

STUDENT EVALUATION OF HOUSING FACILITIES  
AT INDIANA STATE COLLEGE

---


A Master's Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the School of Graduate Studies  
Indiana State College  
Terre Haute, Indiana

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the  
Master of Arts Degree

---

by  
Virgil J. Miller  
=  
June 1963



THESIS APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis of Virgil J. Miller, contribution of the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State College, Series I, Number 831, under the title, "Student Evaluation of Housing Facilities at Indiana State College," is approved as counting toward the completion of the Master of Arts Degree in the amount of six semester hours of graduate credit.

APPROVAL OF THESIS COMMITTEE:

Charles W. Hardaway  
(Signature of Committee Member)

[Signature]  
(Signature of Committee Member)

Louis Jones  
(Signature of Committee Chairman)

5/13/1963  
(Date)

APPROVAL FOR SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

Elmer J. Clark  
(Dean of Graduate Studies)

June 7, 1963  
(Date)

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank Dr. Lonzo Jones, Dr. Charles Hardaway, and Dr. Marguerite Malm for their assistance in planning this study and in helping in its organization and completion.

Thanks are due to Dean Marcus H. Williams and members of the Student Personnel Staff for their cooperation and assistance.

The writer would also like to thank the many students whose courtesy and cooperation made possible the gathering of the data.

The writer wishes to express his thanks also to his wife, Elaine, for her patience and assistance throughout this study.

V.J.M.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND THE PROCEDURES USED IN THIS RESEARCH. . . . .	1
Introduction. . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	2
Statement of the problem . . . . .	2
Definitions of Terms Used . . . . .	2
College residence halls. . . . .	3
College-owned temporary housing . . . . .	3
Off-campus housing . . . . .	4
Fraternities . . . . .	4
Sources of Data and Method of Procedure . . . . .	4
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study . . . . .	6
Organization of the Remainder of the Report . . . . .	7
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	8
III. REPORT OF THE STUDY . . . . .	13
Health--air space. . . . .	22
Health--temperature. . . . .	24
Health--bathroom facilities . . . . .	26
Health--ventilation. . . . .	28
Health--lighting . . . . .	30
Health--electrical outlets . . . . .	32
Health--freedom from hazards . . . . .	34
Summary . . . . .	42
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	44

CHAPTER	PAGE
Summary . . . . .	44
Conclusions . . . . .	47
Recommendations . . . . .	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	50
APPENDIX A. Student Evaluation of Housing Facilities at ISC . . .	54
APPENDIX B. Percentage of Rating Scales Returned . . . . .	59
APPENDIX C. Semesters in Residence . . . . .	60
APPENDIX D. Year in School . . . . .	61

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Effective Study Conditions Reported on the Basis of Ratings. . .	16
II. Rating of Opportunities for Social Activities in Housing Units . . . . .	18
III. Rating of Opportunities for Self-Government in Housing Units .	20
IV. Rating of Adequacy of Air Space in Housing Units . . . . .	23
V. Rating of Optimum Temperature in Housing Units . . . . .	25
VI. Rating of Bathroom Facilities in Housing Units . . . . .	27
VII. Rating of Fresh Air Ventilation in Housing Units . . . . .	29
VIII. Rating of Room Illumination in Housing Units . . . . .	31
IX. Rating of number of Electrical Outlets and Use of Extension Cords in Housing Units . . . . .	33
X. Rating of Freedom From Hazards in Housing Units . . . . .	35
XI. Rating of the Seven Combined Areas of Health . . . . .	37
XII. Rating of the Cost Range in Housing Units. . . . .	39
XIII. Type of Housing Facility Desired by Students . . . . .	41

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Method of Converting Months to Semesters. . . . .	13
2. Rating Scale. . . . .	14
3. Vertical Rating Scale . . . . .	21
4. Composite Rating Scale . . . . .	36
5. Is There Sufficient Cost Range in College Approved Housing? . .	38

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND THE PROCEDURES USED IN THIS RESEARCH

#### I. INTRODUCTION

In 1960 the enrollment at Indiana State Teachers College at Terre Haute, Indiana, was 4,521. By 1970, the enrollment is expected to increase by more than 247 per cent to 11,174.<sup>1</sup> This anticipated enrollment increase presents a serious housing problem at Indiana State. Other institutions of higher learning are experiencing the same problem. According to Riker and Lopez:

The most pressing problem of college housing is that there isn't enough. At the moment college housing is available for roughly one-fourth of a college population of just under four million. By 1970, that population will have mushroomed to more than six million. And as much as 40 per cent of it will have to be housed on campus.<sup>2</sup>

To meet this tremendous increase in enrollment, the College found it necessary to expand the curricula to meet the need of a wider range of students. As a consequence, the word Teachers was officially deleted from the institution's title July 7, 1961, by act of the Indiana General Assembly. This in itself may have the added effect of causing even greater numbers to enroll in subsequent years.

---

<sup>1</sup>"Estimated Fall Enrollments, 1963-72 (Actual Fall Enrollments, 1951-62)," (Indiana State College, Terre Haute, Indiana: Office of the President, 1962), n.p., (Mimeographed).

<sup>2</sup>Harold C. Riker and Frank J. Lopez, College Students Live Here (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961), p. 6.



Desiring to remain a member in good standing of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the College prepared for a visitation of North Central Association representatives in the fall of 1962. Committee C, a self-study group was formed to evaluate, among other things, the housing facilities available at Indiana State College. The Committee discovered that the North Central Association recommended a student evaluation of housing facilities.

The justification for colleges and universities entering the construction and supervision of student housing facilities stems from a responsibility which accompanies the gathering of thousands of young people in one place in pursuit of higher learning.

If the needs and desires of students are to be met the housing facilities must fulfill an even more vital role in the educational process.

## II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to determine the degree of satisfaction which students reported they experienced in Indiana State College housing facilities and to locate specifically those areas in which improvement seemed necessary.<sup>3</sup>

## III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

For the purposes of this study college housing was divided into

---

<sup>3</sup>All data in this chapter refer to the college year 1961-62 when the student-evaluation was made.

four categories--college residence halls, college-owned temporary housing, off-campus housing, and fraternities.

College residence halls. Parsons and Reeve Halls, the former for men and the latter for women, were the first residence halls on campus. They were constructed and furnished in the traditional manner popular in 1920 and 1930. Burford Hall, of modern contemporary design, was the second women's residence hall and was opened in 1959. These three residence halls provided accommodations for over one thousand students.

College-owned temporary housing. The East and West Knisely Units, converted apartment buildings, temporarily accommodated approximately sixty freshmen women. These freshmen women used the dining facilities of Burford Hall located one block distant. Senior women on the teaching curriculum spent one-half of their professional semester at a designated school student teaching and one-half of the semester on campus. Scherer House, a converted private home, provided temporary housing for approximately twenty senior women while on campus. These senior women obtained their meals at the nearby Student Union Building and restaurants located in the immediate area. Approximately fifty men were temporarily housed in Parsons Hall Annex and Crawford House, converted private homes, and these male students used the dining facilities of Parsons Hall located one block from each of the respective units.

It should be emphasized that the converted apartment buildings and private homes were not originally designed for group living and were of a temporary nature.

Off-campus housing. Off-campus housing consisted of sleeping rooms and rooms with cooking facilities located in private homes in the city of Terre Haute. The offices of the Dean of Men and Dean of Women maintained lists of inspected and approved off-campus facilities.

Fraternities. The five national social fraternities on campus owned and maintained their own houses which provided accommodations for approximately one hundred and fifty men. From one to three meals per day were provided for the members residing in the houses, depending on the individual fraternity.

#### IV. SOURCES OF DATA AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE

From a perusal of related literature, Committee C, in conjunction with the writer, agreed on the following five functions characteristic of good housing which students in the various facilities were called upon to evaluate.

- (1) Scholarship - conditions under which students can study effectively.
- (2) Social Activities - organization through which activities can be encouraged and refined.
- (3) Self-government - opportunity to grow in self-discipline and participation in self-government.
- (4) Health.- living quarters which are livable and contribute to good hygienic standards.
- (5) Cost - facilities provided at a range of cost appropriate to the financial status of a wide range of students.

With these functions in mind, the writer devised a questionnaire<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>See Appendix A.

which was distributed to all men and women living in college residence halls, college-owned temporary housing, and to all men living in the five fraternity houses. Of the approximately 500 men living in off-campus housing, 154 were selected at random to receive questionnaires. Approximately 100 women lived in off-campus housing and 35 were selected at random to receive questionnaires.

In order to make such a survey something more than sheer opinion, it was necessary to establish a rating and questionnaire instrument which would remove as many errors of validity and reliability as possible.

Before the final instrument was distributed a pilot survey was conducted using thirty-five students selected at random from each of the four housing categories studied, in an attempt to eliminate or revise any ambiguous items. Also, several college student personnel staff members, familiar with the purpose of the study, were asked to judge the first draft of the questionnaire form. Revisions were made in light of the pilot survey and the personnel staff's reactions.

The procedures for the use of the questionnaire were explained in the written instructions appearing on the questionnaire form. No supplementary oral instructions were required. Students were requested not to put their names on the questionnaire forms to insure, insofar as possible, candid responses to the questions. Therefore, because the written instructions were sufficient and because of the nature of the information sought, students were allowed to fill out the questionnaires in non-supervised situations.

Questionnaires were distributed to the college residence halls

and the college-owned temporary housing units in accordance with the number of student residents in each unit. Questionnaires were mailed to one-third of the men and women living in off-campus housing, selected at random. The number of men living in each of the five fraternity houses was determined from the records of the Office of the Dean of Men and questionnaires were distributed to each of the fraternity houses by student representatives selected by the writer.

Of the 1,004 questionnaires distributed to the college residence halls, 578 or 57.6 per cent were returned. Residents in college-owned temporary housing received 119 questionnaires and returned 98 or 82.6 per cent. The men and women living in off-campus housing returned 96, or 49.2 per cent of the 195 questionnaires mailed to them. The fraternity men received 147 questionnaires and returned 89, or 60.5 per cent. Total returns were 861 questionnaires or 58.8 per cent of the 1,465 questionnaires distributed.<sup>5</sup>

#### V. LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations and delimitations of the study. This study concerned student attitudes toward college housing and was limited to Indiana State College students living away from home. Also, graduate or married students were not included in this study.

The only instrument that was feasible to use to obtain the necessary data was the rating scale, even though its limitations were recognized.

---

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix B.

A further limitation to the study was that respondents completed the questionnaire forms in non-supervised situations and could have misinterpreted the instructions or could have been influenced by others.

#### VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE REPORT

The next chapter, Chapter II, presents a review of related literature.

The data are presented and interpreted in Chapter III.

The final chapter, Chapter IV, will present a summary of this paper, followed by conclusions and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature indicated that very little had been done on the specific subject of student evaluation of college housing facilities. In introducing Stewart's Some Social Aspects of Residence Halls for Women, Sarah Gibson Blanding states:

A considerable body of literature regarding residence halls has appeared it is true, but it is concerned chiefly with their physical aspects--the dimensions for bedrooms, the sanitary facilities necessary for a given number of students, adequate lighting and ventilation. There is a dearth of information as to how the residence hall can serve as a potent means for developing social competence and for providing experience in democratic living.<sup>1</sup>

Stewart goes on to say that the importance of student participation in the government of colleges and universities is receiving increasing recognition from faculty, administrators, and students themselves. She also says that no regulations are so respected as those which are self imposed.<sup>2</sup>

In an investigation conducted in 1932, Caroline Grote concluded that differences in social activities were often statistically significant in comparing various groups and that housing was a real factor in providing social experiences and that the dormitory group had a distinct advantage over all the other groups in this respect.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Helen Quien Stewart, Some Social Aspects of Residence Halls for Women, New York: Professional and Technical Press, 1942, p. VIII.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>3</sup>Caroline Grote, Housing and Living Conditions of Women Students, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), p. 96.

Thompson stated that residence hall personnel must be able to work with people, they must have a conception of the objectives of residence hall living, and they must have appropriate formal training. Much can be accomplished in the form of educational and social programs if these basics are met, says Thompson.<sup>4</sup>

Esther Lloyd-Jones wrote in 1940 that colleges and universities needed to re-examine their situations to evaluate more realistically the opportunity and encouragement they provide their students to grow in social competence.<sup>5</sup> The rest of the brochure discussed the nature of social competence, the structure of a social competence program, the elements of such a program, the difficulties in developing a program, and requirements in terms of personnel, etc.

Strozier and others define the place of student housing in higher education as being closely associated with the major functions and purposes of an institution of higher education. They go on to say that mere board and room do not constitute a wholesome housing program. They also discuss the governmental and educational functions of student housing such as fraternity chapter houses and commercial boarding houses.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Florence M. Thompson, "Residence Halls and the Educational Program," The Educational Record. 29:70, January, 1948.

<sup>5</sup>Esther Lloyd-Jones, "Social Competence and College Students," American Council on Education Studies, Series VI--Student Personnel Work--Number 3, (Washington, D. C.: September, 1940) p. 14.

<sup>6</sup>Robert M. Strozier and others, "Housing of Students," American Council on Education Studies, Series VI--Student Personnel Work--Number 14, (Washington, D. C.; July 1950) p. 68



A third brochure published by the American Council on Education presents two points of view. It discusses how fraternity and sorority chapter programs are being incorporated into over-all educational experiences of students. Secondly, it discusses how the student personnel point of view may be applied to the parts of student life that were once considered peripheral to the main task of the college.<sup>7</sup>

Harriet Hayes and others conclude in Residence Halls for Women Students that residence halls are recognized now as an integral part of the educational program and their planning and administration should be scrutinized with the same care that the academic curriculum receives.<sup>8</sup>

An investigation by Barbara Reid Robson, although concerned mainly with the financial management of fraternities and sororities, concludes that there is an increasing tendency toward administrative concern for the welfare of students as it is influenced by conditions of group life whether it be in residence halls or fraternity or sororities houses.<sup>9</sup>

Further, Grace Augustine states that residence halls are at all times teaching units and educators have long appreciated the

---

<sup>7</sup>Jessie Rhulman and others, "Personnel and Principles in the Chapter House," American Council on Education Studies, XVII (Washington, D. C. Series VI - Student Personnel Work - Number 17, March 1953), p. 40.

<sup>8</sup>Harriet Hayes and others, "Residence Halls for Women Students, Administrative Principles and Procedures," National Association of Deans of Women, (Washington, D. C., 1947) p. 68.

<sup>9</sup>Barbara Reid Robson, House Management Problems of Fraternities and Sororities (Bureau of Publications, Teachers College. New York City: Columbia University, 1933) p. 74.

possibilities of the personal and social development of students inherent in properly administrated group living.<sup>10</sup>

Harold C. Riker and Frank J. Lopez conducted a recent study of college housing. They stated that the college housing program begins and ends with people, but somewhere along the way it must also deal with things. They continue by discussing and showing contemporary group housing plans that have been incorporated on campuses across the nation and possible ways of paying for the housing programs.<sup>11</sup>

Another study investigated student reactions to study facilities at four eastern schools. Stuart Stoke and others found that there is a strong preference for studying in small places where one may study alone or with one or two others. Also, the large library reading room is disliked by most students even though it may be used. Lack of temperature control in libraries (they're usually too warm) was another common complaint. Dormitory rooms are the most popular places for study because they provide the necessary privacy and places to collect and use study materials. The investigation went on to say that there are many unanswered questions about the construction of desirable study space.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Grace M. Augustine, Some Aspects of Management of College Residence Halls for Women, (New York: F.S. Crofts and Co., 1935), p.242.

<sup>11</sup>Harold C. Riker and Frank J. Lopez, College Students Live Here, (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961), p.152.

<sup>12</sup>Stuart M. Stoke and others, "Student Reactions to Study Facilities with Implications for Architects and College Administrators," A Report to the Presidents of Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts, The Committee for New College, (Amherst, Massachusetts, 1960), p.60.

All studies cited point out the increased interest being shown by colleges and universities in the welfare of their students, particularly in the area of student housing.

## CHAPTER III

### REPORT OF THE STUDY

Of the 1,465 questionnaires distributed, 861 or 58.8 per cent were returned within the one-week limit. Such a response was felt to be adequate for consideration in this report.

The respondents were asked to record the number of months they had resided in the housing unit being evaluated. The months were converted to semesters on a  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 ratio as shown in Figure I.

No. of Semesters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
No. of Months	0- $4\frac{1}{2}$	5- $9\frac{1}{2}$	10- $14\frac{1}{2}$	15- $19\frac{1}{2}$	20- $24\frac{1}{2}$	25- $29\frac{1}{2}$	30- $34\frac{1}{2}$	35- $39\frac{1}{2}$

FIGURE I

#### METHOD OF CONVERTING MONTHS TO SEMESTERS

Over seventy-five per cent of the respondents had resided in their respective housing units two semesters or more with one exception, Scherer House, where senior women spend only one-half of their professional semester.<sup>1</sup> Two semesters, or one academic year, were felt to be adequate for consideration in this report.

Of the students responding to the questionnaire, 40.9 per cent were freshmen, 27.5 per cent were sophomores, 17.7 per cent were juniors, and 13.6 per cent were seniors with .3 per cent not indicating

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix C.

their class rank.<sup>2</sup>

The five functions of good college housing with which this study was concerned were scholarship, social activities, self-government, health, and cost. Although the section on health was considered of primary importance, it was placed fourth in the rating instrument because of its necessary length.

Respondents were asked to evaluate scholarship conditions on a five point scale composed of (1) poor, (2) acceptable, (3) average, (4) above average, and (5) excellent. The rating scale is shown in Figure 2.

1	2	3	4	5
POOR	ACCEPTABLE	AVERAGE	ABOVE AVERAGE	EXCELLENT

FIGURE 2  
RATING SCALE

As a basis for evaluating the study conditions of their housing facilities, desirable conditions for studying were enumerated in the questionnaire as shown below:

1. A room where one may study alone or with possibly one or two other students.
2. A place used only for study, at least at the time.
3. Freedom from distractions of movements and noise caused by other people.
4. Freedom from distractions of noise from physical sources: e.g., telephones, plumbing, clanking, radiators, typewriters, etc.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix D.

5. Good lighting.
6. Temperature and ventilation under personal control.
7. Easy access to books and other study materials.
8. Comfortable chairs, adequate desk space, and book shelves.<sup>3</sup>

The respondents were asked to evaluate the study conditions of their own living quarters by considering the eight factors listed above and then circling the appropriate rating on the scale. Table I shows the response to the item pertaining to study conditions.

---

<sup>3</sup>Stuart M. Stoke and others, "Student Reactions to Study Facilities with Implications for Architects and College Administrators," A Report to the Presidents of Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts, The Committee for New College, (Amherst, Massachusetts, 1960), 60 p.

TABLE I

## EFFECTIVE STUDY CONDITIONS REPORTED ON THE BASIS OF RATINGS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	32	15.4	62	29.8	84	40.4	27	13.0	0	...	3	1.4	208	100.0
Burford Hall	1	.5	19	10.4	56	30.8	81	44.5	16	8.8	9	4.9	182	99.9
East Knisely	10	37.0	14	51.9	2	7.4	1	3.7	0	...	0	...	27	100.0
West Knisely	8	44.4	8	44.4	2	11.1	0	...	0	...	0	...	18	99.9
Scherer House	7	46.7	7	46.7	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.1
Parsons Hall	20	10.6	67	35.6	73	38.9	21	11.2	1	.5	6	3.2	188	100.0
Parsons Hall Annex	5	21.7	7	30.4	3	13.0	5	21.7	0	...	3	13.0	23	99.8
Crawford House	9	60.0	5	33.3	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	12	16.2	12	16.2	25	31.1	21	27.0	6	8.1	2	1.4	78	100.0
Off-Campus Women	2	11.1	5	27.8	5	27.8	6	33.3	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity Housing	13	14.6	10	11.2	41	46.1	15	16.9	9	10.1	1	1.1	89	100.0
Totals	119	13.8	216	25.1	293	34.0	177	20.6	32	3.7	24	2.8	861	100.0

As noted in Table I, 38.9 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought their study conditions were below average, 34.0 per cent thought they were average, and 24.3 per cent thought they were above average with 2.8 per cent choosing not to answer. Four units-- East Knisely, West Knisely, Scherer House and Crawford House--were rated below average by the vast majority of the occupants. Burford Hall was reported as the most desirable unit.

The second function of good student housing covered on the rating instrument was social activities. The same five-point rating scale used for evaluating effective study conditions was employed for students to evaluate the social opportunities and experiences provided in their housing facilities.

As a basis for evaluating social opportunities of their housing facilities, the questionnaire stated that a student's living quarters should provide experiences in social skills and the opportunities to develop and refine these social skills: e.g., host or hostess in a variety of situations, dinners, teas, mixers, trade parties, picnics, etc.<sup>4</sup>

The respondents were asked to what extent these opportunities were provided them in their housing facilities and to circle the appropriate number on the rating scale. The data to this item are presented in Table II.

---

<sup>4</sup>Florence M. Thompson, Dean of Women, Indiana State College.



TABLE II

## RATING OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOCIAL ACTIVITIES IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	10	4.8	36	17.3	93	44.7	52	25.0	17	8.2	0	...	208	100.0
Burford Hall	3	1.6	10	5.5	45	24.7	64	35.2	58	31.9	2	1.1	182	100.0
East Knisely	5	18.5	6	22.2	9	33.3	5	18.5	2	7.4	0	...	27	99.9
West Knisely	2	11.1	8	44.4	6	33.3	1	5.6	1	5.6	0	...	18	100.0
Scherer House	13	86.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.1
Parsons Hall	36	19.1	55	29.3	80	42.6	13	6.9	3	1.6	1	.5	188	100.0
Parsons Hall Annex	6	26.1	8	34.8	7	30.4	0	...	0	...	2	8.7	23	100.0
Crawford House	7	46.7	0	...	8	53.3	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	39	48.6	13	17.6	13	17.6	7	9.5	4	4.1	2	2.7	78	100.1
Off-Campus Women	9	50.0	5	27.8	2	11.1	2	11.1	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity Housing	2	2.2	3	3.4	5	5.6	23	25.8	55	61.8	1	1.1	89	99.9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>99.9</b>

As revealed by Table II, 32.1 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the social experiences provided in their housing facilities were below average, 31.2 per cent thought they were average, and 35.7 per cent thought they were above average with .9 per cent choosing not to answer. Two units, Scherer House and Off-campus Women, were rated below average by the greatest number of occupants. Fraternities and Burford Hall were rated as the most desirable units by most of the occupants.

A five-point rating scale was also used for students to evaluate the degree of self-government provided in their housing facilities.

As a basis for evaluating the third function of good student housing, the questionnaire stated that students' living quarters should provide opportunities to participate in self-government and group leadership: e.g., serving on committees, chairing committees, serving as hall council officers and members, student council representatives, etc.<sup>5</sup>

Respondents were directed to use their best judgment in evaluating the degree in which these opportunities and experiences were provided in their housing facilities and to circle the appropriate number on the rating scale. Table III presents the responses to this item.

---

<sup>5</sup>Lonzo Jones, Coordinator of Student Personnel Services, Indiana State College.

TABLE III

## RATING OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	7	3.4	11	5.3	63	30.3	83	39.9	41	19.7	3	1.4	208	100.0
Burford Hall	0	...	3	1.6	21	11.5	63	34.6	92	50.5	3	1.6	182	99.8
East Knisely	3	11.1	6	22.2	11	40.7	4	14.8	2	7.4	1	3.7	27	99.9
West Knisely	2	11.1	5	27.8	9	50.0	2	11.1	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Scherer House	10	66.7	4	26.7	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.1
Parsons Hall	23	12.2	43	22.9	70	37.2	35	18.6	15	8.0	2	1.1	188	100.0
Parsons Hall Annex	2	8.7	11	47.8	4	17.4	3	13.0	0	...	3	13.0	23	99.9
Crawford House	6	40.0	6	40.0	1	6.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	...	15	100.1
Off-Campus Men	33	40.5	17	21.6	15	20.3	6	8.1	1	1.4	6	8.1	78	100.0
Off-Campus Women	9	50.0	6	33.3	3	16.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity Housing	1	1.1	1	1.1	6	6.7	23	25.8	57	64.0	1	1.1	89	99.8
<b>Totals</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>13.1</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>100.0</b>

As shown in Table III, 24.2 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the degree of self-government provided in their living facilities was below average, 23.7 per cent thought it was average, and 49.9 per cent thought it was above average with 2.2 per cent choosing not to answer. Three units--Scherer House, Crawford House, and Off-campus Women were reported below average by most of the occupants. Fraternities and Burford Hall were rated above average by a large majority of the occupants.

The fourth function of good college housing considered in this study was health. Health being the primary function of all housing, it was divided into seven sub-headings and minimum requirements were described in detail to enable the students to make a valid evaluation of their housing facilities. The seven sub-headings were air space, temperature, bathroom facilities, ventilation, lighting, electrical outlets and freedom from hazards. The reader may easily see that health, as used in this study, also covers the category of safety.

A vertical five point rating scale as shown in Figure 3 was used to evaluate each of the seven sub-headings under health.

EXCELLENT	5
ABOVE AVERAGE	4
AVERAGE	3
ACCEPTABLE	2
POOR	1

FIGURE 3

#### VERTICAL RATING SCALE

The respondents were directed to compare their present housing facilities with each of the seven sub-headings under health and to

circle the appropriate number on the individual rating scale provided in the right hand margin.

Health--air space. The questionnaire stated that a minimum of 500 cubic feet of air space per student was necessary for approval.<sup>6</sup>

The respondents to the questionnaire were directed to compare their living quarters with this minimum standard and to circle the appropriate number on the rating scale. The responses are shown in Table IV.

---

<sup>6</sup>"Minimum Health and Safety Standards for Off-Campus Student Housing," (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1961) p. 2. (Mimeographed).

TABLE IV  
RATING OF ADEQUACY OF AIR SPACE IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	21	10.1	45	21.6	91	43.8	33	15.9	15	7.2	3	1.4	208	100.0
Burford Hall	0	...	3	1.6	86	47.3	54	29.7	39	21.4	0	...	182	100.0
East Knisely	3	11.1	4	14.8	8	29.6	6	22.2	4	14.8	2	7.4	27	99.9
West Knisely	1	5.6	1	5.6	10	55.6	4	22.2	2	11.1	0	...	18	100.1
Scherer House	2	13.3	2	13.3	5	33.3	4	26.7	2	13.3	0	...	15	99.9
Parsons Hall	10	5.3	28	14.9	96	51.1	39	20.7	13	6.9	2	1.1	188	100.0
Parsons Hall Annex	2	8.7	4	17.4	7	30.4	3	13.0	6	26.1	1	4.3	23	99.9
Crawford House	0	...	3	20.0	6	40.0	3	20.0	3	20.0	0	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	1	1.3	5	6.4	18	23.1	30	38.5	24	30.8	0	...	78	100.1
Off-Campus Women	0	...	0	...	4	22.2	9	50.0	5	27.8	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity House	6	6.7	20	22.5	26	29.2	21	23.6	15	16.9	1	1.1	89	100.0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>100.1</b>

As noted in Table IV, 18.7 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the air volume of their living quarters was below average, 41.5 per cent thought it was average, and 38.9 per cent thought it was above average with 1.0 per cent choosing not to answer. The greatest number of occupants in two units, Off-campus Men and Off-campus Women, rated their facilities above average.

Health--temperature. The questionnaire stated that the optimum heat requirement was 72° four feet from floor level during the hours of 6:00 A.M. until 11:00 P.M.<sup>7</sup> This would rate average on the rating scale. If the optimum heat requirement was maintained for a longer period of time, it would rate higher on the rating scale. If the optimum heat requirement was for fewer hours, or if it fluctuated from too hot to too cold, it would rate lower on the scale. The respondents were directed to use their best judgment and to circle the appropriate number on the rating scale. The data are shown on Table V.

---

<sup>7</sup>Lonzo Jones, Coordinator of Student Personnel Services, Indiana State College

TABLE V  
RATING OF OPTIMUM TEMPERATURE IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	38	18.3	75	36.1	61	29.3	24	11.5	8	3.8	2	1.0	208	100.0
Burford Hall	31	17.0	51	28.0	50	27.5	31	17.0	17	9.3	2	1.1	182	99.9
East Knisely	12	44.4	13	48.1	1	3.7	0	...	1	3.7	0	...	27	99.9
West Knisely	10	55.6	5	27.8	2	11.1	1	5.6	0	...	0	...	18	100.1
Scherer House	3	20.0	4	26.7	7	46.7	0	...	0	...	1	6.7	15	100.1
Parsons Hall	25	13.3	41	21.8	65	34.6	33	17.6	23	12.2	1	.5	188	100.0
Parsons Hall Annex	8	34.8	5	21.7	3	13.0	1	4.3	5	21.7	1	4.3	23	99.8
Crawford House	5	33.3	9	60.0	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	2	2.6	14	17.9	22	28.2	26	33.3	14	17.9	0	...	78	99.9
Off-Campus Women	0	...	5	27.8	9	50.0	2	11.1	2	11.1	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity Housing	5	5.6	13	14.6	37	41.6	14	15.7	18	20.2	2	2.2	89	99.9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>99.9</b>



As noted in Table V, 43.4 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the temperature condition of their housing facilities was below average, 30.0 per cent thought it was average, and 25.5 per cent thought it was above average with 1.0 per cent choosing not to answer. Three units--East Knisely, West Knisely, and Crawford House--were rated below average by most of the occupants.

Health--bathroom facilities. The questionnaire stated that complete bathroom facilities should be provided for each eight occupants.<sup>8</sup> These facilities included flush water closet, lavatory basin, mirror and bathtub or shower. The questionnaire also stated that hot water should be available from 6:00 A.M. until 11:00 P.M. If these standards were met, the bathroom facilities would rate average on the scale. The respondents were asked to use their best judgment and to circle the appropriate number on the rating scale. Table VI presents the responses concerning bathroom facilities.

---

<sup>8</sup>Municipal Housing Code of the City of Terre Haute, Indiana General Ordinance No. 3, 1960. (Printed).

TABLE VI

## RATING OF BATHROOM FACILITIES IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	16	7.7	44	21.2	83	39.9	50	24.0	15	7.2	0	...	208	100.0
Burford Hall	1	.5	14	7.7	51	28.0	59	32.4	57	31.3	0	...	182	99.9
East Knisely	5	18.5	5	18.5	14	51.9	3	11.1	0	...	0	...	27	100.0
West Knisely	2	11.1	8	44.4	5	27.8	1	5.6	2	11.1	0	...	18	100.0
Scherer House	1	6.7	1	6.7	12	80.0	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	15	100.1
Parsons Hall	14	7.4	35	18.6	82	43.6	42	22.3	15	8.0	0	...	188	99.9
Parsons Hall Annex	3	13.0	4	17.4	9	39.1	3	13.0	3	13.0	1	4.3	23	99.8
Crawford House	2	13.3	2	13.3	8	53.3	2	13.3	1	6.7	0	...	15	99.9
Off-Campus Men	3	3.8	13	16.7	30	38.5	16	20.5	16	20.5	0	...	78	100.0
Off-Campus Women	1	5.6	2	11.1	7	38.9	8	44.4	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity Housing	5	5.6	12	13.5	39	43.8	13	14.6	19	21.3	1	1.1	89	99.9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>100.1</b>

Table VI shows that 22.5 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the bathroom facilities of their housing units were below average, 39.5 per cent thought they were average, and 37.9 per cent thought they were above average with .2 per cent choosing not to answer.

Health--ventilation. The questionnaire stated that every room should have one window that opens easily and faces directly to the outdoors. The window area should also equal at least 10 per cent of the floor area and should be openable one-half of its area. Screens should be provided for the warm months.<sup>9</sup> The respondents were asked to use their best judgment and to circle the appropriate number on the rating scale. The data are presented in Table VII.

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

TABLE VII

## RATING OF FRESH AIR VENTILATION IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	8	3.8	26	12.5	92	44.2	58	27.9	24	11.5	0	...	208	99.9
Burford Hall	1	.5	2	1.1	29	15.9	52	28.6	98	53.8	0	...	182	99.9
East Knisely	0	...	3	11.1	14	51.9	6	22.2	4	14.8	0	...	27	100.0
West Knisely	3	16.7	6	33.3	4	22.2	4	22.2	1	5.6	0	...	18	100.0
Scherer House	6	40.0	3	20.0	4	26.7	2	13.3	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Parsons Hall	33	17.6	24	12.8	68	36.2	35	18.6	28	14.9	0	...	188	100.1
Parsons Hall Annex	2	8.7	1	4.3	8	34.8	7	30.4	4	17.4	1	4.3	23	99.9
Crawford House	3	20.0	1	6.7	1	6.7	3	20.0	7	46.7	0	...	15	100.1
Off-Campus Men	5	6.4	2	2.6	21	26.9	24	30.8	25	32.1	1	1.3	78	100.1
Off-Campus Women	0	...	1	5.6	6	33.3	8	44.4	3	16.7	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity Housing	2	2.2	6	6.7	32	36.0	22	24.7	27	30.3	0	...	89	99.9
Totals	63	7.3	75	8.7	279	32.4	221	25.7	221	25.7	0	.2	861	100.0

Table VII reveals that 16.0 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the ventilation of their living quarters was below average, 32.4 per cent thought it was average, and 51.4 per cent thought it was above average with .2 per cent choosing not to answer. One unit, Burford Hall, was reported as the most desirable unit by a majority of the occupants.

Health--lighting. The questionnaire stated that each room should contain one ceiling light for general lighting and a desk lamp for each study desk.<sup>10</sup> If these minimum standards were met, the respondents were directed to circle 3 on the rating scale. If more or less lighting was provided, the respondents were directed to circle a number appropriately higher or lower on the rating scale. Data pertaining to lighting are shown in Table VIII.

---

<sup>10</sup>"Minimum Health and Safety Standards for Off-Campus Student Housing," (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1961) p. 2. (mimeographed).

TABLE VIII

## RATING OF ROOM ILLUMINATION IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	12	5.8	17	8.2	132	63.5	37	17.8	8	3.8	2	1.0	208	100.1
Burford Hall	2	1.1	9	4.9	23	12.6	69	37.9	79	43.4	0	...	182	99.9
East Knisely	2	7.4	4	14.8	20	74.1	1	3.7	0	...	0	...	27	100.0
West Knisely	0	...	5	27.8	13	72.2	0	...	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Scherer House	9	60.0	5	33.3	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Parsons Hall	23	12.2	25	13.3	107	56.9	23	12.2	10	5.3	0	...	188	99.9
Parsons Hall Annex	2	8.7	5	21.7	7	30.4	4	17.4	4	17.4	1	4.3	23	99.9
Crawford House	4	26.7	4	26.7	7	46.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.1
Off-Campus Men	11	14.1	12	15.4	28	35.9	17	21.8	10	12.8	0	...	78	100.0
Off-Campus Women	2	11.1	2	11.1	11	61.1	3	16.7	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity Housing	2	2.2	8	9.0	34	38.2	25	28.1	20	22.5	0	...	89	100.0
Totals	69	8.0	96	11.1	383	44.5	179	20.8	131	15.2	3	.3	861	99.9

As noted in Table VIII, 19.1 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the lighting of their housing facilities was below average, 44.5 per cent thought it was average, and 36.0 per cent thought it was above average with .3 per cent choosing not to answer. A large majority of occupants in Scherer House reported it below average. Burford Hall was rated above average by most of the occupants.

Health-electrical outlets. The questionnaire stated that each room should contain one double electrical outlet per occupant. This outlet was not to be used for appliances which operated on high wattages unless the wiring was of adequate size. The questionnaire also stated that extension cords were considered safe only when they ran directly from a portable electrical fixture to the electrical outlet and at no time were extension cords to extend through doorways or transoms, neither should they run under rugs, mats, etc.<sup>11</sup> The respondents were directed to use their best judgment and to circle the appropriate number on the rating scale. Table IX presents these data.

---

<sup>11</sup>Municipal Housing Code of the City of Terre Haute, Indiana, General Ordinance No. 3, 1960. (Printed).

TABLE IX

## RATING OF NUMBER OF ELECTRICAL OUTLETS AND USE OF EXTENSION CORDS IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	19	9.1	30	14.4	94	45.2	46	22.1	19	9.1	0	...	208	99.9
Burford Hall	1	.5	5	2.7	19	10.4	48	26.4	109	59.9	0	...	182	99.9
East Knisely	2	7.4	7	25.9	16	59.3	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	...	27	100.0
West Knisely	2	11.1	6	33.3	6	33.3	0	...	4	22.2	0	...	18	99.9
Scherer House	5	33.3	6	40.0	4	26.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Parsons Hall	14	7.4	17	9.0	81	43.1	48	25.5	27	14.4	1	.5	188	99.9
Parsons Hall Annex	3	13.0	9	39.1	7	30.4	0	...	3	13.0	1	4.3	23	99.8
Crawford House	1	6.7	8	53.3	6	40.0	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	12	15.4	15	19.2	28	35.9	11	14.1	12	15.4	0	...	78	100.0
Off-Campus Women	2	11.1	2	11.1	5	27.8	7	38.9	2	11.1	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity House	5	5.6	17	19.1	31	34.8	23	25.8	13	14.6	0	...	89	99.9
Totals	66	7.7	122	14.2	297	34.5	184	21.4	190	22.1	2	.2	861	100.1



As presented in Table IX, 21.9 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the number of electrical outlets in their housing facilities were below average, 34.5 per cent thought they were average, and 43.5 per cent thought they were above average with .2 per cent choosing not to answer. One unit, Scherer House, was reported below average by a great number of occupants and Burford Hall was reported as the most desirable unit.

Health--freedom from hazards. The questionnaire stated that if the living quarters were reasonably free from electrical shock, falling, slipping, and fire the respondents were to circle 3 on the rating scale. If the living quarters provided fire extinguishers, a fire alarm system, and quick unobstructed exit to the outside, the respondent was to circle appropriately above 3 on the rating scale. If any one or more of these hazards existed in the housing facility, the respondent was to circle appropriately below 3 on the rating scale.<sup>12</sup> Table X shows the response to this item.

---

<sup>12</sup>Lonzo Jones, Coordinator of Student Personnel Services, Indiana State College.

TABLE X

## RATING OF FREEDOM FROM HAZARDS IN HOUSING UNITS

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	5	2.4	14	6.7	83	39.9	83	39.9	23	11.1	0	...	208	100.0
Burford Hall	0	...	1	.5	41	22.5	75	41.2	65	35.7	0	...	182	99.9
East Knisely	4	14.8	9	33.3	12	44.4	2	7.4	0	...	0	...	27	99.9
West Knisely	2	11.1	6	33.3	9	50.0	1	5.6	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Scherer House	5	33.3	2	13.3	7	46.7	1	6.7	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Parsons Hall	8	4.3	28	14.9	93	49.5	40	21.3	19	10.1	0	...	188	100.1
Parsons Hall Annex	5	21.7	3	13.0	10	43.5	0	....	4	17.4	1	4.3	23	99.9
Crawford House	2	13.3	1	6.7	12	80.0	0	....	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	4	5.1	9	11.5	40	51.3	15	19.2	10	12.8	0	...	78	99.9
Off-Campus Women	1	5.6	2	11.1	10	55.6	4	22.2	1	5.6	0	...	18	100.1
Fraternity House	2	2.2	3	3.4	34	38.2	30	33.7	20	22.5	0	...	89	100.0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>29.2</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>100.1</b>

As shown by Table X, 13.5 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought their housing facilities were below average relative to freedom from hazards, 40.8 per cent thought their quarters were average, and 45.7 per cent thought they were above average with .1 per cent choosing not to answer. One unit, Burford Hall, was reported above average by a majority of occupants.

After rating all seven statements of the section pertaining to health, the respondents to the questionnaire were directed to total the seven individual ratings and to enter that total at the appropriate place on the Composite Rating Scale shown in Figure 4.

1-7	8 - 14	15 - 21	22 - 28	29 - 35
POOR	ACCEPTABLE	AVERAGE	ABOVE AVERAGE	EXCELLENT

FIGURE 4

#### COMPOSITE RATING SCALE

The questionnaire stated that the total entered on the Composite Rating Scale represented the over-all rating of the housing facility pertaining to health. These data are shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI

## RATING OF THE SEVEN COMBINED AREAS OF HEALTH

	1		2		3		4		5		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	2	1.0	11	5.3	97	46.6	70	33.7	22	10.6	6	2.9	208	100.1
Burford Hall	...	...	...	...	22	12.1	71	39.0	81	44.5	8	4.4	182	100.0
East Knisely	...	...	4	14.8	14	51.9	9	33.3	...	....	...	...	27	100.0
West Knisely	...	...	3	16.7	9	50.0	5	27.8	1	5.6	...	...	18	100.1
Scherer House	...	...	6	40.0	7	46.7	1	6.7	...	....	1	6.7	15	100.1
Parsons Hall	3	1.6	16	8.5	80	42.6	65	34.6	15	8.0	9	4.8	188	100.1
Parsons Hall Annex	1	4.3	2	8.7	6	26.1	7	30.4	4	17.4	3	13.0	23	99.9
Crawford House	...	...	3	20.0	9	60.0	3	20.0	...	....	...	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	1	1.4	3	4.1	25	32.4	33	43.2	14	16.2	2	2.7	78	100.0
Off-Campus Women	...	...	1	5.6	5	27.8	9	50.0	2	11.1	1	5.6	18	100.1
Fraternity House	1	1.1	2	2.2	27	30.3	35	39.3	21	23.6	3	3.4	89	99.9
Totals	8	0.9	51	5.9	301	35.0	308	35.8	160	18.6	33	3.8	861	100.0

Table XI reveals that 6.8 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the over-all rating of their living quarters was poor, 35.0 per cent thought it was average, and 54.4 per cent thought it was above average with 3.8 per cent choosing not to answer. Burford Hall was reported above average by a large percentage of the occupants.

The fifth function covered by the rating instrument was cost of housing facilities. The questionnaire stated that students come to college with varying degrees of financial resources. Some find it difficult to pay the cost of room and board in college residence halls and some are financially able to afford greater privacy in more luxurious surroundings. Hence, the responsibility of providing housing of various costs is important.

The respondents to the questionnaire were asked if they felt there was a sufficient cost range in college approved housing to meet the needs and financial abilities of the students enrolled at Indiana State College. Blanks were provided as shown in Figure 5 for the respondents to check.

\_\_\_\_\_ YES                      \_\_\_\_\_ NO

FIGURE 5

IS THERE SUFFICIENT COST RANGE IN COLLEGE APPROVED HOUSING?

These data are presented in Table XII.

TABLE XII  
 RATING OF THE COST RANGE IN HOUSING UNITS

	Yes		Sufficient Cost Range				Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No Answer	%	No	%
Reeve Hall	97	46.6	108	51.9	3	1.4	208	99.9
Burford Hall	118	64.8	62	34.1	2	1.1	182	100.0
East Knisely	10	37.0	17	63.0	0	...	27	100.0
West Knisely	8	44.4	8	44.4	2	11.1	18	99.9
Scherer House	9	60.0	6	40.0	0	...	15	100.0
Parsons Hall	86	45.7	93	49.5	9	4.8	188	100.0
Parsons Hall Annex	14	60.9	6	26.1	3	13.0	23	100.0
Crawford House	11	73.3	4	26.7	0	...	15	100.0
Off-Campus Men	49	62.2	28	36.5	1	1.4	78	100.1
Off-Campus Women	10	55.6	7	38.9	1	5.6	18	100.1
Fraternity House	59	66.3	29	32.6	1	1.1	89	100.0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>54.7</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>42.7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table XII reveals that 54.7 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire felt a sufficient cost range was provided and 42.7 per cent felt the cost range was not sufficient with 2.6 per cent choosing not to answer.

The questionnaire also stated in function five, cost; for your own needs and financial ability, should the college provide more housing facilities:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. of a cheaper quality and at a lower cost even though they do not meet standards outlined above in functions one through four.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. at about the same physical quality and cost of the present residence hall facilities, but excluding any social or self-government program.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. at about the same quality and cost as represented by present residence hall facilities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. of a better quality (one person per room, private bath, etc.) but at a comparable greater cost.

The respondents were directed to check only one blank. Table XIII presents the data concerning cost of facilities.

TABLE XIII

## TYPE OF HOUSING FACILITY DESIRED BY STUDENTS

	1		2		3		4		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	9	4.3	32	15.4	143	68.8	8	3.8	16	7.7	208	100.0
Burford Hall	4	2.2	18	9.9	147	80.8	3	1.6	10	5.5	182	100.0
East Knisely	2	7.4	0	...	20	74.1	3	11.1	2	7.4	27	100.0
West Knisely	0	...	0	...	15	83.3	1	5.6	2	11.1	18	100.0
Scherer House	1	6.7	2	13.3	12	80.0	0	...	0	...	15	100.0
Parsons Hall	11	5.9	18	9.6	113	60.1	26	13.8	20	10.6	188	100.0
Parsons Hall Annex	3	13.0	1	4.3	11	47.8	1	4.3	7	30.4	23	99.8
Crawford House	1	6.7	0	...	13	86.7	0	...	1	6.7	15	100.1
Off-Campus Men	8	10.8	21	28.4	33	43.2	9	10.8	7	6.8	78	100.0
Off-Campus Women	1	5.6	8	44.4	7	38.9	0	...	2	11.1	18	100.0
Fraternity House	4	4.5	4	4.5	55	61.8	15	16.9	11	12.4	89	100.1
Totals	44	5.1	104	12.1	569	66.1	66	7.7	78	9.1	861	100.1



As noted on Table XIII, 5.1 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire thought the college should provide more housing facilities of a cheaper quality and at a lower cost even though they do not meet standards outlined in functions one through four. Also, 12.1 per cent thought the college should provide more housing facilities at about the same physical quality of the present residence hall facilities, but excluding any social or self-government program. The majority of the respondents, 66.1 per cent, thought the college should provide more housing facilities at about the same quality and cost as represented by present residence hall facilities and 7.7 per cent of the students thought the college should provide more housing facilities of a better quality (private rooms, bath, etc.) but at a comparable greater cost with 9.1 per cent choosing not to answer.

Summary. Reviewing the data presented, Burford Hall was rated above average in all five functions of good student housing covered in this study.

The fraternities far exceeded even Burford Hall in the areas of social activities and self-government as the most desirable housing unit.

Study conditions in four units--East Knisely, West Knisely, Scherer House, and Crawford House--were far below average.

Scherer House and Off-campus Women were far below average in the areas of social activities and self-government.

The men in Crawford House felt their housing unit was below average in the area of self-government.

Slightly more than one-half of the total respondents, 54.7 per

felt the cost range was sufficient in college approved housing.

The vast majority, 66.1% of the respondents felt the college should continue providing more student housing of about the same quality and cost as represented by present residence hall facilities.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

This study was conducted primarily to determine the degree of satisfaction which students reported they experienced in their housing facilities in regard to (1) effective study conditions, (2) social activities, (3) self-government, (4) health, and (5) cost. Also, the study was designed to locate specifically those areas in which improvement seemed necessary. Of the students responding to the questionnaire 578 lived in college residence halls, 98 in college owned temporary housing, 96 in off-campus housing and 89 lived in fraternity houses.

This was a survey conducted at Indiana State College during the second semester of the school year 1961-1962. The instrument used to measure the degree of satisfaction was a questionnaire prepared by the writer. Students were grouped according to sex and housing category. The respondents were asked not to sign the questionnaire.

On the basis of the questionnaire, the following findings are noted:

(1) Of the students living in the college residence halls, 34.1 per cent felt the study conditions were below average, 36.7 per cent felt they were average, and 26.0 per cent felt they were above average with 3.2 per cent choosing not to answer.

(2) Also, 25.9 per cent of the college residence hall students felt the social activities provided were below average, 37.3 per cent

felt they were average, and 36.3 per cent felt they were above average with .5 per cent not answering.

(3) Further, 15.1 per cent of the college residence hall students felt the opportunities to practice self-government were below average, 23.3 per cent felt they were average, and 57.1 per cent felt they were above average with 1.4 per cent choosing not to answer.

(4) Health standards were rated below average by 5.5 per cent of the students living in college residence halls, 33.8 per cent felt they were average, and 56.8 per cent felt they were above average with 4.0 per cent not answering.

(5) The vast majority of students living in college-owned temporary housing, 83.3 per cent, felt the study conditions were below average, 9.0 per cent felt they were average, and 5.1 per cent felt they were above average with 2.6 per cent choosing not to answer.

(6) Well over one-half of the students living in college-owned temporary housing, 59.4 per cent, felt the social activities provided were below average, 31.4 per cent felt they were average, and 7.4 per cent felt they were above average with 1.5 per cent choosing not to answer.

(7) Further, 60.4 per cent of the students living in college-owned temporary housing felt the opportunities to practice self-government were below average, 24.3 per cent felt they were average, and 11.9 per cent felt they were above average with 3.3 per cent not answering.

(8) Of the students living in college-owned temporary housing, 20.9 per cent felt the health standards were below average, 46.9 per cent felt they were average, and 28.2 per cent felt they were above average with 3.9 per cent choosing not to answer.

(9) Of the students sampled living in off-campus housing, 35.7 per cent rated their study conditions below average, 29.5 per cent felt they were average, and 34.2 per cent felt they were above average with .7 per cent not answering.

(10) A large majority of students sampled living in off-campus housing, 72.0 per cent, rated the social activities provided below average, 14.4 per cent felt they were average, and 12.4 per cent felt they were above average with 1.4 per cent not answering.

(11) Also, a large majority of students sampled living in off-campus housing, 72.7 per cent, felt the opportunities to practice self-government were below average, 18.7 per cent felt they were average and 4.8 per cent felt they were above average with 4.1 per cent choosing not to answer.

(12) Only 5.6 per cent of the students sampled living in off-campus housing felt the health standards were below average, 30.1 per cent felt they were average, and 60.3 per cent felt they were above average with 4.2 per cent choosing not to answer.

(13) The study conditions in the fraternity houses were rated below average by 25.8 per cent of the men, 46.1 per cent felt they were average, and 27.0 per cent felt they were above average with 1.1 per cent not answering.

(14) Of the men living in fraternity houses, 5.6 per cent felt the social activities provided were below average, 5.6 per cent felt they were average, and 87.6 per cent felt they were above average with 1.1 per cent choosing not to answer.

(15) Only 2.2 per cent of the men living in fraternity housing felt the opportunities to practice self-government were below average, 6.7 per cent felt they were average, and 89.8 per cent felt they were above average with 1.1 per cent choosing not to answer.

(16) Further, only 3.3 per cent of the men living in fraternity housing felt the health standards were below average, 30.3 per cent felt they were average, and 62.9 per cent felt they were above average with 3.4 per cent not answering.

(17) When asked if a sufficient cost range was provided in college approved housing to meet the needs and financial abilities of the students at Indiana State College, 54.7 per cent of the respondents replied yes and 42.7 per cent replied no with 2.6 per cent choosing not to answer.

(18) Relative to the type of housing facility desired, a large majority of students, 66.1 per cent, felt the college should provide more housing at about the same quality and cost as represented by present residence hall facilities.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

From the analysis of data in this study, the following conclusions seem to be warranted:

(1) One concludes that students living in college residence halls are moderately satisfied with study conditions and social opportunities provided. One might also conclude that these students are well satisfied with the self-government programs and with the health standards that are maintained in the residence halls.

(2) On the basis of the rating instrument, students living in college-owned temporary housing are extremely dissatisfied with the study conditions, social opportunities provided, and opportunities to practice self-government.

(3) One must conclude that self-government or social activity programs are almost completely lacking in off-campus housing. The health standards maintained in off-campus housing would seem to be satisfactory.

(4) Fraternities dominated all other housing areas studied in providing satisfactory social and self-government programs. One could conclude also that fraternities maintain satisfactory health standards.

(5) No conclusion relative to cost may be drawn from the data in this study because only slightly more than one-half of the respondents were satisfied with the present cost range provided in all housing areas studied and slightly less than one-half were dissatisfied with the cost range provided.

(6) It may be concluded that the college should continue providing more student housing of about the same quality and cost as represented by present residence hall facilities.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the rating instrument and the conclusions reached, it is believed by the writer that of the four student housing areas studied the use of college-owned temporary housing would be the most difficult to justify.

Further study into the area of off-campus housing should be made.

From the information shown as a result of the rating instrument, it is the recommendation of the writer that college residence halls and fraternities maintain the present satisfactory health standards and continue their social and self-government programs. The writer also recommends that study conditions in these two housing areas be further investigated.



**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Augustine, Grace M. Some Aspects of Management of College Residence Halls for Women. New York: F.S. Crofts and Company, 1935.
- "Estimated Fall Enrollments, 1963-1972," Actual Fall Enrollments, 1951-62. Indiana State College, Terre Haute, Indiana, Office of the President, 1962. (Mimeographed).
- Grote, Caroline. Housing and Living Conditions of Women Students. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.
- Hayes, Harriett, and others. "Residence Halls for Women Students, Administrative Principles and Procedures." National Association of Deans of Women. Washington, D. C., 1947.
- Lloyd-Jones, Esther. "Social Competence and College Students," American Council on Education Studies. Washington, D. C. September, 1940.
- "Minimum Health and Safety Standards for Off-Campus Student Housing," East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1961. (Mimeographed).
- Municipal Housing Code of the City of Terre Haute, Indiana. General Ordinance No. 3, 1960. (Printed).
- Riker, Harold C. and Frank J. Lopez. College Students Live Here. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961.
- Rhulman, Jessie and others. "Personnel Principles in the Chapter House," American Council on Education Studies, Series 6. Washington, D.C. 1953.
- Robson, Barbara Reid. House Management Problems of Fraternities and Sororities. Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, New York City: Columbia University, 1933.
- Stewart, Helen Quien. Some Social Aspects of Residence Halls for Women. New York: Professional and Technical Press, 1942.
- Stoke, Stuart M. and others. "Student Reactions to Study Facilities with Implications for Architects and College Administration." A Report to the President of Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College and the University of Massachusetts. The committee for New College, Amherst, Massachusetts, 1960.
- Stozier, Robert M. and others. "Housing of Students," American Council on Educational Studies. Washington, D. C. Series 6, July, 1950.

Thompson, Florence M. "Residence Halls and the Educational Program,"  
The Educational Record, January, 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Developing Social Competence in Prospective Teachers Through  
the Residence Hall Program, Teachers College Journal, 21: 5,  
March-April, 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Residence Hall--An Educational Unit," Teachers College  
Journal, 24:4, January, 1953.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Use of Dormitories for Social Education," Educational  
and Psychological Measurement, 7: 3, Autumn, 1947.

**APPENDIX**



## I. Scholarship

### Effective study conditions

Characteristic of effective study conditions include the following:

1. A room where one may study alone or with possibly one or two other students.
2. A place used only for study, at least at the time.
3. Freedom from distractions of movements and noise caused by other people.
4. Freedom from distractions of noise from physical sources: e.g., telephones, plumbing, clanking, radiators, typewriters, etc.
5. Good lighting.
6. Temperature and ventilation under personal control.
7. Easy access to books and other study materials.
8. Comfortable chairs, adequate desk space, and book shelves.

Compare your present living quarters with these eight characteristics of effective study conditions and rate your room by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

I / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 /  
 Poor            Acceptable            Average            Above Average            Excellent

## II. Social Activities

### A Students living quarters

Should provide experiences in social skills and the opportunities to develop and refine these social skills; e.g., host or hostess in a variety of situations, dinners, teas, mixers, trade parties, picnics, etc.

To what extent do your present living quarters provide these opportunities and experiences? Circle the appropriate number on the scale below.

II / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 /  
 Poor            Acceptable            Average            Above Average            Excellent

### III. Self-Government :

#### A student's living quarters

Should provide opportunities to participate in self-government and group leadership: e.g., serving on committees, chairing committees, serving as hall council officers and members, student council representative, etc.

Use your best judgment and circle the appropriate number on the rating scale below. The basis for rating this function is the degree in which these opportunities and experiences are provided you in your present housing facility.

/	1	/	2	/	3	/	4	/	5	/
Poor		Acceptable		Average		Above Average		Excellent		

### IV. Health

Compare your present living quarters with the seven (7) statements that follow and circle the appropriate number on the individual rating in the right-hand margin.

1. Air space - Normally, 500 cubic feet of air space is considered minimum for approval. Thus with two persons in a room, it should measure 12'x12'x7'. Estimate the cubic feet to 520 cubic feet per occupant, circle Average (3). If your room is larger or smaller, circle appropriately above or below 3 on the rating scale at the right.
 

Excellent	<u>5</u>
Above Ave	<u>4</u>
Average	<u>3</u>
Acceptable	<u>2</u>
Poor	<u>1</u>
  
2. Temperature - Each room should have properly installed heating facilities which are maintained in safe and good working condition. For optimum heat requirements, room temperature at four feet from the floor should be 72 degrees from 6:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. This would rate 3, or average, on the scale. If heat is optimum throughout the night, it would rate 5 on the scale. If heat is optimum for fewer hours, or if it fluctuates alternately from too hot to too cold, it would rate lower on the scale. Use your best judgment and circle the appropriate number on the scale at the right.
 

Excellent	<u>5</u>
Above Ave	<u>4</u>
Average	<u>3</u>
Acceptable	<u>2</u>
Poor	<u>1</u>

3. Bathroom facilities--Bathrooms should be kept in a clean and sanitary condition. One flush water closet, lavatory basin, mirror, and bathtub or shower should be provided for each eight occupants. Hot water should be available from 6:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. If these minimum standards are met, it would rate 3 on the scale at the right. Use your best judgment and circle the appropriate number on the scale.

Excellent	<u>5</u>
Above Ave.	<u>4</u>
Average	<u>3</u>
Acceptable	<u>2</u>
Poor	<u>1</u>

Ventilation--Every room should have one window that opens easily and faces directly to the outdoors. Window area should equal at least 10 per cent of the floor area of your room and should be openable one-half of its area. Screens should be provided for the warm months. Use your best judgment and circle the appropriate number on the scale at the right.

Excellent	<u>5</u>
Above Average	<u>4</u>
Average	<u>3</u>
Acceptable	<u>2</u>
Poor	<u>1</u>

Lighting--Each room should contain one ceiling light for general lighting. A desk lamp supplying sufficient illumination for effective study should be provided for each study desk. Circle 3 on the scale if these minimum standards are met. If more or less lighting is provided, circle a number appropriately higher or lower on the scale on the right.

Excellent	<u>5</u>
Above Ave	<u>4</u>
Average	<u>3</u>
Acceptable	<u>2</u>
Poor	<u>1</u>

Electrical Outlets--Each room should contain one double electrical outlet per occupant. This outlet is not to be used for appliances which operate on high wattages unless the electrical wiring is of adequate size. Extension cords are considered safe only when they run directly from a portable outlet fixture to the electrical outlet. At no time are extension cords to extend through doorways or transoms, neither should they run under rugs, mats, etc. Use your best judgment and circle the appropriate number at the right.

Excellent	<u>5</u>
Above Ave.	<u>4</u>
Average	<u>3</u>
Acceptable	<u>2</u>
Poor	<u>1</u>

Freedom from hazards--If your room and bathing facilities are reasonably free from electrical shock, falling, slipping, and fire, circle 3 on the scale. If your facilities appear to be perfectly safe from these hazards, if fire extinguishers are available, if a fire alarm system is used, and if you have quick unobstructed exits to the outside, circle appropriately above 3 on the scale. If any one or more of these hazards exist in your living quarters, circle appropriately below 3 on the scale at the right.

Excellent	<u>5</u>
Above Ave.	<u>4</u>
Average	<u>3</u>
Acceptable	<u>2</u>
Poor	<u>1</u>



After rating all seven (7) statements, total the individual ratings and enter that total at the appropriate place on the Composite Rating Scale below. This is the over-all rating for your living quarters pertaining to health.

Composite Rating Scale

/ 1 - 7	/ 8 - 14	/ 15 - 21	/ 22 - 28	/ 29 - 35 /
Poor	Acceptable	Average	Above Average	Excellent

V. Cost of Housing Facility

Students come to college with varying degrees of financial resources. Some find it difficult to pay the cost of room and board in college-owned residence halls. Some are financially able to afford greater privacy in more luxurious surroundings. Hence, the responsibility of providing housing of various costs is important.

A. Do you feel there is a sufficient cost range in college-approved housing to meet the needs and financial abilities of so large an enrollment as Indiana State College now has?

\_\_\_\_\_ YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO

B. For your own needs and financial ability, should the college provide more housing facilities: )Please check only one blank below.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. of a cheaper quality and at a lower cost even though they do not meet standard outlined above in I through IV.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. at about the same physical quality of the present residence hall facilities, but excluding any social and self-government program.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. at about the same quality and cost as represented by present residence hall facilities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. of a better quality (one person per room, private bath, etc.) but at a comparable greater cost.

## APPENDIX B

## PERCENTAGE OF RATING SCALES RETURNED

	No. of Rating Scales Distributed	No. of Rating Scales Returned	Percentage
Reeve Hall	390	208	53.3
Burford Hall	300	182	60.7
East Knisely	29	27	93.1
West Knisely	28	18	64.3
Scherer House	17	15	88.2
Parsons Hall	314	188	59.9
Parsons Hall Annex	28	23	82.1
Crawford House	17	15	88.2
Off-Campus Men	154	78	50.6
Off-Campus Women	41	18	43.9
Fraternity Housing	147	89	60.5
Totals	1465	861	58.8

APPENDIX C

SEMESTERS IN RESIDENCE

	Reeve		Burford		E.Knisely		W.Knisely		Scherer House		Parsons		Parsons Annex		Crawford House		Off-Campus Men		off-campus Women		Fraternity Housing	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	15	7.2	24	13.2	6	22.2	2	11.1	15	100.0	17	9.0	4	17.4	1	6.7	19	24.3	2	11.1	20	22.5
2	114	54.8	83	45.6	21	77.8	16	88.9	0	...	108	57.4	19	82.6	13	86.7	50	63.5	10	55.6	54	60.7
3	1	.5	9	4.9	0	...	0	.....	0	...	4	2.1	0	...	1	6.7	5	6.8	0	...	2	2.2
4	40	19.2	40	22.0	0	...	0	...	0	...	29	15.4	0	...	0	...	3	4.1	4	22.2	8	9.0
5	2	1.0	6	3.3	0	...	0	...	0	...	7	3.7	0	...	0	...	1	1.4	0	....	4	4.5
6	19	9.1	20	11.0	0	...	0	...	0	...	10	5.3	0	...	0	...	0	...	1	5.6	1	1.1
7	8	3.8	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...	4	2.1	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...	0	...
8	9	4.3	0	...	...	...	0	...	0	...	9	4.8	0	...	0	...	0	...	1	5.6	0	...
	208	99.9	182	100.0	27	100.0	18	100.0	15	100.0	188	99.8	23	100.0	15	100.1	78	100.1	18	100.1	89	100.0

APPENDIX D

YEAR IN SCHOOL

	Freshmen		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		No Answer		Totals	
	No.	%	No	%	No.	%	No	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reeve Hall	86	41.3	62	29.8	33	15.9	27	13.0	0	...	208	100.0
Burford Hall	72	39.6	52	28.6	32	17.6	25	13.7	1	.5	182	100.0
E.Knisely	18	66.7	3	11.1	5	18.5	1	3.7	0	...	27	100.0
W.Knisely	13	72.2	5	27.8	0	...	0	...	0	...	18	100.0
Scherer	0	...	0	...	0	...	15	100.0	0	...	15	100.0
Parsons Hall	83	44.1	55	29.3	33	17.6	16	8.5	1	.5	188	100.0
Parsons Annex	22	95.7	0	...	0	...	0	...	1	4.3	23	100.0
Crawford	10	66.7	3	20.0	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	...	15	100.1
Off-Campus Men	38	47.3	13	16.2	15	20.3	12	16.2	0	...	78	100.0
Off-Campus Wom.	4	22.2	2	11.1	3	16.7	9	50.0	0	...	18	100.0
Fraternity	6	6.7	42	47.2	30	33.7	11	12.4	0	...	89	100.0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>100.0</b>

INDIANA STATE  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY