

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD RESIDENCE  
HALL PROGRAMMING AT THE  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE

by

Deborah K. Kirkeide

A Seminar Paper

Presented To

The Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Wisconsin - La Crosse

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Master of Science

University of Wisconsin - La Crosse

La Crosse, Wisconsin

August, 1978

3 1348 00833764

W3  
78  
Kin.  
C.2

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - LA CROSSE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Candidate: DEBORAH K. KIRKEIDE

I recommend acceptance of this seminar paper in partial fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education: College Student Personnel.

7/26/78  
Date

Miche Holler  
Seminar Paper Advisor

This seminar paper is approved for the College of Education.

July 31, 1978  
Date

Harold C. Rose  
Dean, College of Education

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is given to Dr. Michael Holler for his guidance, advice, and patience throughout this study.

Gratitude is extended to Mr. Richard Kerska for his assistance in processing the data.

A special thank you to the residence hall students who participated in this study.

## ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to assess the attitudes of residence hall students toward residence hall programming at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. Three areas of residence hall programming were explored: (1) the type of residence hall programming most desired, (2) who should plan and initiate residence hall programming, and why, and (3) what type of involvement does the participant of this study have with residence hall programming. Another purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was a difference between class standing, sex, or residence halls in which the participants of this study lived in relation to their attitudes toward programming.

A twenty per cent random sample was taken of the total population of students living in residence halls at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The participants of this study were asked to complete a survey on their attitudes towards residence hall programming. Responses to the survey were computed in percentages and an interpretation of the data was performed to determine the attitude of students toward residence hall programming.

The findings of this study indicated the majority of the total sample of this study preferred social programs, felt the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents should be responsible for programming, and that the students viewed themselves as participants in residence hall programming. However, there were variations among the sub-groups of this study in relation to the three areas which this study investigated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	4
Importance of the Study .....	4
Procedure .....	5
Limitations of the Study .....	5
Definition of Terms .....	6
II. RELATED LITERATURE .....	8
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURE .....	14
Sample .....	14
Instrument .....	14
Administration of Instrument .....	15
Method of Analysis .....	16
IV. RESULTS .....	17
Results .....	19
V. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	35
Discussion .....	35
Recommendations .....	39
APPENDIX A .....	41
APPENDIX B .....	45
APPENDIX C .....	48
APPENDIX D .....	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	56

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Percentage of Return By Sub-Groups .....	18
2	Desired Programs By Sub-Groups In Percentages .....	20
3	Who Should Be Responsible For Residence Hall Programming.	23
4	Reasons For Programming Responsibility .....	29
5	Involvement In Residence Hall Programming .....	34

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Student housing in higher education has gone through many stages of development in the United States before reaching its present position. Student housing in the United States originally grew out of the British System; many of our educators of the Colonial Period were graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, and our housing programs of this time were modeled after these. For example, tutors in American schools lived with students and were responsible for them at all times as were tutors under the British system (Powell, Plyler, Dickson, & McClellan, 1969). However, during these early times American residence halls were places for students to eat and sleep, and they provided an opportunity for the administration of very strict rules which was a contrast to the British system; this was "intended to enhance the total education of the student" (Powell et al., 1969, p. 4). Students of this time were quite young, many only thirteen or fourteen. Combined with the strong religious concern of this time, the university housing philosophy was the moral discipline of students. During these times dormitories were built so that the lives and studies of students could be supervised; students were to restrict their lives to study and prayer.

In the 1800's there was a relaxation in the disciplinary role of the residence hall. This was due to the faculty and tutors revolting against their role of live-in disciplinarians as well as

the increased enrollments of this time which did not allow for the complete control of students' lives. At this time we begin to find one specific person in charge of dormitory supervision. It was also during this time that control of colleges and universities moved from religious to secular control which resulted in the lessening of the need to regulate the religious and moral aspects of student life. Also, the organization of extracurricular programs allowed students to use their energy in less destructive ways than they had previously (Powell et al., 1969). Leonard stated that students were urged to good conduct "by higher motives than fear of punishment" (1956, p. 91).

During the twentieth century administrators started to look at the total education of the student, an attitude which is still present on most campuses and has had a great impact on student housing and its philosophy. Part of the responsibility for this change in attitude is due to federal money that was available following World War II making it possible to employ professional staffs to administer to the residence halls (Powell et al., 1969). As DeCoster and Mable maintain, "our concern is to be responsive to the total needs of students which include a comfortable, safe place to live, an adequate physical environment, as well as opportunities for learning" (1974, p. 27). Housing is part of a total process, the total educational process of a college education according to Riker (1965). DeCoster and Mable say the residence community, peer relationships, and perhaps most importantly, the role of residence

educators and student development specialists perform a vital function for the integration of the total college learning experience (1974). Williamson stated that residence halls should provide satisfactory physical facilities plus well rounded educational, social, and cultural programs (1956). Clark (1968) added that such things as architectural design, programming, staff, policies, student culture, and faculty involvement are all functions of residence halls in direct relation to student satisfaction with his environment.

Riker sees the residence hall as a "living-learning center" and he explains the three essential elements for effectiveness:

PROGRAMS, developed as a framework for student action and reaction learning;  
 STAFF, selected and organized to sustain the programs and guide the day-to-day activities of the housing unit:  
 and  
 PHYSICAL FACILITIES, designed to meet the requirements of students, programs, and staff (1965, p. 6).

The concept of residence halls as educational or learning centers makes it possible for "the integration of the social, cultural, physical, spiritual, and intellectual growth of students in such a way that each compliments the others" (DeCoster & Mable, 1974, p. 89).

The topic of this paper is student attitudes toward residence hall programming at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The housing staff at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse views the residence hall as a living-learning, educational center and realizes the importance of programming to enhance the educational process for the student.

### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this paper was to assess the attitudes of students toward residence hall programming. The three areas that were explored in the study were: (1) the type of residence hall programming most desired, (2) who should plan and initiate the residence hall programming and why, and (3) what type of involvement does the participant of this study have with residence hall programming, at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. Another purpose of this paper was to determine whether or not there was a difference between sex, class standing, and residence halls in which the participants of this study lived in relation to their attitudes toward programming.

### Importance of the Study

With the predicted 1980 enrollment declines residence halls could be left empty. Therefore, it is important to make residence halls more positive, effective, and appealing living-learning centers. If the residence hall can be made an appealing place to live for students, therefore making off-campus living less popular, we could alleviate the empty residence hall problem. It is felt that effective, creative programming that could meet the students' needs and interests, and could have a positive contribution as to how the students view residence hall living. Hopefully effective programming would make it more appealing and inviting to live in a residence hall.

The author believes this study reflects the needs of students living in the residence halls of the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse at this time, and offers the housing office staff and residence hall staff as well as other students an opportunity to use this student input to develop programming that will be effective in meeting the needs of the students.

#### Procedure

A twenty per cent random sample was taken of the total population of students living in residence halls at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The participants of this study were asked to complete a survey on their attitudes toward residence hall programming. The survey contained questions related to participants' class standing, sex, residence hall occupancy, type of programming desired, opinion of who should plan and initiate the programs and why, and involvement in residence hall programming. Responses to the survey were computed in percentages and an interpretation of the data was performed to determine the attitude of students toward residence hall programming and to determine any differences in attitude depending upon class standing, sex, or residence hall occupancy.

#### Limitations of the Study

1. This study was conducted at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse and the results pertain only to this university.

2. The study was done during the spring semester of the 1977-78 academic year and should not be generalized to students living in residence halls at another time.
3. The results are limited because no statistical validity or reliability of the instrument was determined.

#### Definition of Terms

Residence Hall. A group living and learning center financed and maintained by revenue from residents which is an on-campus facility provided by the university with professional and para-professional staff to coordinate and operate.

Resident. A student living in a university residence hall.

Freshman. A student who has earned less than thirty credits.

Sophomore. A student who has earned thirty credits but less than sixty credits.

Junior. A student who has earned sixty credits but less than ninety credits.

Senior. A student who has earned ninety credits or more.

Angell Hall. An all-female university residence hall.

Baird Hall. An upper-classmen, coeducational university residence hall.

Coate Hall. A coeducational university residence hall.

Drake Hall. A coeducational university residence hall.

Hutchison Hall. An all-female university residence hall.

Laux Hall. A coeducational university residence hall.

Reuter Hall. An all-male university residence hall.

Sanford Hall. An all-female university residence hall.

Trowbridge Hall. A coeducational university residence hall.

Wentz Hall. A coeducational university residence hall.

White Hall. An all-male university residence hall.

Programs. Activities planned for residents which would be social, educational, or cultural in nature.

Housing Office. The college student personnel unit responsible for the operation of university student housing. The employees consist of a clerical and professional staff who coordinate the various aspects of the residence halls.

Hall Director. The professional person living in the residence hall who is responsible for the operation of his or her particular hall.

Resident Assistant and Peer Advisor. A student member of the residence hall staff who lives on the floor or cube and works directly with the residents.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATED LITERATURE

It seems that the present literature written on residence hall programming lacks a statistical foundation and is based mainly on personal opinions and experiences. However, there is considerable literature that warrants review for any professional in the field of student development and residential living in higher education.

Moos and Otto (1975) found in their study that students see their living group as an important source of the changes they experience during college; as well as their associations with different people in their living group. Chickering (1974) notes that on-campus living is generally a positive experience for students, providing an environment that enhances self-concepts, broadens political viewpoints, leads to increased social interaction and encourages higher academic goals. Chickering also points out:

Housing arrangements do have an impact on student development. . . . Because a housing unit can become an important reference group for its members, and because an individual's behavior has an observable impact on its housemates, there is significant opportunity to foster the development of a personal value system held actively and with integrity (1967, p. 186).

In his residence hall a student "observes the impact of his behavior on others and feels the force of the group's behavioral norms and standards, therefore, he can better develop a personal system of values (Chickering, 1967, p. 179).

Chickering (1967) continues by stating four means of freeing interpersonal relationships and continuing student development in residence halls: (1) randomly assign students to residence halls so that a wide range of personalities will be living together, (2) architecturally allow the residence hall to foster student interaction, (3) let residents make decisions regarding policies and procedures, and (4) let rules and regulations be such that spontaneity and creativity in activities, programs, and discussions will not be curtailed. This will allow each residence hall or house to "develop its own somewhat distinctive culture, allocating individual roles and responsibilities according to differential abilities and inclinations" (Chickering, 1967, p. 185).

Flanagan says:

Living on campus tends to have a variety of impacts on students. Generally, residential living has a positive effect upon a student's perception of him/herself and the college environment, seems to enhance motivation, tends to create conditions for improved academic achievement and seems to be beneficial for the disadvantaged student. Various living arrangements, i.e. roommates and coed living, seem to have significant impact on students (1975, p. 6).

The college and university residence hall offers an excellent opportunity to work with students as they begin to discover many of their interests and values, and develop their interpersonal and vocational skills. As Riker states: "To contribute favorably and consistently to the college experience, the living and learning that goes on in student housing has to be stimulated and sustained by planned programs" (1965, p. v). "Programs are intended to complement the curriculum by providing a more favorable climate for

learning and expanding the student's opportunities for individual growth" (Riker, 1965, p. 9).

A primary purpose of student housing according to Clarcq is to "provide support for the instructional program of the institution" (1970, p. 44). He claims the residence hall should be used to "provide opportunity that will enable students to act out, question, and apply concepts developed via the formal academic encounter" (p. 44). Clarcq feels the residence hall can become an extension of the classroom by promoting scholarship and encouraging faculty-student interaction within the residence hall.

The target of the residence hall programming is developing and improving the interpersonal or social environment (Yelsma & Yelsma, 1972). Riker and DeCoster state: "It is not possible to disembody the human personality and develop a student's intellectual capacities in isolation from his cultural, spiritual, and psychological growth" (1971, p. 2). Therefore, "a residence hall program is any structured plan within a residence hall designed to maximize a students' positive growth and development;" this definition was developed by the ACUHO Educational Program Committee in 1973 (Sargeant, 1977, p. 7).

Healy points out that the "residence hall population is easily identified and defined. . . Residents are a contained and reachable population" (1978, p. 40). The residence hall is a reachable population and programming offers an arena for students to clarify their values through interaction with others and explore numerous

areas from vocational choices to political and religious matters. It is an area of great wealth for students and professionals in student development.

Sargeant (1977) points out that keys to programming are to clearly assess and define students' needs and interests and set goals. Sargeant also warns that the students should not be left out of the program-planning process. Involving students often stimulates creativity and is a learning experience for the student. It is educational to the student because he/she learns the process of program-planning and allows the student to experience the interaction with the others in the planning process, which is especially beneficial if faculty members and administrators are involved (Sargeant, 1977).

Essential to programming is assessing students' needs so that effective programming can take place. Riker suggests a means for determining residence hall programs would be to organize a group of students to discuss programming in which they would have "the opportunity to verbalize feelings and clarify needs" (1977, p. 10). By doing this students may come to understand their own needs and become active in planning and attending relevant programs (Riker, 1977).

Smith (1977) explains the key to organizing programming is defining goals and then carefully exploring and developing general objectives which will lend themselves to a good foundation for

building strong, comprehensive, specific objectives. Clear objectives are important along with an assessment of students' needs so that programming is done with a purpose; the purpose being to meet students' needs and interests. Smith has formulated six basic areas or categories for programming: "cultural, recreational, informational, developmental, community action, and group building through entertainment" (1977, p. 19). Hoelting (1973, p. 11) has suggested four categories for educational programming: "athletic, cultural, scholastic, and social programs." These categories offer a framework from which to begin programming as well as aiding in evaluation of programs. Evaluation is vital along with a good record keeping method so that programs may be improved upon and used again in the future if warranted.

Healy points out that all a programmer needs to do is to "look around and see what is not provided that students might need or use, investigate how you might offer the service, and examine the feasibility of starting it" (1978, p. 41). She also warns programmers to be aware of what's happening on campus and plan in conjunction with campus events. She also suggests that the rhythm of the campus be identified and programs planned that coordinate with the flow of campus life (1978). What this means is to plan study break programs during final exam week and more active programming at the beginning of each semester or quarter when students have more time. Murphy suggests "balanced programming" which would present different

aspects of a subject or perhaps develop a series of inter-related subjects to form a balanced educational program (1969, p. 64). Murphy also warns programmers against getting hung-up with numbers as a measure of program quality; the two are unrelated.

It appears that residential programs can be beneficial in meeting student learning and interpersonal needs as well as simply providing the student a place to live, but the residential program must be tailored to the specific needs of the students and be consistent with the goals and values of the institution (Flanagan, 1975).

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate students' attitudes toward residence hall programming. Attitudes were assessed by looking at three areas: (1) what type of programs were desired by residents, (2) who should plan and initiate the programs, and why, and (3) what involvement do the participants of this study have in programming. These three areas were also considered by computing the results of the survey and comparing these to class standing, sex, and residence hall occupancy to determine any relationships among these variables.

#### Sample

A twenty per cent random sample of the residence hall population was obtained from the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse computer center. At the time of this study, spring semester of the 1977-78 academic year, there were 2685 students living in the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse residence halls. The random sample of this study consisted of 537 student residents, 333 females and 204 males.

#### Instrument

A survey was developed by the researcher of this study and administered to the random sample of residence hall students at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The survey consisted of seven questions to determine students attitudes toward residence

hall programming at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse (See Appendix A).

The first three questions of the survey were for identification and demographic information. The students were asked to identify their class standing, sex, and in which residence hall they were presently living.

The fourth question asked the students to list some specific programs they would like to see offered in their residence hall (See Appendix D). These were classified as cultural, educational, or social by the researcher in order to compute them by percentages and to identify specific interest areas.

The fifth question asked the students who should plan and initiate the programming in their residence hall. The sixth question asked them why they felt the responsibility of programming belonged to whomever they had answered in number five, and how should organizing and initiating of a program be done. The general information from this question will be presented in Chapter Four.

The final question asked the participants of this study how they see themselves involved in programming; as initiator/organizer, participant, or non-participant.

#### Administration of Instrument

The researcher delivered the survey and a cover letter of explanation to the eleven residence halls where the students of this study lived. The cover letter included a specific return date and directions for returning the survey. One week following the original

survey distribution a follow-up letter and survey was sent out. Students included in this survey were assured that their responses would remain anonymous.

#### Method of Analysis

All questions were hand scored and tabulated by the researcher. The data was obtained by converting the raw score to percentages. The specific programs for question four can be found in Appendix D and the general category of the programs can be found by percentages in Chapter Four. Question six, concerning why the person they chose from question five should be responsible for programming, is presented in Chapter Four. Responses to questions four, five, and seven were scored by percentages of the total sample and for each of the subgroups of the students' class standing, sex, and residence hall occupancy.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine students' attitudes toward residence hall programming at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. This was done by administering a survey to a sample population of residence hall students in which they were asked:

1. The type of residence hall programming they would like.
2. Who should plan and initiate the programming in the residence hall, and why.
3. How they see themselves involved in programming.

The three areas were examined to determine if there was a difference between the sub-groups of class standing, sex, and residence halls in students' attitudes toward residence hall programming.

The survey was administered to a twenty per cent random sample of the residence halls at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse. The survey was sent to 537 residence hall students and 288 were returned. A fifty-four per cent return was obtained. A summary of the return dispersal is shown in Table 1 according to the sub-groups and the total sample.

The results of the three areas of residence hall programming (desired programming, responsibility of programming, and students' involvement) which this study set out to examine are presented in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 and the Appendices.

TABLE 1

## Percentage of Return By Student Sub-Groups

Sub-Group	Number Issued	Number Returned	% of Return
Freshmen	303	162	53.5
Sophomores	148	77	52.0
Juniors	53	31	58.5
Seniors	33	18	54.6
Males	206	90	43.7
Females	331	198	59.8
Angell Hall	78	46	59.0
Baird Hall	38	23	60.5
Coate Hall	64	18	28.1
Drake Hall	48	22	45.8
Hutchison Hall	75	48	64.0
Leux Hall	46	25	54.4
Reuter Hall	39	27	69.2
Sanford Hall	40	25	62.5
Trowbridge Hall	34	18	52.9
Wentz Hall	44	26	59.1
White Hall	31	10	32.3
TOTAL	537	288	53.6

## RESULTS

### Types of Programs Desired

Students were asked to list some specific residence hall programs they would like to see in their residence hall. The researcher scored this answer by recording the answers as social, educational, cultural, or a combination of any of these three answers to determine the general category of desired programs which is presented in Table 2. Specific programs are listed by class standing in Appendix D.

As shown in Table 2 the largest percentage of the total sample, 35 per cent, desired social programming in their residence hall. The second largest group of the total sample desired a combined effort in programming in the areas of social and educational programming, 26 per cent. Cultural programming was desired by 1.4 per cent of the sample, and cultural programs in combinations with social and educational was indicated by 5.9 per cent of the sample. These findings held true for most of the sub-groups as well. The exceptions to this were juniors, seniors, Angell Hall respondents, Baird Hall respondents, Trowbridge Hall respondents, and Wentz Hall respondents who all desired programs in the areas of social and educational by an average of 32 per cent. Social programming was the second largest area responded to by 25 per cent of the population of these sub-groups.

TABLE 2  
DESIRED PROGRAMS BY SUB-GROUPS IN PERCENTAGES

Sub-Group	1	2	3	1 & 2	1 & 3	2 & 3	1,2 & 3	NR **
Freshmen	38	10	1	22	2	.6	3	23
Sophomores	35	6	3	32	3	1	3	17
Juniors	26	19	0	32	0	0	6	16
Seniors	17	17	0	33	0	0	6	28
Males	37	11	0	19	2	1	3	27
Females	34	11	2	30	2	.5	4	18
Angell Hall	28	7	2	35	4	0	7	17
Baird Hall	26	13	0	30	0	0	4	26
Coate Hall	33	17	0	33	0	0	0	17
Drake Hall	36	14	0	27	0	0	5	18
Hutchison Hall	40	10	0	27	0	2	0	21
Laux Hall	36	12	0	24	0	0	8	20
Reuter Hall	41	4	0	15	7	0	4	30
Sanford Hall	44	12	4	20	4	0	4	12
Trowbridge Hall	33	11	6	39	0	0	0	11
Wentz Hall	19	12	4	23	0	0	4	38
White Hall	60	20	0	0	0	10	0	10
TOTAL	35	11	1	26	2	.7	3	21

\*\* 1 = social      2 = educational      3 = cultural

### Responsibility of Programming

The sample population of this study was asked who they felt should be responsible for planning and initiating the programs in residence halls and why they felt this person should be responsible. The results are presented in percentages in Table 3 with the general reasons they should be responsible following in summary form in Table 4.

As shown in Table 3, the largest response was 28 per cent of the total sample who felt the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents should be responsible for hall programming. The second largest response was 17 per cent who thought the residents should be responsible for their own programming. Sixteen per cent saw it as a combined effort of the hall director, resident assistant/peer advisor, and the hall residents, and 13 per cent felt it was the resident assistant/peer advisor's responsibility to plan and initiate the hall programs.

The greatest percentage of freshmen (28%) felt it was the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents who should program as did the sophomores (35%), females (33%), males (18%), Angell Hall respondents (36%), Hutchison Hall respondents (35%), Laux Hall respondents (36%), Sanford Hall respondents (40%), and Wentz Hall respondents (27%). The largest group of juniors (19%), seniors (22%), Baird Hall respondents (30%), Coate Hall respondents (28%), Drake Hall respondents (18%), Reuter Hall respondents (30%), and White Hall respondents (20%) felt it was the combined responsibility

of the hall director, resident assistant/peer advisor, and hall residents to plan and initiate hall programs. The largest percentage of the sample from Trowbridge Hall respondents (33%) felt programming was the responsibility of the hall residents themselves.

TABLE 3

WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING				
Sub-Group	Housing Office	Hall Director	R.A./P.A.	Residents
Freshmen	1.2	1.2	14.2	17.3
Sophomores	0	1.3	11.7	15.6
Juniors	0	3.2	16.1	19.4
Seniors	0	0	11.1	16.7
Males	1.1	3.3	14.4	17.8
Females	.5	.5	13.1	16.7
Angell Hall	0	0	8.7	15.2
Baird Hall	0	0	17.4	8.7
Coate Hall	0	5.6	5.6	16.7
Drake Hall	0	0	9.0	13.6
Hutchison Hall	0	2.1	18.8	16.7
Laux Hall	0	0	16.0	24.0
Reuter Hall	3.7	3.7	7.4	18.5
Sanford Hall	4.0	0	12.0	12.0
Trowbridge Hall	0	0	16.7	33.3
Wentz Hall	0	0	19.2	19.2
White Hall	0	10.0	20.0	10.0
TOTAL	.7	1.4	13.5	17.0

(Continued)

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

## WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING

Sub-Group	Other	Hall Director	Housing Office	Hall Director
		R.A./P.A. Residents Other	Hall Director R.A./P.A. Residents, Other	R.A./P.A. Other
Freshmen	2.5	1.2	.6	.6
Sophomores	1.3	1.3	1.3	0
Juniors	6.5	3.2	0	0
Seniors	0	0	0	11.1
Males	2.2	3.3	1.1	3.3
Females	2.5	.5	.5	0
Angell Hall	4.4	0	4.4	0
Baird Hall	8.7	0	0	0
Coate Hall	5.6	0	0	0
Drake Hall	0	0	0	9.1
Hutchison Hall	0	2.1	0	0
Laux Hall	0	4.0	0	0
Reuter Hall	3.7	3.7	0	3.7
Sanford Hall	4.0	0	0	0
Trowbridge Hall	0	0	0	0
Wentz Hall	0	0	0	0
White Hall	0	10.0	0	0
TOTAL	2.4	1.4	.7	1.0

(Continued)

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

## WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING

Sub-Group	Housing Office Hall Director	Housing Office Hall Director Residents	Housing Office R.A./P.A. Residents
Freshmen	.6	0	0
Sophomores	0	1.3	1.3
Juniors	0	0	0
Seniors	0	0	0
Males	1.1	1.1	0
Females	0	0	.5
Angell Hall	0	0	2.2
Baird Hall	0	0	0
Coate Hall	0	5.6	0
Drake Hall	0	0	0
Hutchison Hall	0	0	0
Laux Hall	0	0	0
Reuter Hall	3.7	0	0
Sanford Hall	0	0	0
Trowbridge Hall	0	0	0
Wentz Hall	0	0	0
White Hall	0	0	0
TOTAL	.4	.4	.4

(Continued)

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

## WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING

Sub-Group	Housing Office	Hall Director R.A./P.A.	Hall Director R.A./P.A.	Hall Director R.A./P.A. Residents
	Hall Director R.A./P.A. Residents			
Freshmen	3.7	4.3		17.3
Sophomores	6.5	7.8		9.1
Juniors	3.2	9.7		19.4
Seniors	5.6	5.6		22.2
Males	4.4	10.0		14.4
Females	4.6	4.6		16.2
Angell Hall	6.5	2.2		10.9
Baird Hall	4.4	4.4		30.4
Coate Hall	5.6	0		27.8
Drake Hall	9.1	9.1		18.2
Hutchison Hall	2.1	2.1		8.3
Laux Hall	4.0	8.0		4.0
Reuter Hall	0	3.7		29.6
Sanford Hall	4.0	8.0		16.0
Trowbridge Hall	5.6	16.7		5.6
Wentz Hall	7.7	11.5		15.4
White Hall	0	10.0		20.0
TOTAL	4.5	5.9		15.6

(Continued)

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

## WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING

Sub-Group	Hall Director Residents	R.A./P.A. Residents
Freshmen	1.9	28.4
Sophomores	1.3	35.1
Juniors	0	12.9
Seniors	0	22.2
Males	2.2	17.8
Females	1.0	32.8
Angell Hall	0	39.1
Baird Hall	0	26.1
Coate Hall	5.6	16.7
Drake Hall	0	18.2
Hutchison Hall	2.1	35.4
Leux Hall	4.0	36.0
Reuter Hall	3.7	14.8
Sanford Hall	0	40.0
Trowbridge Hall	0	5.6
Wentz Hall	0	26.9
White Hall	0	20.0
TOTAL	1.4	28.1

Table 4 lists the reasons why the respondents of this study felt the person they indicated as being responsible for planning and initiating programming in the residence hall felt as they did. The reasons are listed in summary form by category.

TABLE 4

## REASONS FOR PROGRAMMING RESPONSIBILITY

Programmer	Reasons
Housing Office	They are responsible for the halls. They are the governing body of residence halls and have information and entertainment materials.
Hall Director	He is the leader and in charge of his hall. He has the power and knows the students and the housing office so he can best coordinate programming.
Resident Asst./ Peer Advisor	He knows the residents and their interests and needs. He has the most contact with them and can get suggestions and input from them. It's his job; he's getting paid for this. He is a leader and organizer. He is a leader and should have weekly meetings to get students' suggestions for programming ideas.

(Continued)

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

## REASONS FOR PROGRAMMING RESPONSIBILITY

Programmer	Reasons
Hall Residents	<p>They are the participants and know what they want.</p> <p>Volunteers should form a planning committee.</p> <p>Organize programming at floor meetings, democratic vote.</p> <p>It is the residents themselves who participate, are involved, and benefit from programming so they should be responsible.</p>
Others	<p>The others that were listed were hall council (23), floor/cube representatives (4), hall president (1), RHAC (1), desk manager (1), and a special committee (1). Hall council was listed twice as being solely responsible for programming and floor/cube representatives once, otherwise the other people were listed in combination with the hall director, resident assistant/peer advisor, and/or hall residents.</p>
Housing Office	<p>Everyone should work together to make programming a success.</p>
Hall Director	<p>Resident assistant should initiate the programming and hall residents should help plan it and attend.</p>
R.A./P.A.	<p>It should be a combined effort to utilize everyone's talents, resources, and expertise.</p>
Hall Residents	

(Continued)

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

## REASONS FOR PROGRAMMING RESPONSIBILITY

Programmer	Reasons
Hall Director R.A./P.A.	<p>These people are paid to do programming.</p> <p>They are in the best position to ask residents for input, possibly survey the residents on their desires for programming.</p> <p>They are in the best position to motivate residents; they also have access to information and resources that would be helpful in programming.</p>
Hall Director R.A./P.A. Hall Residents	<p>Everyone should work together because all these people live in the hall and are effected by the programming.</p> <p>If everyone would work together they would have input from many different opinions and could get programs they really wanted.</p> <p>Have weekly meetings to plan programs.</p>
Hall Director Hall Residents	<p>Hall director knows the rules and the residents know what they want.</p> <p>Have weekly meetings and a survey to develop programming.</p> <p>Programming between these two groups would give each other a better chance to get acquainted.</p>
R.A./P.A. Hall Residents	<p>Both groups are students and know their wants, needs, and interests, they are affected by programming so they should have input, they have a personal interest in the programs.</p>

(Continued)

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

## REASONS FOR PROGRAMMING RESPONSIBILITY

Programmer	Reasons
R.A./P.A. Hall Residents (Cont.)	<p>Residents should give suggestions and help initiate the programs with the resident assistant.</p> <p>Form committees with the residents and resident assistant to organize programming.</p> <p>On each floor there are natural organizers and leaders and these people should be used to do programming.</p> <p>There should be good communication channels between the resident assistant and floor residents in planning programs.</p>

Student Involvement In Residence Hall Programming

The residence hall students participating in this study were asked how they see themselves involved in the programs in their residence halls. They were asked if they are initiators/organizers, participants, or non-participants. The results are presented in Table 5.

As illustrated in Table 5, 55 per cent of the total sample population of this study indicated they were participants in residence hall programming, 26 per cent are initiators and organizers, and 19 per cent are non-participants in hall programming. The greatest percentage of freshmen (59%), sophomores (57%), and seniors (39%)

saw themselves as participants; juniors saw themselves equally as initiator/organizer and participant (35%). Over 50 per cent of the males (51%) and females (57%) saw themselves as participants. All residence hall respondents had a greater response to being a participant with the exception of Drake Hall residents who responded equally to participant and initiator/organizer.

The largest groups of non-participants were found in the subgroups of juniors (29%), seniors (33%), Baird Hall respondents (48%), Reuter Hall respondents (30%), Trowbridge Hall respondents (28%), and Wentz Hall respondents (23%).

TABLE 5

## INVOLVEMENT IN RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING

Sub-Group	Initiator/Organizer	Participant	Non-Participant
Freshmen	24.7	59.3	16.1
Sophomores	26.0	57.1	16.9
Juniors	35.5	35.5	29.0
Seniors	27.8	38.9	33.3
Males	30.0	51.1	18.9
Females	24.8	56.6	18.7
Angell Hall	32.6	52.2	15.2
Baird Hall	17.4	34.8	47.8
Coate Hall	27.8	72.2	0
Drake Hall	45.5	45.5	9.1
Hutchison Hall	22.9	62.5	14.6
Leux Hall	20.0	68.0	12.0
Reuter Hall	25.9	44.4	29.6
Sanford Hall	28.0	60.0	12.0
Trowbridge Hall	16.7	55.6	27.8
Wentz Hall	26.9	50.0	23.1
White Hall	20.0	60.0	20.0
TOTAL	26.4	54.9	18.8

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate student attitudes toward residence hall programming at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse, based on three areas of programming (types of programs, responsibility of programming, and involvement), and to compare them to three sub-groups (class standing, sex, and residence hall occupancy). A fifty-four per cent return was obtained from the twenty per cent random sample of residence hall students which was considered sufficient for the intended purpose of this study.

The findings of this study indicated the majority of the total sample of this study preferred social programs, felt the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents should be responsible for programming, and that the students viewed themselves as participants in residence hall programming. However, there were variations among the sub-groups of this study in relation to the three areas which this study investigated.

The responses have been computed into percentages for each of the sub-groups in relation to the three areas which this study investigated. A discussion of the results follows for each of the three areas of concern in this study.

Type of Desired Residence Hall Programming

1. For the total population a larger percentage desired social programming than any of the others; a combination of social and educational programming was the second largest percentage indicated.
2. Freshmen desired social programming while seniors desired a combination of social and educational programming. As class standing increased social programming declined and a combination of social and educational programs gained.
3. More females than males desired a combination of social and educational programming, while more males desired social programming.
4. The greatest percentage of students desiring cultural programming lived in Trowbridge Hall.
5. Angell Hall respondents, Baird Hall respondents, Trowbridge Hall respondents, and Wentz Hall respondents had larger percentages desiring a combination of social and educational programming than social programming.
6. Coate Hall respondents had equal percentages for social and a combination of social and educational programming.
7. The remaining hall respondents all had larger percentages desiring social programming than any of the others.
8. Social, educational, and a combination of social and educational received greater percentages, while cultural and the other combinations received very low percentages.

Who Should Be Responsible for Residence Hall Programming

1. The largest percentage of the total sample felt programming was the responsibility of the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents together.
2. The greatest percentage of freshmen and sophomores felt it was the responsibility of the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents.
3. The largest percentage of juniors were split equally between the responsibility belonging to the hall residents themselves and belonging to the hall director, residence assistant/peer advisor, and hall residents.
4. The seniors had their largest number of responses for two equal groups also, one for the hall director, resident assistant/peer advisor, and hall residents and the other group being the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents.
5. The males responded to the hall residents as being responsible for programming and the same number of males responded to the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents being responsible for hall programming.
6. The largest percentage of females felt the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents should be responsible for programming.
7. The greatest percentage of residents in Angell Hall, Hutchison Hall, Laux Hall, Sanford Hall, and Wentz Hall felt the

responsibility of programming was up to the resident assistant/peer advisor and the hall residents.

8. The largest responses for residents of Baird Hall, Coate Hall, and Reuter Hall indicated programming should be done together by the hall director, resident assistant/peer advisor, and the hall residents.
9. Trowbridge Hall respondents had the largest number of responses for the hall residents to be responsible for hall programming.
10. Drake Hall residents responded equally to the hall director, resident assistant/peer advisor, and hall residents being responsible for programming and to the resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents.
11. White Hall respondents responded equally to three groups: (1) hall director, resident assistant/peer advisor, and hall residents, (2) resident assistant/peer advisor, and (3) resident assistant/peer advisor and hall residents for planning and initiating the programming in residence halls.

#### Student Involvement in Residence Hall Programming

1. Over fifty per cent of the total population of this study saw themselves as participants.
2. As class standing increased participation in residence hall programming decreased and non-participation increased; however as class standing increased so did the numbers

considering themselves initiators and organizers except for seniors.

3. Over fifty per cent of the freshmen and sophomores considered themselves participants, as did both males and females.
4. More males than females viewed themselves as initiators and organizers of residence hall programming.
5. Over fifty per cent of Angell Hall, Coate Hall, Hutchison Hall, Laux Hall, Sanford Hall, Trowbridge Hall, Wentz Hall, and White Hall residents viewed themselves as participants in residence hall programming.
6. Baird Hall had the largest group of students that viewed themselves as being non-participants in residence hall programming; this may be due to the large number of juniors and seniors in Baird Hall who also are more likely to be non-participants than freshmen and sophomores.
7. Reuter Hall had the second largest group of non-participants in residence hall programming of all the halls.
8. Drake Hall has the largest percentage of initiators and organizers of residence hall programming than any of the other halls.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made based on the results of this study:

1. It is recommended that programming be social in nature but also incorporate educational and cultural programs

as well, specifically, educational programs that would invite a guest speaker into the residence hall.

2. It is recommended that the hall residents have the initial input into what the program will be and then the resident assistant/peer advisor, hall residents and possibly the hall director should work together to organize it.
3. It is recommended that the hall residents have more of a responsibility for residence hall programming in the future.
4. It is also important to keep in mind the residents class standing, sex, and residence hall when considering programming since this study did point out variances among these sub-groups.
5. It is recommended that surveys of each entire residence hall be taken so that specific programs can be determined for the individual residence hall based on students' needs and interests.
6. It is recommended that surveys of this nature be adapted and expanded by future researchers. The following suggestions are made:
  - (a) The survey should be tested for statistical validity and reliability.
  - (b) The survey's percentage of return may be increased by administering it earlier in the semester.
  - (c) The survey should be administered each semester to determine specific programs for each season.

APPENDIX A

April 22, 1978

Dear Fellow Student:

You have been randomly selected to participate in a research study. This study is asking the students at UW-La Crosse their opinions on residence hall programming so that more effective programming may be planned in the future. Your responses will remain anonymous so you do not need to put your name on the survey.

My name is Debi Kirkeide and I am a graduate student in College Student Personnel. This study is part of my course requirements for my Master's Degree. Your participation is important to me to make this study a success. It will take you approximately 5 minutes to complete this survey.

Please return only the survey page to me, my mailing address is on the reverse side of the survey so just refold the page and staple or tape it shut and drop it in campus mail. Your cooperation in returning this survey by 4:00 pm Thursday, April 27th will be greatly appreciated.

The results of this study will be presented at an open session to be announced at a later date. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Debi Kirkeide  
College Student Personnel  
Graduate Student  
UW - La Crosse

May 1, 1978

Dear Fellow Student:

Due to the fact that all surveys remain confidential, this reminder letter is being sent to all participants of the random sample selected to complete the survey on residence hall programming. If you have already returned this survey, thank you for your cooperation and read no further.

If you have not completed the survey, I would greatly appreciate your taking 5 minutes to do so now. In case you misplaced the first survey sent to you, enclosed you will find an identical one. My graduate work will not be complete unless this study is a success. Your participation is most important to the success of this study.

Again, let me remind you that you were randomly selected and precautions have been taken to assure confidentiality. Your name is not required.

Please return this survey to me through campus mail by 4:00 pm Friday, May 5th. Your participation will be greatly appreciated, since it will make a difference in my graduate study success.

The results of this study will be presented at an open campus session to be announced at a later date. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Debi Kirkeide  
College Student Personnel  
Graduate Student  
UW - La Crosse

RESIDENCE HALL SURVEY

Please circle the appropriate selection.

1. Class Standing:
  1. Freshmen
  2. Sophomore
  3. Junior
  4. Senior
  5. Other
2. Sex:
  1. Male
  2. Female
3. Residence Hall You Live In:
  1. Angell Hall
  2. Baird Hall
  3. Coate Hall
  4. Drake Hall
  5. Hutchison Hall
  6. Laux Hall
  7. Reuter Hall
  8. Sanford Hall
  9. Trowbridge Hall
  10. Wentz Hall
  11. White Hall
4. Please list some specific programs you would like to see in your residence hall. Programs that would be cultural, educational, or social.
5. Who do you feel should plan and initiate the programming in your residence hall. (Please circle the selection or combination of selections you feel are appropriate).
  1. Housing Office
  2. Hall Director
  3. Resident Assistant/Peer Advisor
  4. Hall Residents
  5. Other (Please Specify)
6. Why do you feel the responsibility of programming is up to whomever you answered in number five and how should organizing and initiating of a program be done?
7. How do you see yourself involved in programming?
  1. Initiator/Organizer
  2. Participant
  3. Non-participant
  4. Other (Please Specify)

**APPENDIX B**

## Results of the Residence Hall Survey

Please circle the appropriate selection.

NOTE: N = 288 surveys (53.63%) returned from a random sample of 537 residence hall students at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

Total Group

Raw %

		1. Class Standing
162	56.25	Freshmen
77	26.74	Sophomores
31	10.76	Juniors
18	6.25	Seniors
		2. Sex
90	31.25	Male
198	68.75	Female
		3. Residence Hall You Live In:
46	15.97	Angell Hall
23	7.99	Baird Hall
18	6.25	Coate Hall
22	7.64	Drake Hall
48	16.67	Hutchison Hall
25	8.69	Laux Hall
27	9.38	Reuter Hall
25	8.68	Sanford Hall
18	6.26	Trowbridge Hall
26	9.03	Wentz Hall
10	3.47	White Hall
		4. Please list some specific programs you would like to see in your residence hall. Programs that would be cultural, educational, or social.
100	34.72	Social
31	10.76	Education
4	1.39	Cultural
76	26.38	Social and Educational
5	1.74	Social and Cultural
2	.69	Educational and Cultural
10	3.47	Social, Educational, and Cultural
60	20.83	No Response
		5. Who do you feel should plan and initiate the programming in your residence hall. (Please circle the selection or combination of selections you feel are appropriate).
2	.69	Housing Office
4	1.39	Hall Director
39	13.54	Resident Assistant/Peer Advisor
49	17.01	Hall Residents
7	2.43	Other (Please Specify)
4	1.39	Hall Director, R.A./P.A., Hall Residents, and Other

2	.69	Housing Office, Hall Director, R.A./P.A., Hall Residents, and Other
3	1.04	Hall Director, R.A./P.A., and Other
2	.69	Hall Director and Other
9	3.13	R.A./P.A., Hall Residents, and Other
2	.69	R.A./P.A., and Other
2	.69	Hall Residents and Other
1	.35	Housing Office and Hall Director
1	.35	Housing Office, Hall Director, and Hall Residents
1	.35	Housing Office, R.A./P.A., and Hall Residents
13	4.51	Housing Office, Hall Director, R.A./P.A., and Hall Residents
17	5.90	Hall Director and R.A./P.A.
45	15.63	Hall Director, R.A./P.A., and Hall Residents
4	1.39	Hall Director and Hall Residents
81	28.13	R.A./P.A. and Hall Residents

6. Why do you feel the responsibility of programming is up to whomever you answered in number five and how should organizing and initiating of a program be done?

(See Chapter IV)

7. How do you see yourself involved in programming?

76	26.39	Initiator/Organizer
158	54.86	Participant
54	18.75	Non-Participant

People Listed Under the Other Category in Number 5

23	7.99	Hall Council
4	1.39	Floor/Cube Representatives
1	.35	Hall President
1	.35	RHAC
1	.35	Desk Manager
1	.35	Special Committee

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING SURVEY  
N=288

No.	Responses	Freshmen N=162 N=56.3%	Soph. N=77 N=26.7%	Junior N=31 N=10.8%	Senior N=18 N=6.3%	Males N=90 N=31.3%	Females N=198 N=68.8%	Angell N=46 N=16.0%	Baird N=23 N=8.0%	Coate N=18 N=6.3%	Drake N=22 N=7.6%
4.	a. Social	21.5	9.4	2.8	1.0	11.5	23.3	4.5	2.1	2.1	2.8
	b. Educational	5.9	1.7	2.1	1.0	3.5	7.3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	c. Cultural	.7	.7	0	0	0	1.4	.4	0	0	0
	d. Soc. & Educ.	12.2	8.7	3.5	2.1	5.9	20.5	5.6	2.4	2.1	2.1
	e. Soc. & Cultural	1.0	.7	0	0	.7	1.0	.7	0	0	0
	f. Educ. & Cultural	.4	.4	0	0	.4	.4	0	0	0	0
	g. Soc., Educ., & Cultural	1.7	.7	.7	.4	1.0	2.4	1.0	.4	0	.4
	h. No Response	12.8	4.5	1.7	1.7	8.3	12.5	2.8	2.1	1.0	1.4
5.	a. Housing Office	.7	0	0	0	.4	.4	0	0	0	0
	b. Hall Director	.7	.4	.4	0	1.0	.4	0	0	.4	0
	c. R.A./P.A.	8.0	3.1	1.7	.7	4.5	9.0	1.4	1.4	.4	.7
	d. Hall Residents	9.7	4.2	2.1	1.0	5.6	11.5	2.4	.7	1.0	1.0
	e. Other	1.4	.4	.7	0	.7	1.7	.7	.7	.4	0
	f. H.D., R.A., RES., Other	.7	.4	.4	0	1.0	.4	0	0	0	0
	g. H.C., H.D., R.A., RES., Other	.4	.4	0	0	.4	.4	.7	0	0	0
	h. H.D., R.A., & Other	.4	0	0	.7	1.0	0	0	0	0	.7
	i. H.D. & Other	.4	.4	0	0	0	.7	.4	0	0	0
	j. R.A., RES., & Other	1.7	.4	.7	.4	.7	2.4	0	0	.4	1.0
	k. R.A. & Other	.4	.4	0	0	.4	.4	0	0	0	0
	l. RES. & Other	.4	.4	0	0	0	.7	.7	0	0	0
	m. H.C. & H.D.	.4	0	0	0	.4	0	0	0	0	0
	n. H.O., H.D., RES.	0	.4	0	0	.4	0	0	0	.4	0
	o. H.D., R.A., RES.	0	.4	0	0	0	.4	.4	0	0	0
	p. H.O., H.D., R.A., RES.	2.1	1.7	.4	.4	1.4	3.1	1.0	.4	.4	.7
	q. H.D. & P.A.	2.4	2.1	1.0	.4	2.8	3.1	.4	.4	0	.7
	r. H.D., R.A., & RES.	9.7	2.4	2.1	1.4	4.5	11.1	1.7	2.4	1.7	1.4
	s. H.D. & RES.	1.0	.4	0	0	.7	.7	0	0	.4	0
	t. R.A. & RES.	16.0	9.4	1.4	1.4	5.6	22.6	6.3	2.1	1.0	1.4
7.	a. Initiator/Organizer	13.9	7.0	3.8	1.7	9.4	17.0	5.2	1.4	1.7	3.5
	b. Participant	33.3	15.3	3.8	2.4	16.0	38.9	8.3	2.8	4.5	3.5
	c. Non-Participant	9.0	4.5	3.1	2.1	5.9	12.9	2.4	3.8	0	.7

H.O.=Housing Office H.D.=Hall Director R.A.=Resident Assistant/Peer Advisor RES.=Hall Residents

RESULTS OF RESIDENCE HALL PROGRAMMING SURVEY  
(continued)

	Hutchinson	Laux	Reuter	Sanford	Trowbridge	Wentz	White
No.	N=48	N=25	N=27	N=25	N=18	N=26	N=10
	N=16.7%	N=8.7%	N=9.4%	N=8.7%	N=6.3%	N=9.0%	N=3.5%
11.	a. Social	6.6	3.1	3.8	2.1	1.7	2.1
	b. Educational	1.7	1.0	.4	1.0	1.0	.7
	c. Cultural	0	0	.4	.4	.4	0
	d. Soc. & Educ.	4.5	2.1	1.4	1.7	2.1	0
	e. Soc. & Cultural	0	0	.7	0	0	0
	f. Educ. & Cultural	.4	0	0	0	0	.4
	g. Soc., Educ., & Cultural	0	.7	.4	0	.4	0
	h. No Response	3.5	1.7	2.8	1.0	3.5	.4
5.	a. Housing Office	0	0	.4	0	0	0
	b. Hall Director	.4	0	.4	0	0	.4
	c. R.A./P.A.	3.1	1.4	.7	1.0	1.7	.7
	d. Hall Residents	2.8	2.1	1.7	1.0	1.7	.4
	e. Other	0	0	.4	0	0	0
	f. H.D., R.A., RES., Other	.4	.4	.4	0	0	.4
	g. H.O., H.D., R.A., RES., Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	h. H.D., R.A., & Other	0	0	.4	0	0	0
	i. H.D. & Other	.4	0	0	0	0	0
	j. R.A., RES., & Other	1.4	0	0	0	.4	0
	k. R.A. & Other	0	0	0	0	.7	0
	l. RES. & Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	m. H.O. & H.D.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	n. H.O., H.D., RES.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	o. H.D., R.A., RES.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	p. H.O., H.D., R.A., RES.	.4	.4	.4	.4	.7	0
	q. H.D. & R.A.	.4	.7	.4	1.0	1.0	.4
	r. H.D., R.A., RES.	1.4	.4	2.8	1.4	1.4	.7
	s. H.D. & RES.	.4	.4	.4	0	0	0
	t. R.A. & RES.	5.9	3.1	1.4	3.5	2.4	.7
7.	a. Initiator/Organizer	3.8	1.7	2.4	1.1	2.4	.7
	b. Participant	10.4	5.9	4.2	3.5	4.5	2.1
	c. Non-Participant	2.4	1.0	2.8	1.7	2.1	.7

H.O.=Housing Office H.D.=Hall Director R.A.=Resident Assistant/Peer Advisor RES.=Hall Residents

APPENDIX D

Specific Programs

Listed below are some specific programs that the students of this study listed in response to question number four of the survey. They are listed by class standing and the number of times they were listed.

Freshmen (N = 162)

Speakers - 41

Speakers on: religion, sex, bookkeeping, cooking, sewing, relaxation, contraceptives, career choices, fitness, leadership, rape, interpersonal communication, CPR, yoga, study habits, time management, self-defense, legal rights, and health foods.

Parties Within the Residence Hall - 20

Dances With Other Halls - 19

Parties With Other Residence Halls - 15

Trips - 13

Trips to: Buck's Game, museums, capital, cultural centers, and the brewery.

Camp-Outs - 12

Picnics - 12

Movies - 10

Party Room - 9

Exercise Program - 9

Volley Ball Games - 7

Softball Games - 7

Tutor Service Within the Residence Hall - 7

Theatre and Concerts In Another City - 5

Canoe Trip - 5

Dinners - 5

Hayrides - 4

Nationality Dinner and Program - 3

Biking - 3

Bluff Hike - 3

Free University Type Programs (bartending) - 3

Ping Pong Tournaments - 2

La Crosse River Queen Trip - 2

Self-Awareness Program - 2

Computer Dances - 2

Intra-Residence Hall Projects (Service Projects) - 2

Dance Lessons - 2

Singing Groups - 2

Painting Contests - 1

Carnivals - 1

Hobby Program - 1

Poker Games - 1

Beer Softball - 1

Foosball Tournaments - 1

Advising Group (academic, university, and personal) - 1

Back-Packing Picnics - 1  
 Bike Hikes - 1  
 Tennis Tournaments - 1  
 Symphony - 1  
 Golf Team - 1  
 Basketball - 1  
 Roller Skating - 1  
 Hall Happening Newsletter - 1  
 Watermelon Party - 1  
 Go-Out-For-Dinner Night - 1  
 Bonfire - 1  
 Skiing - 1  
 Fashion Show - 1  
 Wine and Cheese Party - 1  
 Boating - 1  
 Study Sessions - 1  
 Swimming - 1  
 Ice Skating - 1  
 Orgies - 1  
 Pizza Party - 1  
 Make-up Demonstrations - 1  
 Broom Ball - 1  
 Little Sister-Big Brother Program - 1  
 Cheese - 1

Sophomores (N = 77)

Speakers - 21  
     Speakers on: hobbies, minorities, hypnosis, budgetting money,  
     job preparation, communication skills, relaxation, drug and alco-  
     hol abuse, time management, birth control.  
 Parties Within the Residence Hall - 14  
 Camp Outs - 9  
 Dances - 9  
 Picnics - 8  
 Canoeing - 5  
 Movies - 5  
 Concerts and Plays - 4  
 Party Room - 4  
 Arts and Crafts Program - 4  
 Sport Activities - 3  
 Dinner Dances - 3  
 Dinners - 3  
 Roller Skating - 3  
 Hiking - 3  
 Volley Ball - 3  
 Tournaments, Competition - 3  
 Self-Awareness Program - 2  
 Parties With Other Residence Halls - 2  
 Softball - 2

Come-As-You-Are Breakfast - 2  
 Exercise Program - 2  
 Brewery Tour - 2  
 Cribbage Tournaments - 2  
 Bible Study - 1  
 Ice Skating - 1  
 Taboganning - 1  
 Football - 1  
 Activity Parties (no beer) - 1  
 Attend Sporting Events - 1  
 International Dinner - 1  
 Planetarium Visit - 1  
 River Trip - 1  
 Art Show - 1  
 Residence Hall Newsletter - 1  
 Help Sessions - 1  
 Foosball and Pool Leagues - 1  
 Tutors - 1  
 Talent Show - 1  
 Dance Class - 1  
 Speed Reading - 1  
 Bartending Class - 1  
 Guitar and Piano Lessons - 1  
 Caroling - 1

Juniors (N = 31)

Speakers - 13

Speakers on: hypnosis, stereo salesman, Student Senate Representative, alcohol awareness, sex, resume writing, foreign students, hobbies, environmentalists, communication, self-defense.

Parties Within the Residence Halls - 5

Camp Outs - 5

Volley Ball Tournament - 5

Picnics - 4

Dinner Dances - 3

Concerts and Plays - 2

Dances - 2

Canoeing - 3

Badger Game - 1

Cook-Outs - 1

Planetarium Visit - 1

Truth Sessions - 1

Pancake Making and Eating - 1

Softball - 1

Wine and Cheese Party - 1

Card Party - 1

Roller Skating - 1

Trip to the Cities - 1

Bowling Parties - 1

Movies - 1  
 Study Breaks (with food) - 1  
 Weight Watchers Program - 1  
 Community Sharing Fair (Craft Fair) - 1  
 Little Sister-Big Brother Weekend - 1  
 Worship Services Within the Residence Hall - 1  
 Coffee Hour Saturday Morning - 1  
 Support A Deprived Child - 1  
 Tournaments - 1  
 Dinners Within the Residence Hall - 1  
 Intramural Tournaments - 1  
 Tutors - 1

Seniors (N = 18)

Speakers - 13

Speakers on: drug abuse, health issues affecting women, hobbies, apartment renting information, tax return information, gourmet food, human relations, self-concept, religion, cooking.

Parties - 3

Dances - 2

Camp Outs - 2

Roller Skating - 2

Picnics - 1

Challenge of the Sexes Competition - 1

Bike Races - 1

Hikes - 1

Tours - 1

Party Room - 1

Current Events Debate Evening Once a Week - 1

Getting Acquainted Party - 1

Card Party - 1

Birthday Parties - 1

Sockhops - 1

Leo Boscaglia Tapes - 1

Trip to Minneapolis (Guthrie, Zoo, Museums) - 1

Dinner Dances - 1

Bowling Parties - 1

Coffee Houses (musical entertainment) - 1

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chickering, A.W. College residences and student development. Educational Record. 1967, 48, 179-186.
- Chickering, A.W. Commuting versus resident students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Clarq, J.R. The educational impact of residence halls. Improving College and University Teaching. 1970, 18, 44-45.
- Clark, J.R. Perceptions of students and staff relating to the purpose of undergraduate residence halls on selected public college campuses in new york state. Student Housing Research. 1968, April, 2.
- DeCoster, D.A. & Mable, P. Student development and education in college residence halls. Washington D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1974.
- Flanagan, D. The effects of college and university residential programs on students. Empire State College, Sartoga Springs, New York. May, 1975.
- Healy, M.A. Programming for the residence hall community. Student Activities Programming. 1978, April/May, 40-41.
- Hoelting, F.B. How to do it in residence halls: 1001 ways to program. Macomb, Ill., 1973.
- Leonard, E.A. Origins of personnel services in american higher education. Minneapolis: Jones Press, Inc., 1956.
- Moos, R.H. & Otto, J. The impact of coed living on males and females. Journal of College Student Personnel. 1975, 16, 459-467.
- Murphy, R.O. Developing educational meaning for residence halls. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. 1969, 7, 61-64.
- Powell, J.R., Plyler, S.A., Dickson, B.A., & McClellen, S.D. The personnel assistant in college residence halls. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Riker, H.C. College housing as learning centers. Washington D.C.: American College Personnel Association, 1965.

- Riker, H.C. Commentary: The philosophical perspective. Programming and Activities in College and University Residence Halls (ACUHO). 1977, 10-11.
- Riker, H.C. & DeCoster, D.A. The educational role in college student housing. Journal of College and University Student Housing. 1971, 1-4.
- Rudolf, F. The american college and university a history. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Sargeant, R.C. The philosophical perspective. Programming and Activities in College and University Residence Halls (ACUHO). 1977, 7-10.
- Smith, M.M. Developing ideas for residence hall programs. Programming and Activities in College and University Residence Halls (ACUHO). 1977, 18-21.
- Williamson, E.G. Trends in student personnel work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Yelsma, P. & Yelsma, J. Living-learning-communicating. Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York. April, 1972.