student for studying and sleeping</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Stereo music in public lobbies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Full-time secretary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Residence hall directors have extensive purchasing responsibilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Student government disciplinary court</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Suites (2 or more rooms) have one common bath</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Short range research by residence hall student personnel staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Student planned dances</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Suites (2 or more rooms) have small baths located between student rooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Longitudinal research by residence hall student personnel staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Week-end open houses with female privileges</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. &quot;Color &amp; furniture&quot; schemes by professional decorators</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. No managerial responsibilities for residence hall student personnel staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Personal-social counseling</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Large open public lobby areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Student discipline by residence hall student personnel staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Vocational counseling</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Public lobbies with several types of sub-divisions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Conduct supervision of students by residence hall student personnel staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. Extensive financial reports are maintained by residence hall directors.
42. Residence hall directors delegate responsibility with commensurate authority to their staff.
43. Academic counseling
44. Lounges for students only
45. Group counseling
46. Residence hall staff participate in student sponsored functions
47. Residence hall listening centers - i.e., taped lessons for students
48. Students are randomly assigned to rooms
49. Self-evaluations by residence hall student personnel staff
50. Students with similar academic interests room together
51. Carpentry in residence halls
52. Students with dissimilar academic interests room together
53. Self-evaluations by residence hall managerial staff
54. Acoustical tile in residence halls
55. Common study rooms supplement student rooms
56. Bulletin boards and "news-sheets"
57. A strict "chain of command" among residence hall staff
58. Programs for recognition of student scholarship
59. Common study rooms replace student room study areas
60. Periodic residence hall "traffic pattern" surveys
61. An informal "chain of command" among residence hall staff
62. Classrooms within residence halls
63. Students are divided into "living-groups" within residence halls
64. Laundry facilities
65. Student evaluations of residence hall programs
66. Snack vending machines
67. Student evaluations of all types of residence hall staff
68. Faculty and students live together
69. No form of student government program
70. Student evaluations of residence hall facilities
71. Residence hall directors are "efficiency" oriented
72. Office spaces for counselors
73. No orientation program for new students
74. Residence hall directors are "student effectiveness" oriented

SECTION III

Instructions: Section III consists of statements which are related to the total undergraduate men's residence hall program. Indicate by a \( \sqrt{ } \) in the first column (Have) only those statements which characterize your present undergraduate men's residence hall program. Indicate in the second column (HD...HU) by a \( \sqrt{ } \) the way in which you perceive all statements as indicative of related desirable conditions for future undergraduate men's residence hall programs in general.

Legend:
HD = Highly Desirable
MD = Moderately Desirable
D = Desirable
MU = Moderately Undesirable
HU = Highly Undesirable

75. Faculty & students frequently dine together in commons
76. Educators & architects consult on residence hall designs
77. Liaison committees between residence hall staff & other student personnel services
78. Residence halls are constructed at a minimum of expense
79. Stereo music during meals in commons

Continued...
80. Dining commons adjoined to residence halls
81. Planned increases in student residence hall rental rates
82. Planning committees to determine future student housing needs
83. Revenue bonds are the principal source of funds for residence hall construction
84. Dining commons separated from residence halls
85. Liaison committees between residence hall staff & the entire campus community
86. Separate operation of residence halls and food services
87. Research on residence halls by "outside experts"
88. Residence hall construction & renovation projects constitute approximately 20 percent of the total institutional capital outlay
89. Small dining room areas in commons
90. Combined operation of residence halls and food services
91. Residence halls are financially self-liquidating
92. Residence halls combine "living" and "learning"
93. Residence halls are considered an "academic unit"
94. One large dining area in commons
95. Residence halls are financially subsidized
96. Residence halls are considered a "managerial unit"
97. Dissimilarly shaped tables & chairs in commons
98. Seasonal "candlelight" dinners in commons
99. Regular "inter-staff" meetings, e.g., student personnel; managerial; food services
100. Financial profits from residence hall operations are reinvested in the area of student housing
101. Residence halls are considered centers for university public relations
102. Similarly shaped tables & chairs in commons
103. Objectives of residence halls reflect university objectives
104. Residence hall financial reports are available to the public
105. Financial profits from residence hall operations are not reinvested in the area of student housing
106. Objectives of residence halls are dissimilar from university objectives
107. Residence halls are centers for intellectual discourse
108. Intramural sports program
109. Room & board student fees are assessed jointly
110. Co-educational residence halls
111. In loco parentis characterizes the residence hall program
112. Financial experts are consulted prior to residence hall construction
113. Co-educational dining commons
114. Revenue bonds are not the principal source of funds for residence hall construction
115. Residence hall financial reports are not available to the public
116. Thank you.
CODING FOR STUDENT HOUSING INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMMING</th>
<th>PHYSICAL FACILITIES</th>
<th>STAFFING</th>
<th>FINANCING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'E' 'E' 'S'</td>
<td>'E' 'E' 'E' 'S' 'S'</td>
<td>'E' 'S'</td>
<td>'E' 'S'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 60 48</td>
<td>2 55 9</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>81 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 63 52</td>
<td>5 62 16</td>
<td>10 7</td>
<td>83 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 65 69</td>
<td>12 64 27</td>
<td>13 15</td>
<td>88 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 67 73</td>
<td>19 66 36</td>
<td>21 18</td>
<td>91 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 70 86</td>
<td>22 68 59</td>
<td>24 25</td>
<td>100 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 75 96</td>
<td>30 72 78</td>
<td>28 37</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 79 107</td>
<td>33 76 84</td>
<td>31 41</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 82 112</td>
<td>39 80 94</td>
<td>34 57</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 87</td>
<td>44 89 102</td>
<td>40 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 90</td>
<td>47 97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 92</td>
<td>51 111</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 93</td>
<td>54 114</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 98</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 101</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 103</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 108</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 109</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage of Participating Institutions as to Type of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Control</th>
<th>Total Number of Sample Institutions</th>
<th>Total Number of Participating Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Participating Institutions as to Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Institution</th>
<th>Total Number of Sample Institutions</th>
<th>Total Number of Participating Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage Rate of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001-4,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,001-10,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 +</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS AS TO GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACUHO GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF SAMPLE INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE RATE OF RETURN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNANALYZED HYPOTHESES

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who have published research on student housing and chief housing officers who have not published research on student housing and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A.-D.

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who have published research on student housing and chief housing officers who have not published research on student housing with respect to column II factor "E" scores for programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

### MEAN "E" SCORES FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER PUBLISHED RESEARCH ON STUDENT HOUSING BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Research on Student Housing</th>
<th>Mean &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> (N=19)</td>
<td>3.9473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong> (N=147)</td>
<td>4.0401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"t" Test for Published Research on Student Housing

| "t" Test for Published Research on Student Housing | 0.7939 | 0.0489 | 1.8762* | 0.0766 |

*p<.05; 165 d.f.
There is no significant difference between the types of rank for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A.-D.

There is no significant difference between the types of rank for chief housing officers and column II factor "E" scores for programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Rank</th>
<th>Mean &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (N=31)</td>
<td>3.9516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (N=108)</td>
<td>4.0315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of Above (N=28)</td>
<td>4.0571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"T" Test for Type of Rank
0.4268  1.1344  2.7553  0.3249

*p<.05; 2,164 d.f.
There is no significant difference between the way in which chief housing officers at publicly controlled institutions and privately controlled institutions perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A.-D.

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers at publicly and privately controlled institutions and column II factor "E" scores for programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

**MEAN "E" SCORES OF CHIEF HOUSING OFFICERS AT PUBLICLY AND PRIVATELY CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Control</th>
<th>Mean &quot;E&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=108)</td>
<td>4.0611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=58)</td>
<td>3.9706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"t" Test for Type of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; Value</th>
<th>&quot;p&quot; Value</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=108)</td>
<td>1.1613</td>
<td>0.9466</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=58)</td>
<td>0.3732</td>
<td>3.5864*</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05; 165 d.f.
There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who have published research on student housing and chief housing officers who have not published research on student housing and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A.-D.

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers who have published research on student housing and chief housing officers who have not published research on student housing with respect to column II "S" factor scores for programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

### MEAN "S" SCORES FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER PUBLISHED RESEARCH ON STUDENT HOUSING BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Research on Student Housing</th>
<th>Mean &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (N=19)</td>
<td>1.9421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (N=147)</td>
<td>2.0843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"t" Test for Published Research on Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;t&quot; Test</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Physical Facilities</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4239</td>
<td>0.0998</td>
<td>0.4199</td>
<td>0.5259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; 165 d.f.
There is no significant difference between the types of rank for chief housing officers and the way in which they perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A.-D.

There is no significant difference between the types of rank for chief housing officers and column II factor "S" scores for programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

**MEAN "S" SCORES FOR CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER TYPES OF RANK BY PROGRAMMING, PHYSICAL FACILITIES, STAFFING, AND FINANCING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Rank</th>
<th>Mean &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (N=31)</td>
<td>2.0806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (N=108)</td>
<td>2.1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of Above (N=28)</td>
<td>1.9643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"F" Test for Type of Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;F&quot; Test for Type of Rank</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;F&quot;</td>
<td>4.6797*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p&lt;.05; 2,164 d.f.</td>
<td>1.1630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There is no significant difference between the way in which chief housing officers at publicly controlled institutions and privately controlled institutions perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

A.-D.

There is no significant difference between chief housing officers at publicly and privately controlled institutions and column II factor "S" scores for programming, physical facilities, staffing, and financing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Control</th>
<th>Mean &quot;S&quot; Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public (N=108)</td>
<td>2.0777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (N=58)</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"t" Test for Type of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.4141</th>
<th>0.0861</th>
<th>0.4573</th>
<th>3.9829*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*p<.05; 165 d.f.
There is no significant difference between the type, size, and region of the institutions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the total "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

### CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER TOTAL COLUMN II "E" SCORES BY TYPE, SIZE, AND REGION OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>&quot;F&quot; Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5561</td>
<td>3.5561</td>
<td>1.2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2848</td>
<td>0.5712</td>
<td>0.1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.9864</td>
<td>4.6233</td>
<td>1.5770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type x Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.1267</td>
<td>2.5317</td>
<td>0.8640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total "N" = 167

*p < .05
There is no significant difference between the type, size, and region of the institutions and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the total "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>&quot;F&quot; Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9010</td>
<td>2.2253</td>
<td>1.2290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1810</td>
<td>1.2726</td>
<td>0.7030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type x Size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.1073</td>
<td>2.5268</td>
<td>1.3960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total "N" = 167

*p < .05
There is no significant difference between the type and level of chief housing officer educational background and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the total "E" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

### CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS BY LEVEL AND TYPE FOR TOTAL COLUMN II "E" SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>&quot;F&quot; Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Educational Background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5612</td>
<td>0.7806</td>
<td>0.2770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Educational Background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.4882</td>
<td>8.4961</td>
<td>3.0140*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total "N" = 163

*p < 0.05
There is no significance between the type and level of chief housing officer educational background and the way in which chief housing officers perceive future desirable conditions in relation to undergraduate men's residence halls in general (column II) with respect to the total "S" scores on the Student Housing Inventory.

**CHIEF HOUSING OFFICER EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUNDS BY LEVEL AND TYPE FOR TOTAL COLUMN II "S" SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>&quot;F&quot; Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Educational Background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9110</td>
<td>3.4555</td>
<td>1.9060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Educational Background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6417</td>
<td>0.8806</td>
<td>0.4860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total "N" = 163

*p < .05*
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