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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate student attitudes toward the residence hall program at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The study attempted to determine whether sex of the resident, class standing of the resident, size of the residence hall, age of the head resident, or employment as a student resident assistant significantly affected student attitudes toward the residence hall program.

A twenty per cent random sample of the total population of each of the ten residence halls plus the entire staff of residence assistants were surveyed regarding their attitudes toward the residence hall program. The segments of the residence hall program that were investigated were general hall living conditions, the individual resident, fellow residents, the hall council, the resident assistant, and the head resident.

An analysis of variance was used to determine if any significant differences existed between sub-groups in their attitudes toward the six areas of the residence hall program. Significant differences were found to exist between the sub-groups toward certain areas of the residence hall program:

1. Resident assistants were more positive than
general residents in their attitudes toward general hall living conditions, themselves as individual residents, the resident assistant, and the head resident.

2. Upperclassmen were more positive than underclassmen in their attitudes toward themselves as individual residents, the head resident, and the resident assistant.

3. Female residents expressed more positive attitudes than male residents toward fellow residents and the hall council.

4. Residents of the larger halls were more positive toward fellow residents than residents of the smaller halls.

5. Residents of the smaller halls expressed more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant than residents of the larger halls.

6. Residents of halls administered by a younger head resident expressed more positive attitudes toward the head resident than residents of the other halls.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

On-campus living facilities for students have changed greatly since the establishment of the first college in the United States. The first American colleges, patterned after Oxford and Cambridge, provided housing as part of their educational programs. Faculty members lived with the students to provide tutorial services, stimulate intellectual thought, and control conduct. Leonard (1956) stated "the first dormitories were designed to make possible the all-inclusive supervision of the lives of the students (p. 109)." In many cases this emphasis of controlled conduct created an image of staff versus student and damaged the concept of housing as a setting for intellectual activity.

As college enrollments mushroomed, student housing became a big business operation. Housing programs evolved along two broad lines:

1. to provide a place for students to sleep and a place that is proctored so that order is maintained

2. to provide satisfactory physical facilities plus a well rounded educational, social, and cultural program (Williamson, 1949).
In many instances all aspects of the students' environment were not taken into consideration in the implementation of the housing program. Clark (1967) claimed that variables such as architectural design, programming, staff, policies, student culture, and faculty involvement are all influential in determining the impact of the residence hall program on students, and should be considered in the development of the residence hall program. Since the average student resident spends seventy-five to ninety-five hours per week in his hall in contrast to fifteen to eighteen hours in class, the environment should be taken into consideration when implementing housing programs.

Student dissatisfaction seems to be one of the most pressing forces on today's college campuses because many students feel university personnel do not understand their grievances. Dissatisfaction with student housing is apparent on many campuses. In discussing recent changes in residence halls, Sandeen (1968) stated, "Although the architectural design of residence halls has changed greatly and innovations in staffing and programming have been introduced, there is little evidence to suggest that students are greatly satisfied with their living arrangements (p. 228)." The majority of those participating in residence hall living are freshman and sophomore students who are required to live in residence halls while upper division students have shown a tendency to move off campus. To combat the occupancy problem, many colleges have been forced to require certain classifications of students to live in
residence halls. Other colleges have been forced to close some of their residence halls. Some colleges have chosen to get away from the business of housing students entirely. Some housing authorities would strongly disagree with this latter course of action. For example Riker (1965) believes that residence hall living definitely has an important function on a college campus. He feels the function of college housing is to help students to learn and to grow as human beings. He has advised student personnel people to experiment with housing to better meet the needs of contemporary college students and to help insure student success at college.

The ten residence halls at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse were administered in basically the same manner. Each hall was staffed with a head resident and two to twelve resident assistants. The differences in age and personalities of the individual head residents might have affected the manner in which each hall was administered, especially in regard to rules and regulations. The personalities of the resident assistants in each hall might also have affected the image of the hall as perceived by the residents. Although male and female resident assistants were both trained to provide a helping relationship for students, the female resident assistant program has stressed the use of counseling techniques to a greater extent while the male resident assistant has placed more emphasis on discipline.
The size and architectural design of the halls were different. It is often assumed that students living in smaller halls have a stronger feeling of unity than those living in larger halls. Students living in the smaller halls may have had more opportunities to come in contact with one another, creating a more friendly atmosphere.

At this time the Board of Regents of Wisconsin required single freshmen and sophomore students who were under the age of twenty-one to live in residence halls. Upper-classmen were living in the halls because they had chosen to do so.

Each hall council was composed of individuals elected by the hall residents. The effectiveness of each hall council depends on a number of variables. The leadership characteristics of hall council members, their interest in hall government, and the guidance and encouragement they received made each hall council unique.

It might be assumed that students selected as resident assistants possessed values and attitudes that were different from those of the general residence hall population. These students were selected on a variety of characteristics, including attitude toward residence hall living, ability to cooperate and communicate with others, awareness of others and self, ability to cope with stressful situations, and leadership potential. Many of these students seem to understand, act, and feel in a psychologically knowledgeable manner before experiencing any
formal training. During in-service training sessions, residence assistants become familiar with all aspects of the residence hall program as well as its philosophy. They also become familiar with the various student services offered on the campus and the personnel who are involved with these departments.

The resident assistants were directly responsible to their head resident. They held weekly meetings with the head resident and had frequent contacts with this individual. It is felt they get to know and understand this person much better than the general residents.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to assess the attitudes of residence hall students at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse toward the residence hall program. The study attempted to determine: (1) whether student attitudes toward the residence hall program varied among the different halls; (2) whether student staff members and general residents differed in their attitudes toward the residence hall program; and (3) whether student attitudes toward the residence hall program differed according to the sex of the resident, class standing of the resident, size of the residence hall, or age of the head resident. The segments of the residence hall program that were investigated were general residence hall living conditions, the individual resident, fellow residents, the hall council, the resident assistant, and the head resident.
Importance of the Study

Housing programs on many college campuses are being significantly changed to meet the needs of the contemporary college student. No two colleges or universities are alike. Thus, no two housing programs should be identical. "Housing programs should be shaped by the over all goals and policies of the institution, its curricular program, and the attitudes of its faculty and students (Riker, 165, p. 9)."

With the use of objective research, housing staff personnel can better understand the attitudes of the students living in the residence halls toward the existing housing program. This information can be valuable in evaluating the program and pointing out areas in which improvements need to be made. Hopefully, by improving the residence hall program, students will experience a more meaningful situation if required to live in residence halls. Students who are not required to live on campus may find the situation inviting. Thus, the housing program can better fill its two major roles: (1) that of providing a meaningful educational experience for students and (2) that of being an efficient business operation.

Procedure

Twenty per cent of the residents of each residence hall were randomly selected to complete a questionnaire designed to measure student attitudes toward the residence hall program. The questionnaire was comprised of questions concerning six segments of the residence hall program.
They were general residence hall living conditions, the individual resident, fellow residents, the hall council, the resident assistant, and the head resident.

In addition, the questionnaire was distributed to the entire staff of residence assistants for completion. The data gathered from the returned questionnaires were treated statistically.

Delimitations

1. This study was conducted at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse during the spring semester of the 1971-72 academic school year and the results may not be applicable to other campuses. The attitudes expressed were of the students and resident assistants living in the residence halls at that time and cannot be generalized to students residing in the halls at another time.

Limitations

1. The results are limited by the validity and reliability of the instrument used. The instrument was developed at another university and this might have biased the results.

2. Since the questionnaire was administered early in the spring semester after room and hall changes had taken place, all respondents had not lived in their present location the same length of time.

3. The researcher was a member of the University Housing Staff who had worked closely with some of the residents. This could have introduced bias to the study.
4. The sub-groups used in this study were not mutually exclusive.

**Definition of Terms**

- **Resident.** An individual living in a residence hall.
- **Resident Assistant.** A student member of the residence hall staff who works directly with the residents. The responsibilities of a resident assistant range from mechanical duties to those of aiding residents with a wide variety of problems.
- **Resident Hall.** A facility provided by a college or university where students can live while attending the institution.
- **Head Resident.** The individual directly responsible for the operation of a residence hall. In this study, a younger head resident was a head resident under the age of thirty. An older head resident was a head resident over the age of thirty.
- **Hall Council.** The main governmental body of each individual residence hall, composed of officers and a group of elected representatives from each living unit within the hall.
- **Floor.** A living unit within a residence hall in which the rooms are arranged along a straight or L-shaped corridor.
- **Cube.** A living unit within a residence hall in which rooms are arranged around a center stairwell. This gives the living unit the shape of a square.
Underclassmen. All freshmen and sophomore students surveyed in this study.

Upperclassmen. All junior and senior students surveyed in this study.

Large Hall. A residence hall with a capacity for more than 350 residents.

Small Hall. A residence hall with a capacity for less than 250 residents.

Hypotheses

The sex of the resident, the class standing of the resident, the size of the residence hall, the age of the head resident, and employment as a student resident assistant were the variables investigated as to their effect on the attitudes of students toward the residence hall program. The following null hypotheses were developed for the purpose of statistical analysis. The hypotheses regarding the five variables cited were grouped as they related to the six sections of the questionnaire.

The variables cited are as follows:

General Hall Living Conditions

1. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by male and female residents.

2. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by the residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

3. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by residents of small and large halls.

4. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by residents of small and large halls.
5. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

Individual Resident

6. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by male and female residents.

7. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by the residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

8. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by the residents of small and large halls.

9. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by residents and resident assistants.

10. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

Fellow Residents

11. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by male and female residents.

12. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by the residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

13. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by the residents of small and large halls.

14. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by residents and resident assistants.

15. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by upperclassmen and underclassmen.
Hall Council

16. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by male and female residents.

17. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

18. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by residents of small and large halls.

19. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by residents and resident assistants.

20. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

Resident Assistant

21. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistants by male and female residents.

22. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

23. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents of small and large halls.

24. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents and resident assistants.

25. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

Head Resident

26. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by male and female residents.
27. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents of halls administered by a younger head resident and residents of the other halls.

28. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents of small and large halls.

29. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents and resident assistants.

30. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by upperclassmen and underclassmen.
CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Student attitudes toward physical facilities, general group living, regulations, and staffing were investigated for presentation in this chapter. These areas were found to be interdependent and difficult to separate. Thus, much overlapping resulted. In reviewing the literature it was found that there has been little actual research done concerning student attitudes toward residence hall programs. Most of the literature discussing residence hall programs was based on authors' opinions.

According to students participating in a panel discussion at the 1970 Association of College and University Housing Officers Convention, physical facilities in residence halls cause a great deal of student dissatisfaction. The students stated lack of privacy, unusable lounge spaces, furniture that defies rearrangement and inadequate sound proofing as major drawbacks to residence hall living (Switzer, 1970).

Sandeén (1967) suggested that students want to be able to express themselves through their residence. They feel stifled because all the rooms in the halls are identical. This tends to create a cold impersonal atmosphere. A variety of solutions are being attempted in order to remedy these
situations. Some schools have offered students the opportunity to paint and decorate their own rooms. Carpeting in many residence halls has helped cut down on the noise factor. Shay (1968) suggested that built-in furniture be eliminated and students be allowed to select their furnishings from a pool of diverse styles. The University of British Columbia has received student input into the selection of colors, furnishings, and decorations for its residence halls. They have given students the opportunity to design and furnish their own lounges. According to Rohringer (1971), these lounges are kept extremely clean by the students and are better maintained than any other lounge areas on campus. Rohringer (1971) believes the answer to the problem of student dissatisfaction with residence halls lies in catering more to individual human needs rather than just the physical aspect of residences. This becomes increasingly difficult with the size of college enrollments as large as they are.

Penn (1967) surveyed students at the University of Wisconsin regarding their attitudes toward student housing. Over half of the students responded that they preferred university residence halls during some portion of their college career. Specific features that were mentioned as desirable were the new, clean, yet inexpensive facilities. The students expressed favorable attitudes toward the cooking and study facilities. Adequate lighting, heating, ventilation and soundproofing were also features that met with the approval of the residents.
Students at Michigan State University generally approved of the sleeping conditions, the number of telephones, the storage space, and the parking facilities provided through their residence halls (Garrison, 1969). Their dissatisfactions centered around inadequate laundry facilities, study rooms, recreational and lounge areas. Students were also very critical of the maintenance of their halls in general.

Since the physical facilities vary from university to university, it would seem logical that each university's physical plants would have their strengths and weaknesses. However, it was noted that the cold, impersonal atmosphere and the lack of aesthetic appeal of residence halls were common complaints by a number of authors. Shay (1969) and Rohringer (1971) both advocated that physical plants should show more evidence of concern for the needs of students rather than the protection of the individual buildings.

Perhaps some of the cold impersonal feelings within a residence hall are created by the sheer number of individuals living in a relatively small area. Large high rise halls were built to accommodate the vast increases in enrollments that developed during the 1960's. White (1969) commented that administrators and students have different views on what constitutes satisfactory group living experiences. "Administrators desire togetherness while students want to be left alone (p. 123)." She compared the
characteristics of residence hall life with those of mass society. She felt that it is impossible to expect individual students to develop any sense of personal identification with a residence hall, especially a large one.

Students themselves seemed to feel differently. Penn (1967) noted that opportunities involving interpersonal relationships were felt to be the most valuable experiences offered by residence hall life. Interpersonal relationships cover a broad area of experiences. Students felt that meeting people, forming friendships, and learning to cooperate with others were definitely positive factors of residence hall living. Garrison (1969) asked students what they felt was the most profitable activity or experience of residence hall life. Three out of five Michigan State students responded with answers directly related to interpersonal relationships within the hall. Some of the specific items mentioned by these students were the exposure to a great variety of people and the opportunities to work together, act in common in hall government, and take part in intramural sports. On the other hand, when students were asked what they felt was the least profitable experience of residence hall living their responses again centered around interpersonal relationships. Crowding and noise, irrelevant and unorganized government meetings, and routine social activities were the experiences mentioned most frequently as being undesirable. He concluded,

The most favorable aspect and least favorable aspect questions then indicate the same thing;
that when personal relationships are good, they are the best thing that happens in the living experience at college: when they are bad, their badness is seen as the one thing most to be condemned (p. 21).

Rules and regulations often affect many aspects of the residence hall environment. Switzer (1970) stated that regulations preventing flexibility within the physical building brought about negative attitudes from students. Another area of great concern to students was rules and regulations affecting their personal privacy.

Garrison (1969) found that four out of five students at Michigan State University did not find residence hall living too restrictive. The greatest constraints were felt in the areas of visitation, desire to have alcohol in the rooms, mandatory food service, contract release procedures, and restrictions on redecoration and rearrangement of the rooms.

Garrison (1969) also found that students at Michigan State wanted the freedom to have visitors of the opposite sex in their rooms at any and all hours. Tautfest and Young (1970) discovered that students at the University of Wisconsin felt the students themselves should set any regulations concerning visitation and the University should not be involved. However, parents of students at the University of Wisconsin did not agree with this. They felt the University should regulate the visitation policy.

Many students don't realize that regulations concerning alcohol in residence halls are often rules made
by the state itself. Garrison's (1969) results indicated that although students wanted to be allowed to drink in their rooms they had definite doubts about their fellow students. "This seemed to reflect student desire to have other people restrained from disturbing one's own privacy (p. 17)."

Research indicated some interesting points about student attitudes toward enforcement of rules. Enforcement of rules and regulations was handled in a variety of ways. At some schools hall government was very active in establishing rules and enforcing them. The residence hall staff was the main rule enforcing body at some schools, while a combination of students and staff members were used at other schools. Garrison (1969) stated that students at Michigan State had positive attitudes toward their hall government. Seventy per cent of those surveyed felt they were sufficiently involved in planning regulations that govern their hall and in handling violations. However, two inconsistencies were noted: (1) half of the students felt the hall had not been successful in enforcing quiet hours despite their own involvement in running the hall, (2) over half of the students did not prefer to be judged by only their peers in case of violation of hall regulations. Garrison (1969) stated,

"The results cast some doubt upon the almost universal condemnation of the in loco parentis concept. Also their desire to be treated as absolute adults is tempered by their feeling that their peers, if not themselves, are not completely adults (p. 19)."
Brieve and Mayfield (1970) surveyed 200 small private colleges in regard to student involvement in the establishment and enforcement of conduct policies within residence halls. Their results indicated a relationship between the absence of conduct problems and student participation in the establishment and enforcement of conduct policies.

Since the residence hall staff is often involved in the enforcement of rules and regulations, the manner in which these individuals handle problems could affect student attitudes. Hefke (1969) studied the relationship between authoritarianism and resident assistant effectiveness. He developed a form used to measure the effectiveness of resident assistants. Scores on authoritarianism as measured by the Dogmatism Scale were also obtained. His data showed that there was no relationship between authoritarianism and resident assistant effectiveness. However, it was noted that as a group, resident assistants were extremely non-authoritarian.

Hefke's study (1969) did show that head residents and assistant head residents rated the resident assistants in their halls significantly higher than the residents themselves. Schroeder and Dowse (1968) did a similar study, but had different results. They found that head residents and students did not differ in their rating of student staff members.

Clark (1968) conducted a study to measure the extent of agreement between perceptions of students and residence
hall staff members regarding what they perceived to be happening in the residence halls on four college campuses in New York. The questionnaire contained items classified into seven categories of residence hall purposes:

1. Development of the Individual
2. Instructional Support
3. Support of the College
4. Provision of Atmosphere
5. Satisfaction of Physical Needs
6. Experience in Group Living
7. Supervision of Conduct

Staff members felt the residence hall programs were fulfilling their purposes more positively than students in all categories except Support of the College and Experience in Group Living. In these two categories there were no significant differences between the perceptions of students and staff members. It was interesting to note that even though these differences in perceptions existed between the students and the staff, the students felt a positive relationship existed between themselves and the staff.

Few generalizations could be drawn about student attitudes toward residence hall programs. This was partly due to the fact that there is little actual research done regarding the subject. Another factor that must be taken into consideration is that the residence hall program at each university is unique to that campus. It is difficult to draw comparisons.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to measure student attitudes toward the residence hall program at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse to determine if differences in attitude existed between student staff members and the general residents, and to determine if the variables of size of the hall, sex of the resident, age of the head resident, or class standing of the resident could be identified as factors that significantly affected student attitudes toward the residence hall program.

Sample

At the beginning of the spring semester of the 1971-72 academic year a total of 2192 students resided in the ten residence halls at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The researcher requested the computer center to obtain a twenty per cent random sample of the total population from each residence hall. Since the resident assistants also were surveyed, they were not included in the total population from which the random sample was chosen. The random sample consisted of 412 student residents; 230 females and 182 males.

The entire staff of resident assistants were also
surveyed. This group consisted of forty-eight females and thirty-seven males for a total of eighty-five resident assistants. The total sample consisted of 497 students.

**Instrument**

A residence hall questionnaire developed at the University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point was issued to the random sample of residents and the resident assistants. The wording of the original questionnaire was revised somewhat to apply to the residence hall program at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The revised questionnaire consisted of eighty-three true false items. The items were designed so that a true response indicated a positive attitude.

The items in the questionnaire were designed to measure student attitudes toward six specific areas of residence hall living. They were general hall living conditions, the hall council, the resident assistant, the head resident, the individual resident, and fellow residents.

**General Hall Living Conditions.** Eleven questions dealt with general hall living conditions. These questions were designed to determine student attitudes toward the value of social and cultural programs in the halls and to determine the student attitudes toward the existing social and cultural programs.

**Individual Resident.** Twelve questions dealt with the individual resident. These questions attempted to determine how the individual resident viewed himself in
his relationships with others in the residence hall environment.

**Fellow Resident.** The fellow residents section of the questionnaire was designed to identify the attitudes of the residents toward those in their living unit. This included attitudes toward the behavior and values of others in the hall. Sixteen questions were included in this section.

**Hall Council.** The hall council section of the questionnaire consisted of eleven questions. These questions were designed to determine the attitudes of residents toward the importance of hall government as well as their attitudes toward the effectiveness of their individual council and its representatives.

**Resident Assistant.** Twenty questions dealt with the resident assistant program. These questions attempted to determine residents' attitudes toward their individual resident assistant and how they felt the resident assistant handled the various aspects of his job.

**Head Resident.** The head resident section of the questionnaire consisted of thirteen questions. These questions were designed to identify residents' attitudes toward the head resident and, how they felt the head resident carried out the functions of his job.

The questions pertaining to the six areas were not grouped according to each individual area, but were dispersed throughout the questionnaire. In addition, four
questions were added to give identification information. The students were asked to identify their hall, their year in school, and their student group (whether they were a general resident or a resident assistant).

**Administration of the Instrument**

The members of the Residence Hall Association handled the distribution of the questionnaires in each individual residence hall. They were given the names and addresses of the students who lived in their hall and were a part of the sample. They distributed the questionnaires with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and an IBM answer sheet (See Appendix A).

The students selected as part of the sample were assured their answers would remain anonymous. They were instructed to return their answer sheet to their Residence Hall Association representatives or to their hall presidents. In cases where the answer sheets were not returned by the deadline date, the Residence Hall Association members made an attempt to contact the individuals and ask them to complete the questionnaires.

One resident assistant from each residence hall staff was asked to distribute the questionnaires to his fellow staff members. Staff members were also given a letter explaining the study and an IBM answer sheet. The staff members were instructed to return the answer sheet to the resident assistant who had distributed it. Resident assistants were informed that all their responses would
remain anonymous. They were also instructed to respond to any questions concerning the resident assistant as they viewed themselves individually as a resident assistant.

The questionnaires were scored by the computer center. A raw score was obtained for each respondent on each of the six sections of the questionnaire. A grand mean was then determined for each section of the questionnaire. An analysis of variance was used as a statistical test of significant difference. F values were obtained to discover whether significant differences existed as to the several variables cited in Chapter 1.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate student attitudes toward the residence hall program at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The study attempted to determine whether sex of the resident, class standing of the resident, size of the residence hall, age of the head resident, or employment as a student resident assistant significantly affected student attitudes toward the residence hall program. The instrument used was distributed to a twenty per cent random sample of the total population from each residence hall and the entire staff of residence assistants. A fifty-nine per cent return was obtained. The percentage of return by sub-groups is shown in Table 1. It should be noted that the sub-groups were not mutually exclusive. All students did not complete the demographic information correctly. Thus, discrepancies were observed in the return by sub-groups and the total return.

Statistical Analysis of the Data

The data presented in this section were derived from the raw scores of the subjects for the six sections of the questionnaire. A grand mean was determined for each section of the questionnaire. The number of items contained in each section of the questionnaire and the grand mean obtained for each section are illustrated in Table 2.
### Table 1

#### Percentage of Return by Student Sub-Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group</th>
<th>Number Issued</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>% of Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Assistants</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Residents</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Large Halls</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Small Halls</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Halls Administered by Younger Head Residents</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Halls Administered by Older Head Residents</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Number of Items</td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Hall Living Conditions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Resident</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Residents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Council</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Assistant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Resident</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of variance was applied to the results to determine if any differences existed between the subgroups in their attitudes toward the six areas of the residence hall program. An F ratio was computed to determine if significant differences between the means existed.

Five hypotheses were formed concerning each section of the questionnaire. These hypotheses are presented in the null form followed by a tabular description of the data.

General Hall Living Conditions

Hypotheses One Through Five

1. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by male and female residents.

2. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by the residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

3. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by residents of small and large halls.

4. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by residents and resident assistants.

5. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The means, variances, and F values for the hypotheses concerning general hall living conditions are presented in Table 3.
Table 3

Differences Between Sub-Groups Regarding General Hall Living Conditions

Number of questions in the section = 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by younger head resident</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by older head resident</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of small halls</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of large halls</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.334</td>
<td>41.334</td>
<td>7.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General residents</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.334</td>
<td>41.334</td>
<td>7.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclassmen</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclassmen</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F at .05 level = 3.84

* Significant at .05 level
As illustrated in Table 3, a significant F was obtained when the attitudes of general residents and resident assistants toward general hall living conditions were compared. Thus, hypothesis number four was rejected. Since the F values obtained for the other sub-groups were not significant at the .05 level, hypotheses one, two, three, and five were accepted.

**Individual Resident**

**Hypotheses Six Through Ten**

6. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by male and female residents.

7. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by the residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

8. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by the residents of small and large halls.

9. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by residents and resident assistants.

10. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The statistical data for the hypotheses pertaining to the individual resident are presented in Table 4.

As shown in Table 4, a significant F ratio was obtained when comparing the attitudes of general residents and resident assistants and upperclassmen and underclassmen toward the individual resident. Based on this data, hypotheses nine and ten were rejected. Since the F values obtained for the other sub-groups were not significant at the .05 level, hypotheses six, seven, and eight were accepted.
Table 4
Differences Between Sub-Groups
Regarding the Individual Resident

Number of questions in the section = 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.954</td>
<td>7.954</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by younger head resident</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by older head resident</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of small halls</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of large halls</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.191</td>
<td>8.191</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General residents</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.921</td>
<td>106.921</td>
<td>24.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclassmen</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.500</td>
<td>57.500</td>
<td>12.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclassmen</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F at .05 level = 3.84

* Significant at .05 level
Fellow Residents

Hypotheses Eleven Through Fifteen

11. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by male and female residents.

12. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by the residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

13. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by the residents of small and large halls.

14. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by residents and resident assistants.

15. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The means, variances, and F values for the hypotheses pertaining to fellow residents are presented in Table 5.

As illustrated in Table 5, a significant F ratio was obtained when comparing the attitudes of males and females and the attitudes of residents of large and small halls toward fellow residents. Thus, hypotheses eleven and thirteen were rejected. Hypotheses twelve, fourteen, and fifteen were accepted because the F values obtained were not significant at the .05 level.
Table 5
Differences Between Sub-Groups
Regarding Fellow Residents
Number of questions in the section = 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.301</td>
<td>87.301</td>
<td>12.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by younger head resident</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by older head resident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.984</td>
<td>23.984</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of small halls</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of large halls</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General residents</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclassmen</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.576</td>
<td>16.576</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclassmen</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F at .05 level = 3.84

* Significant at .05 level
Hypotheses Sixteen Through Twenty

16. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by male and female residents.

17. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

18. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by residents of small and large halls.

19. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by residents and resident assistants.

20. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the hall council by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The means, variances, and F values for the hypotheses pertaining to hall council are presented in Table 6.

As illustrated in Table 6, a significant F ratio was obtained when comparing male and female attitudes toward the hall council. Based on this data, hypothesis sixteen was rejected. Since the F values obtained when comparing the other sub-groups were not significant at the .05 level, hypotheses seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, and twenty were accepted.
Table 6
Differences Between Sub-Groups Regarding The Hall Council
Number of questions in the section = 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91.099</td>
<td>91.099</td>
<td>12.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by younger head resident</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by older head resident</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of small halls</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of large halls</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General residents</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclassmen</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclassmen</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F at .05 level = 3.84

* Significant at .05 level
Resident Assistant

Hypotheses Twenty-One Through Twenty-Five

21. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by male and female residents.

22. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents living in a hall administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.

23. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents of small and large halls.

24. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents and resident assistants.

25. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The statistical data for the hypotheses pertaining to the resident assistant are presented in Table 7.

As shown in Table 7, the F values obtained when comparing the attitudes toward the resident assistant of males and females, and residents of halls administered by a young head resident and residents of the other halls were not significant at the .05 level. Thus, hypotheses twenty-one and twenty-two were accepted. Significant F values were obtained when comparing the attitudes of residents of small and large halls, residents and resident assistants, and upperclassmen and underclassmen toward the resident assistant. Based on this data, hypotheses twenty-three, twenty-four, and twenty-five were rejected.
Table 7
Differences Between Sub-Groups Regarding The Resident Assistant

Number of questions in the section = 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.488</td>
<td>6.488</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by younger head resident</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by older head resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.684</td>
<td>19.684</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of small halls</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.502</td>
<td>100.502</td>
<td>4.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of large halls</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General residents</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1651.683</td>
<td>1651.683</td>
<td>84.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclassmen</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>963.456</td>
<td>963.456</td>
<td>43.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclassmen</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F at .05 level = 3.84

* Significant at .05 level
Head Resident

Hypotheses Twenty-Six Through Thirty

26. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by male and female residents.

27. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents of halls administered by a younger head resident and residents of the other halls.

28. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents of small and large halls.

29. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents and resident assistants.

30. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The means, variances, and the F values for the hypotheses pertaining to the head resident are presented in Table 8.

The data presented in Table 8 indicated that the F values obtained when comparing the attitudes toward the head resident of males and females and residents of small and large halls were not significant at the .05 level. Thus, hypotheses twenty-six and twenty-eight were accepted. Significant F values were obtained when comparing the attitudes toward the head resident of residents of halls administered by a young head resident and the residents of the other halls, residents and resident assistants, and upperclassmen and underclassmen. Based on this data, hypotheses twenty-seven, twenty-nine, and thirty were rejected.
### Table 8

**Differences Between Sub-Groups Regarding The Head Resident**

Number of questions in the section = 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.465</td>
<td>19.465</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by younger head resident</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of halls administered by older head resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>172.599</td>
<td>172.599</td>
<td>15.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of small halls</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of large halls</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General residents</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>551.753</td>
<td>551.753</td>
<td>56.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident assistants</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclassmen</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclassmen</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F at .05 level = 3.84

* Significant at .05 level
Discussion

As shown in Table 1, fifty-nine per cent of the sample completed and returned the questionnaire. This percentage is basic to the consideration of any implications drawn from this study.

The grand means obtained for each section of the questionnaire (Table 2) indicated that all segments of the residence hall program with the exception of the hall council were viewed positively by the residents. A discussion of the results for each individual section of the questionnaire follows.

General Hall Living Conditions

Six of the eleven questions in the section on general hall living conditions were answered in a positive manner by more than fifty per cent of all those who completed the questionnaire (See Appendix B). The responses indicated that residents felt living in a residence hall was a valuable experience. Students appeared to feel cultural, intellectual, and social activities within their residence halls were valuable to residence hall living. However, the responses indicated that students felt the cultural, intellectual, and social activities programmed in the residence halls at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse were not adequate.

One of the five hypotheses pertaining to general hall living conditions was rejected.

There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward general hall living conditions by residents and resident assistants.
The resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes toward general hall living conditions than the general residents. The difference was found to be significant beyond the .01 level.

At the time this study was conducted, programming within the residence halls was initiated by the students themselves. The majority of the programs planned were social activities. Special programs were initiated through the Housing Office for the resident assistants as part of their training. These programs dealt with a wide variety of subjects ranging from the use and misuse of drugs to the services available at the Counseling Center. Resident assistants were encouraged to be informed about all residence hall activities and to participate as much as possible. More involvement in residence hall activities plus participation in training sessions dealing with contemporary issues may have accounted for the difference in attitudes of resident assistants and residents toward general hall living conditions.

**Individual Resident**

The questions in this section attempted to determine how the individual resident viewed himself in his relationships with others in the residence hall environment. Nine of the twelve questions were answered positively by more than half of those who returned the questionnaire (See Appendix B).

Of the five hypotheses regarding the individual resident, two of them were rejected.
There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by residents and resident assistants.

There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the individual resident by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes toward themselves than the general residents. Upperclassmen expressed more positive attitudes toward themselves than underclassmen. In both instances the differences were found to be significant beyond the .01 level.

There were several possible explanations for resident assistants feeling more positively about themselves than general residents. Students hired as resident assistants have gone through a selection process. Grade point average, personality characteristics, past performance records, and personal recommendations were all taken into consideration during the selection process. It was felt that resident assistants possess certain characteristics such as ability to cooperate and communicate with others, awareness of others and self, ability to cope with stressful situations, and leadership potential. Through training sessions the resident assistants were encouraged to further develop themselves as individuals. They become familiar with all aspects of the University and are probably more apt to know the many resources available to them on campus.

Upperclassmen have completed their first two years of college. It was generally felt that by the time a student had reached his junior year he was more sure of
where he was going and more serious about achieving an education. He had been on campus longer than the underclassmen and was probably more familiar with the University community and better prepared to handle his own problems.

It should be noted that since the sub-groups in this study were not mutually exclusive, a portion of the upperclassmen group were also resident assistants who were more positive toward themselves than the general residents.

**Fellow Residents**

Twelve of the sixteen questions in this section were answered in a positive manner by more than fifty per cent of the residents completing the questionnaire (See Appendix B). This section attempted to determine the residents' attitudes toward the unit with whom they were living.

Two of the five hypotheses regarding fellow residents were rejected.

There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by male and female residents.

There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward fellow residents by residents of small and large halls.

Female residents expressed more positive attitudes toward their fellow residents than male residents. The residents of large halls were more positive about their fellow residents than the residents of the smaller halls. The differences were found to be significant beyond the .01 level.

The results seem to indicate that female residents
get to know the residents of their living unit better and
develop a stronger identification with these individuals
than male residents. This may further indicate that fe-
male college students tend to be more group oriented and
less independent than male college students. Studies have
indicated that females' achievement motivation is associ-
ated with getting along with people while males are moti-
vated by getting ahead (Yamamoto, 1968).

Students who live in large halls may find it necessary
to make a more conscious effort to belong to a group within
the hall than students who live in smaller halls. This
might be a factor in the development of more positive
attitudes toward fellow residents in the larger halls.

The architectural design of the large residence halls
may also offer some explanation for the differences in
attitude toward fellow residents expressed by the residents
of large and small halls. The three large residence halls
are cube shaped halls. Each living unit is arranged in
the shape of a square. The rooms are located around a
center stairwell. This type of room arrangement may pro-
mote more interaction among the residents of each living
unit. The residents may come in contact with one another
more often and it is possible that more positive relation-
ships are developed. Although the small halls have fewer
residents, they are of straight hall or L-shaped design,
with the exception of one hall. The rooms are arranged
along straight or L-shaped corridors. The living units
actually have the capacity for more residents than the living units in the large halls. With such an arrangement, less interaction may take place among the members of each living unit. It is possible that less interaction among living unit members would have some effect on the attitudes developed by individuals toward their fellow residents.

A sample bias may have been introduced here since there were two large female residence halls on campus and only one large male residence hall.

Hall Council

Only two of the eleven questions pertaining to the hall council were answered positively by more than half of the residents who returned the questionnaire (See Appendix B). The responses indicated the residents did not feel the hall councils functioned effectively in meeting the needs and interests of the residents. The hall council members were not recognized as leaders within the residence hall.

One of the five hypotheses pertaining to the hall council was rejected.

There was no significant difference in attitudes expressed toward the hall council by male and female residents.

Female residents expressed more positive attitudes toward the hall council than male residents. The difference was found to be significant beyond the .01 level.

Although residence hall students in general did not view the hall council area of the residence hall program
positively, female residents were less negative in their attitudes than male residents. This may be due to the fact that the hall councils in the female halls have been more active in attempting to provide activities for the residents. The females may have been more successful in this area because they are more sociable than the males (Berdie and Hood, 1965).

**Resident Assistant**

Sixteen of the twenty questions in this section were answered positively by more than fifty per cent of those responding to the questionnaire (See Appendix B). The responses indicated residents were positive about the job their resident assistants were performing.

Three of the five hypotheses regarding the resident assistant were rejected because significant differences were found between the sub-groups.

- There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents of small and large halls.
- There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by residents and resident assistants.
- There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the resident assistant by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

Residents of small halls expressed more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant than residents of large halls. The difference was significant beyond the .05 level. Resident assistants were more positive toward the resident assistant than general residents. Upperclassmen were more
positive toward the resident assistant than underclassmen. The differences for the latter two sub-groups were significant beyond the .01 level.

The architectural design of the residence halls again may offer some explanation for the difference in attitude between residents of small and large halls. It was stated previously that residents of the large halls felt more positive toward their fellow residents than residents of the small halls. This might have indicated more group support for the individual residents of the large halls. In the small halls, which are mostly of straight hall or L-shaped design, this group support does not seem to be as strong. Thus, the students in the small halls may turn to their resident assistant more often for support, advice, and information. More frequent contact with the resident assistant might account for the development of a more positive attitude toward the resident assistant.

Since the resident assistants were instructed to respond to this section of the questionnaire as they viewed themselves individually as a resident assistant, they were in essence evaluating their own job performance. It seems logical that they would view themselves as a resident assistant in a more positive manner than the general residents, because they have a greater understanding of the role of the resident assistant.

When looking at the difference in attitudes toward
the resident assistant of upperclassmen and underclassmen, the fact that the sub-groups were not mutually exclusive must be taken into consideration. A portion of those residents in the upperclassmen group were also resident assistants who did express more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant than general residents. However, it is also felt that as students grow older and more mature, they also develop a greater understanding of the role of an individual such as the resident assistant. This might account for the development of more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant.

Head Resident

Seven of the thirteen questions regarding the head resident were answered positively by more than half of those completing the questionnaire (See Appendix B). The responses indicated that although the majority of the students felt their head resident was interested in them and would willingly help them, they did not feel their head resident was qualified to help them with academic, vocational, or personal problems. The students were hesitant about discussing their concerns about drugs and sex with their head resident.

Three of the hypotheses pertaining to the head resident were rejected.

There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents of halls administered by a younger head resident and the residents of the other halls.
There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by residents and resident assistants.

There was no significant difference in the attitudes expressed toward the head resident by upperclassmen and underclassmen.

The residents of halls administered by a younger head resident expressed more positive attitudes toward their head resident than the residents of the halls administered by the older head residents. Resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes toward their head resident than the general residents; upperclassmen were more positive about their head resident than underclassmen. The differences were found to be significant beyond the .01 level.

At the time this study was conducted, the young head residents were all under thirty. All of them had taken graduate course work in the area of student personnel. The results seemed to indicate that students felt more free to discuss the problems they encountered with a younger person. The additional professional training might have made the young head residents more qualified to offer assistance to students with their vocational, academic, and personal problems.

The resident assistants worked very closely with their head residents. They had many more contacts with these individuals than the general residents and really got the opportunity to know them. Both the head residents and the resident assistants were part of the residence hall staff. They probably had similar ideas about the objectives of the residence hall program.
Upperclassmen may have lived in their residence hall a longer period of time than underclassmen, getting to know their head resident and understanding the role of their head resident better than the underclassmen. This could account for the development of more positive attitudes toward the head resident.

Summary

This study was undertaken to measure the attitudes of residence hall students at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse toward the residence hall program and to determine if sex of the resident, class standing of the resident, size of the residence hall, age of the head resident, or employment as a student resident assistant had any effect on student attitudes toward the residence hall program. Statistical analysis of the data did show that the variables had some effect on the attitudes of residents toward certain aspects of the residence hall program. The conclusions and recommendations resulting from this study are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the attitudes of residence hall students at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse toward the residence hall program. The study attempted to determine: (1) whether student attitudes toward the residence hall program varied among the different halls; (2) whether student staff members and general residents differed in their attitudes toward the residence hall program; and (3) whether student attitudes toward the residence hall program differed according to the sex of the resident, class standing of the resident, size of the residence hall, or the age of the head resident.

A twenty per cent random sample of the total population of each of the ten residence halls plus the entire staff of resident assistants were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding their attitudes toward the residence hall program. The segments of the residence hall program that were investigated were general hall living conditions, the individual resident, fellow residents, the hall council, the resident assistant, and the head resident.

A fifty-nine per cent return was obtained. The grand
means established for each section of the questionnaire indicated that students viewed all segments of the residence hall program in a positive manner, with the exception of the hall council.

An analysis of variance was applied to the results to determine if any significant differences existed between sub-groups in their attitudes toward the six areas of the residence hall program. The statistical results indicated that: (1) student attitudes toward the residence hall program did vary among the different halls; (2) student staff members and general residents did differ in their attitudes toward the residence hall program; and (3) student attitudes toward the residence hall program did differ according to sex of the resident, class standing of the resident, size of the residence hall, and age of the head resident. Significant differences in attitudes were found to exist between the sub-groups toward certain areas of the residence hall program:

1. Resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes toward general hall living conditions than general residents.

2. Resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes toward themselves as individual residents than general residents.

3. Upperclassmen expressed more positive attitudes toward themselves as individual residents than underclassmen.
4. Female residents expressed more positive attitudes toward fellow residents than male residents.

5. Residents of the larger halls expressed more positive attitudes toward fellow residents than residents of the smaller halls.

6. Female residents expressed more positive attitudes toward the hall council than male residents.

7. Resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant than general residents.

8. Residents of the smaller halls expressed more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant than residents of the larger halls.

9. Upperclassmen expressed more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant than underclassmen.

10. Residents of halls administered by a young head resident expressed more positive attitudes toward the head resident than residents of the other halls.

11. Resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes toward the head resident than general residents.

12. Upperclassmen expressed more positive attitudes toward the head resident than underclassmen.
Conclusions

All conclusions of this study are considered in light of the limitations presented in Chapter 1. The conclusions are based on statistical analysis of the data gathered from the administration of a questionnaire designed to assess residents' attitudes toward the residence hall program.

The sex of the resident, class standing of the resident, size of the residence hall, age of the head resident, and employment as a student resident assistant did not have an effect on student attitudes toward the residence hall program. Although no variable affected student attitudes toward all six areas of the residence hall program investigated, definite differences were revealed.

Resident Assistants

Resident assistants expressed more positive attitudes than general residents toward four areas of the residence hall program. These areas were general hall living conditions, the individual resident, the resident assistant, and the head resident.

These differences in attitudes seemed to indicate:

1. Resident assistants possessed certain characteristics not common to the total residence hall population.

2. Resident assistants became more familiar with and gained a greater understanding of their head resident than general residents.
3. Resident assistants possessed a better understanding of their own role, the objectives of the residence hall program, and the University services available to students.

4. Resident assistants found residence hall programs of more value than general residents.

5. Resident assistants were more satisfied with themselves as individuals than the general residents.

**Class Standing**

Upperclassmen expressed more positive attitudes than underclassmen toward themselves as individual residents, toward the head resident, and the resident assistant. These results may have indicated:

6. Upperclassmen were more satisfied with themselves as individuals than underclassmen.

7. Upperclassmen possessed a better understanding of the roles of the head resident and resident assistant than underclassmen.

It was concluded that as students mature, they know more about themselves, their values, and objectives. They also may have developed a greater understanding of the concepts of group living.

**Sex of the Resident**

Female residents expressed more positive attitudes than male residents toward the hall council and fellow residents. These differences in attitudes seemed to show:
8. Hall councils in the female residence halls have been more effective in meeting the needs of the residents.

9. Female residents developed a stronger identification with those in their living unit than male residents.

It was concluded that females were more group oriented than males.

Age of the Head Resident

Residents of halls administered by a young head resident expressed more positive attitudes toward their head resident than residents of the other halls. These results seemed to suggest:

10. Residents found it easier to communicate with a head resident closer to their own age.

11. Residents felt the younger head residents were more qualified to provide assistance in dealing with their problems regarding academics, vocational plans, and personal concerns.

Size of the Residence Hall

Residents of the smaller halls expressed more positive attitudes toward the resident assistant than residents of the larger halls. Residents of the larger halls expressed more positive attitudes toward fellow residents than residents of the smaller halls. These differences seemed to indicate:
12. Residents of the smaller halls depended upon their resident assistant more than their fellow residents as a source of information, advice and support.

13. Residents of the larger halls developed stronger relationships with their fellow residents than residents of the smaller halls.

It might be concluded that when a student enters a larger residence hall, he makes a more conscious effort to belong to a group within the hall. The architectural design of the larger cubed halls might promote more interaction among the residents than the straight hall or L-shaped designs of the smaller halls.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings presented in this study, the following recommendations were made.

1. It is recommended that this study be repeated for the next two or three years for the purpose of comparison. This will be especially important since changes will be made in the residence hall program. However, the following revisions are suggested:

   (a) The questionnaire should be shortened by reducing the number of items contained in each section.

   (b) The sections of the questionnaire should be expanded to include physical facilities
and residence hall policies as parts of the residence hall program to be evaluated.

(c) It is recommended that the researcher contact each hall council individually and seek their cooperation in distributing and collecting the questionnaires, instead of relying only on the Residence Hall Association.

(d) An attempt should be made to obtain a greater percentage of return by using a follow up letter.

(e) The sub-groups should be mutually exclusive. When mutually exclusive sub-groups are used, a chi square statistical test should be used to analyze the data. This test would yield more valuable information pertaining to the specific causes of the differences.

2. More programming should be initiated in the residence halls. Further research should be done to determine the types of programming in which residents have an interest and need. The Housing Office Staff could take a more active part in initiating programs in the residence halls.

3. An attempt should be made to provide hall
councils with additional guidance to help them become more effective.

4. It is recommended that in-service training sessions be developed for the older head residents to provide them with more knowledge and skills in areas that are concerns of present college students.

5. Since the students who had more contact with their head resident expressed more positive attitudes toward the head resident, it is suggested that head residents make a conscious effort to have more contact with the general residents.

6. It is recommended that more younger, professionally trained head residents be added to the staff.
Dear Student:

Student attitudes toward residence hall living are of major importance in evaluating the present programs and in planning for the future. Students often voice their opinions but it is difficult to know how representative they are of all students who live in the residence halls.

You have been selected as part of a random sample of residence hall students to complete this questionnaire. In order for the information to be meaningful it is important for you to be completely honest and that your responses reflect your personal attitudes. Your responses will remain anonymous.

This study is being done as part of the curriculum leading to a Master's Degree in Student Personnel Services. Since the answer sheets will be scored by a computer, they need to be completed in pencil and should not be folded or torn. Upon completing the questionnaire please return the answer sheet to your Hall President or one of your R.H.A. representatives. I would like them all returned by February 29, 1972.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Susan Pelton
University Housing Office
February 18, 1972

Dear Staff Member:

As part of the curriculum leading to a Master's Degree in Student Personnel Services, I am doing a study on student attitudes toward residence hall living. Part of the study is to compare the attitudes of student staff members with those of the general residence hall students.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would take some time to complete this questionnaire. In order for the information to be meaningful it is important for you to be completely honest and that your responses reflect your personal attitudes. Your responses will remain anonymous. When answering questions regarding the resident assistant program, please respond as you see yourself as a resident assistant.

The answer sheets will be scored by a computer. They need to be filled out in pencil and should not be folded or torn. Upon completing the questionnaire please return the answer sheet to the resident assistant designated in your hall to collect them. I would like them all returned by February 29, 1972.

Thank you so much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Susan Pelton
University Housing Office
RESIDENCE HALL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to the True-False questions on the IBM sheet in pencil.

1. My Resident Assistant willingly helps me.
2. Intellectual and cultural activities are a valuable part of hall living.
3. My Head Resident is interested in my academic progress.
4. My Resident Assistant is open to criticism.
5. I can talk with others about my personal concerns.
6. Hall Council is concerned with planning and implementing the intellectual and cultural activities in the hall.
7. My Resident Assistant is open to discussing my concerns about sexuality.
8. Many residents on my wing develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary social and political life.
9. My Head Resident could help me in gaining greater insight into my own personality and potentials.
10. My academic performance, this semester, is satisfactory to me.
12. My Hall Council representative is a recognized leader on the floor/cube.
13. Planned activities dealing with contemporary social issues are valuable in the hall.
14. My Resident Assistant has at times challenged my values.
15. Upperclassmen on my floor/cube play an active role in helping new students adjust to hall living.
16. There is a strong feeling of group loyalty in my hall.
17. My Head Resident knows me.
18. Intellectually stimulating discussions on the floor/cube are important to me.
19. My Resident Assistant could help me with my personal concerns.
20. I can have some impact on changing my living situation to better meet my needs.
21. My Hall Council representative accurately conveys the views of my living unit at Hall Council meetings.
22. My Head Resident willingly helps me.
23. Students on my floor/cube have had some influence on my values.
24. My Resident Assistant is interested in my academic progress.
25. I feel I belong to a group on my floor/cube.
26. I could talk with my Head Resident about my personal concerns.
27. My Resident Assistant could help me in gaining greater insight into my own personality and potentials.
28. Hall Council serves an important function in this hall.
29. I feel that my present sexual adjustment is satisfactory.
30. My Head Resident is open to discussing my concerns about drugs.
31. Residents on the floor/cube are encouraged to be independent and individualistic.
32. My Residents Assistant's primary concern is helping students.
33. Hall Council efforts are meeting my needs and interests.
34. My Head Resident is very concerned with the welfare of the students in the hall.
35. Residents on my floor/cube consider raids, water fights, and other pranks a nuisance.
36. My Resident Assistant is a recognized leader on the wing.
37. I could talk with my Resident Assistant about my personal concerns.
38. The drinking habits of students living on my floor/cube seldom interfere with their academic and/or social development.
39. The present visitation program in my hall is satisfactory to me.
40. My Head Resident is open to criticism.
41. The scope of Hall Council activities is not unnecessarily limited by the Head Resident and the University.
42. I could talk with my Resident Assistant concerning the use of drugs.
43. My roommate has had some influence on my behavior.
44. My Head Resident could help me in making decisions about my educational or vocational plans.
45. My Head Resident is open to discussing my concerns about sexuality.
46. I can confront students when their behavior interferes with my studying and/or sleeping.
47. The Hall Council recommends changes in hall policies and procedures to the Head Resident.
48. My Resident Assistant encourages our participation in activities in the hall.
49. I can talk with others about the use of drugs.
50. Residents on my floor/cube exert considerable pressure on one another to live up to acceptable behavior.
51. My Head Resident is very concerned with the administration of the hall.
52. Planned social activities are a valuable part of hall living.
53. My Resident Assistant is more concerned with the hall residents than with the student staff.
54. Hall Council is concerned with providing opportunities for our involvement in contemporary social issues.
55. My Resident Assistant has had some influence on my personal development.
56. On the floor/cube, an open display of affection is accepted.
57. Many residents try to adapt to others rather than expect others to adapt to them.
58. My Resident Assistant is open to discussing my concerns about drugs.
59. I could talk with my Resident Assistant about my personal concerns.
60. The visitation program is a valuable part of hall living.
61. My Resident Assistant knows me.
62. The Hall Council is the recognized group of student leaders in this hall.
63. My Resident Assistant has had some influence on my behavior.
64. Other students respect my right to study in my room.
65. My roommate has had some influence on my values.
66. My Head Resident is very concerned with the enforcement of university regulations.
67. There is an adequate number of planned social activities in this hall.
68. My Resident Assistant could help me in making decisions about my educational or vocational plans.
69. The students on my floor/cube show respect for the rights of others.
70. My Head Resident could help me with my personal concerns.
71. Students on the floor/cube intellectually challenge and stimulate each other.
72. My Hall Council representative keeps me informed of current activities in the hall.
73. My Resident Assistant respects and values my individuality.
74. I could talk with my Head Resident concerning the use of drugs.
75. On the floor/cube, an open display of anger is accepted.
76. My Head Resident handles matters of discipline fairly.
77. There is an adequate number of intellectual and cultural activities in the hall.
78. My living situation meets my needs.
79. The Hall Council's primary concern is planning social activities.
80. There is a sufficient number of planned activities in the residence hall concerned with contemporary social issues.
81. My Resident Assistant is very concerned with the enforcement of University regulations.
82. My Resident Assistant serves an important function in this hall.
83. Living in a residence hall has been a valuable experience in my life.
84. Leave this space blank.
85. Females identify your hall:
86. Males identify your hall:
87. Identify your student group:
   a. Resident Assistant
   b. Residence Hall Student
88. Identify your classification:
HICAGO is __________

1. a country
2. a mountain
3. an island

1. __________ 2. __________ 3. __________

**IONS:**

- Complete each question and its lettered answers. When you have decided which answer is correct, blacken the corresponding space on this sheet with No. 2 pencil. Make your mark as long as the pair of lines, and completely fill the area between the pair of lines. If you change your mind, erase your first mark COMPLETELY. Make no stray marks; they may count against you.

**SAMPLE SCORES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTOR:**

- IBM 1230 DOCUMENT NO. 016 WHICH CAN BE USED IN LIEU OF IBM 805 FORM NO. 11004 1650

PRINTED IN U.S.A.
## GENERAL HALL LIVING CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2. Intellectual and cultural activities are a valuable part of hall living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>13. Planned activities dealing with contemporary social issues are valuable in the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16. There is a strong feeling of group loyalty in my hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>39. The present visitation program in my hall is satisfactory for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>52. Planned social activities are a valuable part of hall living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60. The visitation program is a valuable part of hall living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>67. There is an adequate number of planned social activities in the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>77. There is an adequate number of intellectual and cultural activities in the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>78. My living situation meets my needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>80. There is a sufficient number of planned activities in the residence hall concerned with contemporary social issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>83. Living in a residence hall has been a valuable experience in my life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.</th>
<th>F.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5. I can talk with others about my personal concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10. My academic performance, this semester, is satisfactory to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20. I can have some impact on changing my living situation to better meet my needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25. I feel I belong to a group on my floor/cube.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>26. I could talk with my Head Resident about my personal concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29. I feel that my present sexual adjustment is satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>39. I could talk with my Resident Assistant about my personal concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42. I could talk with my Resident Assistant concerning the use of drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46. I can confront students when their behavior interferes with my studying and/or sleeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49. I can talk with others about the use of drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>59. I could talk with my Resident Assistant about my personal concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>74. I could talk with my Head Resident concerning the use of drugs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FELLOW RESIDENTS

8. Many residents on my floor/cube develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary social and political life.
15. Upperclassmen on my floor/cube play an active role in helping new students adjust to hall living.
18. Intellectually stimulating discussions on the floor/cube are important to me.
23. Students on my floor/wing have had some influence on my values.
35. Residents on my floor/cube consider raids, water fights and other pranks a nuisance.
31. Residents on the floor/cube are encouraged to be independent and individualistic.
43. My roommate has had some influence on my behavior.
51. Residents on my floor/cube exert considerable pressure on one another to live up to acceptable behavior.
56. On the floor/cube, an open display of affection is accepted.
58. Many residents try to adapt to others rather than expect others to adapt to them.
64. Other students respect my right to study in my room.
65. My roommate has had some influence on my values.
69. The students on my floor/cube show respect for the rights of others.
71. Students on the floor/cube intellectually challenge and stimulate each other.
75. On the floor/cube, an open display of anger is accepted.

HALL COUNCIL

6. Hall Council is concerned with planning and implementing the intellectual and cultural activities in the hall.
12. My Hall Council representative is a recognized leader on the floor/cube.
21. My Hall Council representative accurately conveys the views of my floor/cube at Hall Council meetings.
28. Hall Council serves an important function in this hall.
33. Hall Council efforts are meeting my needs and interests.
41. The scope of Hall Council activities is not unnecessarily limited by the Head Resident and the University.
47. The Hall Council recommends changes in hall policies and procedures to the Head Residents.
54. Hall Council is concerned with providing opportunities for involvement in contemporary social issues.
RESIDENT ASSISTANT

1. My Resident Assistant willingly helps me.
2. My Resident Assistant is open to criticism.
3. My Resident Assistant is open to discussing my concerns about sexuality.
5. My Resident Assistant has at times challenged my values.
6. My Resident Assistant could help me with my personal concerns.
7. My Resident Assistant is interested in my academic progress.
8. My Resident Assistant could help me in gaining greater insight into my own personality and potentials.
9. My Resident Assistant's primary concern is helping students.
10. My Resident Assistant is a recognized leader on the floor/cube.
11. My Resident Assistant encourages our participation in activities in the hall.
12. My Resident Assistant has had some influence on my personal development.
13. My Resident Assistant is more concerned with the hall residents than with the student staff.
14. My Resident Assistant is open to discussing my concerns about drugs.
15. My Resident Assistant knows me.
16. My Resident Assistant has had some influence on my behavior.
17. My Resident Assistant could help me in making decisions about my educational or vocational plans.
18. My Resident Assistant respects and values my individuality.
19. My Resident Assistant is very concerned with the enforcement of University regulations.
20. My Resident Assistant serves an important function in this hall.

HEAD RESIDENT

3. My Head Resident is interested in my academic progress.
4. My Head Resident could help me in gaining greater insight into my own personality and potentials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. F.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221 74 17</td>
<td>My Head Resident knows me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206 88 22</td>
<td>My Head Resident willingly helps me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 162 30</td>
<td>My Head Resident is open to discussing my concerns about drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 101 34</td>
<td>My Head Resident is very concerned with the welfare of the students in the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 129 40</td>
<td>My Head Resident is open to criticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 207 44</td>
<td>My Head Resident could help me in making decisions about my educational or vocational plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 206 45</td>
<td>My Head Resident is open to discussing my concerns about sexuality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 56 51</td>
<td>My Head Resident is very concerned with the administration of the hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 42 66</td>
<td>My Head Resident is very concerned with the enforcement of University regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 191 70</td>
<td>My Head Resident could help me with my personal concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 97 76</td>
<td>My Head Resident handles matters of discipline fairly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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