UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE
COLLEGE OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION
AND TEACHER EDUCATION

THESIS APPROVAL

Meegan M. Harrington
Candidate

We recommend acceptance of this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education - College Student Development and Administration.

Thesis Chair	Department	Date
Thesis Committee Member	Department	Date
Thesis Committee Member	Department	Date

This thesis is approved.

Associate Dean, College of HPERTE	Date
Director, University Graduate Studies	Date

ABSTRACT

HARRINGTON, M. M. Student perceptions of community on co-educational and single-sex floors in the residence halls at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, May 2002. 53 pp. (H. Nicklaus)

This study analyzed the differing perceptions of community found within the two co-educational floors in Sanford Hall and two single-sex floors in Laux Hall, a co-educational hall with single-sex floors. The University Residence Environment Scale (URES), a social climate assessment tool, was administered in November to residents of these four floors. One hundred and twenty-one students participated in the study.

Based on the results, the first null hypothesis, men in a co-educational floor environment would perceive no statistically significant differences regarding community than men in a single-sex floor environment, was rejected due to significant differences on six of the ten subscales of the URES. The second null hypothesis, women in a co-educational floor environment would perceive no statistically significant differences regarding community than women in a single-sex floor environment, was supported due to significant differences on only two of the ten subscales of the URES.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY ON CO-EDUCATIONAL AND SINGLE-SEX FLOORS IN THE RESIDENCE HALLS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

A THESIS PRESENTED TO

THE GRADUATE FACULTY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION –

COLLEGE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

BY

MEEGAN M. HARRINGTON

MAY 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this research project would not have been possible without the assistance of many individuals. I would like to thank Dr. Nick Nicklaus, my thesis committee chairperson, for his constant support, encouragement, and advice. I would also like to thank thesis committee members Dr. Betsy Morgan and Dr. Mary Beth Vahala for sharing their knowledge, resources, and time throughout this entire process. The guidance I received from these three people has been invaluable.

I would also like to extend a special thank you to the Central Staff members in the Office of Residence Life for showing their support of this topic and providing financial assistance for purchase of the instrument. In addition, I give my thanks to the staff members of Sanford Hall and Laux Hall for their willingness to assist me in data collection.

Heartfelt appreciation also goes out to the other members of my thesis support group. These people are Beth Hartung, Karen LaMotte, and Travis Dodge. They not only shared their research, but also their humor, suggestions, and a consistently positive outlook.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their unending love and encouragement. You have supported me not only through the completion of this thesis, but also throughout my entire education. Thank you for always believing that I would succeed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

> For the dormitory held young men to a common experience. It took them from the bosom of a sheltering home and placed them under the same roof, where they might share the experiences which made men of boys. (Rudolph, 1990, p. 96).

The importance of a place to call home has always been of paramount importance to students in college. For roughly the first two hundred years of higher education in America, "home life" was supervised by faculty members who provided rules and discipline to young men seeking an education (Rudolph, 1990). In-class learning was supplemented by the values and interests shared in the dormitory. This in-house setting also encouraged the social interaction between young men living far away from family and old friends, providing diversion, challenges, and purpose.

By the second half of the 1800s, institutional support for student housing had waned considerably. Due to the influence of the German higher education system, American college administrators concluded that students should be treated as adults, and thus be responsible for finding individual housing (Winston & Anchors, 1993). This move away from residence hall construction also freed up more money for the construction of additional academic buildings and classrooms, as well as the purchase of better equipment. It was not long, however, before influences such as women in higher education and the establishment of land-grant institutions had once again sparked the desire for student housing.

The second decade of the twentieth century saw a dramatic increase in the number of residence halls being built on college campuses. In fact, the construction of residence

halls was at an all-time high at that point in history (Winston & Anchors, 1993). This surge in construction occurred after the First World War due to increased student populations and cost some institutions millions of dollars (Blimling & Miltenberger, 1990). The housing on campus at this time was gender segregated and female students were under strict rules for their behavior, including curfews and visitation. Men were also given rules for behavior, although they were treated with much greater leniency. *In loco parentis*, or the concept of student development through specific rules and discipline, came very much into play as administrators were expected to watch over the well-being of these young men and women while they were away from their parents. (Blimling & Miltenberger, 1990; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989).

The post-World War II era on college campuses saw an increase in the enrollment of adult students as a result of the GI Bill (Blimling & Miltenberger, 1990). *In loco parentis* did not necessarily apply to these students, as many were married with families of their own. On-campus housing in the following years adapted to meet changing needs, including the assignment of married students to temporary housing and the construction of new, larger residence halls. Residence life programs, however, faced even more far-reaching changes in the coming years, as students demanded greater personal freedom and fewer restrictions.

The students of 1960s and 1970s, dealing with concerns such as the Vietnam War and rebelling against strict regulations put forth by administrators, demanded to be treated as adults (Blimling & Miltenberger, 1990). Many residence life programs, in an attempt to meet students' needs, re-evaluated policies regarding student curfews,

visitation, and gender segregation in the halls. Of these changes, one of the most important was the establishment of co-educational residence halls, as students could have additional opportunities to generate more open and casual relationships with peers of the opposite sex.

One of the pioneers of co-educational housing was Stanford University, with its first co-educational residence hall opening in 1966 (Katz, 1974). However, the seeds for the concept of co-educational housing had been planted almost a decade earlier by Stanford students studying overseas who lived in co-educational environments. The popularity of co-educational housing in the coming years was clear, as seen in the results from a set of studies of coeducational housing facilities put forth by the American College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO). In 1978, 85 percent of institutions in the studies provided some type of coeducational housing to resident students (DeCoster & Mable, 1980). These coeducational residence halls could be set up in a number of ways, including males and females on different floors, in separate wings, or in suites or apartments on shared floors.

The state of residential life on American campuses in recent years appeared to be thriving, due in part to rising student enrollments. According to the U. S. Department of Education, colleges and universities in the year 1999 would have a total enrollment of 14.9 million students (Gose, 1999). In addition, the Digest of Education Statistics reported that in the 1995-1996 academic year 2,434,988 students resided in on-campus housing (Number and percent of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions, March 15, 2002). As the number of students on campus and in residence halls continued to

increase, colleges and universities have evaluated the addition of new housing environments.

In campus residence halls today, students face many more options for floor mates, neighbors, and even roommates. At Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania and at Haverford College, a small percentage of students have the option of sharing a living space with members of the opposite sex (Borrego, 2001; Schaefer, 2000). These new living arrangements were partly influenced by the desire of LGBT students to have an alternative to traditional housing. And although this concept of coeducational rooming in residence halls may be flatly rejected at many institutions in the United States, it does highlight the call for housing options that fit students' preferences and developmental needs.

Statement of the Problem

In the 2001-2002 academic year, the Residence Life program at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (hereafter referred to as UW-La Crosse) provided housing for nearly 2,900 students and encompassed 11 separate residence halls. Ten of these halls were co-educational, housing men and women on separate floors. The other residence hall on campus housed only women. Each hall was supervised by a live-in hall director and several student staff members. Due to larger numbers of residents, three of the halls also had assistant hall directors. Hall council members provided additional leadership and had representation at the Residence Hall Council Association (RHAC). Both staff members and hall council executives coordinated programming, including social and educational activities, on a regular basis in each hall.

The Residence Life program at UW-La Crosse followed guidelines set by the University of Wisconsin System 30 years ago, including visitation in the halls and opportunities for coeducational living (Regent Policy 72-4, March 20, 2002). Co-educational housing, as defined by the Board of Regents, was men and women living on separate floors. The Resolution from the Board has not been updated since 1972 and has not addressed men and women living on the same residence hall floors on UW campuses.

In the fall of 2001, a pilot program was instituted to create co-educational environments on two floors of Sanford Hall, a four-floor residence hall. The housing assignments on these two co-educational floors would be alternating rooms for male and female students. The impetus for the pilot program came from students who were currently living in Sanford Hall. The proposal was first accepted by RHAC and the Office of Residence Life and then passed through the Student Affairs division and finally the Chancellor's office. The Residence Life professional staff, as well as the Sanford Hall director and student staff members, all assisted in the planning and programming for the new hall environment.

Sanford Hall was an ideal setting for the pilot program, as no renovation had to be done to the building to allow for the two coeducational floors. While the lower two floors of the hall would remain single-sex, rooms on the upper two floors would alternate between men and women. Two students were assigned to each room, with a male and female staff member also living on each floor. Separate bathroom facilities were available on each floor for male and female residents.

During the spring of 2001, students already living in Sanford Hall or in other residence halls on campus had an opportunity to request placement on one of the coeducational floors for the 2001-2002 school year. Incoming students were assigned to these floors as well. Prior to the start of the school year, however, these students received a letter from the Office of Residence Life indicating their assignment to one of the coeducational floors. If a student preferred not to live in this environment, he or she would be assigned to a different living environment.

The purpose of this study was to compare student perceptions of community on single-sex floors and co-educational floors in the residence halls at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. The research hypotheses focused on the differences perceived by men and by women in regard to relationships, change, and growth in the two differing types of residence hall communities. Hypothesis one stated that male students living in a co-educational floor environment would report no significantly differing perceptions of community than male students living in a single-sex floor environment. The second hypothesis stated that female students living in a co-educational floor environment would report no significantly differing perceptions of community than female students living in a single-sex floor environment.

Importance of the Study

In a broad sense, the impact of living on-campus is far-reaching and deep. As summarized by Chickering (1974), residence hall living fosters the chance to create close ties with peers, to learn to appreciate individual differences and values, and to witness first-hand how an individual's behavior has the ability to influence other people. In

particular, coeducational housing arrangements have been perceived to provide unique opportunities and experiences for its members. Research on co-educational housing found that students reported more casual relationships with opposite-sex peers (Williams & Reilley, 1974), greater perceptions of open and friendly living environments (Moos & Otto, 1975), and greater feelings of belonging (Corbett & Sommer, 1972).

Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

1. The inability to factor out students' past experiences living in a mixed-gender environment. The occurrence of same sex or opposite sex siblings was not accounted for, although this could have had an influence on participants' perceptions of their peer interactions. The general demographic information included as part of the survey administered to students (Moos, 1988) did not seem to focus on familial or personal background as external influencing factors.
2. The inability to find two residence hall environments that were almost exactly comparable regarding students' choice of living group. While the majority of students living on either the all-male floor or the all-female floor of Laux Hall in this study had no choice in their living group assignment, the majority of students living on one of the two co-educational floors of Sanford Hall received their first choice. In regard to the number of residents and general floor plan, however, these two halls were the most closely comparable of all the residence halls on the UW-La Crosse campus.

Definition of Terms

Co-educational Floor - male and female students assigned to alternating rooms on the same floor of a residence hall.

Coeducational Residence Hall - male and female students living in the same wing/cube, on the same floor or in the same corridor, in alternating rooms, or in suites/apartments.

Community - social interaction and interpersonal relationships, support from one's peers, involvement, growth as an individual and as a member of the group (Moos, 1988).

Resident Assistant - student staff member trained to work with students and provide programming in the residence halls.

Residence Hall - housing provided by an institution to enrolled students and supervised by professional and student staff members; in earlier contexts were called dormitories.

University Residence Environment Scale (URES) - social climate assessment tool, consisting of three separate forms designed to focus on perceptions of current living groups, perceptions of an ideal living group, and the expectations of a new living group; may be used to assess a variety of living groups (Moos, 1988).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate student perceptions of community on coeducational floors and single-sex floors in the residence halls at UW-La Crosse. The chapter includes sections on the definition of coeducational residence halls, community, personal development and theory, and a review of the literature on residence hall environments.

Coeducational Residence Halls

Co-educational halls, rather than single-sex halls, have been in the mainstream of college and university housing for more than four decades on American campuses. Strictly speaking, co-educational halls were those that housed both men and women in the same structure. In many instances, however, administrators and staff may have differed on their definition of "co-educational" housing. On some campuses, a building could be considered co-educational if alternating floors were male-female. At another institution, a floor could be co-educational if every other room was designated male-female. Finally, some halls were considered co-educational by corridor or wing. One had to be somewhat cautious, therefore, when comparing the results of studies on residence hall environments.

Community

When speaking of community in any type of society or environment, Gardner (1989) defined traditional community as possessing continuity, conformity, and an established history. Current community, in contrast, promoted participation, sharing

leadership roles, and fulfilling obligations to the group. Gardner cited several points in the realization of a strong community, including respect for diversity and sharing culture, free-flowing communication, cooperation, and working toward a shared goal. As all these elements needed to exist in a successful urban, rural, or world community, they also needed to exist on college campuses and in residence halls.

Community, which may exist within any group setting, was evident in housing environments for college students. Interactions within a peer group, a residence hall community, or the larger campus community may have a direct influence on student development and success. According to Moos (1986), on campuses where the perception of community was at a high level, students felt a strong tie to the institution. Astin (1993) noted that one of the strongest influences on student development is the peer group to which he or she belongs and that a lack of student community strongly affected students' satisfaction with the collegiate experience. Mable, Terry, and Duvall (1980) additionally stated that while students created community identities based on understanding, reliability, and responsibility, support was also given to establishing personal identity.

Communities in residence halls, in addition to bringing students together, had the ability to impact individuals' lives by promoting new ways of thinking and increased understanding of human differences. Berger (1997) indicated that students living in a community had the opportunity to share values, beliefs, and goals with one another while also fostering connections on an emotional level. Allen, Collins, Gee and Nudd (1964) further noted that co-educational living environments provided students the opportunity

to become student leaders and work together on projects and programming to advance a more cohesive community. Allen et al. summarized the community in co-educational residence halls with these words:

> Residence halls as coeducational communities are men and women students living in a specific physical environment within a university or college campus, working and learning together in the changing process of human relationships and interrelationships (p. 82-83).

Personal Development and Theory in the Residence Halls

While many researchers have postulated theories regarding the development of students in college, only a select few have related those ideas to the experiences of living in on-campus housing. These student development theorists and researchers have embraced the residence hall environment as a place where students form friendships, grow in their values and attitudes, and find their own individuality (Berger, 1997; Chickering, 1974; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Additionally, Chickering stated that residence halls promote growth in two specific vectors, or dimensions of human development. The two vectors influenced by residence hall living were freeing interpersonal relationships and integrity development. In a new and diverse environment, students may come to re-evaluate previously held beliefs and to gain respect for peers who hold differing values, backgrounds, and goals. These re-evaluations and new appreciation for human differences promoted the freeing of interpersonal relationships.

Chickering (1974) indicated that within the residence halls, students may take on some responsibility for how the hall is run, thus furthering the development of integrity. Furthermore, living in this environment may also affect the values by which each student

decides to live his or her life. A re-affirmation or adjustment in values was also a dimension of integrity development.

Astin (1993) also noted the effects of residence hall living on student growth and satisfaction. According to Astin, living in a residence hall positively affected a student's realization of an undergraduate degree, satisfaction with instructors, and motivation to remain at the same institution. Residence in on-campus housing influenced students' development through their interactions with other members of the campus community. Continued enrollment at an institution also affected personal growth, as students would have opportunities to become involved with various activities and organizations within their residence hall and in other areas of campus.

General Research on Co-educational Residence Halls

Much of the research concerning coeducational residence halls was generated in the early to mid-1970s. The focus of the studies from this time period was on relationships between male and female students, particularly sexual attitudes and social climate. Sexual attitudes and activity were a major concern for many parents as their child(ren) moved into a gender-mixed environment. In a study by Brown, Winkworth, Braskamp (1973), there was not a significant difference between the sexual activity of students living in a co-educational hall and those living in a single-sex hall. Based on the results, Brown et al. stated that co-educational hall living did not appear to promote promiscuous behavior.

Corbett and Sommer (1972) conducted a study at the University of California-Davis campus to assess how co-educational living influenced the social relationships of

resident students. As a comparison sample, the results of a questionnaire distributed to single-sex hall residents on the same campus were utilized in their study, although these data were collected at an earlier date. This same questionnaire was administered to residents of one male floor, two female floors and one co-educational floor in a single residence hall.

The results of the survey indicated that residents living on the co-educational floor gave higher ratings to the ease of meeting and knowing people and felt there was more of a feeling of belonging to the unit. "In general, the coed floor seemed to function as one large, friendly community, with less small group formation and more interaction as a whole than the other floors" (Corbett & Sommer, 1972, p. 216). In this situation, the addition of a co-educational floor appeared to be a great success, although some females on the single-sex floor in the same residence hall felt cut off from the rest of the building. To combat such a problem, Corbett and Sommer suggested assigning to the top floor students who would prefer more privacy or adjusting the layout of the building to promote more male-female interaction.

A study by Brown et al. (1973) focused on the relationships and interactions between men and women in a co-educational setting as compared to a single-sex residence setting. The focus of this study was friendships with the opposite sex, dating activity, student morale, and sexual relationships. The results showed that there did not appear to be a significant difference in the extent of student sexual activity based on residence type. There was, however, a significant difference in the occurrence of casual friendships between members of the opposite sex in regard to living situation. Females

living in the coeducational residence hall were found to interact more with males from the same hall, including participation in social activities and casual conversations. Males in the coeducational hall also interacted more with females and both genders appeared to have higher levels of respect for the opposite sex.

In addition to more casual friendships between males and females in the coeducational residence hall, the concept of formal dating also became less frequent (Brown et al., 1973). For women in this living environment, most dates occurred with men from another residence hall. In fact, males and females living in the coeducational environment often found "[b]rother and sister relationships developed and tended to flourish in casual meetings rather than in formal dating" (p. 100). Thus, coeducational living seemed to promote more familial-type ties between residents, rather than sexual or intimate relationships.

In analyzing research on residence hall environments, Williams and Reilley (1974) found that the impact of coeducational living was clear. Casual friendships between the opposite sexes were noted more often in co-educational halls. There was a higher level of satisfaction with living in the residence halls and students in coeducational environments seemed less fearful of change and experienced further growth and development as individuals.

To assess social climate of student living groups the University Residence Environment Scale (URES) was developed by Moos and Gerst (Moos, 1988). This tool has been used in a variety of settings and contexts including single-sex halls, co-educational halls, fraternities, and sororities. The URES, first introduced in 1974 and

republished 14 years later, had three separate forms: The Real Form (R), the Ideal Form (I) and the Expectations Form (E). Of these three forms, the Form R assessed how both students and staff viewed their current living group. Form I assessed the type of living group that the respondent would prefer while Form E assessed expectations in regard to a new living group. The URES was divided into three dimensions, Relationship, Personal Growth or Goal Orientation, and System Maintenance and Change and ten subscales Involvement (INV), Emotional Support (ES), Independence (IND), Traditional Social Orientation (TSO), Competition (C), Academic Achievement (AA), Intellectuality (INT), Order and Organization (OO), Student Influence (SI), and Innovation (INN).

When administered to a sample of men's halls, women's halls and co-educational halls, the URES (Form R) results found significant differences (Moos, 1988). The co-educational halls had more student involvement and higher levels of INT, SI, and INN. Traditional Social Orientation in the co-educational halls was lower than that of the single-sex halls. Co-educational halls were also found to have as much ES as that in the women's halls and as much IND as in the men's halls. Further research has generally found that women's halls and co-educational halls possessed social climates of a more positive nature than that which was found in men's residence halls (Moos, 1988).

Foster (1974) also sought to determine how social atmosphere and student relationships would be affected by coeducational living. Specifically, Foster proposed that the environment in a mixed-gender hall would be less formal and that stereotyping in sex roles would be lessened as students interacted. To gain a deeper understanding of perceptions of coeducational living, Foster administered a questionnaire to more than 600

students, interviewed 25 students for supplemental information, and also sent a questionnaire home to the parents of the students who were personally interviewed. Also administered was the Interpersonal Check-List (ICL), which evaluated how students perceived the opposite sex, both in single-sex and co-educational residence halls.

The results of this study indicated that students in co-educational halls perceived the environment to have an affect on their social behavior (Foster, 1974). It was also found that students in this environment felt the residents were friendlier and there was greater interaction between members of the opposite sex. Furthermore, a significant proportion of the students felt living in a co-educational environment felt more natural and thus it was suggested that the number of co-educational living units on the campus should be increased. In contrast to this, only three of the 17 parents who returned the questionnaire seeking their perceptions of co-educational living agreed that co-educational housing options should be increased.

Moos and Otto (1975) conducted an assessment that reviewed the differences between incoming students in a co-educational environment and in a single-sex environment and the effects of these environments on residents. Moos and Otto gathered information regarding students' expectations their new living environment, as well as current perceptions of the living environment at a later date. Participants in the study included freshmen from 20 single-sex units (10 male and 10 female) and 17 co-educational units.

The results indicated that while there were a few noticeable differences between women entering co-educational units and single-sex units, there was not a significant

difference in what participants from each group expected of the social environment. In regard to the perception of living environments, however, there were significant differences between the various living units. In the co-educational units, both men and women experienced a lesser perception of TSO and a greater perception of SI. Men, however, perceived a higher level of ES and INT, while women perceived a greater emphasis on INV and IND.

Regarding changes in behavior, females in single-sex units were more likely to get involved in social activities than females in a coeducational environment (Moos & Otto, 1975). Women in co-educational units also tended to develop increasingly negative feelings toward demanding careers, withdrew from school or chose to leave their living group. The overall findings from the study supported the contention that co-educational environments are more open, friendly, and satisfying for college students. Personal development appeared to occur more often in a mixed-gender environment, while academic development saw a decline.

Another assessment of co-educational and single-sex environments was conducted by Jacokes (1975) to look for differences in student behaviors and characteristics. Jacokes compared three living environments: single-sex, coeducational with single-sex wing units, and co-educational with single-sex floors. The participants, all freshmen, were randomly selected from the different housing units and were asked to fill out three questionnaires at different times in a one-year time frame. Students living in co-educational residence halls in this study indicated that student friendliness decreased a great deal over time, while students in the single-sex halls indicated that student

friendliness increased. In addition, it appeared that males and females living in a hall that was co-educational by floor found members the opposite sex to be inferior as a result of living in this environment. These negative findings did not give support to the hypothesis of a perceived warmer and friendlier environment in a co-educational residence hall. Some specific results from this study were in direct contrast from the general findings of other studies evaluating co-educational residence hall environments.

In 1975, Frichette also studied the social climates found in student residences, including single-sex and co-educational halls, cooperatives, fraternities, and sororities. Data were gathered through utilization of the URES scale, as well as information from a locally developed questionnaire and school records. Frichette hypothesized that in regard to co-educational and single-sex halls, there would be no significant differences on the mean scores for each of the ten URES subscales.

The results indicated significantly higher scores on INT for residents of co-educational residence halls in comparison to residents of single-sex halls (Frichette, 1975). There were no other significant differences for the two resident hall types on the URES subscales. Additional analysis noted, however, that a significant relationship existed for TSO and dating activity for men in single-sex residence halls. A significant relationship also existed for in-hall, informal dating activity and TSO for women in the co-educational residence halls. Frichette also indicated that the set visitation hours in the residence halls, in addition to the fact that men and women were segregated on separate floors in the co-educational halls, might have influenced the results of this study.

In the following year, LeMay and Frichette (1976) reported findings regarding the value of the Short Form (Form S) of the URES as a measure of social climate in single-sex and co-educational residence halls at Oregon State University. Included in the study were two single-sex halls and one co-educational hall, all of which predominately housed first-year students. The co-educational residence hall housed men on the upper three floors, while females lived on the lower two floors.

For the ten subscales of the URES, men in the co-educational environment reported higher on IND and C but reported lower on ES, AA, INT and INV (LeMay & Frichette, 1976). Women in the co-educational environment, while reporting higher IND and SI levels, reported lower levels of AA, INT, and TSO. LeMay and Frichette, when noting the results for both men and women, did not find the majority of these results to be statistically significant.

Summary

Community among students was fostered by respect for differences and commonalities, a sense of responsibility, and mutual support. The free exchange of ideas and personal growth was enhanced by working with others in the community. In the residence halls, strong ties were established through peer group interactions. Peers provided both challenge and support and directly influenced student satisfaction with the college experience.

Student development theory asserted that living in the residence halls provided student with unique opportunities for growth. Residents gained an understanding of themselves, as well as their peers, while gaining an appreciation of human differences.

Residence halls also afforded students the chance to gain leadership skills and develop strong values.

The majority of the literature assessing co-educational housing indicated that living in this type of environment was a positive experience for residents. Students found co-educational residence halls and the residents living in the halls to be friendlier, more open to new ideas and change, and less formal in relationships with the opposite sex. The exchange of ideas through casual interactions and student involvement was also reported more often in co-educational housing.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted to assess perceptions of community on co-educational or single-sex floors in the residence halls. The participants resided on a co-educational floor in one residence hall or on a single-sex floor in a second residence hall. The University Environment Residence Scale, a social climate assessment tool, was administered to participants (Moos, 1988). It was hypothesized that male students living on a co-educational floor would report no significantly differing perceptions of community than male students living on a single-sex floor in a residence hall. It was also hypothesized that female students living on a co-educational floor would report no significantly differing perceptions of community than female students living on a single-sex floor in a residence hall.

Participants

There are 11 residence halls on the UW-La Crosse campus. It was necessary to determine another hall that closely resembled the student population, demographics, and building structure of Sanford Hall. Laux Hall was identified to be the most similar, particularly in floor plan, resident capacity, ages of the students, resident demographics, and choice of living environment. Sixty-three men and 60 women lived on the two upper floors of Laux Hall during the first semester, while 60 men and 60 women lived on the two co-educational floors of Sanford Hall. Two student staff members also lived on each of these floors, although they were not participants in the study.

The 121 participants in the study were solicited from four floors in two residence

halls on the UW-La Crosse campus during the fall 2001 semester. Eighty participants from the co-educational floors returned their questionnaires from a possible 120 residents. Forty-one participants from the single-sex floors returned their questionnaires from a possible 123 residents. Participation on the four floors yielded a total response rate of 49.8 percent. The first group of participants lived on the two co-educational floors of Sanford Hall. The second group of participants lived on either an all-male floor or an all-female floor in Laux Hall, a co-educational hall. Demographic information for the study participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

Demographic Information for Survey Participants

Demographics	Co-ed Male Floors (N=37)	Co-ed Female Floors (N=43)	Single-sex Male Floor (N=21)	Single-Sex Female Floor (N=20)
Age				
18	11	16	5	7
19	15	17	11	6
20	5	8	3	7
21	4	2	1	0
22	2	0	1	0
Year				
Freshmen	17	22	11	12
Sophomore	11	14	8	4
Junior	5	6	1	4
Senior	4	1	1	0

Table 1 (Continued).

Demographics	Co-educational Male Floors	Co-educational Female Floors	Single-sex Male Floor	Single-sex Female Floor
Choice of Living Group				
First	36	39	3	6
Second	0	1	2	2
Third	0	0	2	2
No Choice	1	3	14	10
Same Living Group Last Year	13	10	2	3
Different Living Group (or New Student)	24	33	19	17
Same Group (First Semester Only)	1	1	0	0
Same Group (Both Semesters)	12	9	2	3
Choose to Live Here Again				
Yes	13	24	2	2
Probably	7	3	3	1
Neutral	8	3	6	6
Probably Not	2	5	3	1
No	7	8	7	10

Instrumentation

In order to assess student perceptions of community on their residence hall, Form S of the University Residence Environment Scale (URES) was used

(See Appendix A). The URES, put forth by Gerst and Moos, focuses on three dimensions of social climate in various living groups: Relationship, Personal Growth or Goal Orientation, and System Maintenance and Change (Moos, 1988). To assess these dimensions, ten subscales were established.

The "Relationship" subscales were INV and ES (Moos, 1988). Involvement was characterized by commitment to the living group and its members, and interaction and friendship among the living group's members. The ES subscale highlighted concern for other residents, support when dealing with personal and school-related problems, and open communication between residents.

The "Personal Growth or Goal Orientation" subscales were IND, TSO, C, AA, and INT (Moos, 1988). The IND subscale focused on the freedom of residents to participate in varied activities without fear of reprisal for not conforming to behavior deemed appropriate by other people. Traditional Social Orientation was described as an emphasis on conventional heterosexual activities such as dating or attending parties. Competition was characterized by the extent to which activities, both in academic and social spheres, are made competitive. The AA subscale highlighted the importance of one's academic endeavors and concerns. The INT subscale focused on those intellectual activities within an artistic or cultural framework, yet separated from purely academic pursuits.

The subscales for "System Maintenance and Change" included OO, SI, and INN (Moos, 1988). Order and Organization focused on the scope of prescribed structure in the living group. The SI subscale assessed the degree to which residents, not staff

members, were able to establish and enforce policies, aid in the selection of staff members, and decide how monetary funds for the living group would be allocated. The INN subscale focused on the naturalness of resident behavior and creativity while also examining the occurrence and diversity of new activities provided for living group members.

Gerst and Moos developed the URES in the early 1970s (Moos, 1988). The initial form of the URES contained 238-items, but was later pared down to 140-items. Gerst and Moos administered this second form to participants in 74 residence halls. Due to the assessment of correlations among subscales, the form underwent further revisions and reorganization. Form R was then established, with 10 subscales and 100 items.

Included in the URES are three distinct forms: The Real Form (Form R), the Ideal Form (Form I), and the Expectations Form (Form E) (Moos, 1988). Each form contains 100 true-false items with 10 items falling into each subscale. Form R, the base form of the URES, measures perceptions of a current living group. To obtain a faster assessment of a current living environment, the Short Form (Form S) may be used. Form S, a derivative of Form R, contains four questions from each of the 10 subscales. To assess an ideally preferred living environment, Form I would be used. Form E assessed expectations about a new living group. Both Form I and Form E contain reworded statements and instructions from Form R; this format necessitates only one scoring key for the three main forms of the URES.

The instrument used for this study, Form S, was in the Second Edition of the URES (Moos, 1988). Included in the second edition was a larger review of the

applications of the URES to research. The normative samples for Form R and Form S were taken from 16 institutions and included 168 living group units. These living group units included co-educational housing, fraternities, women's houses and men's houses (separated by freshmen or upper-class student status), and units occupied by both undergraduate and graduate students.

According to Moos (1988), the internal consistency of the ten subscales was established for Form R. The consistencies ranged from .88 to .77, with a mean of .82. Test-retest reliability for the URES was also established by administering the survey three times to 83 students at a public institution. Based on the results gathered sufficient stability for individual perceptions of living groups was found. Validity of the URES was ensured by placing each of the 100 items into one of the three social climate dimensions and by clearly defining each subscale and dimension. Validity was further ensured through interviews conducted with students and staff members in eight separate living groups.

For this study, reliability was assessed for each of the ten subscales. The reliability of the survey results was relatively consistent, excluding the subscales of SI and INN. The reason that these two subscales exhibit low reliability alphas was not apparent. Descriptive statistics, including reliability alpha, are listed in Table 2.

Form S, most successfully used when assessing living groups and not individual perceptions, contained a short instruction sheet, a demographic information request sheet, and the 40 true-false statements. Included in the demographic information were the participant's name, age, gender, residence hall or building, corridor or floor, room, and

year in college. Participants were also asked to note if the living group was their first, second, third, or fourth choice or if they had no choice in living group assignment. Participants were also asked to note how long they had lived in the living group during the current year and if they had been assigned to the same living group from the previous year. Finally, participants were asked if they would like to be assigned to the same living group for the next year.

Procedure

Form S of the URES was administered to students on the four designated floors of Sanford Hall and Laux Hall in November 2001. November was chosen because it was believed that by this time students would have had the opportunity to become adjusted to their living environment. Questionnaires were administered during floor meetings for all residents. Due to time constraints, the resident assistants assigned to facilitate the floor meetings aided the researcher in the distribution and collection of the surveys.

Each participant received the following materials:

1. Form S of the URES (Appendix A)
2. Introductory Letter (Appendix B)
3. Informed consent form (Appendix C)

After the staff members had handed out the information, the participants were asked to read the introductory letter and sign the informed consent form. Participation in the study was completely voluntary and anonymity was assured. The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at UW-La Crosse approved this study, thus allowing the participation of students in the residence halls.

At the end of the week in which the survey was to be administered, the researcher contacted the hall directors and requested they collect the finished surveys and signed consent forms. The surveys for the participants in Sanford Hall were returned to the researcher within a few days. The receipt of the surveys from Laux Hall took more time; the researcher made several attempts to collect these surveys from the hall director and finally was able to do so during the second week of December. At least two of the eight Resident Assistants did not hand the survey out during the floor meetings and thus some participants filled out the survey on their own. Additionally, one Resident Assistant returned no completed surveys. The impact of this will be discussed in Chapter V.

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics on the Ten Subscales

Subscale	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability Alpha
INV	0-4	3.35	.99	.61
ES	0-4	3.24	1.11	.66
IND	0-4	1.98	1.13	.39
TSO	0-4	1.62	1.21	.54
C	0-4	1.34	1.12	.46
AA	0-4	2.58	1.42	.75
INT	0-4	1.85	1.61	.39
OO	0-4	3.06	1.03	.44
SI	0-4	1.82	.99	.10
INN	0-4	2.95	.98	.28

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter focuses on the results of the research, including data regarding the two hypotheses and post-hoc ANOVA analyses.

Null Hypothesis 1

Male students living in a co-educational floor environment will report no significantly differing perceptions of community than male students living in a single-sex floor environment.

The first hypothesis was rejected. On six of the ten subscales of the URES significant differences were found. As shown in Table 3, men on co-educational floors reported higher levels of INV, ES, OO, and INN than men on the single-sex floor. Men on co-educational floors also reported lower levels of IND and C.

Null Hypothesis 2

Female students living in a co-educational floor environment will report no significantly differing perceptions of community than female students living in a single-sex floor environment.

The second hypothesis was largely supported; however, there were significant differences found on one subscale, with a strong trend toward significant differences on a second subscale. As shown in Table 4, women on co-educational floors reported higher levels of INV than women on the single-sex floor. Furthermore, there was a strong trend toward women on co-educational floors reporting lower levels of TSO.

A post-hoc analysis of variance (ANOVA) for each of the ten subscales indicated several significant main effects detected for gender and floor type. Table 5 highlights the ANOVA results. There were significant interaction effects determined for the subscales

of Independence, Competition, Order and Organization, and Innovation. These interaction effects are shown in Table 6.

Table 3.

Comparisons of Male Participants on the Ten Subscales

Subscale	Single-Sex Floor (N = 21)	SD	Co-educational Floor (N = 37)	SD	t-value
INV	2.4	1.14	3.51	.80	4.29 ***
ES	2.43	1.36	3.32	1.00	2.87 **
IND	2.76	.94	1.86	1.16	-3.02 **
TSO	1.55	1.19	1.57	1.24	.052
C	2.19	1.08	1.24	1.21	-2.98 **
AA	2.45	1.50	2.59	1.44	.36
INT	1.71	1.01	2.08	1.12	1.25
OO	2.38	1.47	3.05	.88	2.19 *
SI	1.86	.91	2.08	.95	.87
INN	2.00	1.08	3.35	.86	5.19 ***

$p. \leq .05$ *
$p. \leq .01$ **
$p. \leq .001$ ***

Table 4.

Comparisons of Female Participants on the Ten Subscales

Subscale	Single-Sex Floor (N = 20)	SD	Co-educational Floors (N = 43)	SD	t-value
INV	3.10	1.16	3.78	.56	3.14 **
ES	3.30	1.08	3.55	.89	.96
IND	1.80	1.06	1.77	1.09	-.12
TSO	2.10	1.21	1.46	1.18	-1.96 *
C	1.05	.82	1.14	1.00	.36
AA	3.00	1.26	2.42	1.45	-1.51
INT	1.80	1.24	1.73	1.24	-.20
OO	3.55	.51	3.17	.93	-1.71
SI	1.30	.98	1.80	1.00	1.86
INN	2.90	.79	3.07	.87	.75

$p. = .055$ *
$p. \leq .01$ **

Table 5.

Gender by Floor Type ANOVAs on the Ten Subscales

Subscales		Male (N = 58)	Female (N = 63)	Coed. (N = 80)	Single-sex (N = 41)	F
INV	Gender	3.12	3.56			8.29**
	Hall			3.66	2.75	28.39***
	Interaction					1.60
ES	Gender	3.00	3.47			7.32**
	Hall			3.44	2.85	7.99**
	Interaction					n.s.
IND	Gender	2.18	1.78			6.48**
	Hall			1.81	2.29	4.99*
	Interaction					4.31*
TSO	Gender	1.57	1.67			.90
	Hall			1.51	1.82	1.74
	Interaction					1.94
C	Gender	1.59	1.11			9.25**
	Hall			1.19	1.63	4.38*
	Interaction					6.49**
AA	Gender	2.54	2.61			.48
	Hall			2.50	2.73	.59
	Interaction					1.67
INT	Gender	1.95	1.75			.34
	Hall			1.89	1.76	.44
	Interaction					.93
OO	Gender	3.05	2.38			11.07***
	Floor			3.11	2.93	.58
	Interaction					7.82**
SI	Gender	2.00	1.64			4.96*
	Floor			1.94	1.58	3.79*
	Interaction					n.s.
INN	Gender	2.87	3.02			3.22
	Floor			3.70	2.45	19.42***
	Interaction					11.66***

$p. \leq .05$ *
$p. \leq .01$ **
$p. \leq .001$ ***

Table 6.

Significant Interaction Effects of Gender and Floor Type on Four Subscales

Subscale	Floor Type	Male	Female
IND	Coeducational	1.87	1.78
	Single-sex	**2.76**	1.80
C	Coeducational	1.24	1.14
	Single-sex	**2.19**	1.05
OO	Coeducational	3.05	3.16
	Single-sex	**2.38**	3.55
INN	Coeducational	3.35	3.07
	Single-sex	**2.00**	2.90

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will summarize the results reported in Chapter IV, discuss conclusions regarding these findings, and provide recommendations for the Residence Life program and for further research.

Summary and Conclusions

This study examined the influence of a single-sex or co-educational environments in regard to student perceptions of community on their residence hall floor. Data were collected from students living on two co-educational floors in Sanford Hall and two single-sex floors in Laux Hall. Eighty students from Sanford Hall (66.7%) and 41 students from Laux Hall (33.3%) returned the survey. The University Residence Environment Scale developed by Moos and Gerst (Moos, 1988) was administered to floor residents.

There were two null hypotheses posited in this study. One of these was rejected while the other was strongly supported. The first null hypothesis, which stated that male students living in a co-educational floor environment will report no significantly differing perceptions of community than male students living in a single-sex floor environment was rejected. On the individual subscales of the URES, significant findings were noted in six dimensions: INV, ES, OO, INN, IND, and C. The rejection of the null hypothesis generally follows the results of earlier studies. Past research indicated that co-educational environments and the residents found therein were perceived to be friendlier and more supportive with higher levels of INV (Moos & Otto, 1975). A contrasting

study by LeMay and Frichette (1976), however, reported that males in a single-sex environment reported higher perceived levels of ES and INV.

One possible reason for the differing results from the studies from Moos and Otto (1975) and LeMay and Frichette (1976) may be due to the utilization of different form of the URES as an assessment tool. While Moos and Otto administered Form R and Form E, both 100-item questionnaires, LeMay and Frichette administered Form S to participants. Although shown to be reliable, the 40-item Form S provides less depth when compared to Form R.

The findings of the current study suggest that for male residents, a co-educational floor environment offers greater opportunities for becoming involved, receiving support, and participating in new activities. In addition, there appears to be less emphasis on traditional social activities, allowing new types of relationships and attitudes to form. The differences for male residences within the two types of living environments may be influenced by the proximity of female residents. In particular, male residents could be more willing to become involved in floor activities if they have the chance to interact and form friendships with members of the opposite sex.

The second null hypothesis, which stated that female students living in a co-educational floor environment will report no significantly differing perceptions of community than female students living in a single-sex floor environment was supported. On the individual subscales, significant differences were reported for only two of the ten subscales: INV and TSO. The acceptance of the null hypothesis does not support the general findings of past studies.

Previous research suggested that women in co-educational environments reported higher levels of IND and SI and lower levels of AA (LeMay & Frichette, 1976). Moos and Otto (1975) also reported that women in co-educational environment perceived higher levels of INV, IND, and INN and lower levels of TSO, AA, and OO.

The results for female residents in this study may have differed from past research for several reasons. The first may be the growing general independence of women since the time that the past research was conducted. While females living in a co-educational environment were traditionally found to be more independent, women in today's American society are more often encouraged to make their own choices and participate in activities as they choose. Thus, both women in a co-educational living group and women in a single-sex living group may not wish to conform to certain types of behavior.

In addition to greater independence, women in co-educational living groups seem to be realizing their academic potential at higher levels than in the past. This may be due to a greater societal emphasis on women reaching their career goals. Women now have a greater option of having a fulfilling work life along with a strong family life. To reach one's career goal, therefore, a woman must focus on succeeding in her college coursework. The environment in which a woman lives, as she sees other residents, both men and women, studying and making academics a top priority, may also directly influence success in the classroom.

Another possible reason for these results is the percent of women now attending college is greater than in the 1970s. For example, nearly two-thirds of all students living in the residence halls at UW-La Crosse are female and more than 55 percent of the

student body is female. This dynamic may lend itself to greater opportunities for women's leadership roles both on co-educational floors and single-sex floors. The inclusion of a larger population of women in the residence halls may also provide for more extensive support networks on the floors while decreasing the need to compete with one's peers either socially or academically.

There were no significant differences for eight of the ten subscales for women in these two environments. One explanation of this may possibly be due to the small sample size. Further research should be conducted to verify these findings.

In regard to the results of this study, other factors should be considered as possible influences on perceptions of community. According to the demographic information supplied in the survey, 28 of the respondents (23%) indicated they had no choice of in their room and hall assignment. Additionally, 62 of the respondents (51%) were in their first year of college. Twenty-six students (21%) also reported that they had lived in the same hall the previous year. In looking at these statistics, it is important to note that not all students had control over the living environment into which they were placed and most had never lived in close quarters with people other than immediate family members. Therefore, these students may not have had the same underlying characteristics as students who choose to reside on a particular floor. All students who lived on the co-educational floors, however, were informed in advance of their housing assignment.

Another factor that may have influenced perceptions of community were the staff members assigned to the co-educational floors. The hall director and Residence Life

professional staff specially selected student staff members for these living groups. Additional training was also conducted with the staff to focus on programming and activities, as well as to generally provide a smooth transition from single-sex floor environments to co-educational floor environments.

In addition to the results on the subscales focusing solely on gender, the data were reviewed through an analysis of variance (ANOVA) for gender by floor type. Significant interactions were reported for IND, C, OO, and INN. Further analysis of the data indicated that men on the single-sex floor reported the highest levels of IND and C when compared to men on the co-educational floors or women in either floor environment. Women on the single-sex floor reported the highest levels of OO while men on the co-educational floors reported the highest levels of INN when compared to the other three cohorts.

These findings are most prominent for men on the single-sex floor, as they tended to be the least similar to the other three comparison groups. This could be due to the fact of choice of living group. It is possible that since such a large number of male residents on the single-sex floor indicated they had no choice in their housing assignment, this could have influenced their perceptions of floor community. Men on the single-sex floor may not have been as willing to become involved in activities or provide support for their peers, as they were not able to live in their preferred environment. Future research should continue to monitor the reactions of males living in on-campus housing for comparable results.

Recommendations

For the Institution

Based on the results of this study, three recommendations are put forth for consideration by the Office of Residence Life.

1. As evidenced by the strong impact of the co-educational floor environment, particularly for male residents, it is recommended that the pilot program be continued for the 2002-2003 academic year.
2. In order to gain additional information and a differing perspective, it would be beneficial to talk with student staff members in Sanford Hall to assess their reactions to the co-educational floor environment. This could be done through individual interviews or group meetings. Based on the experiences of these student staff members, future staff training sessions could be adapted to focus on specific issues or concerns that arose during the first year of this program.
3. It is also recommended that information regarding social and educational programming in the residence halls and on floors be gathered. The types of activities provided for residents on the floors and in the halls may have been diverse, thus resulting in differing perceptions of community

For Further Research

Due to the limited size and scope of this study, two recommendations for future research are proposed.

1. It is suggested that this study be replicated with a larger sample size from both co-educational floor living groups and single-sex floor living groups. As additional

studies are conducted, there will be a better indication of the impacts of various residence hall environments.

2. It is also recommended that the two groups of residents, those from co-educational environments and those from single-sex environments, be more closely matched for choice of living groups.

Conclusion

This study generally supported the positive impact of co-educational floor environments on perceptions of community. As previously noted, this type of living group strongly influenced the way male residents perceived their floor community. While the impact of living in this type of environment may not have been as strong for female residents, it was not seen to be a negative experience. These results, along with support from past research on the success of co-educational housing, give justification to the continued offering of co-educational floor environments in Sanford Hall. It is imperative to remember that as the needs of college students change, housing and residence life operations must be willing to change in order to enhance success and satisfaction.

REFERENCES

Allen, J. G., Collins, B. B., Gee, C. Y., & Nudd, T. R. (1964). Coeducational residence halls. Journal of College Student Personnel, 6, 82-87.

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? Four critical years revisited. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berger, J. B. (1997). Students' sense of community in residence halls, social integration, and first-year persistence. Journal of College Student Development, 38(5), 441-452.

Blimling, G. S. & Miltenberger, L. J. (1990). The resident assistant. (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Borrego, A. M. (2001, December 21). Today's students want to have sex, but not with their roommates. Chronicle of Higher Education, 48(17), A29-A30.

Brown, R. D., Winkworth, J. Braskamp, L. (1973). Student development in a coed residence hall: Promiscuity, prophylactic or panacea? Journal of College Student Personnel, 14, 98-104.

Chickering, A. W. (1974). Education and Identity: Implications for residence hall living. In D. A. DeCoster & P. Mable (Eds.), Student Development and Education in College Residence Halls. Washington, DC: American College and Personnel Association, 76-86.

Corbett, J., & Sommer, R. (1972). Anatomy of a coed residence hall. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 215-217.

DeCoster, D. A., & Mable, P. (1980). Coeducational living and male-female relationships. In D. A. DeCoster and P. Mable (Eds.), Personal Education and Community Development in College Residence Halls. Cincinnati: American College Personnel Association, 154-172.

Foster, A. M. (1974). A study of the impact of co-educational residence halls at a large metropolitan university. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Frichette, S. R. (1975). Factors associated with the social climate of single-sex and coeducational residence halls, cooperatives, fraternities, and sororities on the Oregon State University campus. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University.

Gardner, J. W. (1989, Fall). Building community. Kettering Review, 73-81.

Gose, B. (1999, September 10). The annual squeeze into hotels, home and those dreaded 'converted triples.' Chronicle of Higher Education, 46(3), A55-A56.

Jacokes, L. E. (1975). Coeducational and single sex residence halls: An experimental comparison. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Katz, J. (1974). Coeducational living: Effects upon male-female relationships. In D. A. DeCoster and P. Mable (Eds.), Student Development and Education in College Residence Halls. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association, 105-116.

LeMay, M., & Frichette, R. (1976). Responses of students in a coed hall and single-sex halls on the university residence environment scale short form. Journal of College and University Housing, 6, 21-23.

Mable, P., Terry, M. J., & Duvall, W. H. (1980). Student development through community development. In D. A. DeCoster & P. Mable (Eds.), Personal Education and Community in College Residence Halls. Cincinnati: American College Personnel Association, 103-113.

Moos. R. H. (1986). The human context. (2nd ed.). Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.

Moos, R. H. (1988). University residence environment scale. (2nd ed.). Redwood, CA: Mind Garden.

Moos, R. H., & Otto, J. (1975). The impact of coed living on males and females. Journal of College Student Personnel, 16, 459-467.

Number and percent of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions, by disability status and selected student characteristics: 1995-96. Retrieved March 15, 2002, from the Digest of Education Statistics, 2000 Website: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/digest/dt212.html.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Regent policy 72-4. Retrieved February 1, 2002, from the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents Web site: http://www.uwsa.edu.

Rudolph, F. (1990). The American college and university: A history. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Schaefer, N. (2000, May 22). Coed? Co-everything! National Review, 52(9), 36-37.

Upcraft, M. L., & Gardner, J. N. (1989). The freshman year experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Williams, D. E., & Reilley, R. R. (1974). The impact of residence halls on students: The research. In D. A. DeCoster & P. Mable (Eds.), Student Development and Education in College Residence Halls. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association, 211-233.

Winston, Jr., R.B., & Anchors, S. (1993). Student housing and residential life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

Form S of the University Residence Environment Scale

Instructions

Form S (Short)

There are 40 statements in this book. They are statements about student living groups. Please decide which statements are true of your student living group and which are not. To the right of each question, circle **T** (true) when you think the statement is true or mostly true of your living group; circle **F** (false) when you think the statement is false or mostly false. Please be sure to answer every statement and to fill in your name and the other information requested.

If you live in a large hall or complex which has 100 or more residents, then your living group, for purposes of this questionnaire, should be the floor or corridor on which you live. If you live in a building or complex of less than 100 people, then your living group is the whole building.

Some of the statements make the distinction between "staff" and "students." For these items, "staff" are faculty, administrative personnel, graduate or undergraduate assistants living in the house. "Students" are all the other student residents living in the house.

Please be sure to answer every item.

Form S

Please provide the information requested below (if applicable)

Your name:_____ Age:_____ Gender (Circle): **M** **F**

Living group: _____ Corridor / Floor _____ Room _____

Are you a (circle one) Student? Staff? Title _____

Year in College (circle one) Fr. So. Jr. Sr. Grad.

Did you choose this living group as your (circle one)	1st choice	2nd choice	3rd choice	4th choice	No choice
Circle all quarters / semesters you have lived here	This year: Fall Last year: Fall		Winter Winter	Spring Spring	Summer Summer
Would you like to live here again next year?	1. Yes 4. Probably not		2. Probably 5. No		3. Neutral

Today's date:_____ Other: _____

Now, please read each statement in the booklet and if you believe a statement is *true* or *mostly true* of your residence, circle **T** (true).

If you think a statement is *false* or *mostly false* of your residence, circle **F** (false).

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

	Inv	S	Ind	TSO	C	AA	Int	OO	SI	Inn
R / S										
S / S										

Form S

1. There is a feeling of unity and cohesion here	T	F
2. People here are concerned with helping and supporting one another	T	F
3. People here tend to check on whether their behavior is acceptable to others in the house	T	F
4. Dating is a recurring topic of conversation around here	T	F
5. Around here discussions frequently turn into verbal duels	T	F
6. People around here hardly ever seem to be studying	T	F
7. People around here talk a lot about political and social issues	T	F
8. The house officers function in a somewhat haphazard manner	T	F
9. The staff here decide whether and when the residents can have visitors of the opposite sex in their rooms	T	F
10. New approaches to things are often tried here	T	F
11. Very few things around here arouse much excitement or interest	T	F
12. Around here people tend to hide their feelings from one another	T	F
13. People here pretty much act and think freely without too much regard for social opinion	T	F
14. Some people here spend a lot of time preparing for dates	T	F
15. People don't try to impress each other here	T	F
16. Around here studies are secondary to most activities	T	F
17. There is a good deal of concern about intellectual awareness in the house	T	F
18. The jobs of house officers are not clearly defined	T	F
19. The students formulate almost all the rules here	T	F
20. Innovation is not considered important here	T	F

Go on to next page

Form S (cont.)

21. In this house there is a strong feeling of belongingness	T	F
22. Trying to understand the feelings of others is considered important by most people in this house	T	F
23. Around here people are not interested in up-holding social conventions.	T	F
24. People here consider other types of social activities to be more important than dating	T	F
25. In this house people tend not to compete with each other	T	F
26. People here work hard to get top grades	T	F
27. People here very rarely discuss intellectual matters	T	F
28. House procedures here are well established	T	F
29. The staff here have the last say about student discipline	T	F
30. In this house people often do unusual things	T	F
31. Most people here have a strong sense of loyalty toward the house	T	F
32. People here try to make others feel secure	T	F
33. Behaving correctly in public is pretty unimportant in this house	T	F
34. In this house dating is not important	T	F
35. People around here are always trying to win an argument	T	F
36. Most people here consider studies as very important in college	T	F
37. There is not much appreciation here for classical music, art, literature, etc	T	F
38. House activities are pretty carefully planned here	T	F
39. House finances are handled exclusively by students here	T	F
40. Doing things in a different way is valued around here	T	F

Stop here.

Student Name or I.D._____

For Form S

Instructions

Carefully match the item number in the booklet with the item number on the answer key. Items are arranged so that each column of responses in the answer key constitute one subscale. Count the number of matching answers between the booklet and each column of the answer key and enter the total in the R/S (raw score) box at the bottom of the booklet. Individual subscale scores or living group averages can be converted to standard scores (use Appendix A), then displayed as profiles.

Inv	1. T	11. F	21. T	31. T
S	2. T	12. F	22. T	32. T
Ind	3. F	13. T	23. T	33. T
TSO	4. T	14. T	24. F	34. F
C	5. T	15. F	25. F	35. T
AA	6. F	16. F	26. T	36. T
Int	7. T	17. T	27. F	37. F
OO	8. F	18. F	28. T	38. T
SI	9. F	19. T	29. F	39. T
Inn	10. T	20. F	30. T	40. T

APPENDIX B

Introductory Letter

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
LA CROSSE

November 5, 2001

Dear Student,

My name is Meegan Harrington and I am a graduate student in the College Student Development and Administration program at UW-La Crosse. For the completion of my degree, I am undertaking a thesis project looking at student perceptions of community on single-sex and co-educational floors in the residence halls. The research gathered will hopefully benefit the Residence Life program this year and in the years to come.

I am requesting that you fill out the following survey and general demographic information; you need not include your name as this survey is confidential. The form should not take more than ten minutes to fill out and is entirely voluntary. If you choose to complete the survey, you will have the opportunity to win one of several prizes to be rewarded at a later date.

If you would like to be part of this research, please fill out the following survey and consent form.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Meegan M. Harrington

Office of Residence Life
213 Wilder Hall, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, 1725 State Street, La Crosse, WI 54601
Phone (608)785-8075, FAX (608)785-8078
An affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Title of Project: Student Perceptions of Community on Single-Sex and Co-educational Floors in the Residence Halls at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

I, _____, agree to participate in the research project named above. I have been informed that participating in this project will aid the Office of Residence Life in better understanding students' perceptions of and satisfaction with community environments in the residence halls at UW-La Crosse.

I have been informed that this research involves filling out general demographic information and completing a short survey. I have also been informed that I will remain anonymous as a participant in the study.

I have been informed that the anticipated risks and/or inconveniences from taking part in this research study are minimal and that participation is entirely voluntary.

I have been informed that the Institutional Review Board has approved this study for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. I have also been informed that any questions regarding the protection of human subjects may be addressed to Dr. Dan Duquette, Chair of the UW-La Crosse Institutional Review Board of Human Subjects, (608) 785-8124.

Signature of the Participant:_____ Date:_____

Signature of the Investigator:_____ Date:_____

Investigator:
Meegan M. Harrington
Student Support Services
109 Wilder Hall
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
(608) 785-8535

Faculty Chair:
Dr. Nick Nicklaus
Director of Residence Life
213 Wilder Hall
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
(608) 785-8075