

1968

A Selected Study of Women Residents' Opinions of Their Respective Dormitory: A High-Rise and Low-Rise Dormitory at Eastern Illinois University

Helen Joyce Cox

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Psychology and Guidance](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Cox, Helen Joyce, "A Selected Study of Women Residents' Opinions of Their Respective Dormitory: A High-Rise and Low-Rise Dormitory at Eastern Illinois University" (1968). *Masters Theses*. 4109.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4109>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #3

To: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

Subject: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements.

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

8/6/68
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

A SELECTED STUDY OF WOMEN

RESIDENTS' OPINIONS OF THEIR RESPECTIVE

DORMITORY: A HIGH-RISE AND A LOW-RISE
(TITLE)

DORMITORY AT EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

BY

HELEN JOYCE COX

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTERS OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1968

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

6 Aug 68
DATE

8-6-68
DATE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express appreciation to the resident assistants of Andrews and Weller Halls for their cooperation in distributing and collecting the survey; to Miss Nancy Tait and Mrs. Sarah Thorburn, for their suggestions and moral support; to Dr. William Crane, for his many ideas and advice; to Dr. Paul Overton, for his confidence in me; and to all the participants of Andrews and Weller Halls who made a success of the survey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND STUDY 3

 Group Size
 Atmoaphere Within
 Interpersonal Relationships
 Leadership and Guidance

III. THE SURVEY AND ITS RESULTS15

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS44

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY48

APPENDIX50

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Everyone should totally participate in social activities in the dorm.19
2. One should prefer dorm activities to floor activities.19
3. One should prefer floor activities to dorm activities.20
4. The social activities of your dorm should be made more adequate in quality21
5. The social activities of your dorm should be made more adequate in quantity.22
6. A better social program of another dorm should be adapted for your own dorm.23
7. Your present residence hall should be made your permanent college quarters.24
8. The atmosphere of your dorm should be changed25
9. Dorm facilities, number of acquaintances, or dorm size should be a reason for dorm preference26
10. Your dorm should make residents more independent.27
11. The attitude of the majority in your dorm should be improved28
12. The size of your dorm should affect the general attitude within your dorm29
13. One should help individuals within your dorm.30
14. One should know a number of individuals before she moves into a dorm31
15. One should be acquainted with all individuals on her floor.32
16. One should be acquainted with all individuals in her dorm33
17. One should constantly talk to another resident in preference to her roommate34

18. An individual's problems should be referred to someone other than a resident assistant.35
19. An individual should acquaint herself with individuals who have personalities which contrast with her own36
20. An individual should have only acquaintances with personalities very similar to her own . . .37
21. The number of acquaintances should make one more secure38
22. Individuals should take the initiative in making new comers welcome in your dorm...39
23. Only upperclassmen should assume leadership within your dorm40
24. An individual's problems should be referred to someone other than a dorm counselor within your dorm.41
25. An individual should not extend her social circle beyond her dorm.42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For the past five years, from 1962 to 1968, at Eastern Illinois University, the campus has experienced the trend of the times--rapid growth. Involved in this growth was the creation of high rise residence halls--the later ones being nine stories high. The dorms already here on campus were the two-story ones common to the 1950's. Other buildings were added, but most obvious of the structures were the tall dorms at the south end of the campus.

This contrast in residence hall building presented the idea of whether there actually were any distinct differences at all between the attitudes of female occupants of a small dorm and the female occupants of a large dorm. This idea, however, only created another idea and that was whether a measurement of attitudes of the occupants of a small and large dorm was actually feasible. The only way to test this was to first make a study of some of the research that had been done in this area. Second, an attitude survey concerning four areas of residence hall living--group size, atmosphere within, interpersonal relations, leadership and guidance--was then constructed. This attitude survey was then distributed in two female residence halls and then collected. Rank correlations

were used to make comparisons between the responses of the classes of the two halls and between the total responses of the two halls. If some of the responses revealed any inconsistencies in residence hall living, recommendations were made accordingly.

As the study progressed, the possibility of obtaining any significant results seemed elusive at times. Any results were relative to the time of tabulation and could only be relative for future time. However, no matter if any results of this survey were or were not significant, the fact can not be disputed that the results were of interest in themselves as they were representative characteristics of the life-blood of any university--her students--some of the female population, that is.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND STUDY

It shortly shall be seen that the research in this area of residence hall operation is nearly negligible. The best that can be done is merely to include some of the opinion and some of the research that is available. In many cases a number of the sources' ideas are similar so the idea is stated once and has one footnote number but a number of sources listed under that number. The body of the background study is divided into four general subject areas that are in correlation with the areas on the survey. The subject areas are not necessarily in order nor are they positively labeled as such in the attitude survey. Encompassing many areas of university activities, these four general subject areas in residence living "introduce students into a truly collegiate way of life."¹ The first that is discussed is the group size within a residence hall.

Group Size

The most important and most intelligent housing proposals in the last few years have been those determining the "natural"

¹Kate Hevner Mueller, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1961), p. 173.

social grouping which include size and composition within.² This "natural" for many administrators meant small group sizes promoted by smaller facilities within a hall would eventually create larger groups. Harold C. Riker added that "this group is a potent force in shaping [a student's] thought and attitudes--a force often greater than that exerted earlier by his family."³ The small group was what Riker had in mind. However, "the size of the residence hall population should not always determine the size of social gatherings."⁴ Most housing officials would agree that the group should be small enough so as to enable an individual to know the others.⁵

²Harold C. Riker, College Students Live Here (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961), p. 14.

"Berkeley: How Do Students Really Live?" Architectural Forum, July, 1967, p. 94.

³Harold C. Riker, College Students Live Here (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961), p. 14.

⁴Robert M. Strozler, Housing of Students (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950), p. 14.

⁵Ibid., p. 15.

Harold C. Riker, College Students Live Here (New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961), p. 14.

Harold C. Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers (Washington, D.C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1965), p. 12.

Ellen Fairchild, "Current Problems and Programs in Residence Halls," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIV (April, 1961), 146.

"The Sociology of Residence Halls," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XX (January, 1957), 3.

According to informal reports, groups of 6-8 men have proved successful in providing a sense of person security. Women students find somewhat larger groups--20-25--satisfying. Yet the housing staff will often be faced with the practical problem of working with groups of 40-50 students on each floor of a residential building.⁶

At Berkeley it has been learned that each floor becomes a cohesive social group that is difficult to break from and that students from a floor even tend to stay together in a large commons and dining room.⁷ Also it was found that students generally prefer relatively small units.⁸ Dean McHenry added that at Santa Cruz, suites for sixteen to twenty students with a common lounge are being tried.⁹ At University of Washington, McMahon Hall which opened in 1966 contained groupings of eight to ten students. "in small bedrooms clustered around a communal living room"; twelve clusters per floor bring the dorm population to one thousand.¹⁰ In 1960 at Stephens College, a house plan was innovated to bring the living and learning worlds closer together. There the residence hall became the basis for both living and classroom quarters.¹¹ Thus, there are both

⁶Harold C. Riker, College Housing as Learning Centers (Washington, D.C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1965), p. 12.

⁷"Berkeley: How Do Students Really Live?" Architectural Forum, July, 1967, p. 95.

⁸Ibid.

Dean E. McHenry, "Environmental Implications of the Concern for Community," Liberal Education, March, 1967, p. 43.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰["McMahon Hall"], Architectural Forum, March, 1966, p. 63.

¹¹Ralph C. Leyden, "Residence Hall as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association of the U.S., 1966), p. 253.

phases in operation--the small units and the small units within the larger units. Robert M. Strozier has given perhaps the best argument for both sides.

Obviously, the optimum size of the unit varies according to the purposes considered. Large units are in general the most efficient economically, though it is a well-known principle of economics that for every purpose there is a point of diminishing returns beyond which, in residence halls, larger size becomes a liability. In general, large units are highly flexible, since they provide great variety of constituent parts. The larger the size of a living unit, the more people can be found within it who have a given interest.

Small units, on the other hand, provide an intensity of experience which the very variety of large halls precludes. A student may come to know all sorts of people in a large unit, but he will get to know few of them very well--fewer, in fact, than he would if he lived in a small unit. Life in cities is known for its loneliness; neighbors may greet each other on the street or in the hall, but they often do not have any real human contact. So, likewise, life in large dormitories can be very lonely.

. . . there are valid social advantages in residence halls of large size in that the multiplicity of interests in a large number of residents usually brings forth a corresponding multiplicity of activities, which may be a great boon to the lonely student: camera clubs, musical societies, debating groups, orchestras, and other types of recreational and hobby organizations.

Small groups are sometimes criticized just because they encourage the formation of strong relationships which tend to mitigate the larger loyalty which appeals to the alumni office. . . Small groups make it difficult for the non-conformist. . . This disadvantage inherent in a small group may be offset somewhat by provisions for some flexibility in membership.¹²

Regardless of the final decision, housing administrators have been particularly concerned with establishing optimum group sizes but how many times have they considered what size for what purpose?¹³

¹²Robert M. Strozier, Housing of Students (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950), p. 21-22.

¹³"Berkeley: How Do Students Really Live?" Architectural Forum, July, 1967, p. 94.

Atmosphere Within

Closely related to group size has been the aura of attitudes or feelings that any group generates around it. Within the conventional large dormitory an atmosphere not unlike a hotel often existed.¹⁴ This largeness logically pointed toward the high rise buildings. At Florida State University, Miss Edith McCollum stated, "Our biggest problem with the high rise buildings is simply their bigness."¹⁵ When a large group of students lived together under one roof, each student tended to become part of the crowd and felt that no one knew him.¹⁶ Then again a small group tended to establish rigid conformity.¹⁷

Already cited were universities where this problem has been somewhat remedied by creating living-learning programs within the residence halls. In Case Hall at Michigan State

¹⁴ Joseph F. Kauffman, "What Institutional Priorities Should Be Given to Student Support Services?" Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association of the United States, 1965), p. 218.

Edward B. Blackman, "Residence Halls as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association of the United States, 1966), p. 250.

¹⁵ "Dormitories Change with the Changing Times," American School and University, July, 1966, p. 38.

¹⁶ Ibid.

Robert M. Strozier, Housing of Students (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950), p. 15.

"The Sociology of Residence Halls," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XX (January, 1957), 51.

¹⁷ Robert M. Strozier, Housing of Students (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950), p. 22.

University, the program has proved successful. The program "has created some feeling of intimacy by capturing the small-college atmosphere within the framework of a large university . . . this kind of residence hall seems to give him roots. . ."¹⁸ The academic performance of these students was slightly superior to that of those living in conventional dormitories.¹⁹ Otherwise the students tended not to be themselves in the dormitory if it had an air of artificiality and indifference.²⁰ In the future, college administrators must consider the effect that a new residence hall will have on students. Quite possibly the future will create more difficulty for students to have better relations within the hall because the officials will be pressed toward choosing high rise dormitories because of rapid expansion.²¹

¹⁸Edward B. Blackman, "Residence Halls as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment," Current Issues in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association of the United States, 1966), p. 252.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 251.

²⁰Ibid., p. 250.

Paul J. Brouwer, Student Personnel Services in General Education (Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1949), p. 74.

"The Sociology of Residence Halls," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XX (January, 1957), 51.

²¹"Dormitories Change with the Changing Times," American School and University, July, 1966, p. 48.

Interpersonal Relationships

Inherent in any sized group have been the interpersonal relationships. This included, of course, some of the atmospheres these relationships created. In dormitories "the most important contributions to students' development, however, is made by associations with roommates and with other students engaging in varied residence hall activities."²² Here, the students learned the art of living with others through close, personal interaction.²³ In Pennsylvania, Lock Haven

expects its students, through dormitory living to have an opportunity to develop their capacity to adjust to limitations upon freedom through acceptance of the rights of others to have their needs and interests met, . . . to come to an understanding of many types of personalities, and to a knowledge of the types most agreeable to them, . . .²⁴

Through residence hall living, the values of community experience can be realized concerning both sides--students and the staff operating the halls.²⁵ In a study of factors parallel

²²C. Gilbert Wrenn, Student Personnel Work in College (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951), p. 297.

²³Ibid., p. 293.

May A. Brunson, Guidance: An Integrating Process in Higher Education (Columbia Univ., New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1959), p. 123.

Gordon J. Klopf, Leona Wise Felsted and Kent T. Hawley, "Utilizing Group Experiences in the Residence Unit," Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women, XV (March, 1952), 117.

²⁴ Subcommittee of the Committee on Studies and Standards of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Student Personnel Services (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1949), p. 150.

²⁵Klopf, et al., "Group Experiences," 117.

Kolle, Harren, and Draeger, "Higher Education Programs," Review of Educational Research, April, 1966, p. 246.

with changes in value orientations of residents of eight Harvard Houses in 1965. Vreeland and Bidwell discovered

that where both student norms and avowed house goals were either individual-oriented or collectively-oriented, individual-oriented students tended to change or retain values and attitudes in accordance with the orientation of their living environment. In houses where the environmental orientation was divided, with residents being collectively-oriented and house goals being individual-oriented, students tended to change or retain values in accordance with norms of peers. Thus (a) when peers and houses held similar orientations, students tended to change toward or remain in harmony with their residence environment, and (b) when peers and houses held divergent orientations, students tended to change toward or remain in harmony with peers rather than with house goals. The investigators suggested that student norms tended to exert greatest influence on individual students when they lived with close friends and classmates.²⁶

Unfortunately many students live in new halls where interpersonal relations were not considered in the designing of the hall, yet close groups can be created in halls with careful planning.²⁷ These groups can experience relationships of three kinds:

- (1) those which aid in developing skills in human relations.
- (2) those which assist in improving attitudes and patterns of responsible citizenship, and
- (3) those which aid in cultivating interests, skills, and knowledge of use to maturing human beings.²⁸

Another quality that can be added was that of leadership developed through the aid of experience and guidance from professional personnel.

²⁶ Koile, et al., "Higher Education Programs," p. 246.

²⁷ Ellen Fairchild, "Current Problems and Programs in Residence Halls," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIV (April, 1961), 146.

²⁸ Brunson, Guidance, p. 123.

Leadership and Guidance

"As a community structured social phenomenon, the student residence provides an excellent opportunity for training in skills necessary for leadership."²⁹ Through residence living a leader may be any individual who stimulated another and possibly many more.³⁰ However, the influence of an individual may have been socially negative in attitude and behavior and thus may have affected a whole corridor or floor.³¹ The leader may have in the following negative ways affected others to:

- (a) imitate those who seem to know what to do,
- (b) withdraw into a sort of shell, or
- (c) assume an attitude of indifference.³²

The first individual will be all right if student leadership was in the right hands but in the second and third the staff has positive responsibility to help the student rediscover the social practices he needs.³³ Such students needed mature leadership but seniors were not often present to give advice or guidance within a hall environment. The average senior has developed beyond his freshmen self, but his development

²⁹Klopf, et al., "Group Experiences," 117.

³⁰Ibid.

May A. Brunson, Guidance: An Integrating Process in Higher Education (Columbia Univ., New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1959), p. 124.

³¹Brunson, Guidance, p. 124.

³²Subcommittee of the Committee on Studies and Standards of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Student Personnel Services (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1949), p. 150.

³³Ibid.

has slowed down because the challenges offered him are inappropriate and oftentimes nonexistent. These seniors have need for new kinds of challenges. "One example would be a campus Peace Corps in which seniors would help freshmen either by tutoring them or by participating in seminars and discussions that would provide a model of discourse."³⁴

Thus, for any kind of quality leadership to develop there must be administrative policies which encourage creation of a democratic governing body. To achieve this, a number of basic considerations should be debated:

- (1) the student governing group in the living unit must be as closely integrated with the professional staff and the policy-making machinery as possible;
- (2) the student residence governing group must be representative;
- (3) effective government involves as many of the residents of the unit as possible in the governmental structure;
- (4) the student governing body should have the opportunity to deal with policy and major issues which affect all the residents;
- (5) if responsibility is to be fully shared, students need experience in handling finances for their government organization.³⁵

If a successful pattern of democracy is to be developed, it should move outward from small groups to the total dorm and to the community without.

A successful pattern can only be accomplished under effective staff guidance. The counselor within the hall should attempt to see that the group

was a "living" group, so that the students might be active participants in the group process and to some extent share

³⁴ Nevitt Sanford, "College Seniors and Social Responsibility," The Journal of the National Education Association, LVII (February, 1968), 52.

³⁵ Klopf, et al., "Group Experiences," 118-119.

each other's living, rather than be a number of individuals each rigidly maintaining his own individuality and never really becoming members of a group.³⁶

The residents themselves will determine whether and where they will go for help.

"Information about the actual impact of the resources for assistance on the student population can be obtained by finding out how the attitudes of students change during the early college years."³⁷ A follow up study of the same students of Cole and Iveys' survey was made by Donk and Oetting in 1967. It revealed that there was significant increase in students' perceptions of the head resident as an appropriate source of help in academic counseling. At the same time there was a decrease in the number of students indicating that they would turn to the student assistant for help. Donk and Oetting gave the following interpretations explaining the decrease:

this may be a function of the multiple roles that these advisors are now called on to play. They are expected to maintain order and discipline on the floor, establish personal relationships with their students and counsel them in both academic and personal problems, report to the head resident infractions of rules and regulations, and report improper behavior or behavior suggesting emotional disturbance to the dean's office. A simpler set of roles, perhaps a single function relating to assistance with academic endeavors, might be both more effective and more in keeping with the primary goals of the university. Floor discipline and order, as it is related to creating an atmosphere conducive to study, would be entirely consistent with this function. It is possible, in fact, that students would perceive the assistant more favorably as source of assistance even for personal problems under these conditions.³⁸

³⁶Dugald S. Arbuckle, Student Personnel Services in Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Books Co., Inc., 1953), p. 218.

³⁷L.J. Donk and E.R. Oetting, "Change in College Student Attitudes Toward Sources of Assistance for Problems," The Journal of College Student Personnel, VIII (September, 1967), 315.

³⁸Ibid., p. 316.

The conclusion reached by Donk and Getting was that there seemed to be a shift of resident attitude away from the personnel services offered by the university.³⁹

Summary

Efficiency still seemed to be of prime importance in organizing residence hall programs, and efficiency will be even more prevalent in the future because of the tremendous growth of the universities. Generally housing officials believed dormitory facilities should be constructed for a large number of occupants. Dissimilarities appeared only on the number within a living unit that would cooperate and interact effectively among themselves. Such groups could be in separate living units within a large structure or be on whole floor units.

What can be concluded from these sources other than that there should be much more research not opinion in these areas of residence halls sociology. A few of the sources consulted revealed the same conclusion of there not being enough research in most of these areas. Hopefully, the following will be a beginning in the alleviation of the shortage of research evidence.

³⁹Ibid., p. 317.

CHAPTER III

THE SURVEY AND ITS RESULTS

First of all, how could the attitudes of a female population within a given dorm be effectively measured? Such a task could be better done in a long range project but was not feasible at the moment. Thus, a survey of definite positive or negative statements seemed to be the best solution. The two dormitories chosen for the survey were Andrews and Weller where there was a sizable difference in dorm populations. At the time of the survey there were 152 individuals living in Weller Hall and 467 individuals in Andrews. The main reason for choosing these two was that these were the only dorms of this comparable size in which the staff was not completely new. The two dormitories appeared to be the most stable in atmosphere and organization. Hopefully, the individuals therein would be freer to express how they really felt toward their surroundings.

Secondly, the survey had to be constructed very simply. In it would be positive or negative statements concerning social activities and group size, dorm atmosphere, interpersonal relations, and leadership and guidance. Scholarship was not included, since the facts of grades or achievement would not be comparable to opinion. ^O Opinion would be the

immediate impulsive responses of individuals after their reading of the statements of which there were twenty-five. The survey in the appendix shows that a few of the statements begin exactly alike. This device was intended to have been a good way to check the individual's actual reading of the survey.

The other article included in the survey was a mark-sense card on which the individual would mark her responses. For each statement she had five choices which were the following: definitely in favor, definitely opposed, mildly in favor, mildly opposed, and indifferent. To identify the dorm in which she was living, she would merely mark A or B in response to statement number one which said "I live in" The same was done to identify the class she was in. One space or bubble was all she needed to mark for each statement making a total of twenty-seven marks on her card. She did not have to sign her name on the card.

To distribute the survey to the dorms, the resident assistants took the responsibility of informing the residents of the purpose of the survey. The resident assistant then distributed the survey to the individuals on her floor or corridor. She collected the mark sense cards within a few days.

For the two dormitories, 117 out of 152 responded from Weller Hall making a seventy-seven per cent return. Three hundred and sixty-three out of 467 responded from Andrews Hall making a seventy-eight per cent return. Thus the total number

of responses from both dorms was 480 out of 619 surveys distributed. The total percentage return was 77.5. For class return from Weller, fifty-eight freshmen, twenty-six sophomores, twenty-three juniors, and ten seniors responded. From Andrews, 168 freshmen, ninety-six sophomores, seventy-five juniors, and twenty-four seniors responded.

Instead of describing all statements and their results in a long description, each statement and results will be discussed separately. Preceding each discussion is a table of results for that statement. In the following twenty-five tables are the rank correlation relationships between the dormitory classes and between the total dorm responses. These correlations indicate the similarity or difference between the dorm or class responses. Thus, for ~~example~~, if the correlation is plus .90 then the responses from both dorms were quite similar. At the other extreme, a minus .35 indicated a dissimilarity in responses between the two dorms.

TABLE 1.--Everyone should totally participate in social activities in the dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Cor- relation	.90		.90		.725		.925		.70	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	4	4	3	4	3	4.5	4	5	3
Definitely opposed	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2
Mildly in favor	1	1	1	1	2.5	2	2	2	1	1
Mildly opposed	3	3	3	4	2.5	4.5	3	4	3	4
Indiffer- ent	4	5	5	5	5	4.5	4.5	4	4	5

Notes:

Throughout the tables A stands for Andrews and W stands for Weller. Beneath each dormitory abbreviation are the numerical rank orders of the responses.

The results of this statement--everyone should totally participate in social activities in the dorm--indicated that there was a relatively high similarity between the two dorm classes' opinions. The freshmen and sophomores from both dorms were generally mildly in favor of the statement. The juniors and seniors of these dorms felt more strongly opposed since "definitely opposed" was ranked number one all the way across the table.

Andrews residents were more distinctly in opposition to the proposal than they were in favor of it. Their ranks one and two were in the same position as those of Weller. However, Weller was almost equally in favor and in opposition to the proposal.

TABLE 2.--One should prefer dorm activities to floor activities.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
Rank Cor- relation	.875		.675		.375		-.25		.90	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	5
Definitely opposed	3.5	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4
Mildly in favor	3.5	3	3	1.5	2	2.5	1.5	2	3	3
Mildly opposed	1	2	1	3	4	1	1.5	4	1	2
Indiffer- ent	2	1	2	1.5	1	2.5	4	4	2	1

Rank correlation for this statement decreased from freshmen to seniors. There was general agreement among the freshmen of both dorms that one should not prefer dorm activities to floor activities. The Andrews' freshmen were more definite in their opposition to the proposition than the Weller freshmen who were more or less indifferent or almost equally divided among the favor, opposition or indifferent stands. The sophomores' responses were more or less similar except in the last three categories where Andrews' sophomores were more mildly opposed than Weller sophomores who were equally mildly in favor or indifferent to the statement. The junior and senior responses were even less alike.

In this case both dorms seemed somewhat indifferent to this proposal. The only variation was that Andrews' first choice was in mild opposition whereas Wellers' was indifferent.

TABLE 3.--One should prefer floor activities to dorm activities.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.775		.30		1.00		.70		.60	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	3	4	3	4	5	5	4	5	4	5
Definitely opposed	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	5	4
Mildly in favor	1	2.5	1	3	2	2	2	3	1	3
Mildly opposed	4	2.5	4	1	3	3	1	1	3	2
Indifferent	2	1	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	1

The juniors of both dorms agreed on this statement--one should prefer floor activities to dorm activities--at least in ranking their responses. Both groups chose the stand "indifferent" as first choice. The freshmen and seniors' correlations were somewhat similar though their ranked responses were not. All were generally "mildly opposed" to the proposition except for the responses from the Andrews' freshmen and sophomores. The Andrews' sophomores seemed to be more in favor of the proposition than the Weller sophomores who were mainly opposed or indifferent.

In contrast to previous statement Andrews residents' first choice was mild preference whereas Weller's first choice was again "indifferent" followed closely by mild opposition. There was more variation between the rank choices of the dorms.

TABLE 4.--The social activities of your dorm should be made more adequate in quality.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	1.00		.575		1.00		.90		1.00	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1
Definitely opposed	4	4	5	3.5	5	5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Mildly in favor	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
Mildly opposed	5	5	4	3.5	4	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Indifferent	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	3

Most residents favored the idea that social activities should be made more adequate in quality. The opposition to this was quite meager from either dorm, ranging from zero per cent to eight per cent. Weller's sophomores and seniors responded less favorable than the other classes in preference that the activities of their dorm should be more adequate in quality. Weller's sophomores and seniors agreed on the first two choices; Andrews' sophomores and seniors agreed on the first two choices but they were the opposite of Weller's. The freshmen from both dorms agreed on the first two choices; likewise, the juniors of both dorms agreed on the first two choices.

There is no doubt about the consensus of beliefs on this point. Both dorms definitely felt that their social activities should be improved. Both preference choices received the first two ranks.

TABLE 5.--The social activities of your dorm should be made more adequate in quantity.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
Rank Cor- relation	1.00		.50		.875		.95		.975	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	1	1	1	1	1	2	2.5	2	1	1
Definitely opposed	4	4	4.5	4	5	4.5	5	4.5	5	4.5
Mildly in favor	2	2	2.5	2	2	1	1	1	2	2
Mildly opposed	5	5	4.5	3	4	4.5	4	4.5	4	4.5
Indiffer- ent	3	3	2.5	5	3	3	2.5	3	3	3

At least in response to social activities being made more adequate in quantity, both dorms were consistent. Not only do they believe that social activities should be made more adequate in quality but there should be more social activities. The more positive stand lessened however from Weller juniors and seniors and Andrews seniors. The category of "indifferent" took the third rank for all the classes from both dorms, except the Weller sophomores who ranked "indifferent" as number five. These last two statements concerned the social activities already present in the dorms.

There was almost complete agreement here between the two dorms--agreement in that the number of social activities should be increased.

TABLE 6.--A better social program of another dorm should be adapted for your own dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Correlation	.675		.60		.525		.075		.60	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	4	2.5	2	4	4	3	2.5	2.5	2	4
Definitely opposed	2	4	3	3	3	2	2.5	4.5	3	3
Mildly in favor	3	2.5	4	2	2	4.5	4.5	1	4	2
Mildly opposed	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5	5
Indifferent	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2.5	1	1

In contrast to the dorms' stand on the previous two statements in which they favored more adequate social programs, the response to the idea that a better social program of another dorm should be adapted for their own dorm was overwhelmingly that of "indifferent". The Weller seniors were the only ones who indicated favor by ranking "mildly in favor" as number one. Weller's freshmen and sophomores rated "mildly in favor" as number two as Andrews' juniors ranked "mildly in favor" as number two.

Here the first choice of both dorms was "indifferent". Andrews, however, seemed to be more definitely favorable than Weller on the proposal since Andrews' second choice was "definitely in favor" and Weller's second choice was "mildly in favor".

TABLE 7.—Your present residence hall should be made your permanent college quarters.

Classes	Pr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
Rank Cor- relation	.80		.40		.125		.775		.50	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	3	2	3	2	4.5	2.5	3.5	2	3	2
Definitely opposed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mildly in favor	5	4	4.5	3.5	4.5	2.5	5	5	5	3
Mildly opposed	2	3	2	5	2	4.5	2	3.5	2	4
Indiffer- ent	4	5	4.5	3.5	3	4.5	3.5	3.5	4	5

The response from both dorms to the idea that their present hall should be made permanent college quarters was "definitely opposed" all the way across the table. The Weller residents, however, ranked "definitely in favor" number two; for Andrews the stand was ranked between three and four. "Mildly opposed" took the second rank from all the Andrews' classes whereas Weller's ranged from three to five in rank.

The first choice was "definitely opposed" from both dorms. Choice number two remained in the opposition for Andrews. Choice number two for Weller was "definitely in favor". Consequently there were more favorable responses from Weller than there were from Andrews.

TABLE 8.--The atmosphere of your dorm should be changed.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.225		.375		.725		.50		.90	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	2	4	1.5	2	3	1	3	3	2
Definitely opposed	1	1	2	1.5	3	1.5	4	3	1	1
Mildly in favor	2	3.5	1	3	1	1.5	3	1	2	3
Mildly opposed	4	3.5	3	4	5	4	2	3	4	4
Indifferent	3	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5

Here it appeared that the freshmen from either dorm were "definitely opposed" to changing the atmosphere of their dorm. By the second year, sophomores were almost equally divided between changing and not changing the atmosphere. The same applied to the juniors of both dorms and the seniors of Andrews. Weller's seniors ranked "mildly in favor" as number one as did the Andrews' sophomores and Andrews' juniors. The category of "indifferent" took the lowest two ranks from all the classes except the response from the freshmen of Andrews which was ranked number three.

Both dorms chose "definitely opposed" as their first selection. The positions of second and third were reversed. Fourth and fifth choices were in the same categories for both.

TABLE 9.—Dorm facilities, number of acquaintances, or dorm size should be a reason for dorm preference.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Correlation	1.00		.70		.875		.925		.90	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Definitely opposed	5	5	4.5	3.5	3.5	4	3	4	5	5
Mildly in favor	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mildly opposed	4	4	4.5	3.5	5	4	4.5	4	3	4
Indifferent	3	3	3	5	3.5	4	4.5	4	4	3

All the classes of both dorms agreed that dorm facilities, number of acquaintances, or dorm size should be a reason for dorm preference. Both categories of preference took the first two ranks. There was no variation at all between the choices of the freshmen, and only slight variation between the choices of the seniors. Sophomores were the only ones who offered any variation of opinion but even theirs revealed not too much difference.

For both dorms the fifth choice was in the same category but choices three and four were reversed. Whether dorm facilities, number of acquaintances, or dorm size was the main reason for favoring this statement can not be definitely known unless some indications from other statements in this survey suggest the answer.

TABLE 10.--Your dorm should make residents more independent.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Cor- relation	.675		.90		.825		.525		.90	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Definitely opposed	5	3.5	4	4	4	3.5	3.5	2.5	5	4
Mildly in favor	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	4.5	2	2
Mildly opposed	4	3.5	5	5	5	5	3.5	2.5	4	5
Indiffer- ent	3	5	2	3	2	3.5	5	4.5	3	3

Both dorms agreed that their hall should make residents more independent. There were more Weller individuals who ranked "mildly in favor" number two than those of Andrews. Andrews' sophomores and juniors second choice was that of "indifferent". For all the classes except Weller's seniors, the categories of opposition received the lowest ranks. The one class that had more variation of opinion were the seniors.

Both dorms agreed as the first, second choices indicate. A number responded indifferently as it was the third choice for both dorms. Fourth and fifth choices were reversed.

TABLE 11.—The attitude of the majority in your dorm should be improved.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.575		.90		.725		.80		.925	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	3	4	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2
Definitely opposed	4	1.5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	3
Mildly in favor	1	1.5	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Mildly opposed	5	5	4	3	5	4.5	4	4	5	4.5
Indifferent	2	3	3	4	3	4.5	3	4	3	4.5

The freshmen of both dorms believed more differently than the other classes on the idea that the attitude of the majority in their dorm should be improved. The upperclassmen's responses revealed a more definite stand that the attitude should be improved. Of the latter three classes, it appeared that Andrews' residents were a bit more "indifferent" than the Weller residents in relation to this one statement.

Apparently most of the residents felt that the attitude of the majority should be improved as preference categories received first and second choices. The third choice represented a more distinct variation between the two dorms as Weller's was definitely opposed and Andrews' were indifferent.

TABLE 12.—The size of your dorm should affect the general attitude within your dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.50		.675		.50		.825		.675	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	4	2	3	2	3	1	3	2	3	1
Definitely opposed	2	1	1	3	1	2	1.5	2	1.5	2
Mildly in favor	1	3	2	1	4	3	1.5	2	1.5	3
Mildly opposed	5	5	4.5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5
Indifferent	3	4	4.5	5	2	4	5	4	4	4

The two choices of favor for size of a dorm affecting the general attitude within the dorm and the two choices of opposition each in a combined state seemed to indicate that Weller's sophomores, juniors, and seniors were more inclined to believe that the size of their hall should affect attitudes within than it did not. Likewise, Andrews' sophomores, juniors, and seniors responded similarly. The Weller freshmen responded more strongly than the Andrews freshmen on the first two choices. The same was true of the Weller juniors in comparison to Andrews' juniors.

Apparently the Weller residents definitely felt that size should affect the attitude within their dorm. Andrews were equally divided between "mildly in favor" and "definitely opposed". Choices four, five were in the same categories for both dorms.

TABLE 13.—One should help individuals within your dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Cor- relation	.775		.925		.975		.825		.825	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitel in favor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Definitel opposed	3.5	3.5	4	3	4	4.5	4	4	4	3
Mildly in favor	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.5	2	2	2
Mildly opposed	5	3.5	5	4.5	5	4.5	5	4	5	4.5
Indiffer- ent	3.5	5	3	4.5	3	3	2.5	4	3	4.5

No one can dispute the one response of "definitely in favor" that one should help individuals within a dorm. Freshmen provided the greatest variation of opinion in comparison to the other classes whose similarity of responses were very close. Over half to ninety per cent believed that one should help another in her respective dorm. However, there were more Andrews residents who responded in the "indifferent" category especially the seniors. Only one individual from Weller marked the category of "indifferent".

General agreement here that one should help another in the dorm. Both first and second choices were in the same category for the dorms.

TABLE 14.--One should know a number of individuals before she moves into a dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Correlation	.40		.825		.675		.90		.70	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	5	5
Definitely opposed	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
Mildly in favor	4	3	3	2	3	3.5	1	1	4	3
Mildly opposed	3	2	4	3.5	4	2	3.5	4.5	3	2
Indifferent	1	4	2	3.5	2	3.5	3.5	3	2	4

The class correlations in themselves have provided variation of opinion considering one knowing a number of individuals before moving into a dorm. Freshmen of both dorms offered more difference of opinion; those from Andrews chose "indifferent" first and those of Weller chose "definitely opposed" as first. The sophomores and juniors agreed in the choice of number one as being "definitely opposed". In contrast to the other classes, the seniors of both dorms chose "mildly in favor" as number one.

Totally, first choice for both dorms was "definitely opposed". The only other similarity between the two dorms' ranks was in the category of "definitely in favor". Second choice for Andrews was "indifferent" while second for Weller was "mildly opposed". Third and fourth were reverse variations.

TABLE 15.--One should be acquainted with all individuals on her floor.

Classes	Pr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Correlation	.70		.575		.925		.90		.825	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Definitely opposed	5	4	5	3	5	4.5	3	4.5	5	4.5
Mildly in favor	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mildly opposed	4	3	4	4.5	3.5	4.5	3.5	4.5	4	3
Indifferent	3	5	3	4.5	3.5	3	3.5	3	3	4.5

All the classes agreed on the first choices concerning the idea that one should be acquainted with all individuals on her floor. They also agreed on the second choices. There were more classes of Andrews who ranked "indifferent" as number three choices than those of Weller. Sophomores of Weller chose "definitely opposed" third in comparison to the lower ranks of the other classes.

Both dorms agreed on first and second choices of preference. Third was "indifferent" for Andrews and "mildly opposed" for Weller. Opposition took the last two choices for Andrews while Weller's last two were evenly divided between "definitely opposed" and "indifferent".

TABLE 16.--One should be acquainted with all individuals in her dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Correlation	-.35		-.10		.325		.225		-.125	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	4	5	2	5	4.5	5	3.5	5	3.5
Definitely opposed	1	5	2	4	2	4.5	2	5	1	5
Mildly in favor	4	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	3	1
Mildly opposed	2	2.5	1	3	1	2	4	2	2	2
Indifferent	3	2.5	4	5	4	3	3	3.5	4	3.5

All the classes distinctly separated concerning the statement that one should be acquainted with all individuals in her dorm. The freshmen proved to have more variations of opinion; however, the other classes also provided several differences of opinion. All the Weller classes chose "mildly in favor" first while those of Andrews chose the same category either third or fourth. Seniors of Andrews were the only ones who chose "mildly in favor" first.

Totally, the only similarity was second choice for "mildly opposed". First choice for Andrews was "Definitely opposed" while Weller's was "mildly in favor". "Mildly in favor" took third for Andrews as Weller's third was evenly divided between "definitely in favor" and "indifferent".

TABLE 17.--One should constantly talk to another resident in preference to her roommate.

Classes	Pr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Rank Cor- relation	.825		.90		.80		.90		1.00	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	4.5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4.5	5	5
Definitely opposed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mildly in favor	4.5	3	4	4	4	5	3.5	4.5	4	4
Mildly opposed	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2
Indiffer- ent	3	4	3	4	3	2	3.5	3	3	3

All classes agreed on choice number one of "definitely opposed" for one constantly talking to another resident in preference to her roommate. General agreement was also present on choice number two except the juniors of Weller who chose "mildly opposed" third. The classes of Andrews rated "indifferent" more highly than those of Weller except the Weller juniors who rated it second.

Both dorms agreed on first and second choices of opposition. Likewise both dorms agreed on the ranking of the other three choices. Thus both dorms opposed the idea that one should constantly talk to another resident in preference to her roommate.

TABLE 18.--An individual's problems should be referred to someone other than a resident assistant.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.80		.90		.475		.425		.875	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	5	5	5	4	4.5	3	5	4	5
Definitely opposed	4	4	4	4	5	2	4.5	4	5	4
Mildly in favor	3	3	3	3	3	4.5	2	1	2.5	3
Mildly opposed	2	1	2	1	2	3	4.5	2.5	2.5	2
Indifferent	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2.5	1	1

Generally all the classes were "indifferent" to an individual's problems being referred to someone other than a resident assistant. Andrews' classes were more strongly "indifferent" than those of Weller as most of them chose "indifferent" first. The freshmen and sophomores from both dorms seemed more content and "indifferent" with resident assistants. The seniors from both dorms ranked "mildly in favor" first. The juniors of Weller ranked "definitely opposed" second while Andrews' juniors ranked it fifth.

Weller's choices followed a one to five order with "indifferent" being first. Andrews was much in the same order except choices four and five were reversed from Weller's.

TABLE 19.--An individual should acquaint herself with individuals who have personalities which contrast with her own.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	1.00		1.00		.675		.825		.975	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2
Definitely opposed	5	5	5	5	5	3	4.5	3.5	5	4.5
Mildly in favor	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1
Mildly opposed	4	4	4	4	4	4.5	4.5	5	4	4.5
Indifferent	3	3	3	3	3	4.5	3	3.5	3	3

Generally all the classes agreed that an individual should acquaint herself with individuals who have personalities which contrast with her own. The freshmen and sophomores were in close agreement as their first two choices indicated. For the juniors the first two ranks were the opposite of the freshmen's and sophomores' to indicate that the juniors more definitely preferred this idea. Andrews seniors' preference slipped back to that of the freshmen and sophomores while the Weller seniors maintained their definite preference.

Both dorms were in very close agreement as their rank of choices were almost the same. Both chose "mildly" and "definitely in favor" as first two choices.

TABLE 20.—An individual should have only acquaintances with personalities very similar to her own.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
Rank Cor- relation	.975		.975		.975		.425		1.00	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	4.5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	5	5
Definitely opposed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mildly in favor	4	4.5	4	3.5	4	3.5	4	2	4	4
Mildly opposed	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4.5	2	2
Indiffer- ent	3	3	3	3	3	3.5	3	3	3	3

All of the classes except the seniors closely agreed on the choices concerning an individual having only acquaintances with personalities very similar to her own. Freshmen, sophomores, and juniors of both dorms agreed on the first two choices of opposing the idea. Weller's seniors agreed with the other classes on the first choice but on the second, they chose "mildly in favor" in contrast to the others' choice of "mildly opposed". "Indifferent" took the third choice for all classes.

Both dorms were in agreement as to the ranking of choices. "Definitely opposed" and "mildly opposed" were the first two choices.

TABLE 21.--The number of acquaintances should make one more secure.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.875		.175		.125		.10		.50	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	1	2	1	3	1.5	3.5	4	2	1	2
Definitely opposed	5	5	3	4.5	1.5	1.5	2	5	3	5
Mildly in favor	2	1	2	1	3	3.5	1	2	2	1
Mildly opposed	4	3.5	5	2	4	5	4	2	5	3
Indifferent	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	1.5	4	4	4	4

Freshmen, sophomores, and juniors of Andrews more definitely prefer the idea that the number of acquaintances should make one more secure. Residents of Weller chose "mildly in favor" as their highest preference. In contrast the juniors of Weller were equally divided between "definitely opposed" and "indifferent". Likewise, there were more seniors of Andrews that "definitely opposed" the idea than there were Weller seniors who were not "definitely opposed" but "mildly opposed" to the idea.

Andrews residents were more "definitely in favor" of the idea whereas Weller's were "mildly in favor". The third choice was in the opposition category for both dorms but it was "definitely opposed" from Andrews and "mildly opposed" from Weller.

TABLE 22.--Individuals should take the initiative in making new comers welcome in your dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Cor- relation	
Rank Cor- relation	.675		.90		.90		.925		.70	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Definitely opposed	4	4.5	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	5
Mildly in favor	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mildly opposed	5	3	4	4	5	4	4.5	4	5	3
Indiffer- ent	3	4.5	3	4	3	4	4.5	4	3	4

All of the classes agreed on the selection of the first two choices concerning individuals taking the initiative in making new comers welcome in her dorm. They chose "definitely in favor" first and "mildly in favor" second. The third selection presented an interesting picture in that the freshmen of Weller and the seniors of Andrews chose opposition categories in contrast to the preference choice of the others. Freshmen of Weller chose "mildly opposed" and the seniors of Andrews chose "definitely opposed".

Both dorms agreed on the first and second choices. The third choice was "indifferent" for Andrews and was "mildly opposed" for Weller. Fourth and fifth choices were more or less reversed for the dorms.

TABLE 23.—Only upperclassmen should assume leadership within your dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.975		1.00		1.00		.525		1.00	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	5	4.5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
Definitely opposed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mildly in favor	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4.5	3	3
Mildly opposed	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
Indifferent	4	4.5	5	5	5	5	5	4.5	5	5

All classes agreed on the first choice of "definitely opposed" that only upperclassmen should assume leadership within their dorm. Second choice of "mildly opposed" was selected by all the classes except seniors of Andrews who chose "mildly in favor" second. The only selection that the seniors agreed was that of "definitely opposed". Seniors of Weller chose "definitely in favor" third while those of Andrews chose "definitely in favor" fourth.

Both dorms were in total agreement on the all the choices concerning the idea of leadership. First and second choices were in the opposition category. Third and fourth choices were in the preference category.

TABLE 24.—An individual's problems should be referred to someone other than a dorm counselor within your dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.80		.50		.675		.475		.70	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5
Definitely opposed	5	3.5	4	3	4	2.5	3	4	4	3
Mildly in favor	2	1.5	3	1	3	2.5	1.5	1	3	2
Mildly opposed	3	3.5	1	3	2	4	5	2.5	2	4
Indifferent	1	1.5	2	3	1	1	1.5	2.5	1	1

The only class that agreed on first choice was the juniors' selection of "indifferent" concerning an individual's problems being referred to someone other than a dorm counselor within a dorm. Generally "indifferent" received fairly high ranks from all the classes. "Mildly in favor" was the first choice for the classes of sophomores and seniors of Weller. The only class that opposed the idea was sophomores of Andrews who chose "mildly opposed" first.

First choice for both dorms was "indifferent". Choice number two for Andrews was "mildly opposed" while it was "mildly in favor" for Weller. Number three was "mildly in favor" for Andrews and was "definitely opposed" for Weller. The only other choice that both dorms agreed was that of "definitely in favor" which was number five.

TABLE 25.--An individual should not extend her social circle beyond her dorm.

Classes	Fr.		So.		Jr.		Sr.		Total Dorm Correlation	
Rank Correlation	.575		.50		.325		.975		.70	
Choices	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W	A	W
Definitely in favor	4.5	2.5	3.5	3	5	2	4.5	4.5	5	3
Definitely opposed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mildly in favor	3	5	5	4.5	3.5	4	4.5	4.5	4	5
Mildly opposed	2	2.5	3.5	2	2	4	3	2.5	2	2
Indifferent	4.5	4	2	4.5	3.5	4	2	2.5	3	4

All classes agreed on choice number one "definitely opposed" that an individual should not extend her social circle beyond her dorm. Juniors of Weller, however, chose "definitely in favor" second in contrast to most of the other classes who selected "mildly opposed" second. Freshmen of Weller were also ranking "definitely in favor" close to second, and also "mildly opposed".

First two choices were the same for both dorms. They were "definitely opposed" first and "mildly opposed", second. "Indifferent" took third for Andrews and "definitely in favor" for Weller. Fourth and fifth choices were in different categories.

On the whole the responses from residents of both halls were quite adequate and perhaps very truthful. The response was not one hundred per cent but those that did respond should be representative of both halls and possibly of the total residence hall environment. In some instances the residents contradicted themselves especially concerning their desire to want a better social program but their indifference to adapt a better social program of another hall.

Thus these were the results of the survey such as they were. Comparison upon comparison could be drawn from these statements and their results but the ones concluded here should be adequate. In the following chapter, some of the results are discussed and recommendations are made accordingly that may just possibly rectify any weaknesses in the residence hall program.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey indicated that many residents were apathetic toward participating in their hall activities, to actually do something to rectify any hall weaknesses in social programs, to refer an individual to someone other than a resident assistant or dorm counselor. Perhaps if residents did have the idea that their dorm community was unique, they would participate more fully in dorm activities. Both halls chose "definitely opposed" second not last in consideration of everyone having to participate in dorm activities. Though both halls wanted better social programs, they were "indifferent" to any suggestion of adapting a better social program. As well as being "indifferent" to improvement of social programs, residents of both halls opposed living in their hall permanently. To improve relations within, more individual participants should then be encouraged in group endeavors, whether within the hall or without. Proof of something needed to be done was the halls' response that the attitude of the majority in their halls should be improved. The residents of the smaller hall more definitely believed that the size of their hall affected the general attitude. If ways could be found to promote harmony of residents' attitudes, then, the unified hall could

take an active role in the campus community. This may be done through competent leadership which is well accepted by the inhabitants.

A not too shocking difference developed between the halls' responses to the idea of knowing all individuals within the hall. The smaller hall of 150 residents believed that one should be acquainted with all individuals in that hall. The larger hall was definitely against any such notion that residents within her hall should know all others. Both halls, however, did believe that one should know all others on her floor. All this can attributed to the success or failure of a residence staff's task of creating cohesive well-being.

This survey also revealed the apathetic attitude of upperclassmen, particularly seniors, toward consulting a resident assistant or dorm director. Upperclassmen have the choice of moving from the dorm, but something should be done to make resident living more attractive to upperclassmen so they will take their role in providing mature ideas. Perhaps it might even be feasible if the seniors within the hall were made unofficial advisors and counselors so they could feel that they were vital segments of the hall community. True, resident assistants provided these services, but couldn't they be upperclassmen also?

Also, something should be done to establish a feeling of permanency within the hall, as can be judged from the responses to the statement that the residence hall should be

made permanent college quarters. Academic quarter terms have been short and oftentimes have led to the "visait" complex of living in the dorm. Residents have been living in their dorm from quarter to quarter, so to speak. Their knowledge and conviction of this belief has not enhanced their willingness to participate in activities of any kind within the hall. If anything, it has hampered it. Within a small hall, the object of learning to know everyone has been a relatively simple task, and thus has enabled some sense of permanency to exist. However, in a large dorm, it has been more difficult to know every resident and thus almost impossible to establish any sense of permanency. Unless the length of dorm assignments are changed, the residents will not react as if they were in living quarters but as if they were in temporary hotel quarters. To rectify the lack of permanency perhaps the system of quarter terms should be changed.

Strangely, no matter what size of residence hall, the occupants therein believed that the number of acquaintances should make one more secure. Again evidence of something that needed to be done can be traced to the larger hall's belief that one's number of acquaintances should make her feel more secure. Those in the smaller hall responded more nearly the same way. Some of the upperclassmen of both dorms may have become more secure because they had been on campus long enough to realize that merely knowing a larger number of people was not enough. Perhaps if the other upperclassmen

did not have this attitude of security in numbers, the freshmen may not be so dependent on others. Again, the best thing that may be done here is the extended service of an experienced staff and competent student leaders who know what to provide for individuals who need the fellowship of others.

These have been recommendations. It has remained for the observer to decide whether or not it will be necessary to make changes and improvements. Anything that has existed on a campus can not or can be worsened by changes or improvements. Ultimately something of lasting permanence will occur through the endurance of time and experience. This has been but a new area in the university environment; time can not help but be an excellent advocate for the enriching variety that resident life can contribute to the total university.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Arbuckle, Dugald S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1953.
- Brouwer, Paul J. Student Personnel Services in General Education. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1949.
- Brunson, May A. Guidance: An Integrating Process in Higher Education. Columbia Univ., New York: Bureau of Publications. Teachers College, 1959.
- Mueller, Kate Hsvner. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1961.
- Riker, Harold C. College Housing as Learning Centers. Washington, D.C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1965.
- Riker, Harold C. College Students Live Here. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961.
- Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951.

Magazines

- "Berkeley: How Do Students Really Live?" Architectural Forum, July, 1967, pp. 90-7.
- Donk, L. J. and E. R. Oetting. "Change in College Students Attitudes Toward Sources of Assistance for Problems." The Journal of College Student Personnel, VIII (Sept., 1967), 315-17.
- [Ed.] "Dormitories Change with the Changing Times." American School and University, July, 1966, pp. 38-39 ff.
- Fairchild, Ellen. "Current Problems and Programs in Residence Halls." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIV (April, 1961), 146 ff.

- Klopf, Gordon J., Leona Wise Felsted and Kent T. Hawley, "Utilizing Group Experiences in the Residence Unit." Journal of the National Association of Deans of Women, XV (March, 1952), 115-20.
- Kolla, Harren and Draeger. "Higher Education Programs." Review of Educational Research, April, 1966, pp. 246 ff.
- ["McMahon Hall"]. Architectural Forum, March, 1966, pp. 62-7.
- McHenry, Dean E. "Environmental Implications of the Concern for Community." Liberal Education, March, 1967, pp. 41-47.
- Sanford, Nevitt. "College Seniors and Social Responsibility." The Journal of the National Education Association, LVII (February, 1968), 52-3.
- "The Sociology of Residence Halls." Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XX (January, 1957), 51-7.

Published Reports

- Housing of Students. Robert M. Srozier, Chairman. American Council on Education Study, Series VI. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950.
- Subcommittee of the Committee on Studies and Standards of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Student Personnel Services. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1949.

Yearbooks

- Kauffman, Joseph F. "What Institutional Priorities Should Be Given to Student Support Services?" Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association of the United States, 1965.
- Blackman, Edward B. "Residence Halls as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association of the United States, 1966.
- Leyden, Ralph C. "Residence Halls as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association of the United States, 1966.

APPENDIX

Sample mark sense card
used in survey

A Study

This is a master's study of the attitudes of girls in your dorm and of another dorm on campus. Hopefully, you will cooperate as your answers may set precedents for organization of residence halls. All that is required is fifteen minutes of your time in reading the statements and marking the reaction on the accompanying card. You need not affix your name on the card. USE A PENCIL ONLY IN MARKING THE CARD.

Mark the appropriate spaces on the card.

1. I live in: A) Andrews
 B) Weller
2. I am a: A) Freshman
 B) Sophomore
 C) Junior
 D) Senior

Read the following statements and mark the appropriate box on the answer card. A stands for definitely in favor; B stands for definitely opposed; C stands for mildly in favor; D stands for mildly opposed; and E stands for indifferent. Each statement has the SAME choice of answers.

3. Everyone should totally participate in social activities in the dorm.
4. One should prefer dorm activities to floor activities.
5. One should prefer floor activities to dorm activities.
6. The social activities of your dorm should be made more adequate in quality.
7. The social activities of your dorm should be made more adequate in quantity.
8. A better social program of another dorm should be adapted for your own dorm.
9. Your present residence hall should be made your permanent college quarters.
10. The atmosphere of your dorm should be changed.
11. Dorm facilities, number of acquaintances, or dorm size should be a reason for dorm preference.
12. Your dorm should make residents more independent.
13. The attitude of the majority in your dorm should be improved.
14. The size of your dorm should affect the general attitude within your dorm.
15. One should help individuals within your dorm.
16. One should know a number of individuals before she moves into a dorm.
17. One should be acquainted with all individuals on her floor.
18. One should be acquainted with all individuals in her dorm.
19. One should constantly talk to another resident in preference to her roommate.
20. An individual's problems should be referred to someone other than a resident assistant.
21. An individual should acquaint herself with individuals who have personalities with contrast with her own.
22. An individual should have only acquaintances with personalities very similar to her own.
23. The number of acquaintances should make one more secure.
24. Individuals should take the initiative in making new comers welcome to your dorm.
25. Only upperclassmen should assume leadership within your dorm.
26. An individual's problems should be referred to someone other than a dorm counselor within your dorm.
27. An individual should not extend her social circle beyond her dorm.