

Freshmen's academic performance and
perceptions of residence hall living as related to
roommates' academic classification

by

Jane E. Moen

A Thesis Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Background Information	7
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Questions	9
Significance of the Study.	10
Limitations.	10
Definitions.	11
LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Values of Residence Hall Living.	12
Academic Performance	13
Retention Efforts in Residence Halls	15
Retention Efforts in the Residence Halls at Iowa State University.	18
Residence Hall Living Arrangements	19
The Impact of Academic Classification on Academic Performance	21
Summary.	22
METHODS	24
Subjects	24
Design of the Survey	26
Procedures	27
Hypotheses of the Study.	29
Analysis	29

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 31

 Academic Performance 31

 Perceptions of Residence Hall Living 32

 Roommate Relationships. 32

 Academic Atmosphere 36

 Number of Room Changes. 40

 Spring Semester Living Arrangements 41

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 43

 Recommendations. 45

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 47

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. 50

APPENDIX A COVER LETTER AND SAMPLE SURVEY. 51

APPENDIX B PERCENTAGES FOR FRESHMEN LIVING WITH
FRESHMEN ROOMMATES. 59

APPENDIX C PERCENTAGES FOR FRESHMEN LIVING WITH
UPPERCLASS ROOMMATES. 67

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
TABLE 1. Means and standard deviations on G.P.A.s for freshmen living with freshmen and freshmen living with upperclassmen	31
TABLE 2. Eigenvalues and percent of variance associated with each of the eleven factors.	33
TABLE 3. Survey questions associated with roommate relationship factor	34
TABLE 4. Means and standard deviations on the roommate relationship factor for freshmen living with freshmen and freshmen living with upperclassmen	36
TABLE 5. Survey questions associated with academic atmosphere factor	37
TABLE 6. Means and standard deviations on the academic atmosphere factor for freshmen living with freshmen and freshmen living with upperclassmen	38
TABLE 7. Means and standard deviations for survey questions not related to significant factors.	40
TABLE 8. Frequencies and percentages of spring semester living arrangements for freshmen living with freshmen and for freshmen living with upperclassmen	42

INTRODUCTION

With general enrollment trends stabilizing or decreasing, college and university administrators have become increasingly concerned about the attrition and retention of students. Attrition refers to the students who drop out or transfer to another college or university before graduation. Research indicates that approximately 50% of the students who enroll in a college or university leave that institution before graduation (Hossler, 1981). Reducing attrition rates by determining why students drop out is a difficult way to maintain college or university enrollments. Instead of concentrating on attrition rates, college and university administrators are beginning to focus their attention on the retention of students (Frederiksen, 1984). Retention, which refers to those students who remain enrolled in a college or university through graduation, is currently a critical issue on college and university campuses (Hossler, 1981). In fact, retaining or maintaining student enrollments was ranked second to inflation and financial concerns by college and university presidents when asked to list twenty critical issues for higher education (Duea, 1981).

Previous research has established several variables related to student retention rates. Astin (1978) indicated that retention rates were increased by achieving academic

success, being involved in campus activities, receiving a major portion of their financial support from parents, and living in the residence halls. The relationships that students developed while attending college were often the single greatest influence on the quality of their college experience. In fact, living in a residence hall during the freshmen year was the most important environmental characteristic associated with college persistence.

Projections for a decline in college and university enrollments from 1978 to 1997 have ranged from an estimate of 39 percent to a more conservative estimate of ten percent (Carnegie Council on Higher Education, 1980). Enrollment projections have been based primarily on demographic trends. However, due to an increase in the percentage of high school graduates attending college and an increase in the enrollment of nontraditional students which include adults, women, minorities, and part-time students, it is much more difficult to predict future college and university enrollments.

Many colleges and universities have experienced a decline in the enrollment of traditional 18-22 year old students, and yet many college and university enrollments have remained steady due to the increased enrollment of nontraditional students. The problem is that even though college and university enrollments have remained steady,

residence hall populations have experienced a decline because a majority of nontraditional students do not live in the residence halls (Hossler, 1981).

Until the 1970s, the philosophy of most college and university residence hall programs was to provide students with a place to eat and sleep (Smith, 1984). Gradually, the prevailing housing philosophy has changed to a student development philosophy where housing administrators are increasingly concerned about meeting the total needs of students. Within the student development philosophy, housing administrators are concerned about providing opportunities for students' personal growth and development as well as providing students with a comfortable, safe place to live (DeCoster & Mable, 1974). Housing administrators are also showing increased interest in roommate relationships and the impact a residence hall living experience has on students (Smith, 1984).

College and university housing administrators are expressing concern about the retention of students in the residence halls. In order to remain competitive with off-campus housing rates and keep housing costs to a minimum, residence halls need to be filled to optimum capacity. However to encourage students to remain living in the residence halls, a much clearer understanding of the factors related to student satisfaction with the residence

hall environment is needed (Wills, 1975).

Several studies have attempted to determine why students choose to leave the residence halls and move off campus. The results indicated that a number of students have moved out of the residence halls because of the inability to study, excessive noise (Hossler, 1981; Ullom & Hallenbeck, 1981), cost, a lack of privacy, a lack in the variety of living options, excessive university regulations (Ullom & Hallenbeck, 1981), and unsatisfactory roommate relationships (Jones, McCaa, & Martecchini, 1980).

Statement of the Problem

Students develop relationships while attending college that are often a great influence on the quality of their college experience. As a result, one can assume that students' roommates, by proximity alone, have a substantial effect on their college experience (Waldo & Morrill, 1983).

Poor relationships between roommates were significantly related to students' dissatisfaction with their living environments (Perkins, 1977), negative perceptions of the university environment, and lower grade point averages (Pace, 1970). Students who were dissatisfied with their living environment often left the residence halls and moved to off-campus apartments or into fraternities or sororities (Waldo & Morrill, 1983). In an

effort to reduce the number of students who leave the residence halls due to roommate dissatisfaction and perhaps encourage students to remain living in the residence halls, residence hall staff frequently assign roommates according to characteristics or behaviors believed to consistently promote roommate satisfaction.

A number of studies have been done in an attempt to determine the impact that housing assignments have on students. DeCoster (1966) studied the effects of assigning high-ability students together. DeCoster found that high-ability students living close together were able to attain a significantly higher degree of academic success than high-ability students randomly assigned to residence hall rooms. Elton and Bate (1966) indicated that when students were assigned to rooms based on academic major that the similarity in major did not influence first-semester academic performance. Beal and Williams, 1968, studied the effects of assigning students by academic classification and found no significant difference in academic performance (cited by Williams & Reilley, 1972).

When studies have focused on the identification of characteristics which promote roommate satisfaction, the similarities between roommates' demographic backgrounds and interests have not demonstrated a consistent association with positive roommate relationships (Jones, McCaa, &

Martecchini, 1980). Therefore, a single characteristic such as academic classification is not likely to be a significant factor in establishing satisfactory roommate relationships and yet, housing administrators frequently deal with the concerns of parents and academic administrators who question room assignment procedures.

A common belief is that freshmen students should not be assigned to live with upperclass students in the residence halls. Consequently, parents sometimes request that their freshman son or daughter be reassigned to live with another freshman when they find their son or daughter has been assigned to live with an upperclass student.

Academic classification is not a factor in assigning residence hall roommates at Iowa State University (J. F. Day, Department of Residence, Iowa State University, personal communication, May 29, 1986). Consequently, entering freshmen are often paired with upperclass roommates. In providing a historical account, Day indicated that one academic administrator at Iowa State University believed that freshmen students should not be assigned to live with upperclass students and requested that the Department of Residence forcibly consolidate returning students to avoid freshmen-upperclass roommate pairings. The administrator was familiar with situations where freshmen had not gotten along with upperclass

roommates. As a result, the administrator formed the opinion that freshmen students should not be assigned to live with upperclass roommates rather than determining the underlying cause for the roommate problems. Because of the belief that freshmen should not be assigned with upperclass students, there is a need to study whether academic classification is a significant factor in roommate satisfaction.

Background Information

At Iowa State University, a house is a floor or a unit of 60 to 70 students. Each year a house elects a governing body called the cabinet. The cabinet, a key element of the house system, usually consists of a group of upperclass students who take the lead in developing house policies and in initiating activities that will meet the needs and interests of house members.

The house system has had an affect on the room assignment procedures at Iowa State University. Because the leadership and residence hall experience that upperclass students provide is an important part in ensuring a well-governed house, students already living in the halls are given the option to return before room assignments for new students are made. After returning students have been assigned a room, the room assignments

are made for new students based upon their priority date determined by the receipt of application and application fee.

New students are given the opportunity to rank their personal preferences of room assignment in order of importance in their residence hall contract. The preferences that students are asked to rank include campus location, double occupancy room, non-smoking roommate, coed house, non-alcohol drinking roommate, same sex building, roommate preference and special interest house. If any of the options are not important in room assignment, the new students leave the options blank. It is important to note that roommates' academic classification is not one of the options listed which demonstrates that academic classification is not a factor in roommate assignment.

During the semester, any enrolled student who is not satisfied with their living arrangement may request a room change. A student requesting a room change contacts their resident assistant to initiate the room change process. Students may move to any available permanent space in the halls. Room change requests are allowed at anytime during the year except during the first two weeks of the fall semester and during the first week of the spring semester (Department of Residence, 1985).

Purpose of the Study

One purpose of this study was to determine if freshmen's perceptions of the residence hall environment were significantly related to the academic classification of their roommates. The second purpose was to determine if freshmen's academic performance was significantly related to their roommates' academic classification. The third and final purpose was to determine if the study supported the room assignment procedures at Iowa State University where academic classification was not a factor in assigning residence hall rooms.

Research Questions

In an attempt to gain an understanding of the factors related to student satisfaction with the residence halls, the following research questions were addressed in the study:

1. Do freshmen living with freshmen roommates perceive their residence hall environment significantly differently than freshmen living with upperclass roommates?
2. Does the academic performance of freshmen who are living with freshmen roommates differ significantly from the academic performance of freshmen who are living with upperclass roommates?

Significance of the Study

The results of the study will indicate whether roommates' academic classification is significantly related to freshmen students' perception of their residence hall living environment and/or their academic performance. If roommates' academic classification is not significantly related to freshmen students' perception of the residence halls and/or their academic performance, the study will support current assignment procedures where academic classification is not a factor in assigning residence hall roommates. However, if a roommates' classification is significantly related to freshmen students' academic performance and/or residence hall perceptions, the study may indicate the need to consider modifying current room assignment procedures.

Limitations

The students surveyed were first year, residence hall freshmen living in double rooms in the Richardson Court residence hall complex at Iowa State University during the 1985 fall semester. Because the study was conducted at a large public research university with a strong residence hall system, generalizations made from this study may only be applicable to residence halls in a similar setting.

Definitions

Freshmen - refers to students who were in their first semester of college and had lived in the residence halls only one semester.

Upperclassmen - refers to students who had completed at least one full semester of college and/or lived in the residence halls more than one semester.

Roommates - refers to undergraduate students of the same sex who live together in a two person occupancy room in a residence hall.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to examine whether freshmen roommates' academic classification influences freshmen's academic performance or their perceptions of the residence hall living environment. The review of the literature, therefore, will focus on: 1) the values of residence hall living, 2) the influence of residence halls on academic success, 3) the retention efforts used at Iowa State University and at other institutions to deal with declining occupancy in the residence halls, 4) the types of residence hall living arrangements, and 5) the studies that previously examined the impact roommates' academic classification has on academic performance.

Values of Residence Hall Living

Previous research indicates that residence hall living increases a student's chances of persisting in college (Astin, 1973, 1978; Nowack & Hanson, 1985). Centra (1968) and Wills (1975) suggested that a relationship exists between student perceptions of the residence hall environment and student perceptions of the total college environment. Both studies indicated that the students who were satisfied with their residence hall environment were generally more satisfied with their college experience. Astin (1978) also found students who lived in residence

halls to be more satisfied than commuters with their undergraduate experience, particularly in the areas of faculty relationships, student friendships, university reputation, and social life. Residence hall students had more contact with faculty, interacted more frequently with student peers, and had many more opportunities to become involved in the campus environment than students who lived at home. Residence hall students were more likely to become involved in extracurricular activities such as student government or athletics.

The residence halls also provide an atmosphere which promotes interaction between students. The transition from high school to college is a difficult time for many freshmen, so residence halls often provide the supportive environment students need while adjusting to being away from home. Ullom and Hallenbeck (1981) compared students who remained living on campus with students who moved off campus after they were no longer required to live in university housing. Ullom and Hallenbeck found that the students who remained on campus chose to do so because of the emotional support and opportunity for involvement they received living in the halls.

Academic Performance

College and university retention rates are enhanced by academic success. Astin (1971) studied the relationship

between freshmen college grade point averages (G.P.A.s) and dropping out of college. Astin's research indicated that as freshmen G.P.A.s decreased, the percentage of freshmen who dropped out before their sophomore year increased. For example, Astin found that when freshmen achieved a G.P.A. of A- (3.50 or better), only 8% of the men and 13% of the women did not return their sophomore year. On the other hand, the study indicated that when freshmen earned a .49 or lower, 84% of the men and 88% of the women dropped out before their sophomore year. One reason for the high percentage of dropouts might have been due to university regulations that did not allow students with low G.P.A.s to continue in school. However, Astin found that a high percentage of dropouts occurred even when G.P.A.s ranged from a D+ (1.00-1.49) to C- (1.50-1.99). The results clearly indicated that the students with below average G.P.A.s were less likely to return to college their sophomore year than the students with above average G.P.A.s.

Residence hall living has an influence on the retention of students because living in the residence halls promotes academic success (Astin, 1973; Moos, 1979; Ballou, 1985; Nowack & Hanson, 1985).

Nowack and Hanson (1985) found that freshmen students who lived in residence halls earned significantly higher

G.P.A.s and experience significantly less academic difficulty than freshmen students who lived off campus.

Nunn and Holland's recent unpublished study compared the academic achievement of freshmen residence hall students and freshmen non-residence hall students (cited by Nowack & Hanson, 1985). The G.P.A.s of students who applied for and were offered on-campus housing were compared with the G.P.A.s of those who applied for but did not receive on-campus housing. The freshmen living on campus achieved significantly higher first quarter G.P.A.s than freshmen excluded from on-campus housing. Due to the random assignments, the differences in academic performance may be related to the students' living environment.

The quality of roommate relationships may also influence students' academic performance. Pace (1970) studied residence hall roommate dissatisfaction and its relationship to academic achievement. The findings indicated that highly dissatisfied roommates had significantly lower academic performance than roommate pairs with little roommate dissatisfaction. Lozier's (1970) research also indicated that roommate satisfaction can influence students' academic achievement.

Retention Efforts in Residence Halls

Many college and university residence halls are currently experiencing declining occupancies. However,

many housing administrators have found that enhancing the positive aspects of residence halls to be an effective method of encouraging students to remain living on campus.

Several studies have focused on the issue of declining occupancy in the residence halls. Ullom and Hallenbeck (1981) found when identifying reasons for students' choice of residence that the cost of living arrangements, the convenient location, and roommate relationships were important factors in students' decisions to remain living on campus. Wills (1975) indicated that increasing the expertise and effectiveness of residence hall staff, involving students in the planning and implementing of programs, and modifying current housing policies increased student satisfaction with on campus housing. Astin (1975) suggested that reducing costs, offering more programming, and improving facilities attracted more students to live on campus.

The Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO, 1984) recently studied the issue of declining occupancy in housing and reported a number of strategies used at various institutions to deal with lower occupancy levels. The results indicated four primary areas in which housing administrators were implementing changes because of declining occupancy levels. The four areas of changes included 1) financial changes, 2) programmatic

changes, 3) physical changes, and 4) policy changes.

One primary area of changes related to occupancy was financial changes. Nearly one-fourth of the institutions contacted were increasing room rates to account for the financial loss due to the decrease in occupancy. Many institutions were also promoting single rooms by increasing the number of single rooms available and increasing single room rates. A number of institutions were experimenting with a variety of payment plans including guaranteed room and board rates at a set rate for four years, discounts for early payment, monthly payment plan, and flexible payments in an effort to encourage students to remain on campus.

A second area was programmatic changes. A majority of the institutions reported changes with regard to room space. The most common trend was toward the increased use of room space for special interest housing such as quiet, scholarship, academic majors and language floors. Other use of room space involved converting rooms for alternate space (guest rooms, lounges, meeting rooms), allowing graduate students to live on campus and increasing occupancy for summer conference programs. Institutions also made changes in how on campus living was marketed. Pamphlets, television, newspapers and radio were all used to attract new students to university housing.

A third area was physical changes. Many institutions

were converting residence hall space to other uses such as office space, conference housing, recreational space, and classroom space. Other physical changes included decreasing room occupancy (i.e., triple to double, doubles to singles), renovating and upgrading commons areas and even closing residence halls because of declining occupancy levels.

A fourth and final area was policy changes. Most policy changes were made with regard to the residence hall contract included increasing the contract breakage fee, tightening requirements and making it more difficult to withdraw from the residence hall system, and changing to a full-year contract. Other policy changes involved changing in the live-in requirement and making it mandatory for certain academic classes of students to live on campus when those students had never been required to live on campus before.

Retention Efforts in the Residence Halls at Iowa State University

In an effort to more nearly meet the needs of students who live on campus, Iowa State University has developed more special interest housing. Recently, cross-cultural, no alcohol, and academic houses have been added to appeal to the diverse interests of students. By offering a

variety of living alternatives, residence hall administrators may encourage students to remain living on campus and also meet the needs of a diverse student population.

Temporary assignments are also used to maintain a maximum occupancy in the residence halls at Iowa State University. When more students are interested in living in the halls than can be accommodated in permanent rooms, the extra students are assigned to a temporary housing space. Residence hall conference rooms, guest rooms, apartments and recreation rooms are usually converted to provide temporary housing. Shortly after the semester begins, as a number of students withdraw from the university, permanent rooms are made available to student in temporary housing. The use of temporary housing assignments allows more students the opportunity for university housing, minimizes room and board rates and maintains a maximum occupancy level in the halls (Department of Residence, 1985).

Residence Hall Living Arrangements

Colleges and universities offer students a variety in residence hall living arrangements. Ballou (1985) indicated that on some campuses freshmen live in all freshmen halls for the entire first year. While on other campuses, freshmen live in residence halls with sophomores,

juniors, and seniors.

Advocates of all-freshmen residence halls believed that the advantages included specialized programming, better academic performance, and positive attitudes about the campus environment. Hayes (1980) indicated that in all-freshmen halls, residence hall staff were able to develop programs to meet the specific needs of freshmen and were able to easily implement the programs with only freshmen living in the hall. Taylor and Hanson (1971) believed that when freshmen lived together and enrolled in many of the same classes, there was a positive influence on their academic achievement. Schoemer and McConnell (1970) proposed that all-freshmen halls provided more opportunity for residence hall staff to promote positive attitudes about the campus environment. However in their study, the freshmen women's residence hall had no significant effects on freshmen women's perceptions of the campus environment except for the possibility of a slightly higher aspiration level and more rapid growth of self-expression.

Advocates of combined freshmen and upperclass halls believed that freshmen students benefit from the ongoing academic advice and assistance given by upperclass students in all-undergraduate halls. All-undergraduate halls also provided opportunities for freshmen to interact on a daily basis with upperclass students and helped them to gain an

understanding of the university as a whole (Schoemer & McConnell, 1970).

The Impact of Academic Classification on Academic Performance

Previous studies have attempted to determine the impact that residence hall assignments according to academic classification have had on the academic performance of freshmen students. Beal and Williams, 1968, found no significant difference in grade point averages when they compared groups of freshmen men and women assigned to all-freshmen halls with groups of freshmen men and women housed with upperclass students (cited by Ballou, 1985). Schoemer and McConnell (1970) compared freshmen women living in three types of halls (all-freshmen women, all-undergraduate women, and coeducational) on the basis of academic performance. The results indicated that the freshmen women living in the all-undergraduate women's hall, composed of freshmen women and upperclass women, achieved better academically than those in the all-freshmen or coeducational halls. Ballou (1985) studied the academic performance of freshmen men and women in six types of residence halls. The six residence hall types used were: 1) freshmen men's halls, 2) freshmen women's halls, 3) freshmen coeducational halls, 4) mixed class (freshmen plus

upperclass) men's halls, 5) mixed class women's halls, and 6) mixed class coeducational halls. The results indicated that the residence hall arrangements had little or no influence on the academic performance of freshmen.

On the basis of these studies, all-freshmen halls had no apparent influence on the academic performance of freshmen students and indicated that using academic performance as a rationale for assigning freshmen to all-freshmen halls may not be valid.

Summary

The review of the literature relating to the values of residence hall living, retention efforts, residence hall living arrangements revealed the following:

1. Residence hall living increases students chances of persisting in college.
2. Students who live in the residence halls are more likely to be satisfied than commuters with their undergraduate experience, particularly in the areas of faculty relationships, student friendships, campus involvement, and university reputation.
3. Students who receive above average grade point averages are more likely to persist in college than students who receive below average grade

point averages.

4. Students living in the residence hall are more likely to perform better academically than students living off campus.
5. Highly dissatisfied roommates do not perform as well academically as satisfied roommates.
6. Residence hall retention efforts have focused primarily on financial, programmatic, physical, and policy changes.
7. On some campuses, freshmen live in all-freshmen residence halls and on other campuses, freshmen live in all-undergraduate residence halls.
8. Residence hall living arrangements have little or no influence on the academic performance of freshmen.

METHODS

The methods will include a description of the students surveyed, the design of the survey, the hypotheses of the study, and procedures used to collect and analyze the data.

Subjects

The sample of students used in this study were freshmen who lived in double rooms in the Richardson Court residence hall complex at Iowa State University during the 1985 fall semester. The freshmen were selected from a master roster provided by the Department of Residence of all the students living in the Richardson Court residence halls. All freshmen students living with upperclass roommates were asked to complete the survey. One freshman was randomly selected to complete the survey when two freshmen were living together to help insure reliability.

The students selected to participate in the survey were freshmen who were in their first semester of college and had lived in the residence halls less than one semester. Slightly over three-quarters of the students completing the survey were women.

Of the 279 surveys returned, 90 of the freshmen had freshmen roommates and 189 of the freshmen had upperclass roommates which indicated that approximately one-third had freshmen roommates and two-thirds had upperclass roommates.

Of the upperclass roommates, thirty-two percent were sophomores, twenty-one percent were juniors and the remaining fifteen percent were seniors.

Two-thirds of the freshmen were eighteen years old and nearly one-third were nineteen. The roommates' ages ranged from seventeen to twenty-five years old. Twenty-four percent were eighteen, twenty-five percent were nineteen, twenty-two percent were twenty, seventeen percent were twenty-one, and ten percent were twenty-two or older.

Approximately fifty percent of the freshmen were from hometowns with populations of 10,000 or less. Only ten percent of the freshmen were from hometowns over 250,000. The results showed the size of hometowns to be similar for the roommates.

The ethnic/racial background of a vast majority of the freshmen and their roommates was white American. Ninety-six percent of the freshmen and ninety-five percent of the roommates were white Americans.

The colleges from which the students intended to graduate were distributed in the following manner: twenty-five percent in science and humanities, sixteen percent in business, thirteen percent in agriculture, twelve percent in home economics, eleven percent in engineering, and nine percent in education. The distribution of the colleges from which the roommates intended to graduate was similar.

Ninety-four percent of the freshmen had not requested to live with their current roommate and ninety-five percent had not known their roommate prior to coming to Iowa State University.

Design of the Survey

The survey was designed to measure the students' perceptions of the residence hall environment and obtain demographic information about each student completing the survey. A portion of the survey was developed from The Quality of Life survey; a survey used at Iowa State University to measure students' perceptions of the residence hall living environment (Robinson, 1985).

A pilot survey was distributed to several professors, residence hall staff and students. The survey was modified using the comments and suggestions from the pilot group.

The survey focused on aspects of the environment often related to residence hall satisfaction such as roommate relationships, house atmosphere, policies, resources, facilities, and services.

Using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSSX), the reliability of the survey statements measuring freshmen's perceptions of the residence hall environment was .93. The high reliability may have been partly due to the large number of statements and large sample size. As a

result, a factor analysis was computed to reduce the number of statements to a more manageable number of underlying common factors.

Procedures

A proposal was submitted for approval to the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research. The committee reviewed the proposal and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected and that any potential benefits of the study outweighed possible risks to the subjects.

The surveys were sent to 418 freshmen students on November 15, 1985. Each survey was coded with a number to identify which surveys were returned. Each subject received a survey, a postpaid return envelope, and a letter indicating the purpose of the study and the procedures to follow. The letter also assured the students that their responses and individual identity would be kept confidential. The freshmen were asked to return their surveys in the return envelope by November 26, 1985. In December, a second mailing was sent to those freshmen who had not returned the first survey to increase the response rate.

Of the 418 surveys distributed, 285 surveys were returned. However, six of the returned surveys were not

included in the final sample because three had lived in the residence halls for more than one semester, two had indicated they were classified as sophomores, and one had classified the roommate as a junior when official housing information classified the roommate as a freshman. As a result, 279 of the 418 surveys were used in the final sample for a 67 percent return rate. The results were coded and keypunched for further analysis.

Additional data on academic performance for the 1985 fall semester and living arrangements for the 1986 spring semester were collected from official university records.

Official Iowa State University records located with the Registrar were the source of the academic performance information. Academic performance in the study was based on 1985 fall semester grade point averages (G.P.A.s). The G.P.A.s were calculated using a four point scale. For the purpose of this study, the students who returned the survey were divided into two groups. One group was freshmen living with freshmen roommates and the other group was freshmen living with upperclass roommates. The Office of the Registrar computed the G.P.A.s for the individuals in each group and returned the grouped data to the researcher for further analysis.

The 1986 spring semester living arrangements of students who returned the surveys were collected from

official Department of Residence records in January. The students were divided according roommates' classification (freshmen, upperclassmen) into the following groups: 1) living in the residence halls, 2) moved off-campus but still attending the university, and 3) no longer attending the university.

Hypotheses of the Study

In the study it was hypothesized that:

1. freshmen living with freshmen roommates do not perceive their residence hall environment to be significantly different than freshmen living with upperclass roommates.
2. the academic performance of freshmen living with freshmen roommates does not differ significantly from the academic performance of freshmen living with upperclass roommates.

Analysis

Evidence to support the first hypothesis was based on the number of room changes made during the fall semester, the students' choice of spring semester living arrangements, and the analysis of the portion of the survey designed to measure a subject's perception of the residence hall environment. The analyses used to compute freshmen's

perceptions of the residence hall environment included:

1. A factor analysis of the portion of the survey designed to measure students' perceptions of the residence hall environment identified the significant underlying factors.
2. A t-test was computed to determine if the freshmen with upperclass roommates perceived the significant factors identified in the factor analysis significantly differently than freshmen with freshmen roommates.
3. The reliability, mean, and standard deviation were computed for each of the significant factors identified by the factor analysis.
4. The mean and standard deviation of the individual survey questions not identified as significant by the factor analysis were computed for freshmen living with freshmen roommate and for freshmen living upperclass roommates.

The second hypothesis was examined by analysis of grade point averages for the 1985 fall semester. The analysis of the grade point averages was done using a t-test. The t-test was used to determine if a significant difference existed between the grade point averages of freshmen living with freshmen roommates and the grade point averages of freshmen living with upperclass roommates.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Academic Performance

An analysis of the 1985 fall semester grade point averages was used to determine whether the academic performance of freshmen living with freshmen significantly differed from the academic performance of freshmen living with upperclassmen.

The mean and standard deviation of the 1985 fall semester grade point averages are shown in Table 1 for the freshmen living with freshmen and the freshmen living with upperclassmen. The grade point averages were calculated using a four point scale.

TABLE 1. Means and standard deviations on G.P.A.s for freshmen living with freshmen and freshmen living with upperclassmen

Variable	<u>Grade Point Averages</u>		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	n
Freshmen living with Freshmen	2.64	.73	90
Freshmen living with Upperclassmen	2.65	.80	189

A t-test of group differences was used to compare the academic performance of freshmen living with freshmen roommates and academic performance of freshmen living with

upperclass roommates. The test indicated no significant difference ($t(277)=-.09$, $p = .93$) between the two groups.

Accepting grade point average as an accurate measure of academic performance, the findings supported the hypothesis that the academic performance of freshmen living with freshmen did not differ significantly from the academic performance of freshmen living with upperclassmen.

Perceptions of Residence Hall Living

A factor analysis of the survey questions 22 through 71 identified eleven underlying variables (factors) which measured students' perceptions of the residence hall living environment. However, a plot of the eigenvalues indicated that only two of the eleven factors were significant according to the Scree test (Catell, 1966). As shown in Table 2, the first factor accounted for a 22 percent of variance and the second factor for a 12.8 percent of variance, whereas, the other nine factors each accounted for less than six percent of variance.

Roommate Relationships

The factor analysis of questions 22 through 71 clearly indicated that one significant factor in student perceptions of the residence hall environment was roommate relationships. The significance of roommate relationships

TABLE 2. Eigenvalues and percent of variance associated with each of the eleven factors.

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance
1	10.990	22.0
2	6.409	12.8
3	2.574	5.1
4	2.277	4.6
5	2.038	4.1
6	1.891	3.8
7	1.486	3.0
8	1.466	2.9
9	1.334	2.7
10	1.269	2.5
11	1.114	2.2

in students' perceptions of the residence hall environment directly supported the research of Perkins (1977) and Waldo (1984). Perkins found that poor relationships between roommates were significantly related to students' dissatisfaction with their living environment. Waldo (1984) indicated that the quality of relationships between roommates was related to students' perceptions of involvement and support in the residence halls.

The fifteen survey questions with a loading above .30 on the factor pertaining directly to roommate relationships are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Survey questions associated with roommate relationship factor

Factor Loading	Survey Question
.85	I have open and honest communication with my roommate.
.84	I share personal concerns with my roommate.
.79	I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate.
.78	When my roommate and I disagree, I will share my feelings with my roommate.
.78	My roommate and I are compatible.
.76	When my roommate and I disagree, my roommate is willing to compromise.
.72	My roommate accepts me for who I am.
.68	When my roommate and I disagree, I am willing to compromise.
.67	I have made a sincere effort to get to know my roommate.
.50	My roommate respects my personal belongings.
.44	I am free from fear of intimidation, physical and/or emotional harm from my roommate.
.41	I can sleep in my room without being disturbed by my roommate.
.38	I have free access to my room with out pressure from my roommate.
.35	My roommate's lifestyle interferes with my use of the room.
.34	I can study in my room without being distracted by my roommate.

Five of the fifteen survey questions which loaded onto the roommate relationship factor focused on various aspects of communication. Open and honest communication, a willingness to compromise, and the ability to share feelings and personal concerns all loaded highly onto the factor. Waldo and Fuhriman (1981) supported the need for communication in roommate relationships. Waldo and Fuhriman found that roommates who had better relationships demonstrated higher levels of self-disclosure than roommates with poorer relationships. Roommates who were able to verbalize their feelings about each other had a clearer understanding of each other's expectations. Roommates with high levels of trust and intimacy were significantly more satisfied with their relationships, were better adjusted emotionally, and had fewer problems concerned with submissiveness and hostility than less satisfied roommates.

The internal consistency (reliability) of the roommate relationship factor (coefficient alpha) was computed. The factor had a reliability of .93.

The means and standard deviations of the roommate relationship factor were computed for the freshmen living with freshmen roommate and for the freshmen living with upperclass roommates. The results are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4. Means and standard deviations on the roommate relationship factor for freshmen living with freshmen and freshmen living with upperclassmen.

Variable	<u>Roommate Relationship Factor</u>		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	n
Freshmen living with Freshmen	2.03	.79	90
Freshmen living with Upperclassmen	2.11	.78	189

Using a scale ranging from one to five, with one as strongly agree and five as strongly disagree, the means indicated that the two groups were in agreement with the statements pertaining to roommate relationships. The freshmen living with freshmen were in slightly higher agreement than the freshmen living with upperclass roommates. However, a t-test of group differences on the roommate relationship factor showed that the difference ($t(277) = -.75, p = .45$) between the way freshmen/freshmen group and the freshmen/upperclassmen group perceived roommate relationships was not significant.

Academic Atmosphere

The second significant factor identified in the analysis of student perceptions of residence hall living was academic atmosphere. The significance of the academic atmosphere in students' perceptions of the residence hall

environment indirectly supported the findings of Ullom and Hallenbeck (1981) and Hossler (1981). Both studies indicated that an atmosphere conducive to study could be a factor in students' choice of living environment.

The nine survey questions in Table 5 loaded above .30 on the factor relating to academic atmosphere.

TABLE 5. Survey questions associated with academic atmosphere factor

Factor Loading	Survey Question
.78	My house is quiet enough for me to sleep.
.73	My house is quiet enough for me to study.
.72	Residents living in my house consider how their own actions affect others.
.71	Residents respect the rights of others living in my house.
.62	I am satisfied with the quiet hours policy in my house.
.60	I am satisfied with the way policies are enforced in my house.
.34	There are enough study facilities in my hall.
.34	There are enough educational activities in my house.
.32	I am given an opportunity to provide input into house policies.

A quiet atmosphere to study and sleep loaded highly onto the academic atmosphere factor. Hossler (1981)

indicated that noise and inability to study were the two most common reasons why students chose to leave the residence halls. Noise and inability to study were factors likely to influence the academic performance of students. Moos (1979) observed that students had greater academic success when they viewed their residence halls as places that promote studying and intellectual activity.

The reliability (internal consistency) for the academic atmosphere factor (coefficient alpha) was computed. The factor had a reliability of .83.

The means and standard deviations of the academic atmosphere factor were computed for the freshmen with freshmen roommates and the freshmen with upperclass roommates. The results are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6. Means and standard deviations on the academic atmosphere factor for freshmen living with freshmen and freshmen living with upperclassmen.

Variable	<u>Academic Atmosphere Factor</u>		
	Mean	Std Dev.	n
Freshmen living with Freshmen	2.49	.65	90
Freshmen living with Upperclassmen	2.43	.62	189

Using a scale ranging from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree), the means indicated that both the freshmen living with freshmen and the freshmen living with upperclassmen were in slight agreement with the statements regarding academic atmosphere.

A t-test of group differences on the academic atmosphere factor showed that freshmen living with freshmen did not perceive the academic atmosphere significantly differently ($t(277) = .78, p = .44$) than freshmen living with upperclass roommates.

The other twenty-six survey questions were not used in the computation of factor scores, because they did not produce high loadings on either of the two significant factors. The means and standard deviations for the individual survey questions not related to the significant factors were computed for freshmen living with freshmen roommates and for freshmen living upperclass roommates. The findings are shown in Table 7.

The responses of freshmen living with freshmen roommates compared with the responses of freshmen living with upperclass roommates indicated little or no difference between the two groups.

TABLE 7. Means and standard deviations for survey questions not related to significant factors

Question Number	<u>Freshmen Living with Freshmen</u>			<u>Freshmen Living with Upperclassmen</u>		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	n
Q36	2.02	1.07	90	2.17	1.18	189
Q38	2.71	.89	90	2.58	.91	189
Q41	2.66	1.01	90	2.61	1.10	189
Q42	2.13	.84	90	2.17	.91	189
Q44	2.28	.82	90	2.23	.91	188
Q45	2.47	.93	88	2.38	.93	187
Q46	3.17	.91	87	3.29	.88	189
Q47	2.53	1.05	90	2.58	1.05	189
Q48	2.74	1.08	90	2.57	1.00	189
Q49	2.45	.99	89	2.37	.93	189
Q51	2.14	.84	90	2.27	.95	189
Q52	2.49	1.06	90	2.61	1.17	189
Q53	2.04	.75	90	2.03	.78	188
Q54	2.01	.82	89	1.93	.77	189
Q55	2.30	.79	90	2.37	.86	189
Q56	2.41	.67	90	2.44	.82	189
Q57	2.50	.84	90	2.47	.83	189
Q58	2.18	.68	90	2.22	.76	189
Q63	3.01	1.11	90	2.73	1.11	189
Q64	2.09	1.00	90	1.92	.84	189
Q65	2.22	.99	90	2.04	.93	187
Q66	1.72	.82	90	1.77	.90	189
Q67	2.38	.98	90	2.53	.98	189
Q69	2.04	.83	90	2.09	.88	188
Q70	2.07	.83	90	2.04	.82	189
Q71	2.08	.81	90	2.09	.92	188

Number of Room Changes

The survey results indicated that a small percentage of freshmen changed rooms during the semester. Eighty-eight percent of the freshmen never changed rooms

during the semester and ten percent changed rooms only once during the semester.

A majority of the students (59%) were not planning to change roommates, twenty-nine percent were planning to change roommates, and twelve percent were uncertain whether they would change roommates at the semester.

Spring Semester Living Arrangements

The survey indicated that a large majority (91%) of the freshmen were planning to live in the residence halls during the 1986 spring semester. The other nine percent of the freshmen were either undecided where they would be living second semester or were planning other living arrangements. Of those students planning to continue living in the residence halls, eighty-six percent were planning to live in the same room and fourteen percent were planning to live in a different room.

Data collected from the Department of Residence in January indicated that a very high percentage of both the freshmen living with freshmen and the freshmen living with upperclassmen actually returned to the residence halls for the spring semester. The results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8. Frequencies and percentages of spring semester living arrangements for freshmen living with freshmen and for freshmen living with upperclassmen

Variables	<u>Freshmen living with Freshmen</u>		<u>Freshmen living with Upperclassmen</u>	
	#	%	#	%
Residence Halls	85	94.4%	181	95.8%
Off-campus	3	3.3%	4	2.1%
Left University	2	2.2%	4	2.1%

Using the number of room changes, students' choice of spring semester living arrangements, and the analysis of the survey to measure freshmen's perceptions of the residence hall environment, the findings supported the hypothesis that freshmen living with freshmen roommates did not perceive their residence hall environment significantly differently than freshmen living with upperclass roommates.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine whether freshmen roommates' academic classification influences freshmen's academic performance or their perception of the residence hall living environment.

The sample of students selected to participate in the survey were freshmen who lived in double rooms in the residence halls at Iowa State University. The students were freshmen who were in their first semester of college and had lived in the residence halls less than one semester.

The survey used to collect the data was developed to measure the students' perceptions of the residence hall environment. The survey focused on aspects of the environment often related to residence hall satisfaction such as roommate relationships, house atmosphere, policies, resources, facilities, and services.

Of the 418 surveys distributed, 279 usable surveys were returned for a 67 percent return rate. Ninety of the surveys were from freshmen living with freshmen roommates and 189 were from freshmen living with upperclass roommates.

Two general hypotheses were tested:

- 1) the freshmen living with freshmen roommates do not perceive their residence hall environment significantly differently than freshmen living

with upperclass roommates.

- 2) the academic performance of freshmen living with freshmen roommates does not differ significantly from the academic performance of freshmen living with upperclass roommates.

Evidence supporting the first hypothesis was obtained from the analysis of the survey measuring students' perceptions of the residence hall environment, the number of room changes made during the 1985 fall semester, and the students' choices of 1986 spring semester living arrangements. Analysis of the 1985 fall semester grade point averages were examined for support of the second hypothesis.

Based on analysis of the data collected, the following conclusions concerning freshmen's perceptions of the residence halls and freshmen's academic performance may be made:

- 1) The academic performance of freshmen living with freshmen roommates did not differ significantly from the academic performance of freshmen living with upperclassmen.
- 2) Roommate relationships and academic atmosphere are significant factors in students' perceptions of the residence hall environment.
- 3) Freshmen living with freshmen roommates did not

perceive roommate relationships significantly differently than freshmen living with upperclass roommates.

- 4) Freshmen living with freshmen did not view the academic atmosphere significantly differently than freshmen living with upperclassmen.
- 5) Freshmen living with freshmen roommates did not perceive the residence hall environment significantly differently than freshmen living with upperclassmen.

Based on the analysis of the survey, the number of room changes, students' choice of spring semester living arrangements, and the fall grade point averages, the study indicated that roommates' academic classification had no significant influence on freshmen's academic performance or freshmen's perceptions of the residence hall living environment. As a result, this study indicates no need to modify current assignment procedures at Iowa State University where academic classification is not a factor in assigning residence hall roommates.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered for future research as a result of this investigation:

- 1) A similar study possibly encompassing a full academic year as opposed to one semester would serve to further substantiate the validity of the findings in this study.
- 2) A replication of this study should be made on upperclass students to determine if the findings of this investigation are similar for upperclass students.
- 3) Research using separate academic classifications (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors) should be made on freshmen to find if the results are similar.
- 4) A similar study using gender as a variable would determine if a difference existed between men and women.
- 5) A replication of this study at another institution would serve to further support the findings of this study.
- 6) The degree of roommate satisfaction and dissatisfaction should be assessed and this study repeated to determine if perceptions of the residence hall environment and academic performance are influenced with the degree of roommate satisfaction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Association of College and University Housing Officers. (1984). Strategies for coping with declining occupancy. Available from Grant Sherwood, Department of Housing and Residence Education, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Astin, A. W. (1978). Four critical years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1973). Impact of dormitory living on students. Educational Record, 54, 203-210.
- Astin, A. W. (1971). Predicting academic performance in college. New York: The Free Press.
- Astin, A. W. (1975). Preventing students from dropping out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ballou, R. A. (1985). Freshmen in college residence halls: A study of freshman academic performance at five liberal arts colleges. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 15, 27-30.
- Carnegie Council on Higher Education. (1980). Three thousand futures: The next twenty years for higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The meaning and strategic use of factor analysis. In R. B. Cattell (Ed.), Handbook of Multivariate Experimental Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Centra, J. A. (1968). Student perception of residence hall environment: Living/learning v. conventional units. Journal of College Student Personnel, 9, 266-272.
- DeCoster, D. A. (1966). Housing assignments for high ability students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 7, 19-22.
- DeCoster, D. A., & Mable, P. (Eds.). (1974). Student development and education in college residence halls. Washington, D.C.: American College Personnel Association.

- Department of Residence. (1985). The guide to residence hall living. (Available from Department of Residence, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa)
- Duea, J. (1981). Presidents' view on current and future issues in higher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 586-588.
- Elton, C. F., & Bate, W. S. (1966). The effects of housing policy on grade-point average. Journal of College Student Personnel, 7, 73-77.
- Frederiksen, C. F. (1984). Student housing: Prognosis for the future. National Association of College Auxiliary Services, 6, 28-30.
- Hayes, J. A. (1980). Student, faculty, and staff perceptions of freshman residence halls. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 10, 13-15.
- Hossler, D. (1981). Systematic approaches to student retention in residence halls. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 11, 22-25.
- Jones, L. M., McCaa, B. B., Jr., & Martecchini, C. A. (1980). Roommate satisfaction as a function of similarity. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 229-234.
- Lozier, G. G. (1970). Compatibility of roommates assigned alphabetically versus those assigned according to educational goals or extracurricular plans. Journal of College Student Personnel, 11, 256-260.
- Moos, R. H. (1979). Evaluating educational environments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nowack, K. M., & Hanson, A. L. (1985). Academic achievement of freshmen as a function of residence hall housing. NASPA Journal, 22, 22-28.
- Pace, T. (1970). Roommate dissatisfaction in residence halls. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 11, 145-147.
- Perkins, K. A. (1977). The effect of value similarity on satisfaction with college residence hall living groups. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 491-495.
- Robinson, P. (1985). The quality of life survey.

Unpublished data. Department of Residence, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

- Schoemer, J. R., & McConnell, W. A. (1970). Is there a case for the freshman women's residence hall? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 49, 35-40.
- Smith, J. W. (1984). Satisfied roommates' and dissatisfied roommates' perceptions of residence hall environmental climates (Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, DA8415749.
- Taylor, R., & Hanson, G. (1971). Environmental impact of achievement and study habits. Journal of College Student Personnel, 12, 445-454.
- Ullom, M., & Hallenbeck, D. A. (1981). Factors affecting the return rate of students to the residence halls. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 11, 27-29.
- Waldo, M., & Fuhriman, A. (1981). Roommate relationships, communication skills, and psychological adjustment in residence halls. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 11, 31-35.
- Waldo, M., & Morrill, W. (1983). Roommate communication skills workshops in university residence halls. The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 13, 33-36.
- Williams, D. E., & Reilley, R. R. (1972). The impact of residence halls on students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 403.
- Wills, B. S. (1975). Variables related to satisfaction with college housing. The Journal of University and College Student Housing, 5, 5-8.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As with any project such as this, there are always a great many people besides the author who contribute to its ultimate success and completion. First, I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Mary Huba and Dr. Penny Ralston for their help and guidance. A special thanks goes to my major professor, Dr. Larry Ebbers for his professional advice and encouragement.

Thanks to the Department of Residence for providing the financial support for this project. A special thanks goes to Jim Day and Sally Deters for their suggestions and encouragement.

Many thanks also go to my family and friends for the support and understanding they provided throughout this project.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND SAMPLE SURVEY

Dear Residence Hall Student:

The purpose of this survey is to examine your perceptions about your living environment in the residence halls at Iowa State.

Please complete the following survey and return it in the enclosed, postpaid envelope by November 26, 1985.

All responses will be kept confidential. The number on the cover which identifies your survey will be removed when the information is put into the computer. The identifying information is being used only to account for returned surveys since the interest is in group, not individual responses.

Your cooperation and honesty in filling out the survey will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you have any questions about this survey, please feel free to contact me at 294-6224.

Sincerely,

Jane E. Moen

PERCEPTIONS OF RESIDENCE HALL LIVING

DIRECTIONS: CIRCLE THE LETTER NEXT TO THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ANSWER.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your sex?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female

2. What is your classification?
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior
 - e. Graduate

3. What is your roommate's classification?
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior
 - e. Graduate

4. What residence hall are you currently living in?
 - a. Maple
 - b. Willow
 - c. Larch
 - d. Oak-Elm
 - e. Linden
 - f. BLF
 - g. BWR
 - h. Fisher/Nickell

5. What is your ethnic background?
 - a. Black American
 - b. White American
 - c. Asian American/Oriental
 - d. Native American
 - e. Puerto Rican/Hispanic American
 - f. Other _____

6. What is your roommate's ethnic background?
 - a. Black American
 - b. White American
 - c. Asian American/Oriental
 - d. Native American
 - e. Puerto Rican/Hispanic American
 - f. Other _____

7. What is the size of your hometown?
 - a. less than 1,999
 - b. 2,000 - 9,999
 - c. 10,000 - 49,999
 - d. 50,000 - 249,999
 - e. 250,000 - 499,999
 - f. over 500,000
 - g. Uncertain

8. What is the size of your roommate's hometown?
- | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| a. less than 1,999 | e. 250,000 - 499,999 |
| b. 2,000 - 9,999 | f. over 500,000 |
| c. 10,000 - 49,999 | g. Uncertain |
| d. 50,000 - 249,999 | |
9. Circle the college from which you intend to graduate.
- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| a. Agriculture | f. Design |
| b. Engineering | g. Business |
| c. Education | h. Other |
| d. Science & Humanities | i. Undecided |
| e. Home Economics | |
10. Circle the college from which your roommate intends to graduate.
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Agriculture | f. Design |
| b. Engineering | g. Business |
| c. Education | h. Other |
| d. Science & Humanities | i. Roommate Undecided |
| e. Home Economics | j. I don't know |
11. How many semesters including this semester have you lived in the residence halls at ISU?
- | | |
|----------|-----------------|
| a. One | d. Four |
| b. Two | e. Five or more |
| c. Three | |
12. Did you request to live with your current roommate?
- | | |
|--------|-------|
| a. Yes | b. No |
|--------|-------|
13. Did you know your roommate prior to coming to ISU?
- | | |
|--------|-------|
| a. Yes | b. No |
|--------|-------|
14. How many room changes have you made since the beginning of the semester?
- | | |
|---------|-----------------|
| a. None | d. Three |
| b. One | e. Four or more |
| c. Two | |
15. Do you plan on changing roommates next semester?
- | | | |
|--------|-------|--------------|
| a. Yes | b. No | c. Uncertain |
|--------|-------|--------------|
16. Where do you plan to live next semester?
- Same room in the residence halls
 - Different room in the residence halls
 - University student apartments
 - Fraternity/Sorority
 - Apartment or other off campus arrangement
 - Will not be attending university next semester
 - Undecided

17. Where do you plan to live next fall?
 - a. Residence halls
 - b. University student apartments
 - c. Fraternity/Sorority
 - d. Apartment or other off campus arrangement
 - e. Will not be attending the university next fall
 - f. Undecided

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE FILL IN THE BLANK WITH YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH QUESTION.

18. What is your age? _____
19. What is your roommate's age? _____
20. What was the approximate size of your high school graduating class? _____
21. How many hours do you work at a job each week? _____

DIRECTIONS: USING THE RATING SCALE BELOW SCALE BELOW INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT FOR STATEMENTS 20 - 69. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER STATEMENT).

- 1 - STRONGLY AGREE (SA)
- 2 - AGREE (A)
- 3 - NEUTRAL (N)
- 4 - DISAGREE (D)
- 5 - STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

<u>ROOMMATE RELATIONSHIP</u>	SA	A	N	D	SD
22. I have made a sincere effort to get to know my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5
24. My roommate accepts me for who I am.	1	2	3	4	5
25. My roommate and I are compatible.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I have open and honest communication with my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I share personal concerns with my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5

28.	When my roommate and I disagree, I will share my feelings with my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	When my roommate and I disagree, I am willing to compromise.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	When my roommate and I disagree, my roommate is willing to compromise.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	My roommate respects my personal belongings.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	My roommate's lifestyle interferes with my use of the room.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	I have free access to my room without pressure from my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	I can sleep in my room without being disturbed by my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	I can study in my room without being distracted by my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	I am satisfied with the cleanliness of my room.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	I am free from fear of intimidation, physical and/or emotional harm from my roommate.	1	2	3	4	5

HOUSE ATMOSPHERE

	SA	A	N	D	SD
38.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	1	2	3	4	5

44.	There are enough social activities in my house.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	There are enough recreational activities my house.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	The quality of the social atmosphere in my house is more important to me than the quality of the educational atmosphere.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	There is a feeling of unity and support in my house.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	Students have a strong sense of loyalty toward my house.	1	2	3	4	5
49.	House members know each other and are comfortable interacting with others.	1	2	3	4	5
50.	Residents respect the rights of others living in my house.	1	2	3	4	5
51.	I am comfortable with the relationships I have developed in my house.	1	2	3	4	5
52.	I participate in many house activities.	1	2	3	4	5

RESOURCES

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
53.	I receive adequate information about activities within my house.	1	2	3	4	5
54.	When I have questions, I know where to go for help.	1	2	3	4	5
55.	The Department of Residence does a satisfactory job of communicating with me about contracts, deadlines and changes in procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
56.	My contact with residence hall staff has been helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
57.	I am comfortable using the residence hall staff as a resource.	1	2	3	4	5

POLICIES

	SA	A	N	D	SD	
58.	The policies established by the Department of Residence are fair and reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5

59.	I am satisfied with the way policies are enforced in my house.	1	2	3	4	5
60.	Residents living in my house consider how their own actions affect others.	1	2	3	4	5
61.	I am given an opportunity to provide input into house policies.	1	2	3	4	5
62.	I am satisfied with the quiet hours policy in my house.	1	2	3	4	5
63.	When someone in my house is too noisy, I tell the person the noise is bothering me.	1	2	3	4	5
64.	I am satisfied with the visitation policy in my house.	1	2	3	4	5
65.	I am satisfied with the alcohol policy in my house.	1	2	3	4	5

FACILITIES AND SERVICES

	SA	A	N	D	SD
66.	1	2	3	4	5
67.	1	2	3	4	5
68.	1	2	3	4	5
69.	1	2	3	4	5
70.	1	2	3	4	5
71.	1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY IN THE ENCLOSED POSTPAID ENVELOPE
 BY NOVEMBER 26, 1985.
 THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

APPENDIX B

PERCENTAGES FOR FRESHMEN LIVING WITH FRESHMEN ROOMMATES

PERCENTAGES FOR FRESHMEN LIVING WITH FRESHMEN ROOMMATES

DIRECTIONS: CIRCLE THE LETTER NEXT TO THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ANSWER.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your sex? (n=90)
 - a. Male (14.4%)
 - b. Female (85.6%)
2. What is your classification? (n=90)
 - a. Freshman (100%)
 - b. Sophomore (0%)
 - c. Junior (0%)
 - d. Senior (0%)
 - e. Graduate (0%)
3. What is your roommate's classification? (n=90)
 - a. Freshman (100%)
 - b. Sophomore (0%)
 - c. Junior (0%)
 - d. Senior (0%)
 - e. Graduate (0%)
4. What residence hall are you currently living in? (n=90)
 - a. Maple (36.7%)
 - b. Willow (26.7%)
 - c. Larch (8.9%)
 - d. Oak-Elm (13.3%)
 - e. Linden (1.1%)
 - f. BLF (10.0%)
 - g. BWR (3.3%)
 - h. Fisher/Nickell (0%)
5. What is your ethnic background? (n=90)
 - a. Black American (1.1%)
 - b. White American (97.8%)
 - c. Asian American/Oriental (0%)
 - d. Native American (0%)
 - e. Puerto Rican/Hispanic American (0%)
 - f. Other _____ (1.1%)
6. What is your roommate's ethnic background? (n=89)
 - a. Black American (0%)
 - b. White American (96.7%)
 - c. Asian American/Oriental (1.1%)
 - d. Native American (0%)
 - e. Puerto Rican/Hispanic American (0%)
 - f. Other _____ (1.1%)
7. What is the size of your hometown? (n=90)
 - a. less than 1,999 (35.6%)
 - b. 2,000 - 9,999 (23.3%)
 - c. 10,000 - 49,999 (17.8%)
 - d. 50,000 - 249,999 (15.6%)
 - e. 250,000 - 499,999 (3.3%)
 - f. over 500,000 (2.2%)
 - g. Uncertain (2.2%)

8. What is the size of your roommate's hometown? (n=88)
- a. less than 1,999 (35.6%)
 - b. 2,000 - 9,999 (24.4%)
 - c. 10,000 - 49,999 (16.7%)
 - d. 50,000 - 249,999 (12.2%)
 - e. 250,000 - 499,999 (1.1%)
 - f. over 500,000 (0%)
 - g. Uncertain (7.8%)
9. Circle the college from which you intend to graduate. (n=90)
- a. Agriculture (12.2%)
 - b. Engineering (12.2%)
 - c. Education (7.8%)
 - d. Science & Humanities (26.7%)
 - e. Home Economics (13.3%)
 - f. Design (1.1%)
 - g. Business (17.8%)
 - h. Other (0%)
 - i. Undecided (8.9%)
10. Circle the college from which your roommate intends to graduate. (n=89)
- a. Agriculture (6.7%)
 - b. Engineering (10.0%)
 - c. Education (11.1%)
 - d. Science & Humanities (21.1%)
 - e. Home Economics (8.9%)
 - f. Design (10.0%)
 - g. Business (14.4%)
 - h. Other (4.4%)
 - i. Roommate Undecided (12.2%)
 - j. I don't know (0%)
11. How many semesters including this semester have you lived in the residence halls at ISU? (n=90)
- a. One (100%)
 - b. Two (0%)
 - c. Three (0%)
 - d. Four (0%)
 - e. Five or more (0%)
12. Did you request to live with your current roommate? (n=90)
- a. Yes (15.6%)
 - b. No (84.4%)
13. Did you know your roommate prior to coming to ISU? (n=90)
- a. Yes (14.4%)
 - b. No (85.6%)
14. How many room changes have you made since the beginning of the semester? (n=90)
- a. None (87.8%)
 - b. One (11.1%)
 - c. Two (0%)
 - d. Three (1.1%)
 - e. Four or more (0%)
15. Do you plan on changing roommates next semester? (n=279)
- a. Yes (22.2%)
 - b. No (70.0%)
 - c. Uncertain (7.8%)

16. Where do you plan to live next semester? (n=90)
- a. Same room in the residence halls (82.2%)
 - b. Different room in the residence halls (12.2%)
 - c. University student apartments (0%)
 - d. Fraternity/Sorority (0%)
 - e. Apartment or other off campus arrangement (2.2%)
 - f. Will not be attending the university next semester (1.1%)
 - g. Undecided (2.2%)
17. Where do you plan to live next fall? (n=90)
- a. Residence halls (75.6%)
 - b. University student apartments (0%)
 - c. Fraternity/Sorority (10.0%)
 - d. Apartment or other off campus arrangement (4.4%)
 - e. Will not be attending the university next fall (3.3%)
 - f. Undecided (6.7%)

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE FILL IN THE BLANK WITH YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH QUESTION.

18. What is your age? _____ (n=90)
- | | |
|------------|-----------|
| 17 (1.1%) | 20 (1.1%) |
| 18 (68.9%) | 21 (0%) |
| 19 (28.9%) | 22 (0%) |
19. What is your roommate's age? _____ (n=90)
- | | |
|------------|-----------|
| 17 (1.1%) | 20 (3.3%) |
| 18 (72.2%) | 21 (1.1%) |
| 19 (21.1%) | 22 (1.1%) |
20. What was the approximate size of your high school graduating class? _____ (n=90)
- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 - 50 (23.0%) | 201 - 300 (13.0%) |
| 51 - 100 (26.0%) | 301 - 400 (12.0%) |
| 101 - 200 (14.0%) | Over 400 (12.0%) |
21. How many hours do you work at a job each week? _____ (n=90)
- 0 (87.8%)
 - 1 - 10 (4.4%)
 - 11 - 20 (6.7%)
 - 21 - 40 (1.1%)

DIRECTIONS: USING THE RATING SCALE BELOW SCALE BELOW
 INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT FOR STATEMENTS 20 - 69.
 (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER STATEMENT).

- 1 - STRONGLY AGREE (SA)
 2 - AGREE (A)
 3 - NEUTRAL (N)
 4 - DISAGREE (D)
 5 - STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

<u>ROOMMATE RELATIONSHIP</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
22. I have made a sincere effort to get to know my roommate. (n=90)	58.9	33.3	6.7	1.1	0.0
23. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate. (n=90)	46.7	24.4	12.2	12.2	4.4
24. My roommate accepts me for who I am. (n=90)	45.6	33.3	13.3	6.7	1.1
25. My roommate and I are compatible. (n=90)	40.0	28.9	10.0	14.4	6.7
26. I have open and honest communication with my roommate. (n=90)	40.0	21.1	26.7	7.8	4.4
27. I share personal concerns with my roommate. (n=89)	36.7	23.3	17.8	12.2	8.9
28. When my roommate and I disagree, I will share my feelings with my roommate. (n=89)	26.7	27.8	28.9	12.2	3.3
29. When my roommate and I disagree, I am willing to compromise. (n=90)	27.8	52.2	20.0	0.0	0.0
30. When my roommate and I disagree, my roommate is willing to compromise. (n=89)	27.8	47.8	14.4	7.8	1.1
31. My roommate respects my personal belongings. (n=90)	54.4	27.8	7.8	6.7	3.3
32. My roommate's lifestyle interferes with my use of the room. (n=90)	15.6	11.1	11.1	30.0	32.2
33. I have free access to my room without pressure from my roommate. (n=90)	50.0	24.4	12.2	6.7	6.7
34. I can sleep in my room without being disturbed by my roommate. (n=90)	43.3	30.0	13.3	11.1	2.2

35.	I can study in my room without being distracted by my roommate. (n=90)	28.9	28.9	14.4	21.1	6.7
36.	I am satisfied with the cleanliness of my room. (n=90)	37.8	36.7	14.4	7.8	3.3
37.	I am free from fear of intimidation, physical and/or emotional harm from my roommate. (n=90)	70.0	22.2	4.4	1.1	2.2

HOUSE ATMOSPHERE

		<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
38.	The quality of the educational atmosphere in my house is more important to me than the quality of the social atmosphere. (n=90)	7.8	31.1	46.7	11.1	3.3
39.	My house is quiet enough for me to sleep. (n=90)	25.6	52.2	10.0	6.7	5.6
40.	My house is quiet enough for me to study. (n=90)	21.1	40.0	16.7	14.4	7.8
41.	I am an active member of my house. (n=90)	10.0	38.9	31.1	15.6	4.4
42.	I am given the opportunity to provide input into house decisions. (n=90)	22.2	48.9	22.2	6.7	0.0
43.	There are enough educational activities in my house. (n=90)	5.6	37.8	40.0	13.3	3.3
44.	There are enough social activities in my house. (n=90)	13.3	54.4	24.4	6.7	1.1
45.	There are enough recreational activities my house. (n=88)	12.2	42.2	32.2	7.8	3.3
46.	The quality of the social atmosphere in my house is more important to me than the quality of the educational atmosphere. (n=87)	3.3	15.6	45.6	25.6	6.7
47.	There is a feeling of unity and support in my house. (n=90)	13.3	43.3	25.6	12.2	5.6
48.	Students have a strong sense of loyalty toward my house. (n=90)	10.0	35.6	32.2	14.4	7.8

49.	House members know each other and are comfortable interacting with others. (n=89)	13.3	47.8	20.0	15.6	2.2
50.	Residents respect the rights of others living in my house. (n=90)	11.1	53.3	23.3	10.0	2.2
51.	I am comfortable with the relationships I have developed in my house. (n=90)	20.0	54.4	16.7	8.9	0.0
52.	I participate in many house activities. (n=90)	18.9	34.4	28.9	14.4	3.3

RESOURCES

		<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
53.	I receive adequate information about activities within my house. (n=90)	18.9	64.4	10.0	6.7	0.0
54.	When I have questions, I know where to go for help. (n=89)	25.6	53.3	13.3	6.7	0.0
55.	The Department of Residence does a satisfactory job of communicating with me about contracts, deadlines and changes in procedures. (n=90)	10.0	58.9	23.3	6.7	1.1
56.	My contact with residence hall staff has been helpful. (n=90)	8.9	42.2	47.8	1.1	0.0
57.	I am comfortable using the residence hall staff as a resource. (n=90)	11.1	37.8	42.2	7.8	1.1

POLICIES

		<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SA</u>
58.	The policies established by the Department of Residence are fair and reasonable. (n=90)	8.9	70.0	16.7	3.3	1.1
59.	I am satisfied with the way policies are enforced in my house. (n=90)	10.0	48.9	26.7	11.1	3.3
60.	Residents living in my house consider how their own actions affect others. (n=90)	4.4	38.9	31.1	18.9	6.7

61.	I am given an opportunity to provide input into house policies. (n=90)	8.9	62.2	26.7	2.2	0.0
62.	I am satisfied with the quiet hours policy in my house. (n=90)	13.3	57.8	6.7	15.6	6.7
63.	When someone in my house is too noisy, I tell the person the noise is bothering me. (n=90)	12.2	16.7	35.6	28.9	6.7
64.	I am satisfied with the visitation policy in my house. (n=90)	31.1	41.1	17.8	7.8	2.2
65.	I am satisfied with the alcohol policy in my house. (n=90)	21.1	50.0	18.9	5.6	4.4

FACILITIES AND SERVICES

		<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
66.	The custodians do a good job of keeping the dens, bathrooms and hallways clean. (n=90)	46.7	38.9	10.0	4.4	0.0
67.	The maintenance staff responds to repair requests in a reasonable amount of time. (n=90)	20.0	37.8	26.7	15.6	0.0
68.	There are enough study facilities in my hall. (n=90)	15.6	28.9	32.2	16.7	6.7
69.	I am satisfied with the overall cleanliness of my house. (n=90)	23.3	56.7	13.3	5.6	1.1
70.	I am satisfied with the general physical condition of my hall. (n=90)	21.1	58.9	14.4	3.3	2.2
71.	I am satisfied with the security of my hall. (n=90)	21.1	56.7	16.7	4.4	1.1

APPENDIX C

PERCENTAGES FOR FRESHMEN LIVING WITH UPPERCLASS ROOMMATES

PERCENTAGES FOR FRESHMEN LIVING WITH UPPERCLASS ROOMMATES

DIRECTIONS: CIRCLE THE LETTER NEXT TO THE RESPONSE WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR ANSWER.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your sex? (n=189)
 - a. Male (26.5%)
 - b. Female (73.5%)

2. What is your classification? (n=189)
 - a. Freshman (100%)
 - b. Sophomore (0%)
 - c. Junior (0%)
 - d. Senior (0%)
 - e. Graduate (0%)

3. What is your roommate's classification? (n=189)
 - a. Freshman (0%)
 - b. Sophomore (46.6%)
 - c. Junior (31.7%)
 - d. Senior (21.7%)
 - e. Graduate (0%)

4. What residence hall are you currently living in? (n=189)
 - a. Maple (22.2%)
 - b. Willow (22.8%)
 - c. Larch (9.5%)
 - d. Oak-Elm (21.7%)
 - e. Linden (3.2%)
 - f. BLF (9.5%)
 - g. BWR (10.1%)
 - h. Fisher/Nickell (1.1%)

5. What is your ethnic background? (n=189)
 - a. Black American (2.6%)
 - b. White American (94.7%)
 - c. Asian American/Oriental (2.1%)
 - d. Native American (0%)
 - e. Puerto Rican/Hispanic American (0%)
 - f. Other _____ (0.5%)

6. What is your roommate's ethnic background? (n=189)
 - a. Black American (3.2%)
 - b. White American (94.7%)
 - c. Asian American/Oriental (0.5%)
 - d. Native American (0%)
 - e. Puerto Rican/Hispanic American (0%)
 - f. Other _____ (2.1%)

7. What is the size of your hometown? (n=188)
 - a. less than 1,999 (32.8%)
 - b. 2,000 - 9,999 (21.2%)
 - c. 10,000 - 49,999 (19.6%)
 - d. 50,000 - 249,999 (12.7%)
 - e. 250,000 - 499,999 (4.8%)
 - f. over 500,000 (6.9%)
 - g. Uncertain (1.6%)

8. What is the size of your roommate's hometown? (n=186)
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. less than 1,999 (23.8%) | e. 250,000 - 499,999 (6.3%) |
| b. 2,000 - 9,999 (26.5%) | f. over 500,000 (5.8%) |
| c. 10,000 - 49,999 (15.9%) | g. Uncertain (9.0%) |
| d. 50,000 - 249,999 (11.1%) | |
9. Circle the college from which you intend to graduate. (n=189)
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| a. Agriculture (13.2%) | f. Design (5.8%) |
| b. Engineering (10.6%) | g. Business (15.3%) |
| c. Education (9.0%) | h. Other (0.5%) |
| d. Science & Humanities (25.4%) | i. Undecided (8.5%) |
| e. Home Economics (11.1%) | |
10. Circle the college from which your roommate intends to graduate. (n=187)
- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| a. Agriculture (12.7%) | h. Other (5.3%) |
| b. Engineering (10.1%) | i. Roommate Undecided (5.6%) |
| c. Education (9.5%) | j. I don't know (4.8%) |
| d. Science & Humanities (22.8%) | |
| e. Home Economics (7.4%) | |
| f. Design (2.6%) | |
| g. Business (22.2%) | |
11. How many semesters including this semester have you lived in the residence halls at ISU? (n=189)
- | | |
|---------------|----------------------|
| a. One (100%) | d. Four (0%) |
| b. Two (0%) | e. Five or more (0%) |
| c. Three (0%) | |
12. Did you request to live with your current roommate? (n=189)
- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| a. Yes (2.1%) | b. No (97.9%) |
|---------------|---------------|
13. Did you know your roommate prior to coming to ISU? (n=189)
- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| a. Yes (1.1%) | b. No (98.9%) |
|---------------|---------------|
14. How many room changes have you made since the beginning of the semester? (n=189)
- | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| a. None (88.4%) | d. Three (0%) |
| b. One (10.1%) | e. Four or more (0.5%) |
| c. Two (1.1%) | |
15. Do you plan on changing roommates next semester? (n=189)
- | | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------------|
| a. Yes (32.8%) | b. No (54.0%) | c. Uncertain (13.2%) |
|----------------|---------------|----------------------|

16. Where do you plan to live next semester? (n=189)
- a. Same room in the residence halls (76.2%)
 - b. Different room in the residence halls (13.2%)
 - c. University student apartments (0%)
 - d. Fraternity/Sorority (1.6%)
 - e. Apartment or other off campus arrangement (0.5%)
 - f. Will not be attending the university next semester (1.1%)
 - g. Undecided (7.4%)
17. Where do you plan to live next fall? (n=189)
- a. Residence halls (61.9%)
 - b. University student apartments (0%)
 - c. Fraternity/Sorority (15.9%)
 - d. Apartment or other off campus arrangement (5.3%)
 - e. Will not be attending the university next fall (2.6%)
 - f. Undecided (14.3%)

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE FILL IN THE BLANK WITH YOUR RESPONSE TO EACH QUESTION.

18. What is your age? _____ (n=189)
- | | |
|------------|-----------|
| 17 (1.1%) | 20 (1.1%) |
| 18 (68.3%) | 21 (0%) |
| 19 (29.1%) | 22 (0.5%) |
19. What is your roommate's age? _____ (n=188)
- | | | |
|------------|------------|-----------|
| 17 (0%) | 20 (31.2%) | 23 (3.2%) |
| 18 (1.1%) | 21 (24.9%) | 24 (0%) |
| 19 (27.5%) | 22 (10.6%) | 25 (1.1%) |
20. What was the approximate size of your high school graduating class? _____ (n=188)
- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 - 50 (24.0%) | 201 - 300 (12.0%) |
| 51 - 100 (22.0%) | 301 - 400 (10.0%) |
| 101 - 200 (18.0%) | Over 400 (14.0%) |
21. How many hours do you work at a job each week? _____ (n=189)
- 0 (80.4%)
 - 1 - 10 (9.0%)
 - 11 - 20 (8.5%)
 - 21 - 40 (2.1%)

DIRECTIONS: USING THE RATING SCALE BELOW SCALE BELOW
 INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT FOR STATEMENTS 20 - 69.
 (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER PER STATEMENT).

- 1 - STRONGLY AGREE (SA)
 2 - AGREE (A)
 3 - NEUTRAL (N)
 4 - DISAGREE (D)
 5 - STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD)

<u>ROOMMATE RELATIONSHIP</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
22. I have made a sincere effort to get to know my roommate. (n=189)	50.3	38.6	9.5	1.6	0.0
23. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate. (n=189)	39.2	26.5	15.3	14.3	4.8
24. My roommate accepts me for who I am. (n=189)	38.6	33.9	20.1	5.8	1.6
25. My roommate and I are compatible. (n=189)	33.9	30.2	14.3	15.3	6.3
26. I have open and honest communication with my roommate. (n=189)	30.7	31.7	19.6	12.7	5.3
27. I share personal concerns with my roommate. (n=189)	24.9	25.4	24.9	14.3	10.6
28. When my roommate and I disagree, I will share my feelings with my roommate. (n=188)	18.0	32.8	29.6	14.3	4.8
29. When my roommate and I disagree, I am willing to compromise. (n=188)	30.2	49.7	19.0	0.5	0.0
30. When my roommate and I disagree, my roommate is willing to compromise. (n=188)	23.3	38.1	29.6	7.9	0.5
31. My roommate respects my personal belongings. (n=189)	47.6	37.0	9.0	4.2	2.1
32. My roommate's lifestyle interferes with my use of the room. (n=189)	11.6	15.3	14.3	25.4	33.3
33. I have free access to my room without pressure from my roommate. (n=189)	47.6	32.3	6.3	10.1	3.7
34. I can sleep in my room without being disturbed by my roommate. (n=189)	40.7	38.6	7.4	8.5	4.8

35.	I can study in my room without being distracted by my roommate. (n=189)	29.6	34.4	18.0	11.6	6.3
36.	I am satisfied with the cleanliness of my room. (n=189)	32.8	39.7	12.7	7.4	7.4
37.	I am free from fear of intimidation, physical and/or emotional harm from my roommate. (n=189)	64.0	25.4	5.8	3.7	1.1

HOUSE ATMOSPHERE

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>	
38.	The quality of the educational atmosphere in my house is more important to me than the quality of the social atmosphere. (n=189)	15.3	23.8	49.2	10.6	1.1
39.	My house is quiet enough for me to sleep. (n=189)	24.3	51.3	15.9	5.8	2.6
40.	My house is quiet enough for me to study. (n=189)	16.4	45.5	27.5	6.9	3.7
41.	I am an active member of my house. (n=189)	13.8	38.6	27.0	13.8	6.9
42.	I am given the opportunity to provide input into house decisions. (n=189)	21.7	49.7	20.6	5.8	2.1
43.	There are enough educational activities in my house. (n=189)	7.4	34.9	37.0	15.3	5.3
44.	There are enough social activities in my house. (n=188)	17.5	54.0	16.9	9.5	1.6
45.	There are enough recreational activities my house. (n=187)	13.8	47.6	27.0	7.4	3.2
46.	The quality of the social atmosphere in my house is more important to me than the quality of the educational atmosphere. (n=189)	2.1	13.2	47.1	28.6	9.0
47.	There is a feeling of unity and support in my house. (n=189)	13.2	41.3	24.3	16.9	4.2
48.	Students have a strong sense of loyalty toward my house. (n=189)	14.3	34.4	33.9	14.8	2.6

49.	House members know each other and are comfortable interacting with others. (n=189)	14.3	49.7	22.8	11.1	2.1
50.	Residents respect the rights of others living in my house. (n=189)	9.0	48.1	34.4	6.3	2.1
51.	I am comfortable with the relationships I have developed in my house. (n=189)	17.5	54.0	15.9	10.1	2.6
52.	I participate in many house activities. (n=189)	15.9	38.1	24.3	12.7	9.0

RESOURCES

		<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
53.	I receive adequate information about activities within my house. (n=188)	23.8	54.5	15.9	5.3	0.0
54.	When I have questions, I know where to go for help. (n=189)	28.0	55.6	11.6	4.8	0.0
55.	The Department of Residence does a satisfactory job of communicating with me about contracts, deadlines and changes in procedures. (n=189)	11.1	52.9	26.5	7.4	2.1
56.	My contact with residence hall staff has been helpful. (n=189)	11.1	43.4	36.5	8.5	0.5
57.	I am comfortable using the residence hall staff as a resource. (n=189)	11.1	40.2	40.2	7.4	1.1

POLICIES

		<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SA</u>
58.	The policies established by the Department of Residence are fair and reasonable. (n=189)	13.8	56.6	23.3	6.3	0.0
59.	I am satisfied with the way policies are enforced in my house. (n=189)	13.2	54.5	22.2	7.9	2.1
60.	Residents living in my house consider how their own actions affect others. (n=189)	5.8	34.4	41.8	14.3	3.7

61.	I am given an opportunity to provide input into house policies. (n=189)	15.9	46.6	28.0	9.0	0.5
62.	I am satisfied with the quiet hours policy in my house. (n=189)	20.1	51.9	15.3	9.0	3.7
63.	When someone in my house is too noisy, I tell the person the noise is bothering me. (n=189)	14.3	28.0	35.4	14.8	7.4
64.	I am satisfied with the visitation policy in my house. (n=189)	31.7	51.9	10.6	4.8	1.1
65.	I am satisfied with the alcohol policy in my house. (n=187)	28.0	48.7	14.8	4.8	2.6

FACILITIES AND SERVICES

		<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
66.	The custodians do a good job of keeping the dens, bathrooms and hallways clean. (n=189)	45.5	39.7	7.9	5.8	1.1
67.	The maintenance staff responds to repair requests in a reasonable amount of time. (n=189)	13.8	38.1	31.7	13.8	2.6
68.	There are enough study facilities in my hall. (n=189)	15.3	40.7	20.1	21.2	2.6
69.	I am satisfied with the overall cleanliness of my house. (n=188)	22.8	54.0	15.9	4.8	2.1
70.	I am satisfied with the general physical condition of my hall. (n=189)	21.2	61.9	10.1	5.3	1.6
71.	I am satisfied with the security of my hall. (n=188)	24.3	52.9	14.8	4.2	3.2