

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS
OF STUDENTS, PARENTS, FACULTY,
STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS,
AND APARTMENT OWNERS CONCERNING
THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE
UNIVERSITY TOWARD THE STUDENT'S
OFF-CAMPUS LIVING SITUATION

Thesis for the Degree of Ed. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Patrick Byrnes Smith
1968



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS, PARENTS, FACULTY,
STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS, AND APARTMENT OWNERS
CONCERNING THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY TOWARD
THE STUDENT'S OFF-CAMPUS LIVING SITUATION

presented by

Patrick Byrnes Smith

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Doctorate degree in Education

Date A

~~Feb 71~~

~~11-3-71~~

~~179~~
A-1502

213
OCT-04 1999

~~179~~
a-283

~~NOV 4 1971~~

JUN 5 - 351
JAN 17 '75 330

~~179~~
G-70

1

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS, PARENTS, FACULTY, STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS, AND APARTMENT OWNERS CONCERNING THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY TOWARD THE STUDENT'S OFF-CAMPUS LIVING SITUATION

by Patrick Byrnes Smith

Problem

The purposes of this study were (a) to compare perceptions of students, parents, faculty, apartment owners, and student personnel administrators with respect to the University's responsibility in the area of off-campus housing and (b) to compare perceptions of parents and their children (students in the study) with regard to the University's responsibility off-campus. The more specific areas of responsibility studied were (1) community relations, (2) student personnel services, (3) student-university relations and (4) regulatory and law enforcement.

Methods and Procedures

A random sample of five groups (parents, students, faculty, apartment owners, and student personnel administrators) associated with Michigan State University were chosen for the study.

An instrument concerning various aspects of the University's responsibilities off-campus was developed. The instrument contained 65 items which covered four functionally defined areas of responsibility. The functionally defined areas were as follows: community

relations, parent-university relations, student personnel services, and regulatory and law enforcement. In addition to the instrument, the parent sample was asked to fill out a one-page demographic information sheet.

The instrument was submitted to 344 individuals in the fall term of 1968. A total of 320 or 93 per cent was returned.

The statistical procedure used for analyzing the data collected was chi square. The .05 level of confidence was used to determine the level of significant differences.

Findings

The principal findings of the study were:

1. Community Relations: Significant differences among all the sample groups as well as between the parent-student sample group were found in all the items in the Community Relations area. Parents held the greatest expectation for university responsibility and involvement in the students' off-campus living situation. Students and faculty held the least expectation for the University in this area. Student personnel administrators and apartment owners' expectations fell midway between these two positions with both groups tending to be more in sympathy with the faculty-student position.

2. Parent - University Relations: Significant differences among all the sample groups as well as between the parent-student sample group were found in all the items in the parent-university relations area. A polarization effect seemed to take place with parents and apartment owners taking one extreme and students taking

the other. Faculty and student personnel administrators' position fell between these two positions. Faculty tended to support the students' position. Parents and apartment owners expected the greatest amount of parent-university contact. Students expected the least amount of university contact.

3. Student Personnel Services: For the total sample group, significant differences were found on 14 out of the 16 items in the area of student personnel services. For the parent-student sample, 10 items were found to be significantly different out of the entire 16 items covering this area. Parents and students indicated the greatest concern for having the university accept the responsibility for providing the student personnel services discussed in this section. Faculty showed the least concern for these services. The position of student personnel administrators and apartment owners fell midway between the position of parents, students, and faculty. The greatest number of no opinion responses was registered in this area and the sample groups were more divided with respect to the percentage selecting one particular response or position of agree, disagree, or no opinion.

4. Regulatory and Law Enforcement: Significant differences among all the sample groups were found on all the items in this area. Significant differences were also found on twenty out of the twenty-one items in this area for the parent-student sample group. The same polarization effect seemed to take place in this area as in the parent-university area. Parents and apartment owners were at one extreme;

they maintained the greatest expectations of involvement and responsibility on the part of the university. At the other extreme were the students, maintaining the least expectations on the part of the university in this area. The position of student personnel administrators and faculty fell between the positions of parents-apartment owners, and students. The faculty's position tended more toward the direction of the students' position, whereas the student personnel administrators' position tended more towards the stand of the apartment owners and parents. Over all, student personnel administrators and faculty tended to support the position of apartment owners and parents more often than they tended to support the position of the students.

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS, PARENTS, FACULTY,
STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS, AND APARTMENT OWNERS
CONCERNING THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY TOWARD
THE STUDENT'S OFF-CAMPUS LIVING SITUATION

By

Patrick Byrnes Smith

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Counseling, Personnel Services,
and Educational Psychology

1968

651530
10/8/68

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this study wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the members of his Guidance Committee, Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker, Chairman, Dr. Walter F. Johnson, Dr. Richard L. Featherstone and Dr. J. Allan Beegle for the assistance given during this study. He is especially grateful to Dr. Nonnamaker for his constant encouragement throughout its preparation.

Appreciation is also expressed to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Smith and his aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Hubert Mc Avoy for their early direction, continued guidance and encouragement, without whose help this study would not have been made possible.

A special expression of deepest gratitude is due to his wife, Marcia. Her patience, encouragement and understanding throughout the study provided constant inspiration and incentive, thus this thesis is truly as much hers as the author's.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
The Purpose of the Study	5
Statement of the Problem	6
Definition of Terms	7
Hypotheses	7
Hypothesis I	7
Hypothesis II	10
Limitations of the Study	11
Delimitation of the Study	11
Procedures Used in this Study	12
Significance of the Study	13
Organization of the Study	14
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
Historical Perspective	15
Late 1700's - Early 1800's	15
Late 1800's - Early 1900's	18
Early 1960's	24

CHAPTER	Page
Legal Position of the University Off-Campus	29
Review of Related Research	32
Summary	42
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	44
Introduction	44
The Populations, Method of Selection and Sample	44
The Instrument and Procedures Used in Obtaining the Data	46
Analyzing the Data	48
Summary	49
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	51
Introduction	51
Hypotheses	52
Null Hypothesis I	52
Null Hypothesis II	52
Analysis	54
Non-Significant Items	54
Significant Items	54
Community Relations	56
Parent - University Relations	76
Student Personnel Services	82
Regulatory and Law Enforcement	96
Demographic Information	118
Open Ended Responses	124
Summary	148

CHAPTER	Page
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	150
The Problem	150
The Design and Procedure of the Study . .	150
Findings and Conclusions	151
Areas of Agreement	152
Areas of Disagreement	153
Community Relations	153
Parent - University Relations	155
Student Personnel Services	157
Regulatory and Law Enforcement	160
Implications for Further Research	165
BIBLIOGRAPHY	168
APPENDIX	173

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. <u>Responses to Questionnaire</u> : The number of responses by sample groups.	48
2. <u>A Comparison of the Results - Omitting Response 3 (No Opinion)</u> : Items showing differences in results omitting response 3 (no opinion) for hypothesis I, using all of the sample groups respondents; and for hypothesis II, using only parents and students . .	53
3. <u>Non Significant Items</u> : A summary of those items on which the sample groups agreed, the most frequently selected responses and the percentage of the sample selecting a particular response	55
4. The University has the responsibility to involve students, apartment owners, and parents in the formulation of off-campus housing policies	56
5. University personnel should be involved as consultants in the planning of off-campus apartment buildings	57
6. University personnel should screen and approve managers living in residence in all off-campus student housing	58
7. The University, rather than the apartment owner should hire and pay resident managers in off-campus student apartments	59
✓8. The University should establish a council of students, apartment owners, university staff, and city officials to arbitrate off-campus housing problems	60
9. The University should <u>require</u> uniform rental contracts for all off-campus housing.	61

Table		Page
10.	The University should <u>provide</u> uniform rental agreements for all off-campus housing.	62
11.	The University should not be involved in any way in off-campus housing rental contracts between students and apartment owners	63
12.	University personnel should be a third party and final arbitrator in all rental contracts used by students in off-campus housing	64
13.	The cost of printing the off-campus rental contracts should be the responsibility of the University rather than the apartment owner	65
✓ 14.	University personnel should inspect off-campus dwellings and enforce state and city housing codes	
15.	University personnel should inspect and approve all off-campus student housing for proper safety standards	67
16.	University personnel should inspect and approve all off-campus student housing for proper sanitation standards	68
17.	University personnel should assess and arbitrate repairs charged to apartment owners by students to determine fairness of charges	69
18.	University personnel should assess and arbitrate damage costs in off-campus housing charged to students by apartment owners to determine fairness charges	70
19.	The University should hold in escrow damage deposits and the last month's rent of off-campus students living in apartments.	71
20.	The University should not permit a student to register for a subsequent term until damage claims and/or rental debts submitted by apartment owners are paid	72
21.	The University should not issue grades to students who have off-campus housing debts	73
22.	The University should break up off-campus student parties when they become disorderly	74

Table	Page
✓23. Apartment owners should notify the University when off-campus student parties are causing a public disturbance	75
24. The University should notify parents of off-campus students when they are arrested	76
✓25. The University should notify parents of off-campus students under 21 when they are convicted of a violation of civil law by the civil authorities	77
26. The University should contact parents when students are known to be using marijuana	78
27. The University should contact parents when students are known to be using LSD.	79
28. The University should inform parents of off-campus students co-habiting	80
29. When a single female under 21 years of age, living off-campus, is pregnant and withdrawing from the University, the University should notify the student's parents	81
30. The University should provide a special orientation program for off-campus transfer students . .	83
31. Physicians from the University health center should make home calls to student residences off-campus	84
32. The University should publish a list of apartments not meeting established University standards . . .	85
33. The University should screen and match possible roommates for vacancies in off-campus apartments .	86
34. The University should offer a formal or informal course in apartment living, money management, food purchasing, etc.	87
35. The University should have a home owner's insurance policy covering fire, theft, damage to personal belongings, for off-campus students	88
✓36. The University should encourage the development of a formal student governing council for off-campus students	89

Table	Page
37. The University should provide an advisor from the student personnel staff to advise off-campus student government	90
38. Storage lockers on campus should be provided by the University for the off-campus student	91
39. The University should provide bail bond for students arrested	92
40. Luchroom facilities should be provided on campus for off-campus students carrying their lunches . .	93
41. When students are prosecuted for civil offenses, the University should provide legal council for the student	94
42. Off-campus students should be permitted to use residence hall facilities (e.g., laundry, study, recreation)	95
43. A lawyer should be kept on retainer by the University to give off-campus students legal advice	96
44. The University should have no housing regulations for students (first year residence hall requirement, off-campus approved supervised housing). . .	97
✓45. Any student, after the freshman year, should be allowed to live off-campus in housing of his choice <u>without</u> his parents' consent	98
46. The University should have no regulations concerning the students' off-campus housing situations .	99
✓47. Any student, after the freshman year, should be allowed to live off-campus in housing of his choice <u>with</u> his parents' consent.	100
48. Apartments not meeting established University standards should be placed "off-limits."	101
49. The University should have the right to place some off-campus dwellings "off-limits" to students . .	102
50. The University should have the authority to require students to move out of off-campus apartments . .	103
51. The University should declare "off-limits" homes or apartments which discriminate for reasons of race, creed, or color.	104

Table	Page
52. The University should not allow students to rent an apartment for party purposes only	105
53. The University should not allow members of the opposite sex in students' living quarters off-campus	106
✓ 54. The University should have no regulations which prohibit the use of alcohol in off-campus student housing	107
55. The University should have no regulations which prohibit co-habitation by off-campus students . .	108
56. The University should discipline off-campus students for co-habitation (i.e., single members of the opposite sex living together)	109
✓ 57. Apartment owners should notify the local law enforcement agency when off-campus student parties are causing a public disturbance	110
58. The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency when it is aware of violations of civil law	111
✓ 59. The University should take disciplinary action against an off-campus student when the student is arrested and convicted for a violation of a civil or criminal law	112
60. The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency in cases where residences are known places of narcotics use	113
61. The University has the responsibility to inform students of state laws when the University has reason to believe that LSD is being used off-campus	114
✓ 62. The University has the responsibility to inform students of state laws when the University has reason to believe that marijuana is being used off-campus	115
63. The University should report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency	116
64. The University should report the use of marijuana by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency	117

Table	Page
65. Who Filled Out the Questionnaire	118
66. Total Amount of Money Each Family Contributed to Each Child in College	119
67. Parents' Education	120
68. Number of Children Each Family Has in College. .	120
69. Family Size - Members	121
70. Population of Home Town	122
71. Total Family Income	123
72. Parents Occupation	124
73. <u>Student Responses to the Open End Question:</u> This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study . .	125
74. <u>Parents Responses to the Open End Question:</u> This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study . .	131
75. <u>Apartment Owners Responses to the Open End Question:</u> This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particu- lar question the respondents might have had on this study	136
76. <u>Faculty Responses to the Open End Question:</u> This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study . .	139
77. <u>Student Personnel Administrators Responses to the Open End Question:</u> This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study	143

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The housing of students off campus is not a new idea. Off-campus living arrangements have been a part of higher education since the conception of colleges and universities. During the history of higher education the degree to which colleges and universities have been involved in an off-campus housing program has fluctuated greatly depending upon the philosophy of the institution, the economics of the times, the number of students enrolled and the number of units available to house students on and off campus.

Changes in college and university off-campus housing policies and regulations have taken place in higher education more rapidly during the last ten years than ever before. Several factors have greatly influenced these changes. The first, is the increased number of students seeking a college education and their ensuing need for housing facilities. In Michigan alone between 1962 and 1965 there has been a 24 per cent increase in the number of students attending institutions of higher education (10). The Michigan Coordinating Council of Higher Education has predicted that in 1970 higher education in Michigan will experience a 74 per cent increase over the 1962 enrollment (10). This increase is not unique to Michigan. A survey of 152 institutions

compiled by the Off Campus Housing Sub-Committee of the Association of College and University Housing Officers indicated that colleges and universities across the country were experiencing a similar growth trend (3). In addition, this survey points out that there has been an increase of 62 per cent in the last five years in the use of off-campus facilities to satisfy the increased demands for housing (3).

The situation at two major Michigan universities provides a very good example of what changes are taking place across the country. The President's Commission on Off-Campus Housing at the University of Michigan (32) indicated that there were more building permits issued for off campus apartments during the 1964 academic year than in the previous five years combined (32). The off-campus housing program at Michigan State University has also changed considerably in the last few years. In 1955 Michigan State University had approximately 900 students living off campus. By 1966 this figure jumped to nearly 5,500. Between 1962 and 1966, 3,500 apartment units, designed for students, were built in the East Lansing area (13)

Along with this growth in off-campus apartment housing have come increasing requests by apartment owners and their agents for the university to accept more responsibility for developing student programs and supervising and regulating students' behavior. However, the apartment owners and their agents have refused to initiate or develop programs or supervise student behavior themselves, after the students have moved in. In effect, they seem to want to realize the profits and accept none of the responsibilities.

The second factor influencing the change in the university's regulations and policies in off-campus housing has been the emphasis

on group living and residence hall programs. During the last ten years many colleges have initiated massive residence hall building projects on their campuses. Coupled with this building program, universities have placed their major emphasis in providing services, staffing, and research to give those students in residence halls the best possible programs and living environment that higher education can offer. Colleges have directed their major energies toward the residence hall programs while giving little or no emphasis to off-campus housing. Robert Shaffer and William Martinson in their book, Student Personnel Services in Higher Education, have pointed out this situation very well.

"Commuting students living at home and in private rooming houses present a special challenge to the student personnel worker. Because of day-to-day concerns with residence halls and fraternal units, staff time and energy is almost totally consumed in this area to the exclusion of any creative thinking and planning for the students not in group housing. . . this problem is often erroneously labeled "lack of communication." While this may be a contributing factor, in reality it is one of assimilating off-campus students into the main stream of the campus. It is important to offer these students some of the benefits attainable through group living." 39:67-68

The third major factor affecting the change in universities regulations and policies in off-campus housing has been the change in philosophy of "in loco parentis." This philosophy states that the university will act in place of the parents and would serve as surrogate parents directing and controlling conduct to the same extent that the parents might. The original concept of "in loco parentis" was meant to prevail throughout all aspects of student behavior. The supervision and regulation of fraternity and sorority systems, social affairs, discipline

problems, on and off-campus housing, and all extra-curricular life were all or in part entrusted to the university. This concept was extended to the point of regulating the place a student could eat off campus, or the place of his residence off campus. (9,17)

Due to recent conflicts between the law and the private rights of students, colleges and universities have undergone a change in theory from one of "in loco parentis" toward one of contract theory (23). This theory implies the fact that the students enter into a contractual relationship with the university, and as party to a matriculation contract is bound by the obligations of said agreement. This change toward contract theory has liberalized and changed the thinking of many administrators and in doing this had a direct effect upon the role of the university toward the off-campus student's living situation. What, in fact, this really has done is change housing regulations to allow more students to move off campus and to allow them more freedom in their living situations. The position universities occupied 15 years ago of regulating and supervising off-campus behavior has completely reversed itself today.¹ In off-campus housing co-habitation, drinking, disorderly conduct, public disturbance, loud parties, delinquent contracts, damage deposit problems, and personnel programming are not viewed as much today as the university's responsibility as they once were. But, at the same time students, parents, apartment owners, and, in some cases, faculty are requesting that the university accept this responsibility.

The last, and perhaps one of the more significant factors affecting the off-campus living situation has been the lack of research and investigation in the off-campus area. There have been no doctoral

dissertation studies since 1950 dealing with the off-campus student and his living arrangements other than a few dealing with the student's living situation and his academic achievements. There has only been a scattering of research articles pertaining to various specific aspects of the student's off-campus living environment during the past ten years. There has been no investigation of the perceptions of those individuals responsible for the formulating of off-campus housing policies and procedures. Consequently there has been no attempt to determine the specific responsibility the university has today in light of the recent influences which have changed the complexity of the off-campus area.

The preceding four major factors point out a need for student personnel administrators to conscientiously begin a serious investigation of the off campus living environments of students; therefore, it is hoped that this dissertation will begin to add to a necessary body of knowledge in this area so that the universities can effectively administer and formulate policies which govern the off-campus student.

The Purpose of the Study

There has been a paucity of research which examines the student's behavior off campus or the university's responsibility to the student living off campus. There have been some attempts made to assess the feelings of parents, administrators, and students on specific types of behavior (i.e. student visitation to off-campus private quarters) (15) but there has been no attempt to ascertain the responsibility the

university has toward the total living environment.

The purpose of this study is to compare perceptions of students, faculty, apartment owners, parents, and student personnel administrators with respect to the university's responsibility in the area of off-campus housing. Behind the purpose of this study is the desire to gain insight into the perceptions of those individuals most actively involved in the policy formulation regarding off-campus housing. The more specific areas of responsibility to be studied are: 1) community relations, 2) student personnel services, 3) parent-university relations, and 4) regulatory and law enforcement.

It is hoped that this study will aid the university in its educational aims in the areas of policy formulation, student personnel programming, and proper administrative staffing in the off-campus housing area. In addition, this study can help point out the specific areas which the university should or should not emphasize in working with the off-campus student.

Statement of the Problem

In this study the perceptions of students, parents of students, faculty, apartment owners, and student personnel administrators will be compared with respect to their opinions concerning the university's responsibility for the student's off-campus living situation. An attempt will be made to analyze any differences between students, parents of students, faculty, apartment owners, and student personnel administrators with respect to the types of responsibility that Michigan State University has toward its off-campus students.

Definition of Terms

Student - A full-time (12 credits or more) single male or female, sophomore, junior or senior, attending Michigan State University, living in off-campus housing other than a fraternity house, a sorority house, cooperative living unit, supervised housing, with relatives or at home.

Faculty - A member of the academic faculty at Michigan State University holding the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or full professor.

Parent - The parents of the students described above.

Student Personnel Administrator - Full time professional staff members of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs.

Apartment Owner - An individual who owns a student apartment building or his managing agent renting primarily to M.S.U. students.

Off-Campus Housing - Those dwellings, primarily apartments that are not part of Michigan State University's organized housing program. These dwellings are unsupervised and unapproved by the University.

University's Responsibility - The responsibility entrusted to the judgment of Michigan State University for developing and supervising student programs and for regulating the students' behavior.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

This study is concerned with the perceptions of students, parents of students, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators with respect to the Michigan State University's responsibility

in the students' off-campus living situation. The major hypothesis is that there will be a difference between the perceptions of students, parents of students, faculty, apartment owners, and student personnel administrators as to the responsibility Michigan State University has toward the student's off-campus living situation. The theory² behind this hypothesis is that through the role these groups play, their perceptions as to the types and extent of responsibility the university should have off campus will differ.

The concept of role theory which supports the above hypothesis has been thoroughly reviewed by Gross (18), Sarbin (37), Brookover (7), Nonnamaker (31), Neiman and Hughes (30). The definition of role has been defined in different ways by different researchers.

Newcomb describes role in terms of position. He states:

"each position carries with it definite perceptions for behaving toward other persons in related position . . . Such ways of behaving toward others which are defined for different positions are called roles. (29:298) The ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position constitutes the role associated with that position. A position . . . is something static; it is a place in the structure recognized by members of the society and accorded by them to one or more individuals. A role, on the other hand, is something dynamic; it refers to the behavior of the occupants of a position --not all their behavior, as persons, but what they do as occupants of the position." (29:280)

Brookover (7) does not describe role in terms of position but rather in terms of status and status in situations. He has divided his concept of role into seven categories:

General status -- others' expectations of any actor in a broadly defined position, i.e. teacher.

Status in situation -- others' expectations of any actor in a particular situation.

Role -- others' expectations of a particular actor in a particular situation.

Actor -- the individual as he enters the situation with his previous experience in related situations, personality needs and the meaning of the situation for him.

Self involvement -- actor's image of the ends anticipated from participation in the status as he projected his self image in the role.

Definition -- actor's definition of what he thinks others expect of him in the role.

Behavior in interaction -- actor's behavior in interaction with others. This is determined by definition and role but also continually redefines them. (7:3)

Nonnamaker (31) drawing from Newcomb (29), Brookover (7) and Gross (18) defined role as:

"the expectations which others have for any actor in a particular position or the expectations that any actor may have for his own position." (31:21)

Gross, Mason and McEachern (18) defined role as: "a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position." They defined position as: "a location of an actor or class of actors in a system of social relationships." (18:60)

Gross, Mason and McEachern go on further to explain their theory stating that: "the greater the homogeneity among or between position incumbents the more consensus they will have on the expectations for their own and others' positions."

Although role is defined and interpreted differently by different investigators, for purposes of this study the Gross, Mason and McEachern definition of role will be used.

Each of the sample groups involved in this study occupies a different position with respect to the university community. It is assumed

that there is a certain degree of homogeneity in each of these positions and that persons filling the various positions will vary with respect to their expectations of what the university's role in off-campus housing ought to be.

As indicated above, the sample groups consist of parent, student, apartment owners, faculty, and student personnel administrators.

The faculty form a homogeneous group involved in teaching and academic pursuits. They have an advanced degree in a specialized area and are personally concerned with pursuing this specialty through teaching and research. The student personnel administrators are involved in administration of the university and out-of-class education of students. The apartment owners are not part of the university and are involved in the commercial venture through financial investments. The students are not involved in the teaching and administration of the university. They are all undergraduates pursuing an undergraduate academic degree. In most cases they are younger, less educated, and experienced than the faculty or the student personnel administrators and they are not primarily involved in a commercial venture as are the apartment owners. Parents form a homogenous group. All are associated with the university due to the fact that they have children in college; they are normally removed from the physical environment of the university, and usually maintain certain educational and behavioral expectations of the university and their children.

Hypothesis II

The second hypothesis in the study states that there will be significant differences between the perceptions of parents and their children,

i.e., the students involved in the research.

The basis for this second hypothesis comes not only from role theory but mainly from the exposure of the author to students and their off-campus problems for the past four years. When interviewing students on off-campus concerns during this period, the author has repeatedly encountered situations where the student indicates that he is expressing the same opinions on these concerns as his parents. This research will attempt to clarify any differences which exist between students and their parents with regard to the items used in the study.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited by the factors inherent in the use of any questionnaire, namely the difficulties in tabulating, validating, and securing the complete cooperation of the respondents.

A further limitation to the study might be the fact that parents and students discussed the questionnaire jointly before returning it to the author.

Delimitation of the Study

The principle delimitation of this study is that it is concerned only with the perceptions of students, faculty, student personnel administrators, parents, and apartment owners associated with Michigan State University.

Procedures Used in this Study

The populations of this study consists of: 1) all full-time (12 credits or more sophomores, juniors, and seniors) enrolled at M.S.U. fall term, 1967, living off campus, excluding individuals living in a fraternity house, sorority house, cooperative living unit, supervised housing, living with relatives or at home; 2) the parents of these students; 3) all academic faculty working full time fall term, 1967, at Michigan State University with academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor; 4) all student personnel administrators working full time fall term, 1967, in the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs; 5) all apartment owners or their managing agents, renting primarily to M.S.U. students. From these populations a random sample of individuals was selected for this study. The sample consists of 100 students, 100 parents, 50 faculty, 50 student personnel administrators, and 50 apartment owners.

In order to adequately compare the five groups, a questionnaire covering the four major areas of responsibility related to the university's responsibility off campus was developed. In answering the questionnaire individuals were asked to select one response for each item using the following scale: Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no comment. Chi square, a non-parametric statistic, was used to determine significant differences. The .05 level of significance was selected to determine the significant differences between the perceptions of the groups.

The most important aspect of the study will be to compare the different perceptions concerning the responsibility the University has

toward the off-campus living situation. Specifically, the questionnaire was developed and designed so that it will be possible to compare the different perceptions in the following areas: 1) community relations, 2) student personnel services, 3) parent-university relations, and 4) regulatory and law enforcement.

Significance of the Study

Exploring the area of the University's responsibility toward the off-campus student should prove to be extremely valuable to all those people who are concerned with the problems of the off-campus student. Specifically, this study should give those university administrators concerned with off-campus housing policies some idea as to how students, parents, apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators view the responsibility of the university with regard to the student's off-campus living environment. In addition, it should also help in the following manner: 1) Provide an impetus for research in the off-campus housing area which has, for a long time, been an area greatly lacking in investigation and research. 2) Provide a foundation from which future policy formulation can be based to best serve the off-campus student. 3) Stimulate and aid other institutions in reviewing and formulating policies on their campuses. 4) Evaluate for the first time our present position at Michigan State University.

It is hoped that this research will help parents, students, faculty, and student personnel administrators understand the responsibility of the university as it relates to the off-campus student in terms of the changing climate of higher education today. It is only when we under-

stand the university's responsibility that we can best utilize our energies and facilities for the betterment of the student in higher education.

Organization of the Study

For the purpose of convenience and systematic consideration, this study is reported in five chapters. Chapter I presents an introduction of the study, the purpose of the study, a statement of the problem, the population examined, the limitations and significance of the study. Chapter II includes a review of pertinent literature related to this study. Chapter III consists of a detailed report of the design and methodology used in developing the questionnaire, conducting the study, and analyzing the data. The findings are reported in Chapter IV. A summary of the findings, along with the conclusions and implications for further study are found in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a review of the literature which has some bearing on this thesis. To put the topic being investigated into proper perspective, an historical development of off-campus housing is presented. This is followed by a brief description of the legal position of universities with regard to off-campus housing, a review of the pertinent research in this area and last, a brief summary of the chapter.

Historical Perspective

Late 1700's - Early 1800's

The problem of housing students at American Colleges and the utilization of off-campus housing to help alleviate this problem had its beginnings during the mid 1700's. During this period there was great concern by the university officials for the welfare of students. (8, 11, 22) This concern was reflected in the regulations placed on students, restricting their places of residence and behavior off-campus. Students wishing to live off-campus had to obtain special permission from the university officials. Once a student had received special permission, he could move only into an approved home. Students living

off-campus were expected to adhere to the same standards of behavior as those living on campus. (11, 22)

Leonard, (22) in describing the development of the Colonial College states that:

After the appointment of the President, one of the first major problems of the trustees of the Colonial Colleges was housing the students. In several instances, the students had first lived in the house of the President but as their number increased, they were allowed to live in approved homes in the neighborhood of the President's home or the College Building. This arrangement was found unsatisfactory and great efforts were made to raise funds for building dormitories in order that the students could be under the constant supervision of the President and faculty. As soon as dormitories were built, all students were required to live in the college except by special permission from the President and/or the trustees . . . each person admitted shall have an inhabitation in the College assigned to him by the President in which he shall be obliged to lodge (except by special leave obtained from the governor or the President) . . . Students living off-campus were generally subject to the same discipline as other students. This is illustrated by a rule passed by the overseers of Harvard in 1660 requiring Presidential permission to live outside the college. Such students had to be under the same college order and discipline as other residents in the College. (22:24)

During the late 1700's and early 1800's college officials continued to be faced with housing problems, Leonard states that:

Of all the personnel services for which early college officials held themselves responsible, the first and most pressing appeared to have been that of providing appropriate living conditions for the students. Many factors entered into the assumption of this responsibility, but the precedent set by the Colonial College doubtless carried the most weight with the benefactors and legislators who accepted the need for housing the students in their plans for endowing and in chartering the institution. In some cases the granting of charter rested on the evidence of existing facilities or money to purchase or build facilities for housing the students and faculty . . . Groups promoting a college met the problem of housing the student in different ways, depending upon the existing facilities in the locality, but in general they either built dormitories or farmed the students out among the faculty or in community homes which were supervised. Most colleges actually used both methods . . . In the early years some colleges with only a few students housed them in the home of the President. Soon, however, students overflowed into the homes of faculty and carefully selected Christian homes . . . (22:40)

The type of relationship which existed between the college, the student and the community during this period was very closely controlled. In some cases, students were not allowed to go out of sight of the college buildings or hearing range of the college bell without special permission. (22:54-55) Students were forbidden to "attend any sporting games, purchase or possess any spiritus liquors, make tumultuous or indecent noises in the town, build fires in the trustees' homes or annoy the townspeople in any way. Shooting at the neighbors' dog or overseer or molesting the townspeople's orchards or gardens, was also forbidden." (22:56) When students violated any of the above, they were disciplined. As these examples show, during this period colleges assumed almost total responsibility for the behavior of students on and off campus. (8,11,22)

Between 1800 and 1850 little change took place in the nature of off-campus housing. However, because of the great increase in enrollments during this period it became increasingly difficult to find proper supervised homes for the off-campus student. (11)

As was true during the earlier periods, supervision of students was done by the faculty and selected respectable persons of the community. The supervisory family was responsible for carrying out the college rules, a copy of which was given, in many cases, to each householder. (22) Homeowners were expected to accept the students as part of their families. It was hoped that this practice would cultivate in the students some of the social and domestic habits of the family. (22) The philosophy behind this practice was reflected in one catalogue in the following way:

The young ladies will here be brought under the first moral influence and maternal supervision exerted by those who will act in harmonious concert with the teachers to aid in the thorough education of the mind, manners, and heart. (46:32-33)

Late 1800's - Early 1900's

As American institutions of higher education continued to grow in size during the late 1800's, the number of college dormitories constructed decreased and the number of fraternities and off-campus residences increased. (8,11,22) A major contributing factor was the influence of the German philosophy of education which was affecting American colleges. (11,48) This German emphasis of "paying no attention to students outside of the classroom and insisting that they find their own social life and boarding and rooming facilities" played a significant part in the move away from dormitory construction during the middle and late 1800's. (11:711) Cowley states that during this time "the German point of view, in fact, ruled and as it grew in popularity, dormitories were frowned upon, occasionally abolished and seldom built at state universities." (11:711) Wrenn noted that:

By 1900 many students in Eastern Colleges had moved out of the few existing dormitories into fraternity houses and private residences and among the universities of the Middle West there was only a handful of dormitories in operation. (48:294)

Cowley, in tracing the history of student residences went on to say:

Dormitories built early in the nineteenth century continued in operation but many of them had been allowed to fall into semi decay . . . Students irked by the primitive conditions in the residence halls, under which they were expected to live, moved out in large numbers into fraternity houses and private residences. (11:712)

Cowley, in pointing out the move away from dormitory construction reports a situation where private individuals constructed a dormitory

off-campus with the idea of making a profit from the fees collected from the students for room and board. (11:712) He also discusses the growth of fraternity houses on college campuses and the effect this growth had on dormitory construction. The fraternity influence at one institution (Amherst) was so intense that during the late 1800's the institution abandoned the construction of a new dormitory. Fraternities and off-campus living thus supplied the bulk of housing for the great numbers of students seeking residence at colleges between 1850 and 1900. (11,43)

The traditional idea of a student moving in with a faculty member, into a "Christian home," or into an "approved home" decreased in emphasis between 1850 and the early 1900's. (8,11,22) There were two major factors affecting this change. This change occurred, for one, because of the great increase in enrollments taking place. Faculty could no longer house all of the students looking for accommodations, and colleges soon had to expand their "proper" housing programs away from the campus to the local farm areas. (11) In doing this, institutions lost some degree of control over the students' living situation. The second reason was that the President could no longer approve of dwellings himself, and for awhile the responsibility for the approval process shifted aimlessly among the university officials. (11) While colleges continued to require approval of off-campus housing, the tight control once held on the approval process disappeared. As a result, the conditions of some of the approved homes began to deteriorate, so that by the late 1800's much of the off-campus housing was in the same primitive state as were the dormitories. (11)

During the early 1900's there was a return to the English philosophy

of education, utilizing the residence unit as the center of the educational life of the student. (11) Accompanying the return of the English philosophy was the rapid increase construction of dormitories. (11,22,48)

This influence, plus the marked increase in the number of women students at American institutions, greatly influenced future role off-campus housing would have in higher education. This change in philosophy, and the increased enrollments of female students helped change the future role of off-campus housing to one of supplementing the dormitory program.

During this same time off-campus housing came under close scrutiny by university officials. (11,48) This movement began with an increased concern for women students and their places of residence. (11,48) In addition, the responsibility for inspecting and approving off-campus residences at most campuses was finally stabilized and became the duty of the student personnel administrator. As Wrenn points out:

One of the earliest responsibilities of the personnel worker was to inspect and supervise boarding houses off-campus and incorporate these units into the total campus life. (48:295)

Deans of women, responsible traditionally for the female students' welfare, began to take a close look at off-campus female student residences. (11) Cowley points out that few institutions were willing to let female students "shift for themselves." (11:761) Cowley goes on to say:

The notion that women were physically unequal to higher education had by no means completely died down and the Victorian morality left no room for anything but strict housing regimentation . . . Some deans of women charged with the social and physical welfare of their students gave devoted and continuous attention to housing. (11:761)

An interesting illustration of the reason administrators were concerned about off-campus residences is given by Cowley in his report of a survey compiled on rooming houses at a Middle West institution in 1906.

He reports:

. . . that 18 of the 40 householders admitted both sexes; that approximately 30 householders permitted students to provide and prepare their own food; that cooking, eating, sleeping and studying were done in the same room; that in these houses girls had no parlors in which to entertain friends or callers; that none of the houses provided single beds; that only six had bathrooms and inside toilets; that ten had furnace heat; that three still used kerosene lamps. Those doing light housekeeping might wash and iron in their own rooms, where kitchen duties were usually taken care of on kerosene stoves . . . (11:761)

As student personnel administrators assumed the responsibility for off-campus residences they became intensely concerned about the physical, social and intellectual condition of off-campus dwellings. Administrators attempted to use the social, physical and educational programs in the residence halls as their yardstick to measure the off-campus facilities. (2,48)

The American Council on Education in a special report on the housing of students supported the idea of using the residence halls as a standard.

The minimum physical provisions for students comfort and adequate living should be as closely identical as possible with standards set by the college residence halls . . . In the eyes of the community and of the parents, the responsibilities of the college for life in commercial residences are far different from those in communities with college owned halls. From the educational point of view -- which should be that of any educational institution -- the responsibilities for all its students must be the same, no matter where they may live . . . The college offices of dean of women, dean of men, or directors of housing should be provided with the necessary budget and personnel to create in private homes conditions which resemble those in its own housing units as closely as possible. (2:62-63)

Wrenn went so far as to describe "the ideal off-campus house as a miniature residence hall." (48:314)

However, because of the inherent differences between off-campus housing and on-campus housing, administrators found it very difficult to make "miniature residence halls" out of private residences.

The difficulty with providing proper shelter for students through the use of private commercial dwellings -- to say nothing of their use for educational purposes -- comes not from the fact that they are private dwellings but from the fact that they are commercial. The use of this word in designation of such dwellings indicates a fundamental conflict with the purposes of an educational institution. In the matter of shelter, the primary objective of the commercial landlord is to get the greatest possible income with the smallest possible expense for maintenance. Some individual landlords may temper this with humanitarian concerns, but in general, the market forces them, even if desire for profit does not, to operate their properties with commercial purposes foremost in mind. Any college program which attempts to bring another major purpose to the foreground, therefore, meets a constant obstacle in the fact that the people who control the property do not possess an interest or share in the major purposes of the institution. Such persons may be inspected, trained, and refused approval, but they can never be expected to do more than comply with the rules, the basic premises of which they do not understand. (2:60-61)

The fundamental differences which existed between on-campus and off-campus housing made it impossible or extremely difficult to turn off-campus housing into a "miniature residence hall." Eventually administrators changed their emphasis from trying to duplicate residence halls off-campus to one of trying to provide adequate off-campus facilities to supplement those on campus. From this time on the bulk of student personnel administrators' energy was centered in the following three areas: (a) the inspection of off-campus dwellings for proper safety and sanitary conditions; (b) the selection and education of supervisors; and (c) the development of social and educational

programs for off-campus students.

Wrenn, (48) stated that the major responsibility for the director of residences in dealing with off-campus housing falls in three areas:

- (1) To see that the off-campus houses are carefully inspected.

Inspection and selection of off-campus houses should be made early in the summer by a committee comprising a dietitian, a nurse, members of the home economics and the physical education departments, and representatives from the personnel office. This committee should appraise each house in terms of established standards of diet, heating, ventilation, lighting, sanitation, sleeping facilities, supervision, and social life. Inspection tours should be made at the beginning of the academic year and at intervals during the year, to see that these standards are being maintained. If the above steps are carefully taken, the college can avoid some of the common deficiencies of off-campus housing: small rooms, poorly lighted and ventilated; inadequate toilet facilities -- more than six students to one bathroom; lack of closet space; lack of desks; double rather than single beds; poor provision for quiet; inadequate recreation facilities; no provision for segregation in case of illness; undesirable location.

- (2) To see that householders are chosen with discrimination.

The householder, landlady, or house mother, as she is variously called, is the key person in the off-campus situation. That is why it is so important to try to find householders who are willing to cooperate with the college and are interested in the welfare of the students; who understand the conditions necessary for effective student life; have social ideals; are reliable, clean and orderly; and who have families that contribute rather than interfere with the student's development . . . Regular meetings of the householders with the student personnel staff are mutually helpful. Householders bring current problems to the attention of the college staff and together they work out practical solutions with respect to health, diet, social life, and student conduct. In a series of such meetings, householders gain not only suggestions for supervision but also a feeling of working toward an important common goal -- the education of American youth.

- (3) To see that a wholesome social life is provided and that the student takes advantage of the educational values available.

A living room for students where they can entertain callers and engage in small group activities is essential for social life in off-campus houses. It should be considered an intrinsic part of the personnel program and maintain close contact with the activities of the institution as a whole. Representatives from off-campus houses should be active in the Student Council and serve on

committees responsible for campus events. Moreover, these events should be planned at times when off-campus students can conveniently attend them. Similarly, dormitory open-house occasions and other forms of hospitality to off-campus students encourage the desired functional unity between campus and off-campus students. (48:312-315)

The American Council on Education's publication on housing went so far as to say that the system of inspection and approval of off-campus dwellings is the only real weapon that colleges can use in controlling off-campus students' residences. (2) Mueller (25) and Wrenn (48) recommended that off-campus housing be inspected and that the proprietors be educated to the university's standards and regulations. In the process of educating the home owners, Mueller recommended that an organization of home owners be developed. This organization would be a vehicle to inform home owners what responsibilities are expected of them by the university. Mueller, believes universities should be more involved in women's off-campus housing than men's because of society's demands for high standards and good supervision of women. In discussing women's housing she states that:

No young student may live in a distant area not serviced by public transportation, nor in any area so badly lighted or so inadequately patrolled that walking home at night is a hazard. (25:197-198)

Mueller, (25) Wrenn(48) and the Council on Education's housing report (2) all recommended the enforcement of university social rules and regulations pertaining to students' living off-campus.

Early 1960's

College policies toward off-campus housing during the early 1960's indicate that, basically, student personnel administrators' concerns remained pretty much as they were in the early part of the century. In

many cases they were still concerned with and involved in: (a) the inspection of off-campus dwellings; (b) the education of off-campus supervisors; and (c) the supervision of students' social behavior while they are living off-campus. (3,24,25,34,41,43,47) In addition there was a renewed concern for the inspection of off-campus housing for proper safety and sanitary conditions. Although this concern had its beginning in the mid and late fifties it was not until the 1960's that it was revitalized and began to blossom.

A Joint Commission on Student Housing Standards¹ feeling that college administrators had hesitated to set standards for their own institution, recommended a set of minimum standards for non-institutional owned housing. (20) These standards included the following items:

"basic construction and exterior, exit routes and interior stairways and corridors, habitable space requirements, bath and toilet facilities, water requirements, heating and ventilation, electrical facilities, lighting, food service and equipment, pest control, housekeeping, maintenance, cleanliness, and fire protection." (20:363)

Westfall, (47) in an attempt to ascertain how universities felt about off-campus inspection standards, surveyed sixty-five selected universities. He received responses from ninety-eight per cent of the sample. Ninety-six per cent of the universities responding were in favor of establishing minimal standards for non-institutional owned housing. Westfall in summarizing his report supported the Joint

¹The committee was composed of members of the American College Health Association, the Campus Safety Association and the Association of College and University Housing Offices. This report can be obtained in monograph form from any one of the three professional organizations.

Commission on Student Housing position and made the following recommendations:

Colleges should use the Joint Commission on Student Housing recommendations as: (a) guidelines and establish their own minimum health and safety requirements, (b) employ the services of a registered public health sanitation official to conduct inspections, (c) conduct inspections at least once a year, (d) maintain a list of approved off-campus dwellings. (47:121)

Opp, (33) in an article strongly supporting the position of establishing proper safety and sanitation standards for off-campus housing, went on further to say that, "the institution should list and refer or recommend only facilities which have been inspected and found acceptable." (33:26) Most of the literature of the 1960's has supported the position of strict inspections and approval standards for off-campus housing.

The second important trend in the 1960's has been the rebirth of the German philosophy of education as it relates to off-campus housing. Accepting this philosophy in its purest form, universities should be concerned only with educational pursuits in the classroom and not involved in housing, particularly off-campus housing. Few institutions adopted the German philosophy of education toward housing completely, yet many institutions have developed a classification of housing in this direction. (3,24,26,32,38,43,47)

What has happened is that institutions have developed two classifications (types) of off-campus housing. The first type usually called "supervised or approved" is molded after the early American philosophy of education which includes the supervision and inspection of off-campus housing.

The second type modeled after the German philosophy of education,

is usually called "unsupervised" and/or "unapproved." No responsibility is assumed for the students outside of the classroom under this philosophy. The university does not inspect or approve dwellings, or involve itself in the behavior problems of students living in these dwellings. (41,43) In a survey conducted by Sprunger and Smith (41) on ten randomly selected non-western (Big Ten) conference schools, fifty per cent of the institutions reported "unapproved" and/or "unsupervised" housing programs.

In a study conducted by Tombaugh and Smith (43) of colleges in the Western Conference (Big Ten), all ten schools indicated some kind of "unapproved" and/or "unsupervised" housing program. Smith and Tombaugh note that:

Qualifications for living in "unsupervised" housing are easily described. Practices range from no restrictions at Minnesota to a twenty-three year old minimum for undergraduate students at the University of Illinois. Four schools have different regulations for men and women undergraduate students. Some institutions identify students eligible for "unsupervised housing by age, some by year in school, and some by an either/or criteria" . . . (43:3)

Smith and Tombaugh, stated further that there seems to be a commitment to the provision of both "supervised" and "unsupervised" off-campus housing by the majority of the schools included in this study. (43)

In 1965 the ACUHO Off-Campus Housing Commission survey indicated that seventy-two per cent of the 162 universities responding to their questionnaire indicated that their university did not require supervision in all non-institutionally owned facilities for single students.

(3) This report showed that approximately fifty per cent of the institutions had adopted the dual system of approved/supervised, unapproved/unsupervised off-campus housing philosophy. This was particularly true of the larger institutions.

The President of the University of Michigan² in 1965 established a special commission of students, faculty, administrators and townspeople charged with the responsibility of investigating the University's role in off-campus housing. (32) After a year of investigation the commission concluded:

. . . that in our free enterprise system the university lacks the legal and political authority (if it has the wisdom) to impose new regulations upon privately owned facilities . . . Except for recommendations concerning health, safety and cleanliness the commission does not recommend increased supervision by the university of the private lives of its students living in off-campus housing. Such problems as there are must largely and necessarily be met by the local authorities. The university should, of course, continue to cooperate with the local authorities to keep the problems to a minimum in both number and scope. The commission believes that the university's greatest responsibility to private owners and developers of student housing and to the city of Ann Arbor as well, is to provide an effective channel of communication between the university and all others whose cooperation and participation is required in order to assess suitable student housing facilities in Ann Arbor. Universities should accomplish this means of communications best by offering its services as mediator. (32:30-50)

It appears from this study that the University of Michigan's Off-Campus Housing Office will only play the role of mediator and communications agent for all parties concerned with off-campus housing of students. This university has almost completely gone in the direction of having only unapproved/unsupervised housing off-campus.

In 1963 Michigan State University developed a housing policy which moved in the direction of supporting this dual classification of supervised/unsupervised housing philosophy. (1) The following housing regulations were adopted:

²It should be noted that the University of Michigan has favored the German philosophy of education with regard to housing for some time. In 1853 President Henry Philip Tappan so strongly objected to the dormitory system that he converted the only university residence hall into a classroom.

Students who will have attained senior status by the last official day of registration fall term or who will attain the age of 21 during the academic year will be eligible to live in unsupervised housing beginning with fall term of that year . . . Any eligible student (i.e. a student turning 21 during the academic year or attaining senior status by fall term registration) under the age of 21 must have a parental consent form filed in the Off-Campus Housing Office in order to be eligible to live in unsupervised housing. (1:12)

Under this policy students living in unsupervised housing are responsible only to the laws of the local community. The university no longer assumes responsibility for (a) the students' behavior off-campus, (b) the selection and education of home owners, (c) the inspection of off-campus dwellings. Conflicts between students and landlords are the concern of those parties and the university assumes no responsibility for this conflict other than acting as a mediator at the request of the parties.

The extent to which institutions of higher education move toward this dual classification of housing during the early sixties seems to depend on a number of factors. Among these might be included: (a) the geographic location of the school; (b) the size of the community in which the school is located; (c) the size of the institution; (d) the composition of the student body; (e) the institution's age; and (f) the institution's educational and student personnel philosophies.

Legal Position of the University Off-Campus

In determining the university's responsibility off-campus, it is appropriate that consideration be given to the legal position of the university in off-campus housing affairs. University officials should be aware of their legal rights and responsibilities in working with

off-campus housing programs in order to insure their regulations, policies and procedures are not in conflict with the law.

Titus, (42) in a paper prepared for the Association of College and University Housing Officers, states that:

There seems to be no doubt either morally or legally that colleges and universities have the right and authority to control or approve the residence of all students attending their institutions. (37:1)

He based this statement on two court cases, Hoyt vs. Trustees (1943) and Castleberry vs. Tyler Commercial College (1920).

In the Castleberry vs. Tyler Commercial College law suit of 1920 (9) the Texas court upheld the right of the college to require its students to "board" (meaning lodging) in homes approved by the college. The court went so far as to state the college could ask students to change their lodging if they were not in proper housing.

In the Hoyt vs. Trustees case of 1943 (19) a group of off-campus rooming house owners challenged the right of the state university to require students to live in college buildings. The court upheld the university's right to require students to live in college buildings or college approved buildings.

The right of the university to order students out of off-campus housing into dormitories was established in another court case. (6) Texas Technological College (1967) in an attempt to keep its dormitories filled, ruled in 1967 that students must live in dormitories as long as there is space. Thirty-four students living in apartments filed suit in circuit court seeking permission to remain in their apartments. The court upheld the right of the institution to require all students who were under 25 and unmarried to live in college dormitories. (6) In this case the students were required by the university to move

into residence halls.

Bakken, (4) in a monograph prepared for the American College Personnel Association, supported and documented this right of the university to require students to live in university owned or approved housing. Bakken states that:

The right of a university to require residence in university owned or approved dwellings is not dependent upon age or marital status of the student . . . (4:16)

Bakken points out that married students could not be required to live apart from their spouses. He also stated that:

. . . colleges and universities may specify which off-campus housing is acceptable to the institution and insist that students live in only those places listed as acceptable. This would, however, not apply to students living with relations or at home. He suggests that the institution which uses this method should, to be safe, set up inspection procedures and standards for off-campus housing. (4:18)

The courts have made it clear that when an institution establishes housing control for its off-campus students there must be a clear-cut policy statement covering their position. (16,17) Approval procedures for off-campus housing must be well defined and the approval standards must be reasonable. The standards may cover physical, social and moral issues, but they must be clearly stated. (42)

Titus (42) has pointed out three common misunderstandings that often occur when institutions try to interpret the college's right to control students off-campus.

- 1.) That institutions of higher learning can justify controlling its students but it has no right to control private citizens, especially landlords.
- 2.) That it might be assumed that since we have the authority to approve the residences of our students that we also have the right to inspect, this is not so.

- 3.) That the right to control student housing does not affect the law of contracts which applies to the relationship between the institution and the landlord. (42:1-5)

Titus (42) feels these three points should be foremost in university officials' minds in administering off-campus housing programs in order to avoid possible embarrassment and legal suits. Institutions usually get around the first two of these points by requiring "approved homes" to be inspected and the landlords be in agreement with the university's housing philosophy before the dwelling can be labeled "approved housing." The relationship between institutions and landlords varies among colleges from one of much control to one of no control, yet legally, as mentioned above, the law of contracts regulates whatever relationship exists. (42)

Review of Related Research

Two investigations have been made of the characteristics of the off-campus student. Prusok's study, (35) conducted at the State University of Iowa in 1959, was aimed at discovering the characteristics of the single, off-campus resident student, his living situation, his reasons for selecting this type of residence, and other factors which would be beneficial in determining if the existing program of personnel services was reaching this segment of the student population.

A sample of 201 single freshman men and all 329 single undergraduate women residing off-campus was selected. The information was gathered by a questionnaire. Sixty per cent of the men and 63.5 per cent of the women responded.

Prusok (35) found that: (a) The average age of the students

off-campus was twenty years. They participated in a number of extra-curricular activities in high school but this did not carry over to college. They attended a high school of an average size of six hundred students. (b) Male students more often live in single rooms than do females. Both usually reside in facilities which rent to four or more students. (c) The Off-Campus Housing Office and students' friends are the two most frequent sources for finding rooms. (d) The three primary reasons for selecting off-campus housing are (1) finances; (2) desire for independence; and (3) poor study conditions or dormitory living. (e) In approximately fifty per cent of the cases the students were working at least seventeen hours per week. (f) Both men and women find their living situations quite satisfactory. (g) Male students most frequently had problems with course work, academic major and finances, whereas the women's problems most often were academic major, personal and course work. (h) Men most frequently found assistance with problems from other students, instructors and faculty, while females most frequently received assistance from faculty advisors, instructors and parents. (i) Most of the activities engaged in by the off-campus students were characterized by an anonymous quality (i.e. the student does not have to "belong" to a group to participate). (10) The majority of both groups had a favorable impression of the university.

Prusok (35) drew three major conclusions from his study. He concluded that, first, the off-campus student is, in fact, a somewhat marginal member of the university community. Second, that the typical student personnel program does not reach the off-campus student because of (a) a great communication barrier between the student and the institution. The main communicative links are impersonal (i.e. student

newspaper); (b) the off-campus student does not seem responsive to the structured experience normally embodied in a Student Activities program; (c) the off-campus student appears to have a greater need for independence than does the typical fraternity and dormitory resident. Finally, he concluded that the off-campus student, despite his unique characteristics, has the same problems of adjustment to the educational experience as do other segments of the student population.

In reviewing Prusok's study it is difficult to accept his conclusions based on the information gathered in his survey. It is hard to accept the idea that the results of his study merit a conclusion that the off-campus student is a marginal member of the university community. The author also assumed that the lack of responses submitted by the students to structured activities and experiences of the student personnel program reflect the need of greater independence on the part of the off-campus student. The major limitations of this study were pointed out by the author: (a) the small number of returns; (b) the fact that 150 of the female students in the sample were living at home; and (c) the male sample only represents freshman students and not a cross-section of the student body. This study is valuable, however, because of the descriptive information collected. Generalizations based on the findings should be restricted and interpreted with caution.

Neal, (28) in a study of single undergraduate females off-campus at the University of Florida, surveyed certain key characteristics; housing, academic performance, activities, dating and advantages and disadvantages of off-campus residence. The sample consisted of all 150 single females under thirty years of age living off-campus. Seventy-three per cent of the sample responded to the questionnaire.

The results of the study indicated that approximately ninety per cent of the respondents were upperclassmen and had been living off-campus for at least two semesters. The mean age of the group was 21 years. The respondents' parents represented a wide range of occupational classifications. The majority of the respondents were paying for some or all of their educational expenses by means of part-time and/or vacation employment. Sixty-two per cent of the respondents were living in an apartment, with sixty-seven per cent of them sharing it with one or two roommates and twenty-three per cent with three or more roommates. The primary reasons given for choosing apartment living was the availability of cooking facilities and space.

Students gained information about off-campus vacancies from a number of sources. The primary source was the off-campus housing counselor, but friends and newspaper ads were also helpful.³

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents were enrolled in Arts and Sciences or Education curriculums. Fifty per cent of the respondents felt off-campus living had a positive effect on their academic standing while only six per cent felt it had an adverse effect.

The results show only limited participation in campus activities. Forty-five per cent reported non-membership in any campus activities and only two-fifths of the respondents regularly or frequently attended voluntary extra-curricular events.

About two-thirds of the females felt that their dating habits had been unaffected by off-campus residence. The majority (2/3) were

³All female students seeking off-campus housing are referred to the off-campus housing counselor for consultation regarding listed facilities.

dating a considerable amount of time with most of it taking place at "home" over coffee or while studying.

The respondents reported that the advantages of living off-campus surpassed disadvantages by a ratio of four to one, the preponderant reason seeming to revolve around a more comfortable homelike atmosphere and an environment that is less ordered in comparison to campus residence halls. More room renter respondents (70%) listed disadvantages than did apartment renters (52%). Distance was the primary disadvantage listed.

Neal concludes (27,28) that "there is little doubt that many undergraduate women flee for refuge" to off-campus residences in order to escape the pressures of campus community living and to establish increased autonomy. Neal also concludes that the university environment on campus can not provide the necessary climate for all students to obtain a clear sense of self identity and perhaps off-campus housing can provide this climate.

This study was worthwhile in that it added to the descriptive information about the off-campus student already collected. The conclusions drawn by Neal were general and easily supported by her survey. The author did not attempt to define or explain the response but rather merely reported the results.

Dua (15) surveyed students, parents, and faculty-administrators in an attempt to ascertain who should be responsible for regulating student visitation in off-campus housing by members of the opposite sex.

A questionnaire was sent to a random sample of students, parents, and faculty-administrators associated with the University of Pennsylvania, asking whether the responsibility for regulating such visitations

should (a) be entrusted to the judgment of parents; (b) continue to be a part of the university's function; or (c) be delegated to the individual student concerned. The results showed that thirty-three per cent of the student and thirty-eight per cent of the faculty-administration respondents believed parents should have the responsibility for regulating visitation. Only twenty per cent of the parents were willing to accept the responsibility. The primary reasons given by parents for not accepting this responsibility is that they are out of touch with university environment and unaware of special needs of youth.

Sixty per cent of the students, twenty-two per cent of the parents and sixteen per cent of the faculty-administrators felt that the responsibility for regulating off-campus visitation should be delegated to the students themselves. Many parents and faculty-administrators felt that students lacked the maturity required for determining their own standards of social behavior. Only seven per cent of the students want the university regulating the off-campus visitation whereas fifty-seven per cent of the parents and forty-six per cent of the faculty-administrators felt this was the university's function.

The majority of the students felt that each individual student should be responsible for his own off-campus visits for the following three reasons: (a) morality is and should be an individual matter; (b) if a student is of legal age he or she should have the freedom to determine his or her own moral or social standards; and (c) the university environment must provide the utmost freedom for exploration and personal experimentation in social life.

Dua, (15) concluded from her study that parents do not want to

supervise their students behavior while they are at the university. They prefer to have the university assume this responsibility.

The purpose of this study was well defined but the reporting and interpretation of the results are questionable. In reporting and interpreting the results, the author failed to make clear (a) the percentage of returns in her sample; (b) the percentage of male and female students in her sample; (c) the percentage of female students living off-campus; (d) the presence of any statistical analyses for determining significant differences, and (e) the responses were given in percentage only, (no N's were available). Because of these limitations, any conclusions drawn from this research would be questionable.

Crookston (12) directed a study at Colorado State College, Fort Collins investigating the attitudes of parents, students, student leaders, academic faculty, and student personnel faculty with regard to what relationship should exist between the university and its students. The study was undertaken with the idea of gathering and providing information to be used as a basis for further policy formulation in five areas. The five areas investigated were: (1) overall educational philosophy, (2) student academic freedom, (3) type and nature of living regulations, (4) student conduct including attitudes on social activities, (5) to what extent should students be allowed to govern themselves.

All undergraduate students, excluding foreign and married students, were included in the population for this study. A random sample of ten per cent was selected to participate. The parents of the random sample of students were used as the parent sample. Over eighty per cent of each of the sample groups responded to the questionnaire.

A summary of the results related to the type and nature of living regulations showed that (a) parents have strongly restrictive attitudes concerning living regulations both on and off-campus; (b) the administrative faculty tended to agree with parents while students and student leaders expressed more liberal views; (c) student personnel faculty tended to take a more intermediate position; (d) parents, as a group, consistently felt very strongly about regulations governing social conduct both on and off-campus; (e) student leaders tended to be more liberal with regard to housing regulations than did students in general.

All five sample groups agreed that college women twenty-one years of age or more should be allowed to live in housing of their choice. On the question regarding university supervision of housing being limited only to the campus, parents and academic faculty strongly disagreed, whereas students were split evenly on this issue. There was an observable tendency for parents' attitudes to become less restrictive in the category of living regulations as their daughters proceeded from freshman to senior year. This was also somewhat true for social conduct. Parents of sons tended to be generally more liberal with their attitudes on living regulations than were parents of daughters.

The author points out in summarizing this study that there is a wide discrepancy between (1) the attitudes and expectations of parents about the relationship which should exist between the university and its students; (2) the attitudes of their sons and daughters; (3) the faculty; and (4) student personnel administrators. He indicated that many policies concerning students at Colorado State College were at variance with what the parents expect the relationship between the

university and the students should be. The university permitted more freedom than parents would.

This study was extremely well conducted, the objectives, procedures and methodology all clearly defined.

The NASPA Division of Research and Publications, (26) in a special report for the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators, conducted a survey to determine institutional policies with regard to selected controversial topics which are frequently the focus of administrative concern and action. Eighteen topics were identified for this study. A questionnaire designed to secure data unwritten or written on policies or guidelines which institutions had on the eighteen topics was submitted to 455 NASPA member institutions. Seventy-six per cent of the institutions returned the questionnaire.

One of the topics surveyed dealt with policies regarding unacceptable off-campus behavior. Eighty-two per cent of the institutions responding had some type of off-campus housing regulations. Thirty-three per cent accepted some responsibility for the students' behavior off-campus, and used a "general conduct" statement as their basis for action. Fifteen per cent felt a responsibility for taking action in the event of off-campus misbehavior even in those instances where civil action was also taken. One-fifth of the respondents relied on civil authorities to enforce laws and showed university concern only when student behavior was detrimental to the welfare of the institution or when asked by civil authorities to act. Less than ten per cent stated that students off-campus were responsible only to state and local civil officials as any citizen in the community would be.

The majority of institutions responding established off-campus

housing policies for one of two reasons: The first reason was to maintain campus standards and control all institutional values; the second reason was to encourage adult community responsibility and self discipline. Almost seventy per cent of the respondents stated that their policies were systematically communicated to the university community. The policies were most often formulated by student-faculty administrative committees, but also they were frequently established by the administrative counsels or student personnel staff. Student-faculty consultants were infrequently involved. Although a relatively high percentage of the respondents verbalized their policies regarding unacceptable off-campus behavior, there was a surprising lack of specificity in their expectations. The respondents were divided on the action taken on consequences in cases of violations off-campus, of expected behavior.

When institutions were requested to list in order of importance the issues that were of most concern to the colleges and universities, off-campus housing misconduct ranked number two. Yet, as mentioned earlier, the eighty-four per cent of the respondents who had policies, only had a "general conduct" statement. As mentioned by the author, "there was a surprising lack of specificity in institutional expectations and of clear guidelines of processing violations off-campus." (26:21)

Although this research study was not involved in collecting specific procedures and regulations governing off-campus housing, it would appear from the results of this study that universities are extremely concerned about the off-campus housing area, yet they have not clearly defined or researched their position with regard to what their real

responsibility is.

SUMMARY

In this chapter a brief history of off-campus housing has been presented, together with a summation of the legal relationship involved in this area, and a review of relevant studies.

As the history of off-campus housing indicates universities have utilized this area for the housing of students for over two hundred years. Most institutions have exercised a good deal of control over the approving and supervising of the off-campus living environment. Recently, a trend has developed whereby universities appear to be moving away from this position of controlling the students' off-campus living situation. Accompanying this trend has been the development of an unsupervised-unapproved, off-campus housing classification at many institutions.

There seems to be no doubt that universities have the right to control the residences (including off-campus residences) of students attending their university. This right should not be interpreted as meaning a right to control private citizens (i.e. landlords) off-campus or the right to inspect. In addition, all arrangements involved between the university and the landlords off-campus are bound by the law of contracts.

Although there has been a paucity of research in the off-campus housing area, there has been some investigation into the characteristics of the off-campus student and the assignment of where the responsibility for regulating off-campus students' behavior should be placed.

In the next chapter the description and methodology of the study will be discussed.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter III is a discussion of the methods and procedures which were followed in conducting the study. The chapter consists of a definition of the populations, and the method of selecting the sample. A description of the instrument and procedures used in obtaining the data and a review of the procedures used for analyzing the data are included.

The Populations, Method of Selection and Sample

This study consists of several different populations.

1. The student population of this study consisted of all full-time (12 credits or more) sophomores, juniors and seniors attending Michigan State University during fall term, 1967, living off-campus in unsupervised housing.
2. The faculty population includes all Michigan State University faculty members with the academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor.
3. The parent population contains the parents of the above described students.

4. All student personnel administrators employed full time by the office of the Vice President for Student Affairs make up the student personnel administration population.
5. The apartment owners population comprises all apartment owners or their managing agents renting primarily to Michigan State University students.¹

The student sample was selected by using the Michigan State University housing card. This card lists every student's home address, local address, number of credits being carried, age, sex, major, and parents' name and address. Five thousand students were identified from the housing card as meeting the established criteria. A random procedure was used in selecting 100 individuals for the sample. Of the 100 students selected, 95 or 95 per cent of the individuals returned the questionnaire.

The parents of the students selected were chosen as the parent sample. Of the 100 parents selected, 95 or 95 per cent returned the questionnaire.

The faculty sample was selected by using a list of all faculty with the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor. One thousand eight hundred and fifty-four were identified. From this group, 50 were selected at random for the sample. Forty-two or 84 per cent of the faculty members responded to the questionnaire.

A list of full-time student personnel administrators was obtained from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. One hundred individuals were identified. From this group, 50 were selected at

¹Operational definitions are found in Chapter I.

random for the sample. All 50 or 100 per cent of the student personnel administrators responded to the questionnaire.

The personnel of the Off-Campus Housing Office at Michigan State University identified 44 individuals as apartment owners or managing agents. Because of the small number, the entire population was used. Of the 44 identified, 38 or 86 per cent returned the questionnaire.

The Instrument and Procedures Used in Obtaining the Data

The final questionnaire of 65 items was developed in the following manner:²

A total of 96 items was originally developed for possible use in the questionnaire by the personnel in the Off-Campus Housing Office at Michigan State University. In addition, selected student personnel administrators, University officials, faculty, and students at Michigan State University were interviewed to obtain their views and ideas. Seven more items were added to the original list. This brought the list up to 103 items.

Since all of the items related to various aspects of the University responsibility off-campus, a definition of University responsibility was formulated to aid the respondents in answering the items. University responsibility was defined as "the responsibility entrusted to the judgment of the University for developing and supervising student programs and for regulating students' behavior."

A five-point response scale was then developed in order that each of the respondents could indicate the degree or extent of agreement,

²A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix.

disagreement or no comment he or she might have on each item. Using the 103 items, the definition of University responsibility, and the response scale, a questionnaire was developed and presented to a selected group of faculty, students, student personnel administrators, for their criticism as to the content, clarity, and purpose of the questionnaire.

Following this, the questionnaire was presented to the Office of Institutional Research at Michigan State University for criticism and refining. In order to further refine the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted. The pilot study was administered to a group of students, student personnel administrators and individual members of the East Lansing community not associated with the University. Interviews were held with individuals after completion of the questionnaire.

After making several significant changes in the instrument, as a result of the suggestions of the reviewers and the pilot study, the questionnaire was submitted to the Doctoral Guidance Committee for final recommendations. Of the original 103 items developed, 65 were considered appropriate for the final instrument. The Doctoral Guidance Committee felt it would be helpful in interpreting the results of the study if a demographic information sheet could be developed and given to the parents. A demographic data sheet was developed in cooperation with the thesis chairman, Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, and enclosed with the questionnaire to the parents.³

During the sixth week of fall term, 1967, the questionnaire and a personal cover letter were mailed to the members of each sample group.

³ A copy of the demographic data sheet is found in the Appendix.

The questionnaire was coded for purposes of identifying the samples and non-respondents. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed to encourage a prompt return. A period of two weeks was allowed for completion and return of the questionnaire before a follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed to all non-respondents. The sample groups are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Responses to Questionnaire: The number and percentage of responses by sample groups.

	Number in Sample	Number Responded	Per Cent Responded	Follow-up Letter Sent
Students	100	95	95%	Yes
Parents	100	95	95%	Yes
Faculty	50	42	84%	Yes
Student Personnel Admin.	50	50	100%	No
Apartment Owners	44	38	86%	No
TOTAL	344	320	93%	

Analyzing the Data

The research hypotheses for this study were stated in Chapter I. To facilitate statistical analysis, they were formulated into operational or null hypotheses. The hypotheses are:

- 1.) There will be no difference in the perceptions of parents, students, faculty, student personnel administrators, apartment owners as they view the University's responsibility toward students living off-campus.
- 2.) There will be no difference between parents and their

children (students in study) as they view the University's responsibility toward students living off-campus.

The statistic used for analyzing the data in this study was the Chi square. The .05 level of confidence was established to determine statistical significance. In addition to the testing of the stated hypotheses, the responses to all items were reported in frequencies and percentages. This was done to add clarity and meaning to the data. The demographic information collected is presented in Chapter IV in table form using frequencies and percentages.

The questionnaire used in this study was designed in such a way that the data were analyzed by an IBM 3600 Computer. The respondents were instructed to circle the appropriate answer to each item. The items contained in the questionnaire called for a response to a five-category (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, or no comment) rating scale. For purposes of analysis, the researcher grouped the responses into three categories: agree, disagree, and no comment.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a definition of the populations, and the sample. A description of the instrument use, in obtaining the data along with a review of the procedures used for analyzing the data given.

The null hypothesis was derived from the purposes of the study and presented. The data was analyzed by computer using the appropriate test statistics.

The next part of this study (Chapter 4) will be the analysis of

the findings followed by a summary and conclusions in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Chapter IV is divided into three major parts. Part One of this chapter contains an analysis of the data concerning the perceptions of selected students, parents, faculty, student personnel administrators and apartment owners with respect to the University's responsibility toward the student's off-campus living situation. The section also includes a comparison of the perceptions of students and their parents.

Part Two is a presentation and analysis of the demographic information collected on the parent sample.

Part Three is a summary of the open ended question provided for each of the respondents, in all of the sample groups.

In analyzing the data in Part One, items were grouped under four main functionally defined areas: (1) community relations, (2) parent-university relations, (3) student personnel services, and (4) regulatory and law enforcement. The items that were not statistically significant will be discussed first followed by an examination of those items in which the null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypotheses

In order to test the hypotheses, which were stated in Part One, statistically, they were converted into their null form.

Null hypothesis I:

There will be no difference in the perception of parents, students, faculty, student personnel administrators, and apartment owners as they view the University's responsibility toward students off-campus living situation.

Null hypothesis II:

There will be no difference between parents and their children (students in study) as they view the University's responsibility toward students' off-campus living situation.

The chi square statistic was employed in determining independence of relationship. The .05 level of confidence was used to determine statistical significance in interpreting the data. When items were significant at the .01 level, this was reported for the convenience of the reader. In addition, all items are reported in terms of raw scores as well as percentages.

One table will be presented for each item. In each table, the degrees of freedom, the chi square, and the level of significance for the two hypotheses will be presented.

As mentioned above, the statistic chi square was used on all 65 items in the study. In order to further test the hypotheses, an additional computation omitting response 3 (no opinion) was completed for all items. This additional computation revealed statistical differences in the responses of four items for hypothesis I and the same number for hypothesis II. Table 2 summarizes the results for those items where significant differences appeared because of the omitting of response 3

Table 2. A Comparison of the Results - Omitting Response 3 (No Opinion): Items showing differences in results omitting response 3 (no opinion) for hypothesis I, using all of the sample groups respondents; and for hypothesis II, using only parents and students.

Item No.	Item	agree-disagree-no opinion	agree-disagree
HYPOTHESIS I (Total Sample Group)			
8	The university should provide a list of students seeking roommates.	Not Significant	Significant at .05
12	The university should provide bail bond for students arrested.	Significant at .05	Not Significant
14	The university will cover the cost of printing off-campus contracts.	Significant at .05	Not Significant
44	The university should have no housing regulations for students.	Significant at .05	Not Significant
HYPOTHESIS II (Parents-Students Sample)			
3	Study lounges on campus should be provided for the off-campus student.	Not Significant	Significant at .05
23	The university should establish a council of students, apartment owners and parents to arbitrate off-campus housing problems.	Significant at .05	Not Significant
39	The university should encourage a governing council for off-campus students.	Significant at .05	Not Significant
44	The university should have no housing regulations for students.	Significant at .05	Not Significant

(no opinion).

When the additional computation of omitting response 3 (no opinion) was applied to Null Hypothesis II, the chi square with Yates correction was used at the recommendation of Downie and Heath (14).

Analysis

Non Significant Items

Of the 65 items covering the functional defined areas of university responsibility off-campus listed in the questionnaire, the responses to two items for Hypothesis I, and seven items for Hypothesis II revealed no statistically significant difference among the groups. The items that were not statistically significant are presented in Table 3. This table is designed to present (a) items which are not statistically different, (b) the most frequently selected response and (c) the percentage of the total sample selecting that particular response. An examination of Table 3 shows that seven of the items indicate agreement by the respondents in the parent-student sample and two items indicate agreement by respondents in the total sample group. Of the nine items, eight are from the student personnel services area and one from the regulatory and law enforcement area.

Significant Items

Of the 65 items listed in the questionnaire, 62 items were found to be statistically significant for Hypothesis I and 57 statistically significant for Hypothesis II. Those items categorized under the heading of Community Relations will be discussed first.

Table 3. Non Significant Items: A summary of those items on which the sample groups agreed, the most frequently selected responses and the percentage of the sample selecting a particular response.

Item Number	Responsibility Entrusted to the University For:	Most Frequently Selected Response*	Per Cent of Sample
HYPOTHESIS I (Total Sample Group)			
3	Providing study lounges on campus for the off-campus student	1	63.8
8	Providing a list of students seeking roommates	1	69.4
HYPOTHESIS II (Parents-Students Sample)			
3	Providing study lounges on campus for the off-campus student	1	76.2
8	Providing a list of students seeking roommates	1	71.5
12	Providing bail bond for students arrested	2	76.3
34	Providing legal counsel for students	1	43.9
37	Allowing students after freshman year to live in housing of their choice with parents' consent	1	66.7
46	Keeping a lawyer on retainer for the students	1	67.7
64	Permitting off-campus students to use residence hall facilities	1	62.4

* Response scale: (1) agree (2) disagree (3) no opinion or comment

Community Relations

The responses given for item 22, that the university has the responsibility for involving students, apartment owners, and parents in off-campus housing policy formulation, are found in Table 4.

Table 4. (22) The University has the responsibility to involve students, apartment owners, and parents in the formulation of off-campus housing policies.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	37	39.0	46	48.4	12	12.6	95	100
Parents	60	63.8	15	16.0	19	20.2	94	100
Apartment Owners	26	68.4	10	26.3	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	21	50.0	16	38.1	5	11.9	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	41	82.0	8	16.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF	8	X^2	44.775	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	X^2	22.784	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Parents (63%), apartment owners (68%), faculty (50%) and student personnel administrators (82%) agreed that students, apartment owners, and parents should be involved in off-campus housing policy formulation. Students were divided on the issue with 39 per cent agreeing, 48 per cent disagreeing and 12 per cent taking a "no opinion" position. It should be noted that 20 per cent of the parents selected response 3 (no opinion). There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence, in comparing the responses of the groups.

Parents and their students also disagreed significantly (.01 level)

on this issue. Parents (63%) most frequently choosing to agree with the statement and their sons and daughters (48%) most frequently choosing to disagree with the statement. In both of these groups a sizeable percentage selected response 3 (no opinion).

Item 43 is concerned with involving university personnel as consultants in the planning of off-campus apartments. Table 5 summarized the responses to this item. Sixty-five per cent of the students, 63 per cent of the apartment owners and 52 per cent of the faculty disagreed that university personnel should act as consultants in the planning of off-campus apartments. Fifty-four per cent of the student personnel administrators and 56 per cent of the parents most often chose response 1 (agree). The sample groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this question.

Table 5. (43) University personnel should be involved as consultants in the planning of off-campus apartment buildings.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	22	23.2	62	65.2	11	11.6	95	100
Parents	54	56.9	25	26.3	16	16.8	95	100
Apartment Owners	13	34.2	24	63.2	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	14	35.0	21	52.5	5	12.5	40	100
Student Pers. Admin.	27	54.0	21	42.0	2	4.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	41.302	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	30.135	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Parents and students also differed significantly (.01 level) on

this item. More parents (56%) felt that the university should act as consultants than did students (23%).

Item 51 of the questionnaire stated that university personnel should screen and approve managers living in residence in all off-campus student housing. The responses to this item are found in Table 6. Students (89%), apartment owners (86%), faculty (73%) and student personnel administrators (76%) were not in favor of having university personnel screen and approve managers for student housing off-campus. Parents, on the other hand, most frequently (68%) agreed that the university should screen and approve managers. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in comparing these sample groups.

Parents and students differed significantly (.01 level) on this question. Sixty-eight per cent of the parents chose response 1 (agree) most frequently, while only five per cent of the students chose this response.

Table 6. (51) University personnel should screen and approve managers living in residence in all off-campus student housing.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	5	5.3	85	89.5	5	5.2	95	100
Parents	65	68.4	20	21.1	10	10.5	95	100
Apartment Owners	4	10.5	33	86.9	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	5	11.9	31	73.8	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	8	16.0	38	76.0	4	8.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	132.399	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	93.333	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

A summary of the responses to item 42, that the university rather than the apartment owner should hire and pay resident managers in off-campus apartments, are found in Table 7. Students (93%), parents (60%), apartment owners (92%), student personnel administrators (90%) and faculty (85%) all disagreed that the university should hire and pay resident managers in off-campus student apartments.

Table 7. (42) The University, rather than the apartment owner, should hire and pay resident managers in off-campus student apartments.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	2	2.1	89	93.7	4	4.2	95	100
Parents	11	11.7	57	60.6	26	27.7	94	100
Apartment Owners	3	7.9	35	92.1	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	2	4.8	36	85.7	4	9.5	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	3	6.0	45	90.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF 8 χ^2 48.007 Significant at .01 level *DF 2 χ^2 29.373 Parents-Students Significant at .01 level								

Parents differed significantly from students with regard to item 42. Twenty-seven per cent of the parents selected response 3 (no opinion) whereas students selected this response only four per cent of the time. There was a sizeable difference in the percentage of parents (60%) and students (93%) disagreeing with this item. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in comparing the sample groups. Parents and students differed significantly at the same level.

Table 8 gives the responses to item 23, should the university

establish a council of students, apartment owners, university staff, and city officials to arbitrate off-campus housing problems.

Table 8. (23) The University should establish a council of students, apartment owners, university staff, and city officials to arbitrate off-campus housing problems.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	75	79.0	14	14.7	6	6.3	95	100
Parents	73	76.8	7	7.4	15	15.8	95	100
Apartment Owners	23	60.5	13	34.2	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	19	45.2	15	35.7	8	19.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	36	72.0	11	22.0	3	6.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	33.682	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	6.218	Parents-Students Significant at .05 level				

All of the sample groups supported the idea of a council to arbitrate housing problems. Faculty were more split on this issue than the other sample groups, with 45 per cent of the respondents selecting response 1 (agree), 35 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree), and 19 per cent selecting response 3 (no opinion). All of the groups differed significantly on item 23, at the .01 level of confidence.

The greatest difference appearing between students and their parents was in the no opinion responses. Fifteen per cent of the parents selected response 3 (no opinion), while only six per cent of the students selected this response. A large number of parents (76%) and students (79%) both agreed on having a council for arbitration.

Parents and students differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence.

The responses to item 29 that the university should require uniform rental contracts, are found in Table 9. Students (76%), apartment owners (92%), faculty (64%) and student personnel administrators (74%) all agree that the university should not provide rental contracts. Apartment owners (92%) voiced the strongest disagreement with the university providing this service. Although faculty most frequently selected response 2 (disagree), 26 per cent of this group showed lack of concern on this issue by selecting response 3 (no opinion).

Table 9. (29) The University should require uniform rental contracts for all off-campus housing.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	16	17.0	72	76.6	6	6.4	94	100
Parents	56	59.6	26	27.7	12	12.7	94	100
Apartment Owners	3	7.9	35	92.1	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	4	9.5	27	64.3	11	26.2	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	10	20.0	37	74.0	3	6.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	94.617	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	45.814	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Parents most frequently selected response 1 (agree) but were somewhat divided on the issue with 27 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree), and 12 per cent selecting response 3 (no opinion).

Students and their parents differed on this issue. Seventy-six

per cent of the students selected response 2 (disagree), whereas only 27 per cent of the parents selected this response. A good percentage of the student sample would rather not see the university require a uniform contract. In comparing all of the sample groups there was a statistical significant difference at the .01 level of confidence. This was also true with comparing the parent and student sample.

Item 4 concerns the responsibility of the university to provide uniform rental agreements for all off-campus housing. An examination of Table 10 reveals that apartment owners (81%), students (68%), faculty (66%) and student personnel administrators (60%) most frequently chose response 2 (disagreeing that the university should provide uniform rental agreements). Parents most frequently (66%) selected response 1 (agree) while students (68%) most often chose response 2 (disagree).

Table 10. (4) The University should provide uniform rental agreements for all off-campus housing.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	21	22.1	65	68.4	9	9.5	95	100
Parents	63	66.3	29	30.5	3	3.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	7	18.4	31	81.6	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	11	26.2	28	66.7	3	7.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	15	30.0	30	60.0	5	10.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	58.851	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	37.787	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

There was a significant difference (.01 level) on this item between the responses of all the sample groups as well as the responses of parents and students. All of the sample groups except parents most often supported the position of the university providing uniform rental agreements.

Table 11. (35) The University should not be involved in any way in off-campus housing rental contracts between students and apartment owners.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	51	53.7	37	38.9	7	7.4	95	100
Parents	21	22.1	66	69.5	8	8.4	95	100
Apartment Owners	21	55.3	15	39.5	2	5.2	38	100
Faculty	21	50.0	13	30.9	8	19.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	19	38.0	29	58.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF	8	X^2	36.009	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	X^2	20.732	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

The responses to item 35, that the university should not be involved in off-campus rental contracts, are listed in Table 11. Students (53%), apartment owners (55%) and faculty (50%) most frequently selected response 1 (agreeing that the university should not be involved in rental contracts). Even though this was the most frequently selected response a sizeable percentage of faculty (30%), apartment owners (39%), and students (38%) selected response 2 (disagree). Parents (69%) and student personnel administrators (58%) chose response 2 (disagree) most often. It should be noted that a

good percentage of parents (22%) and student personnel administrators (38%) selected response 1 (agree). The groups differed significantly at a .01 level of confidence on item 35.

Students and parents also differed significantly (.01 level) on this issue. Parents more frequently (69%) disagreed with the statement than did the students (38%).

The responses to item 48 that the university should act as arbitrator and third party to all rental contracts are found in Table 12.

Table 12. (48) University personnel should be a third party and final arbitrator in all rental contracts used by students in off-campus housing.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	14	14.7	69	72.6	12	12.7	95	100
Parents	43	46.2	29	31.2	21	22.6	93	100
Apartment Owners	7	18.4	29	76.3	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	2	4.8	32	76.2	8	19.0	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	6	12.0	38	76.0	6	12.0	50	100
DF	8	X ²	61.270	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	X ²	33.518	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Nearly all of the sample groups disagreed with the university being involved in off-campus contracts as an arbitrator and third party. Only parents were significantly divided on the issue with 46 per cent agreeing, 31 per cent disagreeing and 22 per cent having no opinion. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in comparing the sample groups' responses to this item.

Students and parents also differed significantly (.01 level) on this item. Seventy-two per cent of the students disagreed with the university being involved and only 37 per cent of their parents took this position.

Table 13 lists the results of item 14. Item 14 states that the university rather than the apartment owners should cover the cost of the rental contracts.

Table 13. (14) The cost of printing the off-campus rental contracts should be the responsibility of the University rather than the apartment owner.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	2	2.1	82	86.3	11	11.6	95	100
Parents	12	12.8	67	71.3	15	15.9	94	100
Apartment Owners	4	10.5	32	84.2	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	5	11.9	29	69.0	8	19.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	4	8.0	45	90.0	1	2.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	18.929	Significant at .05 level
*DF	2	χ^2	9.263	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

The majority of respondents in all sample groups agreed that the university should not be responsible for the cost of the contracts. Through an inspection of the Table, however, it can be observed that 12 per cent of the parents, 10 per cent of the apartment owners and 11 per cent of the faculty agreed that the cost of the rental contracts should be the university's responsibility.

Parents and students most often selected response 2 (disagree), yet a sizeable percentage of both groups selected response 3 (no opinion). A larger percentage of parents, 12 per cent; than students; two per cent, selected response 1 (agree). There was a significant difference (.05 level) in comparing the responses of all the groups as well as the parent-student group (.01 level).

Item 24 refers to having university personnel inspect off-campus dwellings and enforce state and city housing codes. Table 14 lists the responses to item 24.

Table 14. (24) University personnel should inspect off-campus dwellings and enforce state and city housing codes.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	37	39.0	52	54.7	6	6.3	95	100
Parents	73	76.8	19	20.0	3	3.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	12	31.5	24	63.2	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	11	26.2	28	66.7	3	7.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	13	26.0	31	62.0	6	12.0	50	100

DF	8	X^2	58.035	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	X^2	28.120	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Only the parent group most frequently chose response 1 (agree). Seventy-six per cent of the parents believe that university personnel should inspect off-campus dwellings. Fifty-four per cent of the students, 63 per cent of the apartment owners, 66 per cent of the faculty, and 62 per cent of the student personnel administrators most frequently

selected response 2 (disagree). These groups do not favor university personnel inspecting off-campus dwellings. The responses of the groups differed at the .01 level of significance.

Students differ significantly (.01 level) with their parents in responding to this item. Only 39 per cent of the students chose response 1 (agree) while 76 per cent of their parents chose this response.

Table 15 contains the results of item 50 that the university should have personnel inspect and approve all off-campus student housing for proper safety standards. Parents were the only sample group which felt this necessary. Seventy-four per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree). All of the remaining four sample groups most frequently selected response 2 (disagree).

Table 15. (50) University personnel should inspect and approve all off-campus student housing for proper safety standards.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	35	37.2	51	54.3	8	8.5	94	100
Parents	71	74.7	17	17.9	7	7.4	95	100
Apartment Owners	13	34.2	24	63.2	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	10	23.8	24	57.1	8	19.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	16	32.0	31	62.0	3	6.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	58.286	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	29.289	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

The difference between parents and students was most noticeable in

the agree-disagree response rather than the no opinion response. Seventy-four per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree) whereas only 37 per cent of the students selected this response.

In comparing the groups' responses there was a statistical significant difference at the .01 level. The same level of significant difference was evident with the parent-student samples.

Table 16. (47) University personnel should inspect and approve all off-campus student housing for proper sanitation standards.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	34	36.2	54	57.4	6	6.4	94	100
Parents	74	77.9	15	15.8	6	6.3	95	100
Apartment Owners	19	50.0	19	50.0	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	11	26.2	27	64.3	4	9.5	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	16	32.0	30	60.0	4	8.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	57.604	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	36.854	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Table 16 lists the responses to item 47, that university personnel should inspect off-campus dwellings for proper sanitation standards. Apartment owners were evenly divided on this issue with 50 per cent agreeing and 50 per cent disagreeing with the statement. Students (57%), faculty (64%), and student personnel administrators (60%) most frequently disagreed that the university should inspect and approve all off-campus dwellings for proper sanitation standards. Parents' responses were quite different from those of students, faculty and student personnel

administrators. Seventy-seven per cent of the parents sampled agreed with the university making inspections, while only 36 per cent of the students, 26 per cent of the faculty and 32 per cent of the student personnel administrators agreed with inspections. In comparing the sample groups there was a significant difference (.01 level) in their responses.

Parents and students differed on this item significantly at the .01 level of confidence.

Table 17. (15) University personnel should assess and arbitrate repairs charged to apartment owners by students to determine fairness of charges.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	42	44.2	44	46.3	9	9.5	95	100
Parents	63	67.0	24	25.5	7	7.5	94	100
Apartment Owners	7	18.4	29	76.3	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	10	23.8	30	71.4	2	4.8	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	7	14.3	41	83.7	1	2.0	49	100
DF 8	X^2	65.085	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	X^2	10.327	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

Item 15 concerns the responsibility of university personnel in the assessment of repairs charged to apartment owners by students. The responses to item 15 are found in Table 17. The majority of the apartment owners (76%), faculty (71%) and student personnel administrators (83%) do not feel that university personnel should assess and arbitrate

repairs charged by students. On the other hand, students neither strongly agree nor disagree on the item. Forty-four per cent of the students selected response 1 (agree) and 46 per cent selected response 2 (disagree). Parents (67%) most frequently selected response 1 (agree). There is a significant difference (.01 level) in the responses of the sample groups on this item.

Students and their parents did not agree on item 15. Parents (67%) more frequently selected 1 (agree) than did students (44%). Neither group overwhelmingly felt that university personnel should assess or arbitrate repairs, yet there is a significant difference (.01 level) in their responses.

Table 18. (2) University personnel should assess and arbitrate damage costs in off-campus housing charged to students by apartment owners to determine fairness of charges.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	45	47.9	41	43.6	8	8.5	94	100
Parents	69	72.6	25	26.3	1	1.1	95	100
Apartment Owners	6	16.0	32	84.0	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	9	21.4	29	69.1	4	29.5	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	12	24.0	37	74.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	73.236	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	14.371	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

The responses to item 2, that university personnel should assess and arbitrate damage costs in off-campus housing, are listed in Table 18. Only 16 per cent of the apartment owners, 21 per cent of the faculty,

24 per cent of the student personnel administrators and 47 per cent of the students indicated that they believed that the university should assume responsibility in this area. On the other hand, nearly 73 per cent of the parents believed the university has responsibility in this area. This item was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence in comparing all groups and in comparing just the students and their parents.

Table 19. (57) The University should hold in escrow damage deposits and the last month's rent of off-campus students living in apartments.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	14	15.0	73	78.5	6	6.5	93	100
Parents	30	31.9	37	39.4	27	28.7	94	100
Apartment Owners	3	7.8	35	92.2	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	2	4.8	37	88.1	3	7.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	6	12.0	42	84.0	2	4.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	70.153	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	30.959	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Item 57, that the university should hold in escrow damage deposits and the last month's rent for off-campus students living in apartments, is presented in summary form in Table 19. The majority of the sample groups, students (78%), apartment owners (92%), faculty (88%), student personnel administrators (84%) disagree with the university holding these funds. The parent sample is quite divided on the issue with 31 per cent agreeing, 39 per cent disagreeing and 28 per cent with no

opinion. The sample groups differed at the .01 level of confidence.

Parents and students differed significantly (.01 level) on the issue. Twice as many students indicated that the university should not hold damage deposits and the last month's rent in escrow than did their parents.

Table 20. (18) The University should not permit a student to register for a subsequent term until damage claims and/or rental debts submitted by apartment owners are paid.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	7	7.4	85	89.4	3	3.2	95	100
Parents	40	42.1	41	43.2	14	14.7	95	100
Apartment Owners	28	73.7	7	18.4	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	4	9.5	32	76.2	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	7	14.0	42	84.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	104.344	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	45.653	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

The responses to item 18, that the university should not permit a student to register for a subsequent term until damage claims and/or rental debts submitted by apartment owners are paid, are found in Table 20. The Table indicates a variety of opinions. Students (89%), faculty (76%) and student personnel administrators (84%) agreed that the university should not withhold students from registration for damage and/or rental debts incurred in off-campus housing. On the other hand, apartment owners (73%) agree and would like to see the university hold students at registration for damage claims and/or

rental debts. Parents have mixed feelings on the issue with 42 per cent agreeing, 43 per cent disagreeing and 14 per cent with no opinion. The sample group differed at the .01 level of significance with regard to this item.

Students were strongly against the issue with 89 per cent of the total student sample selecting response 2 (disagree) as compared to only 43 per cent of their parents selecting this response. There were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence in the responses of parents and students.

Table 21. (5) The University should not issue grades to students who have off-campus housing debts.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	6	6.3	87	91.6	2	2.1	95	100
Parents	17	17.9	68	71.6	10	10.5	95	100
Apartment Owners	28	73.7	10	26.3	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	3	7.2	35	83.3	4	9.5	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	6	12.0	43	86.0	1	2.0	50	100
$DF \ 8 \ \chi^2 \ 101.007$ Significant at .01 level $*DF \ 2 \ \chi^2 \ 12.923$ Parents-Students Significant at .01 level								

The responses to item 5 (holding students' grades for off-campus housing debts) are found in Table 21. Seventy-three per cent of the apartment owners indicated that the university should hold the students grades for off-campus debts. Whereas parents (71%), students (91%), student personnel administrators (86%) and faculty (83%) do not view

this as the university's responsibility.

A higher percentage (91%) of students recognized the holding of grades as unfavorable than did their parents (71%). This item was statistically significant (.01 level) in comparing all groups and in comparing just the students and parents.

Item 54 in the questionnaire stated, "the university should break up off-campus student parties when they become disorderly."

An inspection of Table 22 reveals that students (97%), faculty (87%), student personnel administrators (90%) and apartment owners (60%) favor the position of not having the university disperse disorderly parties off-campus. The responses of the groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this item.

Table 22. (54) The University should break up off-campus student parties when they become disorderly.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	0	0.0	93	97.9	2	2.1	95	100
Parents	55	58.5	26	27.7	13	13.8	94	100
Apartment Owners	13	34.2	23	60.5	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	3	7.3	36	87.8	2	4.9	41	100
Student Pers. Admin.	3	6.0	45	90.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	136.027	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	100.787	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

The difference between parents and students is quite clear. Fifty-eight per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree), while not

one single student chose this response. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between parents and students.

Item 17 of the questionnaire stated that apartment owners should notify the university when off-campus students' parties are causing a public disturbance. The responses to this item are found in Table 23. Parents (67%) and apartment owners (59%) agreed that apartment owners should contact the university in cases when student parties are causing a public disturbance. Students (97%), faculty (78%), and student personnel administrators (80%) all strongly disagreed with this item. There is a statistically significant difference (.01 level) in comparing the responses of the sample groups on item 17.

Table 23. (17) Apartment owners should notify the University when off-campus student parties are causing a public disturbance.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	0	0.0	93	97.9	2	2.1	95	100
Parents	64	67.4	25	26.3	6	6.3	95	100
Apartment Owners	22	59.5	12	32.4	3	8.1	37	100
Faculty	8	19.0	33	78.6	1	2.4	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	9	18.0	40	80.0	1	2.0	50	100
<hr/>								
DF	8	χ^2	132.710	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	105.186	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Parents and students also disagreed significantly (.01 level) on this issue. Only 26 per cent of the parents selected response 2 (disagree) while 97 per cent of the students selected this response.

No student selected response 1 (agree) while 67 per cent of their parents chose this response.

Parent - University Relations

The responses to item 32, that parents should be notified by the university when students are arrested, are found in Table 24. Eighty-one per cent of the parents and 73 per cent of the apartment owners believed that parents should be notified when students are arrested. On the other hand, 87 per cent of the students, 52 per cent of the faculty and 50 per cent of the student personnel administrators disagreed with the statement. The sample groups differed significantly (.01 level) on this issue.

Table 24. (32) The University should notify parents of off-campus students when they are arrested.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	9	9.5	83	87.4	3	3.1	95	100
Parents	77	81.9	12	12.8	5	5.3	94	100
Apartment Owners	28	73.7	9	23.7	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	15	35.7	22	52.4	5	11.9	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	20	40.0	25	50.0	5	10.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	127.205	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	107.328	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

In testing parents and students, it was also found that these two groups disagreed significantly (.01 level) on this issue. Only nine

per cent of the students agreed that parents should be contacted while 81 per cent of their parents thought they should be contacted.

Item 28 was a statement that the university should notify parents of off-campus students under 21 when they are convicted of a violation of civil law by the civil authorities. Table 25 lists the responses to item 28. Parents (87%), apartment owners (89%), faculty (43%) and student personnel administrators (56%) most frequently selected response 1 (agreeing that parents should be notified). Students (80%) most frequently disagreed with the item and indicated that parents should not be notified.

Table 25. (28) The University should notify parents of off-campus students under 21 when they are convicted of a violation of civil law by the civil authorities.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	15	15.8	76	80.0	4	4.2	95	100
Parents	82	87.2	8	8.5	4	4.3	94	100
Apartment Owners	34	89.5	4	10.5	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	18	43.9	15	36.6	8	19.5	41	100
Student Pers. Admin.	28	56.0	21	42.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	143.142	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	101.324	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

Although faculty (43%) and student personnel administrators (56%) most frequently chose response 1 (agreeing that parents should be notified), a good percentage of both groups chose response 2 (disagree). In addition, 19 per cent of the faculty selected response 3 (no opinion).

The sample groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this question.

Parents and students also differed significantly (.01 level), with 87 per cent of the parents selecting response 1 (agree) and only 15 per cent of the students selecting this response.

Table 26. (26) The University should contact parents when students are known to be using marijuana.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	16	17.0	73	77.7	5	5.3	94	100
Parents	90	94.7	5	5.3	0	0.0	95	100
Apartment Owners	35	92.1	2	5.3	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	19	45.2	15	35.7	8	19.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	19	38.0	25	50.0	6	12.0	50	100
DF	8	X ²	163.043	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	X ²	115.940	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Item 26 states that "the university should contact parents when students are known to be using marijuana." An inspection of Table 26 reveals a variety of opinions with regard to item 26. The vast majority of parents (94%) and apartment owners (92%) agree that the university should contact parents when students are using marijuana. Thirty-eight per cent of the student personnel administrators agree that the university should contact parents. The sample groups differed at a .01 level of confidence on this item.

Seventy-seven per cent of the students felt that the university

should not contact the students' parents. Students and parents differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this item. Seventeen per cent of the students indicated that the university should contact parents whereas 94 per cent of the parents indicated that parents should be contacted.

Table 27 presents the responses to item 6 (the university should contact parents when students are known to be using LSD).

Table 27. (6) The University should contact parents when students are known to be using LSD.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	16	16.9	67	70.5	12	12.6	95	100
Parents	89	93.7	6	6.3	0	0.0	95	100
Apartment Owners	35	92.1	2	5.3	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	21	50.0	14	33.3	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	21	42.9	23	46.9	5	10.2	49	100
DF	8	χ^2	143.627	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	113.725	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Parents and apartment owners strongly agreed that parents should be notified when students are known to be using LSD. Ninety-three per cent of the parents and 92 per cent of the apartment owners selected response 1 (agree). Fifty per cent of the faculty also agreed with item 6. Student personnel administrators were split on the item with 42 per cent choosing response 1 (agree) and 46 per cent choosing response 2 (disagree).

Students indicated disagreement with having the university contact parents when students are known to be using LSD. Seventy per cent of the students selected response 2 (disagree). In comparing the groups, there was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in their responses.

Parents and students strongly disagreed with respect to item 6. Parents feel they should be notified when students are using LSD. Students, on the other hand, disagree and believe parents should not be notified. There also was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in comparing parents and students on this item.

Table 28. (36) The University should inform parents of off-campus students co-habiting.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	4	4.2	86	90.5	5	5.3	95	100
Parents	75	79.0	14	14.7	6	6.3	95	100
Apartment Owners	19	51.4	16	43.2	2	5.4	37	100
Faculty	10	23.8	25	59.5	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	12	24.0	34	68.0	4	8.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	136.061	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	115.741	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

In Table 28 the responses to item 36, that the university should inform parents of off-campus students co-habiting, are presented. Ninety per cent of the students, 59 per cent of the faculty and 68 per cent of the student personnel administrators disagree that the

university should inform parents of students co-habiting. Apartment owners (51%) and parents (79%) most often selected response 1 (agree). A good percentage of apartment owners (43%) also chose response 2 (disagree). The sample group differed to the .01 level of significance.

Parents and students also differed to the .01 level of significance. Only four per cent of the students agreed with informing parents of students co-habiting whereas 79 per cent of the parents agreed that parents should be informed.

Table 29. (30) When a single female under 21 years of age, living off-campus, is pregnant and withdrawing from the University, the University should notify the student's parents.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	22	23.2	69	72.6	4	4.2	95	100
Parents	84	88.4	7	7.4	4	4.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	28	73.7	10	26.3	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	25	59.5	12	28.6	5	11.9	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	36	72.0	12	24.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	105.949	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	86.843	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Item 30 in the questionnaire stated that when a single female under 21 years of age living off-campus is pregnant and withdrawing from the university, the university should notify the student's parents. The sample groups' responses are found in Table 29. Parents (88%), apartment owners (73%), student personnel administrators (72%) and

faculty (59%) indicated that parents should be contacted by the university. At the same time, a sizeable percentage of the faculty (28%), apartment owners (26%) and student personnel administrators' sample (24%), selected response 2 (disagreeing that parents should be contacted).

Seventy-two per cent of the student sample agreed that the university should not contact the parents of a pregnant single female under 21, when she is leaving school. At the same time, 88 per cent of the parent sample indicated parents should be contacted in such cases.

In comparing the sample groups a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence is noted. This same level of confidence is true in comparing the student-parent sample.

Student Personnel Services

The responses to item 9, that the university should provide a special orientation program for off-campus transfer students, are found in Table 30. Ninety per cent of the student personnel administrators agreed there should be a special orientation program. Parents (60%), apartment owners (55%) and faculty (45%) were also in favor of the program, but to a lesser extent than were student personnel administrators.

Students (48%) disagreed and most frequently selected response 2 (disagree). It should be noted that a sizeable percentage of students (21%), parents (24%) and faculty (21%) selected response 3 (no opinion). The groups' responses to item 9 differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence.

Students and parents viewed the orientation program differently. Sixty per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree), while only 30 per cent of the students selected this response. Parents and students also differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on item 9.

Table 30. (9) The University should provide a special orientation program for off-campus transfer students.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	29	30.5	46	48.4	20	21.1	95	100
Parents	57	60.0	15	15.8	23	24.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	21	55.3	10	26.3	7	18.4	38	100
Faculty	19	45.3	14	33.3	9	21.4	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	45	90.0	4	8.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	59.574	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	25.080	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

Item 1 in the questionnaire dealt with the university's responsibility for providing physicians from the University Health Center for home calls to student residents off-campus. An examination of Table 31 reveals that students (59%), apartment owners (44%), faculty (69%) and student personnel administrators (86%) most frequently disagreed with having University Health Center physicians making home calls to student residences off-campus. Parents (69%) were much more prone to select response 1 (agree), that the university has a responsibility to provide physicians for home calls off-campus. The groups differed significantly

00

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

on item 1 at the .01 level of confidence.

Parents and students also differed significantly (.01) in their response to this item. Sixty-nine per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree), while 59 per cent of the students selected response 2 (disagree).

Table 31. (1) Physicians from the University health center should make home calls to student residences off-campus.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	29	30.5	56	59.0	10	10.5	95	100
Parents	65	69.2	22	23.4	7	7.4	94	100
Apartment Owners	11	29.0	17	44.7	10	26.3	38	100
Faculty	10	23.8	29	69.1	3	7.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	5	10.0	43	86.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	81.304	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	29.133	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

The responses to item 27, that the university should publish a list of apartments not meeting established university standards, are listed in Table 32. All of the sample groups favored the publication of a list of apartments not meeting established university standards. Parents (86%), faculty (64%), apartment owners (60%), students (57%) and student personnel administrators (57%) indicated that the university should publish a list. Thirty-one per cent of the students, 31 per cent of the apartment owners and 36 per cent of the student personnel administrators selected response 2 (disagree). An

investigation of Table 32 reveals a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence for item 27.

Parents and students disagreed on the publishing of a list of apartments not meeting established university standards. Nine per cent of the parents chose response 2 (disagree) while 31 per cent of the students chose this response.

There also was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between the response of parents and students on item 27.

Table 32. (27) The University should publish a list of apartments not meeting established University standards.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	55	57.9	30	31.6	10	10.5	95	100
Parents	82	86.3	9	9.5	4	4.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	23	60.5	12	31.6	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	27	64.3	8	19.0	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	28	57.2	18	36.7	3	6.1	49	100
DF	8	χ^2	28.774	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	19.200	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

The responses to item 59, that the university should screen and match possible roommates for vacancies in off-campus apartments are listed in Table 33. An inspection of Table 33 reveals students (76%), parents (41%), apartment owners (57%), faculty (85%) and student personnel administrators (92%) believe the university should not screen and match possible roommates. Parents and apartment owners both show

some lack of concern on this issue with 20 per cent of the parents and 21 per cent of the apartment owners selecting response 3 (no opinion). Thirty-eight per cent of the parent sample also selected response 1 (agree). The groups differed significantly on item 59 at the .01 level of confidence. Seventy-six per cent of the students chose response 2 (disagree) while only 41 per cent of their parents selected this response. Parents and students also differed at the .01 level of confidence on item 59.

Table 33. (59) The University should screen and match possible room-mates for vacancies in off-campus apartments.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	15	15.8	73	76.8	7	7.4	95	100
Parents	37	38.9	39	41.1	19	20.0	95	100
Apartment Owners	8	21.1	22	57.8	8	21.1	38	100
Faculty	2	4.9	35	85.3	4	9.8	41	100
Student Pers. Admin.	4	8.0	46	92.0	0	0.0	50	100

DF 8 χ^2 58.905 Significant at .01 level
 *DF 2 χ^2 25.168 Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Item 45 states that the university should provide a special course in apartment living. The responses are listed in Table 34. All of the sample groups were divided in their responses to this question. Parents (58%), students (41%), apartment owners (60%) and student personnel administrators (61%) favored the idea of having a special course and most frequently selected response 1 (agree). Faculty (45%)

most frequently selected response 2 (disagree). All of the groups showed some lack of concern on this issue by frequently selecting response 3 (no opinion). The groups differed significantly on this question at the .05 level of confidence. The response differences between parents and students were small, but they were high enough to be significantly different at a .05 level of confidence.

Table 34. (45) The University should offer a formal or informal course in apartment living, money management, food purchasing, etc.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	39	41.1	36	37.8	20	21.1	95	100
Parents	56	58.9	20	21.1	19	20.0	95	100
Apartment Owners	23	60.5	7	18.4	8	21.1	38	100
Faculty	16	38.1	19	45.2	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	30	61.2	13	26.5	6	12.3	49	100
$DF \quad 8 \quad X^2 \quad 17.386 \quad \text{Significant at .05 level}$ $*DF \quad 2 \quad X^2 \quad 7.639 \quad \text{Parents-Students} \quad \text{Significant at .05 level}$								

The responses to item 7, that the university should provide a home owner's insurance policy for off-campus students is presented in Table 35.

Parents (52%), apartment owners (73%), faculty (76%), student personnel administrators (82%) all disagreed with providing a home owner's insurance policy for students off-campus. Fifty-one per cent of the students agreed that the university should provide an insurance policy.

Parents' and students' responses were exactly reversed in item 7 with 49 students selecting response 1 (agree) and 33 selecting response 2 (disagree).

In comparing the groups they differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence.

Table 35. (7) The University should have a home owner's insurance policy covering fire, theft, damage to personal belongings, for off-campus students.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	49	51.6	33	34.7	13	13.7	95	100
Parents	33	35.1	49	52.1	12	12.8	94	100
Apartment Owners	7	18.4	28	73.7	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	6	14.3	32	76.2	4	9.5	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	6	12.0	41	82.0	3	6.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	45.494	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	6.279	Parents-Students Significant at .05 level

The responses to item 39 regarding encouragement by the university in the development of a formal student governing council for off-campus students, are found in Table 36. The general lack of concern on this issue is perhaps best reflected in the no opinion responses. Twenty-nine per cent of the students, 15 per cent of the parents, 26 per cent of the apartment owners, and 28 per cent of the faculty selected response 3 (no opinion). Students (53%), parents (74%), apartment owners (55%) and student personnel administrators (84%) most frequently agreed that the university should encourage the development of a formal

student governing council. The faculty were divided on the issue with 42 per cent agreeing, 28 per cent disagreeing and 28 per cent selecting no opinion. The sample groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on item 39.

Both parents and students most often selected response 1 (agree), yet there was a significant difference (.05 level) in the responses of these groups to this item.

Table 36. (39) The University should encourage the development of a formal student governing council for off-campus students.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	51	53.7	16	16.8	28	29.5	95	100
Parents	71	74.7	9	9.5	15	15.8	95	100
Apartment Owners	21	55.3	7	18.4	10	26.3	38	100
Faculty	18	42.8	12	28.6	12	28.6	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	42	84.0	6	12.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	30.434	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	9.169	Parents-Students	Significant at .05 level			

With respect to the university providing an advisor for off-campus student government (item 10), Table 37 reveals a significant difference of opinion among the groups at the .01 level. Student personnel administrators (86%) see having an advisor as favorable. Students (43%), parents (64%), faculty (45%) and apartment owners (63%) also all selected response 1 (agree) most frequently, yet a sizeable percentage of this group chose response 3 (no opinion). Twenty-seven per cent of

the students and 31 per cent of the faculty disagree with having the university provide an advisor.

Parents and students differ significantly at the .01 level of confidence on item 10. Sixty-four per cent of the parents are in favor of having an advisor for off-campus student government while only 43 per cent of the students favor this. Twenty-four per cent of the parents and 29 per cent of the student respondents chose response 3 (no opinion).

Table 37. (10) The University should provide an advisor from the student personnel staff to advise off-campus student government.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	41	43.2	26	27.4	28	29.4	95	100
Parents	61	64.2	11	11.6	23	24.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	24	63.2	5	13.2	9	23.6	38	100
Faculty	19	45.2	13	31.0	10	23.8	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	43	86.0	7	14.0	0	0.0	50	100
DF 8	X ² 36.497	Significant at .01 level						
*DF 2	X ² 10.493	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level						

Item 33 is concerned with the university providing storage lockers on campus for the off-campus student. Table 38 presents the responses to item 33. The sample groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this issue. Apartment owners (63%), faculty (54%) and student personnel administrators (54%) most often selected response 2 (disagreeing that lockers should be provided). A sizeable percentage of these samples also selected response 1 (agree) and response 3 (no

opinion). Students and parents were evenly split on the issue. Twenty-eight per cent of the students and 47 per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree), 47 per cent of the students and 29 per cent of the parents selected response 2 (disagree), and 24 per cent of the students and 23 per cent of the parents selected response 3 (no opinion).

Although there was a split between the responses given by the parents and students, parents differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence with students on this issue.

Table 38. (33) Storage lockers on campus should be provided by the University for the off-campus student.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	27	28.4	45	47.4	23	24.2	95	100
Parents	45	47.4	28	29.5	22	23.1	95	100
Apartment Owners	7	18.4	24	63.2	7	18.4	38	100
Faculty	16	38.1	23	54.8	3	7.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	18	36.0	27	54.0	5	10.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	25.434	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	8.481	Parents-Students	Significant at .05 level			

The responses to item 12 regarding the responsibility for the university to provide bail bond for students who are arrested are listed in Table 39. All of the sample groups selected response 2 (disagree) most frequently. Of the sample groups, apartment owners (92%) and student personnel administrators (96%) were the two groups who most frequently disagreed with providing bail bond for students

arrested. The groups differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence on this question.

There was no significant difference between parents and students regarding this issue. Seventy-nine per cent of the students and 73 per cent of the parents selected response 2 (disagree). Table 39 reveals that the null hypothesis is accepted in parent-student sample comparison.

Table 39. (12) The University should provide bail bond for students arrested.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	13	13.6	75	79.0	7	7.4	95	100
Parents	10	10.5	70	73.7	15	15.8	95	100
Apartment Owners	2	5.3	35	92.1	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	5	11.9	32	76.2	5	11.9	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	0	0.0	48	96.0	2	4.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	18.677	Significant at .05 level
*DF	2	χ^2	3.473	Parents-Students Not Significant

Item 49 was concerned with the university providing lunchroom facilities on campus for off-campus students who carry their lunches. Table 40 presents the responses to item 49. Parents (70%), student personnel administrators (70%), apartment owners (52%), faculty (61%) and students (46%) agreed that lunchroom facilities should be provided. A closer inspection of the Table will show that a sizeable percentage of students (31%), student personnel administrators (22%) and faculty

(21%) are not in favor of providing lunchroom facilities. Students (22%) and apartment owners (34%) showed the greatest lack of concern with this issue by frequently selecting response 3 (no opinion). The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this item.

Parents and students did differ in regard to this statement. A significant difference (.01 level) also appeared between these two samples in their responses to this item.

Table 40. (49) Lunchroom facilities should be provided on campus for off-campus students carrying their lunches.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	44	46.3	30	31.6	21	22.1	95	100
Parents	67	70.6	14	14.7	14	14.7	95	100
Apartment Owners	20	52.6	5	13.2	13	34.2	38	100
Faculty	26	61.9	9	21.4	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	35	70.0	11	22.0	4	8.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	23.197	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	11.984	Parents-Students		Significant at .01 level			

Item 34 of the questionnaire states, "when students are prosecuted for civil offenses, the university should provide legal counsel for the student." Table 41 lists the responses to item 34. Fifty per cent of the students wanted to see the university provide legal counsel while 35 per cent disagreed and 14 per cent had no opinion. Seventy-five per cent of the apartment owners, 78 per cent of the faculty and 86 per cent

of the student personnel administrators disagreed with providing legal counsel.

Parents were divided on the question with 37 per cent selecting response 1 (agree), 45 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree) and 16 per cent with no opinion. The groups differed significantly on this issue at the .01 level of confidence.

There was no significant difference between parents and students on this issue. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 41. (34) When students are prosecuted for civil offenses, the University should provide legal counsel for the student.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	47	50.0	33	35.1	14	14.9	94	100
Parents	36	37.9	43	45.3	16	16.8	95	100
Apartment Owners	7	18.9	28	75.7	2	5.4	37	100
Faculty	3	7.1	33	78.6	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	5	10.0	43	86.0	2	2.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	58.872	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	2.902	Parents-Students Not Significant

The responses given for item 64, that off-campus students should be permitted to use residence hall facilities, are listed in Table 42. Faculty members (61%), and student personnel administrators (96%) both disagree that off-campus students should be permitted to use residence hall facilities. Students (66%) and parents (58%) most frequently selected response 1 (agree). Apartment owners were divided on the

issue with 31 per cent agreeing with the item, 39 per cent in disagreement and 28 per cent with no opinion. There was no significant difference between parents and students on this issue. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in comparing the responses of all the groups.

Table 42. (64) Off-campus students should be permitted to use residence hall facilities (e.g., laundry, study, recreation).

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	63	66.3	21	22.1	11	11.6	95	100
Parents	55	58.5	30	31.9	9	9.6	94	100
Apartment Owners	12	31.6	15	39.5	11	28.9	38	100
Faculty	10	23.8	26	61.9	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	2	4.0	48	96.0	0	0.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	102.000	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	2.325	Parents-Students Not Significant

Item 46 of the questionnaire stated that the university should keep a lawyer on retainer to give off-campus students legal advice. Table 43 lists the responses to item 46. Parents and students most frequently agreed that a lawyer should be kept on retainer by the university. Seventy-four per cent of the students and 60 per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree). Apartment owners (55%), faculty (57%) and student personnel administrators (62%) most often chose response 2 (disagree). A good percentage of faculty (28%), apartment owners (36%), student personnel administrators (26%) showed

agreement with item 46 by selecting response 1 (agree). In comparing the responses of the groups, they differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence.

There was no significant difference between students and their parents on this issue.

Table 43. (46) A lawyer should be kept on retainer by the University to give off-campus students legal advice.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	71	74.8	16	16.8	8	8.4	95	100
Parents	57	60.6	26	27.7	11	11.7	94	100
Apartment Owners	14	36.8	21	55.3	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	12	28.6	24	57.1	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	13	26.0	31	62.0	6	12.0	50	100
DF 8	X^2	53.793	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	X^2	4.381	Parents-Students Not Significant					

Regulatory and Law Enforcement

Table 44 contains the results to item 44, that the university should have no housing regulations for students. All of the sample groups most often disagreed with this item. Students (78%), parents (80%), student personnel administrators (90%), faculty (66%), and apartment owners (67%), most often chose response 2 (disagree). Eleven per cent of the parents, 24 per cent of the apartment owners, and 14 per cent of the faculty selected a no opinion response on the issue.

The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence.

Parents and students also differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence on this item.

Table 44. (44) The University should have no housing regulations for students (first year residence hall requirement, off-campus approved supervised housing).

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	17	17.9	75	78.9	3	3.2	95	100
Parents	8	8.4	76	80.0	11	11.6	95	100
Apartment Owners	3	8.1	25	67.6	9	24.3	37	100
Faculty	8	19.0	28	66.7	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	3	6.0	45	90.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF 8	X ² 24.761	Significant at .01 level						
*DF 2	X ² 7.818	Parents-Students Significant at .05 level						

Item 20 states that any student, after the freshman year, should be allowed to live off-campus in housing of his choice without his parents' consent. Table 45 lists the responses to item 20. All the sample groups most frequently selected response 2 (disagree). However, a closer look at Table 44 reveals a significant difference in the percentage of agreement-disagreement responses by each sample group. Parents (84%) and apartment owners (71%) disagreed to the greatest extent. They were followed by student personnel administrators (66%), students (62%) and finally faculty (47%). It should also be pointed out that a sizeable number of student personnel administrators (28%), apartment owners (23%), faculty (33%) and students (34%) selected

response 1 (agree). Faculty were split even further with 19 per cent selecting response 3 (no opinion). The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this issue.

Parents more frequently selected response 2 (disagree) than did students. More students felt that students should be allowed off-campus after their freshman year in housing of their choice without parents consent than did their parents. There were significant differences at the .01 level in the responses of parents and students on this issue.

Table 45. (20) Any student, after the freshman year, should be allowed to live off-campus in housing of his choice without his parents' consent.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	33	34.7	59	62.1	3	3.2	95	100
Parents	9	9.5	80	84.2	6	6.3	95	100
Apartment Owners	9	23.7	27	71.1	2	5.2	38	100
Faculty	14	33.3	20	47.6	8	19.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	14	28.0	33	66.0	3	6.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	32.257	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	17.887	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

The responses to item 25, that there should be no off-campus housing regulations, are listed in Table 46. An inspection of the Table reveals that parents (81%), student personnel administrators (81%), and apartment owners (72%) disagreed with having no off-campus housing regulations for students living off-campus. Faculty members were evenly

divided on the issue with 45 per cent selecting response 1 (agree) and 45 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree). The sample groups differed on this issue at the .01 level of confidence.

The majority (51%) of students selected response 1 (agree) but at the same time a sizeable percentage (40%) selected response 2 (disagree). Eighty-one per cent of the parents disagreed with the item while only 40 per cent of the students disagreed. Students and parents differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on the issue of no off-campus housing regulations.

Table 46. (25) The University should have no regulations concerning the students' off-campus housing situations.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	48	51.1	38	40.4	8	8.5	94	100
Parents	10	10.5	77	81.1	8	8.4	95	100
Apartment Owners	8	22.2	26	72.2	2	5.6	36	100
Faculty	19	45.2	19	45.2	4	9.6	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	5	10.4	39	81.3	4	8.3	48	100
DF 8	X^2	55.605	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	X^2	38.118	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

Item 37 states that any student after his freshman year may live in housing of his choice with his parents' consent. The responses are given in Table 47.

All of the sample groups; parents (63%), faculty (70%), apartment owners (84%), student personnel administrators (54%) and students (70%)

most often agreed that students, after their freshman year, should be allowed with parents' consent to live where they choose. A sizeable percentage of student personnel administrators (42%), parents (32%), and students (26%) selected response 2 (disagree). The sample groups differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence.

Parents and students both agree with the item. The null hypothesis of no difference between the responses of parents and students was accepted.

Table 47. (37) Any student, after the freshman year, should be allowed to live off-campus in housing of his choice with his parents' consent.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	66	70.2	25	26.6	3	3.2	94	100
Parents	60	63.2	31	32.6	4	4.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	32	84.2	4	10.5	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	29	70.7	7	17.1	5	12.2	41	100
Student Pers. Admin.	27	54.0	21	42.0	2	4.0	50	100

DF	8	X^2	18.707	Significant at .05 level
*DF	2	X^2	1.066	Parents-Students Not Significant

Item 58 states, "apartments not meeting established university standards should be placed "off limits". Responses to item 58 are listed in Table 48. An inspection of this table reveals that students (75%), apartment owners (47%), faculty (48%) and student personnel administrators (52%) most often disagree with placing apartments "off limits" for not meeting established university standards. Parents (83%)

most often selected response 1 (agree). In responding to this item a good percentage of student personnel administrators (38%), apartment owners (44%) and faculty (29%) selected response 1 (agree). In comparing the responses, the groups differed at the .01 level of confidence.

Eighty-three per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree) whereas only 15 per cent of the students chose this response. The difference between students and their parents was statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Table 48. (58) Apartments not meeting established University standards should be placed "off-limits."

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	15	15.8	72	75.8	8	8.4	95	100
Parents	78	83.9	11	11.8	4	4.3	93	100
Apartment Owners	17	44.7	18	47.7	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	12	29.3	20	48.8	9	21.9	41	100
Student Pers. Admin.	19	38.0	26	52.0	5	10.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	104.585	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	88.831	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

In Table 49 the responses to item 16 regarding the placing of off-campus dwellings "off limits" by the university are given. Parents (91%) felt that the university should have the right to place residences "off limits" to students. Students (86%) disagreed with parents and strongly favored a position of not giving the university this right. Apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators neither

strongly favored a position of agree nor disagree on item 16, although 56 per cent of the student personnel administrators selected response 2 (disagree). The faculty were split further with 14 per cent of the faculty choosing response 3 (no opinion). In comparing the sample groups they differed significantly (.01 level) on this issue.

Students and parents also differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this issue. Parents most frequently selected response 1 (agree) while students most frequently chose response 2 (disagree).

Table 49. (16) The University should have the right to place some off-campus dwellings "off-limits" to students.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	9	9.5	82	86.3	4	4.2	95	100
Parents	87	91.6	7	7.4	1	1.0	95	100
Apartment Owners	18	47.4	17	44.7	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	20	47.6	16	38.1	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	20	40.0	28	56.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	143.290	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	128.377	Parents-Students		Significant at .01 level			

Item 41 in the questionnaire stated that the university should have the authority to require students to move out of off-campus apartments. Table 50 shows the responses to item 41. Students (93%), faculty (66%), apartment owners (57%), and student personnel administrators (51%) disagreed that the university should have the authority to move students out of off-campus apartments. Parents were quite

divided on the issue with (41%) agreeing, (38%) disagreeing and (20%) with no opinion. A good percentage of apartment owners (36%) and student personnel administrators (26%) selected response 1 (agree). It should be noted that 22 per cent of the student personnel administrators also selected response 3 (no opinion). In comparing the responses of these groups, they differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on the item.

Ninety-three per cent of the students disagree with the statement while only 38 per cent of the parents disagreed. Even though the parents were split on this issue, there was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between parents and students.

Table 50. (41) The University should have the authority to require students to move out of off-campus apartments.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	4	4.2	89	93.7	2	2.1	95	100
Parents	39	41.5	36	38.3	19	20.2	94	100
Apartment Owners	14	36.8	22	57.9	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	8	19.1	28	66.6	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	13	26.5	25	51.0	11	22.5	49	100
DF	8	χ^2	72.812	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	64.719	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Item 56 states that the university should declare "off-limits" certain dwellings which discriminate for reasons of race, creed or color. The responses to item 56 are found in Table 51. Student

personnel administrators were evenly divided on the question of placing units "off-limits" for discrimination, with 49 per cent selecting response 1 (agree) and 49 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree). Parents (47%) most frequently selected the agree response (placing units "off-limits"), yet 32 per cent chose disagree and 20 per cent chose no opinion. Apartment owners (65%) most often favored an "off-limits" policy. Students (65%) most often selected response 2 (disagree). Faculty, like the student personnel administrators, were divided on the issue with 41 per cent agreeing and 43 per cent disagreeing with the question. There was a significant difference (.01 level) in the responses of the sample groups.

Parents and students also differed significantly at the .01 level in regard to this question.

Table 51. (56) The University should declare "off-limits" homes or apartments which discriminate for reasons of race, creed, or color.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	22	23.2	62	65.2	11	11.6	95	100
Parents	45	47.4	31	32.6	19	20.0	95	100
Apartment Owners	25	65.8	10	26.3	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	17	41.5	18	43.9	6	14.6	41	100
Student Pers. Admin.	24	49.0	24	49.0	1	2.0	49	100
DF	8	χ^2	38.601	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	20.362	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level				

Item 55 states that the university should not allow students to rent an apartment for party purposes only. Table 52 lists the responses to item 55. Parents (75%) and apartment owners (55%) both agreed that students should not be allowed to rent apartments for party purposes only. Students (86%), faculty (71%), and student personnel administrators (86%) disagreed with the item. A sizeable percentage (34%) of student personnel administrators did agree with the item. The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this issue.

Parents and students also differed significantly (.01 level) on this item. Only 3 per cent of the students selected response 1 (agree) while 75 per cent of the parents chose this response.

Table 52. (55) The University should not allow students to rent an apartment for party purposes only.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	3	3.2	82	86.3	10	10.5	95	100
Parents	71	75.5	11	11.7	12	12.8	94	100
Apartment Owners	21	55.3	15	39.5	2	5.2	38	100
Faculty	5	11.9	30	71.4	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	17	34.0	31	62.0	2	4.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	138.484	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	116.871	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Item 63 in the questionnaire stated that the university should not allow members of the opposite sex in students' living quarters off-campus. A summary of the responses to this question are found in Table 53.

Table 53. (63) The University should not allow members of the opposite sex in students' living quarters off-campus.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	0	0.0	94	98.9	1	1.1	95	100
Parents	20	21.3	55	58.5	19	20.2	94	100
Apartment Owners	4	10.5	32	84.2	2	5.3	38	100
Faculty	2	4.8	34	80.9	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	0	0.0	48	96.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	65.386	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	46.404	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level				

Respondents in all the sample groups, parents (58%), students (98%), faculty (80%), apartment owners (84%) and student personnel administrators (96%) indicated that the university should allow members of the opposite sex in students' living quarters off-campus. The parents were the only sample group that showed a sizeable division on the issue. Twenty-one per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree) and 20 per cent selected response 3 (no opinion).

Students and parents differed significantly (.01 level) on the issue. While no member of the student sample selected response 1 (agree), 21 per cent of their parents did.

Parents selected response 3 (no opinion) 20 per cent of the time whereas only one per cent of the students chose this response. The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this issue.

A summary of the responses to item 53, that the university should

have no regulations which prohibit the use of alcohol in off-campus student housing, is found in Table 54. With the exception of parents, all the sample groups; faculty (69%), students (96%), apartment owners (47%), student personnel administrators (70%), most frequently agreed with having no regulations regarding alcohol in off-campus student housing. Parents were divided on the issue. Twenty-four per cent selected response 1 (agree), 54 per cent selected response 2 (disagree) and 21 per cent selected response 3 (no opinion). Thirty-six per cent of the apartment owners disagreed with the issue. There was a significant difference (.01 level) in the responses of the sample groups.

Ninety-six per cent of the students selected response 1 (agree), while only 24 per cent of the parents chose this response. There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in the responses of these two groups.

Table 54. (53) The University should have no regulations which prohibit the use of alcohol in off-campus student housing.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	92	96.8	2	2.1	1	1.1	95	100
Parents	23	24.2	52	54.7	20	21.1	95	100
Apartment Owners	18	47.4	14	36.8	6	15.8	38	100
Faculty	29	69.0	7	16.7	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	35	70.0	13	26.0	2	4.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	114.707	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	104.887	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Table 55. (52) The University should have no regulations which prohibit co-habitation by off-campus students.

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	81	85.3	8	8.4	6	6.3	95	100
Parents	9	9.6	77	81.9	8	9.5	94	100
Apartment Owners	6	15.8	26	68.4	6	15.8	38	100
Faculty	24	57.1	11	26.2	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	20	40.0	28	56.0	2	4.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	140.633	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	113.895	Parents-Students		Significant at .01 level			

The responses to item 52, that the university should have no regulations which prohibit co-habitation by off-campus students, are found in Table 55. Only students (85%) and faculty (57%) most frequently agreed with having no regulations prohibiting co-habitation. Parents (81%), apartment owners (68%), and student personnel administrators (56%) disagreed with the statement and selected response 2 (disagree) most often. Forty per cent of the student personnel administrators selected response 1 (agree) in answering item 52. In comparing the responses of the groups it was established that a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence existed.

Parents differed significantly at the .01 level from students on the issue of having the university prohibit co-habitation. Eighty-five per cent of the students, as compared to nine per cent of the parents, felt that the university should have no regulations against co-habitation.

Table 56. (21) The University should discipline off-campus students for co-habitation (i.e., single members of the opposite sex living together).

Scale: Sample Groups	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	2	2.1	90	94.7	3	3.2	95	100
Parents	70	73.7	18	18.9	7	7.4	95	100
Apartment Owners	18	47.4	13	34.2	7	18.4	38	100
Faculty	8	19.0	29	69.1	5	11.9	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	17	34.0	29	58.0	4	8.0	50	100
DF 8 χ^2 134.679 Significant at .01 level *DF 2 χ^2 113.822 Parents-Students Significant at .01 level								

Item 21 states that the university should discipline off-campus students for co-habitation. The responses to item 21 are listed in Table 56. Students (94%) overwhelmingly disagreed that the university should discipline students for co-habiting. Faculty members (69%), and student personnel administrators (58%), also favored this position.

Parents (73%) thought students should be disciplined for co-habitation. Apartment owners were divided on the issue with 47 per cent selecting response 1 (agree), 34 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree) and 18 per cent selecting response 3 (no opinion). In comparing the sample groups a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence was established, this was also true for the parent-student sample.

Only two per cent of the students agree that students should be disciplined for co-habitation while 73 per cent of their parents felt

students should be disciplined.

Table 57. (38) Apartment owners should notify the local law enforcement agency when off-campus student parties are causing a public disturbance.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	66	69.5	25	26.3	4	4.2	95	100
Parents	88	92.6	4	4.2	3	3.2	95	100
Apartment Owners	36	94.8	1	2.6	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	35	83.3	3	7.1	4	9.5	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	47	94.0	3	6.0	0	0.0	50	100

DF	8	χ^2	37.853	Significant at .01 level
*DF	2	χ^2	18.493	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Item 38 in the questionnaire states that apartment owners should notify the local law enforcement agency when off-campus students' parties are causing a public disturbance. The responses to this item are found in Table 57. All of the sample groups, parents (92%), students (69%), apartment owners (94%), faculty (83%) and student personnel administrators (94%) supported the position of having the apartment owners notify the law enforcement agencies in cases of parties causing a public disturbance. Twenty-six per cent of the students disagreed with the statement and selected response 2 (disagree). The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence.

Although both parents (92%) and students (69%) most often selected response 1 (agree), there were significant differences at the .01 level of confidence in their responses to this item. The major difference

occurred in the disagree area with only four per cent of the parents disagreeing and 26 per cent of the students disagreeing.

Table 58. (61) The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency when it is aware of violations of civil law.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	31	32.6	52	54.8	12	12.6	95	100
Parents	82	87.2	6	6.4	6	6.4	94	100
Apartment Owners	37	97.4	1	2.6	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	27	64.3	7	16.7	8	19.0	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	41	82.0	6	12.0	3	6.0	50	100
DF	8	X^2	103.696	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	X^2	61.497	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

Table 58 lists the responses to item 61 that the university should contact the proper law enforcement agency when it is aware of violations of civil law. The majority of parents (87%), apartment owners (97%), faculty (64%) and student personnel administrators (82%) indicated that the university should notify the proper law enforcement agency when it is aware of violations of civil law. Fifty-four per cent of the students disagreed with this position. Only 32 per cent of the student sample agreed with contacting law enforcement agencies in such matters.

Parents and students disagreed significantly (.01 level) with respect to item 65. Only six per cent of the parents selected response 2 (disagree) whereas 54 per cent of the students chose this response. In comparing the responses of the sample groups they differed at the

.01 level of confidence on this issue.

Table 59. (13) The University should take disciplinary action against an off-campus student when the student is arrested and convicted for a violation of a civil or criminal law.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	5	5.3	87	91.6	3	3.1	95	100
Parents	53	56.4	24	25.5	17	18.1	94	100
Apartment Owners	17	44.7	18	47.4	3	7.9	38	100
Faculty	11	26.2	29	69.1	2	4.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	9	18.0	36	72.0	5	10.0	50	100

DF 8 χ^2 97.334 Significant at .01 level
 *DF 2 χ^2 85.278 Parents-Students Significant at .01 level

Item 13 in the questionnaire stated that the university should take disciplinary action against an off-campus student when the student is arrested and convicted for a violation of a civil or criminal law. An inspection of Table 59 reveals that students (91%), faculty (69%) and student personnel administrators (72%) are not in favor of disciplining students arrested or convicted of civil or criminal law. Apartment owners appear to be split on the issue with 44 per cent selecting response 1 (agree) and 47 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree). Parents most frequently (56%) chose response 1 (agree), yet it should be noted that 18 per cent of the parents chose response 3 (no opinion). The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this item.

Parents and students also differed significantly at the .01 level

of confidence on this issue. Ninety-one per cent of the students selected response 2 (disagree) while only 25 per cent of their parents selected this response.

Table 60. (11) The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency in cases where residences are known places of narcotics use.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	32	33.7	53	55.8	10	10.5	95	100
Parents	92	96.8	2	2.1	1	1.1	95	100
Apartment Owners	36	94.7	2	5.3	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	32	78.1	7	17.1	2	4.8	41	100
Student Pers. Admin.	44	88.0	5	10.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	120.318	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	83.687	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

The responsibility of the university to contact proper law enforcement agencies in cases where residences are known places of narcotics use is the question asked in item 11. The responses to item 11 are found in Table 60.

Parents (96%), apartment owners (94%), faculty (78%) and student personnel administrators (88%) all agreed that the proper law enforcement agency should be contacted. Parents and apartment owners expressed the highest agreement on the question. Only 33 per cent of the students selected response 1 (agree) while 55 per cent selected response 2 (disagree). The groups differed significantly on this item at the .01 level of confidence.

Students and parents also differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence in their responses to item 11. Students most frequently selected response 2 (disagree) while parents most frequently selected response 1 (agree).

Table 61. (40) The University has the responsibility to inform students of state laws when the University has reason to believe that LSD is being used off-campus.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	35	36.8	48	50.6	12	12.6	95	100
Parents	83	87.4	10	10.5	2	2.1	95	100
Apartment Owners	29	76.3	3	7.9	6	15.8	38	100
Faculty	18	42.8	17	40.5	7	16.7	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	38	76.0	11	22.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	73.918	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	51.610	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

Table 61 lists the responses to item 40 which states that the university has the responsibility to inform students of state laws when the university has reason to believe that LSD is being used off-campus.

Parents (87%), apartment owners (76%) and student personnel administrators (76%) most frequently chose response 1 (agreeing that students should be informed of state laws). Faculty members were split on the issue. Forty-two per cent of the faculty agreed with the statement, 40 per cent disagreed and 16 per cent had no opinion. Students were also divided on the question with 36 per cent agreeing, 50 per cent disagreeing and 12 per cent selecting no opinion. The sample groups differed

significantly at the .01 level of confidence on this issue.

Students and parents also differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence in selecting responses to this item. Parents most frequently agreed with the item while students most frequently disagreed.

Table 62. (31) The University has the responsibility to inform students of state laws when the University has reason to believe that marijuana is being used off-campus.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	33	34.7	48	50.6	14	14.7	95	100
Parents	87	91.6	7	7.4	1	1.0	95	100
Apartment Owners	32	84.2	5	3.2	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	19	45.2	18	42.9	5	11.9	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	39	78.0	10	20.0	1	2.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	88.196	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	66.130	Parents-Students Significant at .01 level					

Item 31 is concerned with the responsibility of the university to inform students of state laws when there is reason to believe that marijuana is being used off-campus. Table 62 lists the results of this question. Faculty members were split on the issue with 45 per cent selecting response 1 (agreeing that the students should be informed), 42 per cent selecting response 2 (disagree) and 11 per cent selecting response 3 (no opinion). Fifty per cent of the students selected response 2 (disagree). The remaining members of the student sample were divided on the question with 34 per cent selecting response 1 (agree) and 14 per cent selecting response 3 (no opinion).

Parents (91%), apartment owners (84%) and student personnel administrators (78%) most frequently selected response 1 (agreeing students should be informed). The groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence.

There was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence between parents and students. Parents (91%) agree with item 31 while students (50%) disagree with the item.

Table 63. (62) The University should report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	37	38.9	51	53.7	7	7.4	95	100
Parents	89	94.7	4	4.3	1	1.0	94	100
Apartment Owners	36	94.7	2	5.3	0	0.0	38	100
Faculty	25	59.5	9	21.4	8	19.1	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	40	80.0	7	14.0	3	6.0	50	100
DF	8	χ^2	104.478	Significant at .01 level				
*DF	2	χ^2	66.121	Parents-Students	Significant at .01 level			

The responses to item 62, that the university should report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency, are listed in Table 63. Parents (94%), faculty (59%) and student personnel administrators (80%) most frequently selected response 1 (agreeing that the proper law enforcement agency should be contacted). Students (53%) most frequently chose response 2 (disagree). A sizeable percentage of students (38%) did agree with reporting the use of LSD to

the proper law enforcement agency. The sample groups differed at the .01 level of confidence on this issue.

Students and parents also differed significantly (.01 level) on this issue. Ninety-four per cent of the parents selected response 1 (agree) while only 38 per cent of the students selected this response.

Table 64. (60) The University should report the use of marijuana by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency.

Scale:	Agree		Disagree		No Opinion		Total	
Sample Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
*Students	31	32.6	57	60.0	7	7.4	95	100
Parents	86	91.5	4	4.3	4	4.2	94	100
Apartment Owners	36	94.8	1	2.6	1	2.6	38	100
Faculty	23	54.8	13	30.9	6	14.3	42	100
Student Pers. Admin.	36	72.0	10	20.0	4	8.0	50	100
DF 8	χ^2	102.979	Significant at .01 level					
*DF 2	χ^2	72.719	Parents-Students		Significant at .01 level			

Table 64 summarizes the responses to item 60. Item 60 states that the university should report the use of marijuana by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency. Parents (91%), apartment owners (94%), faculty (54%) and student personnel administrators (72%) agreed that the university should report the use of marijuana. A sizeable percentage of faculty (30%) and student personnel administrators (20%) disagreed with reporting the use of marijuana. The majority of students (60%) disagreed with item 60. The sample groups as well as the student and parent groups differed significantly at the .01 level of confidence

on the issue. Thirty-two per cent of the students selected response 1 (agree) while 91 per cent of the parents selected this response.

Demographic Information

The following demographic information was gathered from the parent sample. Every parent in the sample group received a demographic information sheet with their questionnaire. The number of parents responding to a particular question found in the demographic information sheet will vary with respect to the nature of the question and the individual parent's reaction to it.

It is hoped that this information will be helpful to the reader in interpreting this research.

Table 65. Who Filled Out the Questionnaire

Questionnaire filled out by:	N	%
Father	24	26.09
Mother	31	33.70
Both	37	40.22
Guardian	0	0.0

Ninety-two out of the 100 respondents in the parent sample filled out the appropriate space on the demographic information sheet marked "questionnaire filled out by." The majority (40%) of the questionnaires were filled out by both parents. The remaining percentage was evenly divided with 26 per cent of the fathers and 33 per cent of the mothers filling out the questionnaire.

Table 66. Total Amount of Money Each Family Contributed to Each Child in College

The amount of money parents contributed to each child in college	N	%
\$ 0 - \$ 500	13	14.61
\$ 500 - \$1,000	18	20.22
\$1,000 - \$1,500	19	21.35
\$ Over - \$1,500	39	43.82

The amount of money each family contributed to each of their children in college is listed in Table 66.

A sizeable percentage (43%) of the parent sample indicated they contributed \$1,500 or more to each child in college. The other categories were quite evenly divided with 14 per cent contributing 0-\$500, 20 per cent contributing \$500-\$1,000 and 21 per cent contributing \$1,000-\$1,500.

Sixty-four per cent of the parents contributed \$1,000 or more to each of their children in college.

The highest educational level attained by the respondents in the parent sample is found in Table 67. Ninety-one fathers and 92 mothers filled out the space marked parents' education. Thirty per cent of the fathers and 43 per cent of the mothers attended high school but did not graduate. More fathers (23%) than mothers (19%) started college but did not finish. The reverse is true for college graduates with only (14%) of the fathers graduating while (17%) of the mothers graduated. Fourteen per cent of the fathers and six per cent of the mothers had graduate or professional degrees.

Table 67. Parents' Education

Parents' Education	Father		Mother	
	N	%	N	%
Completed Eighth Grade	10	10.99	5	5.43
High School but didn't Graduate	28	30.77	40	43.48
High School Graduate	6	6.59	7	7.61
College but didn't Graduate	21	23.08	18	19.57
College Graduate	13	14.29	16	17.39
Graduate or Professional Degree	13	14.29	6	6.52

Table 68 lists the responses to the item asking how many children each family had in college.

Ninety-four out of the 95 respondents filled in the proper space in answering the statement. Over half (57%) of the respondents had only one child in school. Thirty-two per cent of the sample had two children in college. Only nine per cent of the sample had three or more students in college.

Table 68. Number of Children Each Family Has in College

Number of children in college	N	%
One	54	57.45
Two	31	32.98
Three	7	7.45
Four	2	2.13

Table 69. Family Size - Members

Size of family (members)	N	%
2 members*	2	2.22
3 members	13	14.44
4 members	28	31.11
5 members	25	27.78
6 members	12	13.33
7 members	4	4.44
8 members	3	3.33
9 members	0	0.0
10 members	1	1.11
11 members	0	0.0
12 members	1	1.11
13 members	0	0.0
14 members	1	1.11

*Fathers of the students were deceased.

Table 69 reports the data collected on the size of the family (members) for the parent sample. Of the 95 questionnaires returned, 90 respondents of the parent sample filled out the appropriate space for family size.

The majority (31%) of the respondents indicated there were four members in their family. Twenty-seven per cent of the sample indicated five members, 13 per cent six members, and 14 per cent three members. The mean family size was 4.89 with a standard deviation of 1.86. Eighty-five per cent of the responses had three, four, five or six members in their family.

The data as reported in Table 70 reveals that the largest percentage (23%) of the parent-student respondents came from home towns of 25,000-75,000 in population. The distribution of responses was quite evenly divided. Of the parent-student sample ten per cent came from towns with a population of 0-1,000; 11 per cent with a population of 5,000-10,000; 16 per cent with a population of 10,000-20,000; 13 per cent with a population of 75,000-300,000 and 17 per cent with a population of 300,000 or greater. Fifty-seven per cent of the parent sample came from home towns with populations of 25,000 or greater.

Table 70. Population of Home Town

Population of home town	N	%
0 - 1,000	9	10.11
1,000 - 5,000	6	6.74
5,000 - 10,000	10	11.24
10,000 - 25,000	15	16.85
25,000 - 75,000	21	23.60
75,000 - 300,000	12	13.48
Over - 300,000	16	17.98

Table 71 represents the total family income of the parent sample. Ninety out of 95 of the respondents returning the questionnaire answered the question asking for the total family income.

Seventy per cent of the total sample had incomes of \$10,000 or greater per year. The category receiving the highest percentage (39%) of responses was for incomes of \$10,000-\$15,000 per year. Twenty-one

per cent of the sample selected the \$15,000-\$20,000 per year category. Only five per cent of the sample selected the \$3,000-\$5,000 per year category.

Table 71. Total Family Income

Total Family Income (per year)	N	%
\$ 3,000 - \$ 5,000	5	5.49
\$ 5,000 - \$10,000	19	20.88
\$10,000 - \$15,000	36	39.56
\$15,000 - \$20,000	20	21.98
Over - \$20,000	10	10.99

Table 72 lists the responses to the parents occupation question. Of the 95 parents returning the questionnaire, 86 fathers and 71 mothers filled out the appropriate square marked "parents occupation." An inspection of the Table reveals considerable variation in the occupations of the fathers in the parent sample. Twenty per cent of the fathers were engaged in occupations of an executive or managerial nature. Eleven per cent of the fathers were employed as skilled labor and ten per cent were engaged in sales as an occupation. The remainder of the fathers were engaged in a variety of occupations.

The majority of mothers (56%) gave their occupation as housewife. Although 15 per cent of the mothers selected office-clerical and 12 indicated teaching.

Table 72. Parents Occupation

Parents Occupation	Father		Mother	
	N	%	N	%
Manual Worker	8	9.3	2	2.8
Skilled Labor	10	11.6		
Business Owner	7	8.1	2	2.8
Farm Owner-Operator	6	6.9		
Executive or Managerial	18	20.9		
Office, Clerical	6	6.9	11	15.4
Teacher Elementary or Secondary	3	3.4	9	12.2
Professional	5	5.8	3	4.2
Service (store clerk, barber)	6	6.9	3	4.2
Engineer	8	9.3		
Sales	9	10.4	1	1.4
House Wife			40	56.3

Open Ended Responses

The following Tables, 73-77, list by sample group the responses to item 65. The items which were similar have been consolidated for the convenience of the reader. Rather than attempt to summarize the open ended questions and responses, and perhaps lose much of their meaning, they are listed by sample group and by item number as given by the respondents.

Table 73. Student Responses to the Open End Question: This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study.

Item No.	Item	Comments
6	The University should contact parents when students are using LSD.	Depending on age of student. N-2*
7	The University should provide a home owner's insurance policy for off-campus students.	Should be optional. N-3
13	The University should take disciplinary action against off-campus students convicted for civil or criminal law violations.	Not unless it's against University property. Perhaps they could put him on some sort of warning but with his being off-campus there isn't much the University can do.
16	The University should have the right to place dwellings "off limits" to students.	The University cannot place a house, apt., off limits. That should be the duty of the local officials to condemn housing because of safety standards.
17	Apartment owners should contact the University when students' parties are causing public disturbances.	Not the University's responsibility. N-2
20	Students should be allowed to live where they choose after the freshman year without parents' consent.	I feel 21 is a good determining age for living off-campus.

* Number of similar responses.

Table 73--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
21	The University should discipline students for co-habitation.	Not any of the University's business. God save the kids who are not responsible enough to live by society's long practiced standards.
26	The University should contact parents when students are using marijuana.	Depends on age -- over 21, no. N-2 Because of the danger of involving unknowing friends.
30	The University should notify parents of single female students under 21 years of age who are pregnant and withdrawing from school.	It is the girl's right and responsibility to tell her parents. It would be a difficult situation and should be personally discussed. The University should not start sending "Dear Parents" letters. This policy is RIDICULOUS and the University should change it.
36	The University should inform parents of students off-campus co-habiting.	Not unless students are under 21.
47	The University should inspect for proper sanitary standards in off-campus dwellings.	Students should be able to handle these problems with apartment owners themselves.
52	The University should have no regulations prohibiting co-habitation.	Cross out regulations. It should take a policy stand as students know it does not condone co-habitation and why.

Table 73--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
62	The University should report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency.	<p>I don't think there should be a law prohibiting the use of narcotics.</p> <p>I agree here because it is in violation of the law plus potentially harmful.</p>
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>A general comment to all of the questions above. I feel that it should be the students responsibility to live within the law and to initiate what action he feels necessary. However, because of the age and inexperience of those living off-campus, I feel that the University should provide advice and recommendations to students desirous of help.</p> <p>I do not believe that the University should have the power to decree where, when or how a student should live. I do believe that the University should provide such services as legal aid and/or advice for all its students, <u>when requested</u>, and should make available to all its students on and off-campus, the same services and facilities. (e.g., question 64). N-1</p> <p>I feel the University has some responsibility over the students and their welfare (under 21), but apts. and University should remain separate. N-1</p> <p>Does the "university" want to hold my hand the rest of my life?</p>

Table 73--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>This University should be more concerned with giving its students an education than leading them around by their noses. Ninety per cent of the SD's I have circled are the most assinine ways I can think of to spend money paid in a sliding scale or even straight pay scale. Just because the U.S. is becoming more socialistic every day is no reason the University should become dictators . . . leave the students alone! If they aren't grown up at 20, 21, or 22, they never will be. The University's job is to <u>prepare</u> students for life, not live it for them.</p> <p>The purpose of the university, within legal limits, should be to advise and aid students, not determine their living, dating or moral obligations. It should not adopt the position of being "big brother" for people, who, in other societies or communities, would be responsible citizens with their own families.</p> <p>The university should restrict its involvement with students residing off-campus to providing strictly voluntary services. University responsibility should be limited to such services and no supervisory role undertaken. N-4</p> <p>Off-campus students should be responsible enough to regulate their own affairs! Only when apartment owners cheat dwellers should the university step in.</p>

Table 73--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>In some areas I feel the university is already filling an important role. There should be basic requirements to live in unsupervised housing, ie., parents permission. In some cases (dope, LSD) it is the responsibility of police and/or university to contact parents.</p> <p>When the Multiversity starts to play king off-campus also, by telling students how to live, they are overstepping their boundaries.</p> <p>I am completely astounded that anyone could consider so many of these items the responsibility of the university . . . as unsophisticated as this view may be, I have always considered the responsibility of the university to be <u>education</u>. N-4</p> <p>Any student 21 years old has a legal right to conduct his moral life as he sees fit. No university should be allowed the authority to interfere. I personally will not let the university regulate my personal affairs, and I believe an attempt on the part of the university would be a big setback in the MSU progressive image. N-1</p> <p>A student should be able to regulate his life (outside of violations of the law) on campus in the same manner that he would if he or she had just moved to a new city to set up residence. N-3</p>

Table 73--Concluded

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	This survey is a good example of how this university wastes money. ALL these statements saying "the University <u>should</u> " means more bureaucracy which means more money. What's wrong with free enterprise? Just because L.B.J. is president of the United State of America doesn't mean you should go berserk with regulations. Don't take <u>Time</u> , <u>Newsweek</u> , etc. too seriously -- we are not all a bunch of dope addicts and fornicating slobbs.

Table 74. Parents Responses to the Open End Question: This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study.

Item No.	Item	Comments
1	University physicians should make home calls to off-campus student residences.	Emergencies. N-3*
6	The University should contact parents when students are using LSD.	We believe students should be suspended from school to parents' guardianship. We believe no students should live in other than dormitories or other supervised housing until they are enrolled in graduate school. Then they should be entirely responsible for themselves and suspended from the university if they are not cooperative or achieving in classes. Married housing is O.K. We believe the university should be responsible for academic and on-campus activities. When students move off-campus they do it as adults or with written permission of parents and the university should be absolved of responsibility for them.
13	The University should take disciplinary action against off-campus students convicted for civil or criminal law violations.	One punishment only -- not two for same offense.
17	Apartment owners should contact the University when students' parties are causing public disturbances.	Warn students and parents. Notify police.

* Number of similar responses.

Table 74--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
20	Students should be allowed to live where they choose after the freshman year without parents' consent.	After sophomore year.
24	The University should inspect off-campus dwellings and enforce housing codes.	City should.
N-2		
32	The University should notify parents of off-campus students' arrest.	If under 21 and/or supported by parents.
55	The University should not allow students to rent apartments for party purposes only.	This yes; if students are on-campus residents--a dorm regulation-- off-campus students should be strictly as "Day" students and must be old enough to be trusted until proven otherwise. If an individual student has a good record for three years by the fourth year it should be assumed he is old and mature enough to live without supervision.
60	The University should report the use of marijuana to proper law enforcement agency.	The parents should be notified.
61	The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency when it is aware of students' violation of civil law.	The parents should be notified.
62	The University should report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency.	The parents should be notified.

Table 74--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>I think off-campus students (unmarried) should have a limited degree of supervision and with the university's backing in disputes with landlords, law enforcement, but let them try their wings--if they get out of line, inform parents and make students realize they have responsibility as well as freedom.</p> <p>A heavy fine should be imposed on students leaving the apartment when they do not turn in keys at the end of their lease, ie., when new students moved in all the girls were robbed of all their cash. What other way did the burglar get in but thru the door with the missing key. The landlord could only furnish two keys out of four. A few weeks later a former male tenant came to the apartment and gave the girls the missing two keys. Actually it would be a good idea to interchange the lock cylinder throughout the building.</p> <p>We feel that after the first and possibly the sophomore years of protection in dormitory living, students should be treated as responsible adults in regard to morals. Transgressors should be left to the civil authorities with the overall moral climate monitored by the university.</p> <p>The university should establish off-campus housing standards to protect the students from poor sanitation, poor safety and economic tyranny. N-1</p>

Table 74--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>I believe that students over 21 should use off-campus housing, should they choose. Those who are under 21 and are not legally responsible for their actions should use on-campus housing.</p> <p>The university should expel any student whose behavior is illegal, indecent, or harmful to another person, for example, use of obscene telephone calls, harassment, stealing, vandalism. If a student doesn't behave in accordance with regulating the university -- out with him or her.</p> <p>Too much responsibility assumed by the university will have students screaming for more freedom.</p> <p>Students must realize that off-campus housing <u>contracts</u> are just as binding as any of the contracts they make with the university for their education. Common sense and a strong sense of responsibility by students will solve many problems.</p> <p>It seems to me that the university needs to pay more attention to educating the students and not entering into the "off" campus building business</p> <p>Off-campus housing should be handled within the laws and regulations of the local community or city. I don't see that the university can or should regulate beyond the local laws.</p>

N-3

Table 74--Concluded

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>Our son lived two years in off-campus housing and it worked fine except for parking car facilities. At one time it was unfair for apartment manager to charge the student the cost of a new chair when a small hole in the damaged chair could have been repaired at small cost.</p> <p>The large dorms on campus have so <u>little</u> supervision, any undesirable character may come and go into these dorms, students seem only responsible to themselves! There is absolutely no resemblance to "home"--more to institutional living. The freshman is thrown in with all kinds and heaven help the boy who isn't mature. He gets no guidance unless he asks or begins to get unsatisfactory marks. I can see no difference between dorm and apartment--there is no help or supervision for boys in either.</p>

Table 75. Apartment Owners Responses to the Open End Question: This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study.

Item No.	Item	Comments
6	The University should contact parents when students are using LSD.	If under 21 years. N-2*
16	The University should have the right to place dwellings "off limits" to students.	I would question the right of the university to place specific units off limits, but I think that it should be the university's duty to inform the students of any owners who are obviously operating substandard units.
21	The University should discipline students for co-habitation.	Morals are a personal thing but enforcement would change apartment attitudes. N-2
26	The University should contact parents when students are using marijuana.	If under 21 years. N-2
32	The University should notify parents of off-campus students' arrest.	When student is under 21 only!
36	The University should inform parents of students off-campus co-habitation.	If under 21 years.
52	The University should have no regulations prohibiting co-habitation.	How can you regulate morality and emotions?

* Number of similar responses.

Table 75--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>Any restrictions on apartment owners and their "free enterprise" will cause a lessening of new apartment buildings. Let the inferior apartment fall in the market place through competition with the better ones.</p> <p>University personnel <u>can</u> assess and arbitrate damage and repair charges in off-campus housing <u>if</u> the university supplies its own crew <u>to do</u> the <u>repair job</u> so costs are as stated by the university.</p> <p>I believe the students off-campus should assume the responsibilities indicative of independent young citizens. The university can assist, offer help and direction to those students seeking such but not directly deal or interfere with apartment managing, civil actions and offenses. The student should be able to turn to the university for assistance but not be limited by them. I feel the university should notify the students of the civil laws involving drugs, alcohol, etc., but only in an informative fashion. It's his duty to abide or suffer civil action. This university (or any other) is not a crutch for the student.</p> <p>There should be some attempt made by the university to educate the student off-campus of his obligations to the school, landlord, and city. He should be aware of why rent for students is high. He should live in an apartment as if he were living in his parents home and not a garage. Thank you.</p>

Table 75--Concluded

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>In most areas covered on your questionnaire we have city, state and county regulatory agencies. Anything the university could do would be a duplication of effort. They have no business advising or regulating building plans, drawing leases, providing free legal service for the student, and policing off-campus housing. My belief is that the university has their job cut out for them on the campus and that they should confine their policing and regulating activities to the campus and leave the regulations, inspections, etc., of the city to the regular governmental agencies. N-2</p> <p>I feel that with the increase of new off-campus facilities that the student desiring to live off-campus will find adequate housing without the help of a campus organization. I believe that the off-campus housing department has served its purpose of providing housing when there was a shortage. Today there is no shortage so I would recommend this department be abolished.</p> <p>Once a student is allowed to live off-campus he, by definition, must be an adult. Either trust them or keep them on campus. Specifically let the university fulfill its function of instruction for these students and keep its nose out of their business.</p> <p>In come areas you are assuming a paternal attitude and infringing on the rights of all concerned.</p>

Table 76. Faculty Responses to the Open End Question: This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study.

Item No.	Item	Comments
20	Students should be allowed to live where they choose after the freshman year without parents' consent.	If he pays his way.
30	The University should notify parents of single female students under 21 years of age who are pregnant and withdrawing from school.	If notification is sent for other withdrawals, ok; otherwise no.
46	The University should keep a lawyer on retainer for legal advice to off-campus students.	This is not a responsibility of the university; but I think it would be helpful for them to be able to get legal counseling--not legal representation--from a university paid lawyer.
47	The University should inspect for proper sanitary standards in off-campus dwellings.	If the city of East Lansing does not enforce its housing codes, the university might inspect apartments and provide students with the information that they are unclear, unsafe--but I don't think they have the right to prevent students from living in them.
50	The University should inspect for proper safety standards in off-campus dwellings.	
52	The University should have no regulations prohibiting co-habitation.	There are other officials for this.
53	The University should have no regulations prohibiting the use of alcohol.	Regulations which are essentially unenforceable are always a bad idea.

Table 76--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>It seems to me that "Students" are members of society, subject to the same civil and criminal code. Responsibility for prosecution in case of violation, and enforcement off-campus must not be assumed by the university. N-3*</p> <p>University should remain apart from private lives of students over 21. Under 21, MSU should be responsible to parents only. MSU should neither interfere with them or provide services for them.</p> <p>The structure that I visualize is one of treating students as though they are children--which they may be--but it is none of our business. The resources of the university are limited to and intended for teaching and research and not for babysitting. I would do away with <u>all</u> student housing--and I am the parent of a university student.</p> <p>It is my opinion that with the exception of Open Housing the university must have no role in Off-Campus Housing: what positive services offered (lawyers, doctors) are over-balanced by the negative.</p> <p>Answers are predicted on the assumption of the university's being able to provide sufficient on-campus housing as an alternative</p>

* Number of similar responses.

Table 76--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>I think the key to the problem is clearly informing students and parents of their rights and obligations, and what the university will not do, examples such as in these statements.</p> <p>I feel that the university policy should be directed by the following considerations: 1) Service to the student and the cause of his education, 2) A strict (and widely advertised) avoidance of the concept of "in loco parentis", 3) Working through the city and state law enforcement agencies to enforce laws rather than the university taking on the job. Some special laws regarding tenancy in East Lansing and Lansing might be encouraged. 4) Within the context of (a) Parents' knowledge of university policy regarding "in loco parentis" and (b) full cooperation with law enforcement agencies and agitation for tightening laws, the students should have full privileges to live as any other citizen. It is abhorrent to me to think that a boy can work in a factory and have rights denied a boy who elects to seek an education.</p> <p>I believe that the university should get out of all activities except education and should force students to take full responsibility for their actions, it should report these.</p>

Table 76--Concluded

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>This is a strongly paternalistic pattern and the question of cost, hiring and training of effective personnel will determine the effectiveness of many of these propositions. The rights of the adult individual (over 21) must be preserved in private matters (sex, alcohol, marijuana) as long as the individual does not become a public nuisance.</p> <p>The principle concern in this context from the university view should be to ensure (1) that the mechanics of living near the university should not involve the student in problems which may interfere with his pursuit of academic objectives, so that the conditions under which he lives are within the range of the university responsibility, <u>and</u> (2) that the good name of the university must be protected, bearing in mind that the population with a high turnover must exercise more than average care with regard to the rights and comfort of its more permanent neighbors.</p> <p>I experienced a sense of inconsistency in my responses. In the beginning I felt a kind of "hands off" policy on the part of the university would be desirable. Someone should be providing some services or resources for these people. It should ideally have a cooperative effort between the university and community. Generally, if the law is being broken the university must inform the proper authorities.</p>

Table 77. Student Personnel Administrators Responses to the Open End Question: This is a compiling of the opinions, additional comments or reactions to any particular question the respondents might have had on this study.

Item No.	Item	Comments
13	The University should take disciplinary action against off-campus students convicted for civil or criminal law violations.	Unless the nature of the offense may present a demonstrable threat to the university community. N-2*
20	Students should be allowed to live where they choose after the freshman year without parents' consent.	Depending on dependency of student for financial assistance--if completely independent, it should be student's decision. N-2
26	The University should contact parents when students are using marijuana.	Depends on age of student.
36	The University should inform parents of students off-campus co-habitation.	Would depend on age of the student--not if over 21.
47	The University should inspect for proper sanitary standards in off-campus dwellings.	Not "all", same provision should be arranged for specific instances of below standard housing being inspected (perhaps in conjunction with city inspector).
52	The University should have no regulations prohibiting co-habitation.	Regulation should be the same as that of the state.
53	The University should have no regulations prohibiting the use of alcohol.	City and state regulations should apply.

* Number of similar responses.

Table 77--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
54	The University should break up disorderly off-campus student parties.	Civil authority should break up disorderly off-campus student parties, not the university. N-2
60	The University should report the use of marijuana to proper law enforcement agency.	There is a difference between the fact (that is what I see) and rumor (that is what I hear) about use of, or violation of laws. I would report rumors if I felt it was in the best interest of the university community and the students involved. I also might warn the students of my actions.
61	The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency when it is aware of students' violation of civil law.	
62	The University should report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency.	
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	My answers are based on the assumption and belief that when a student chooses to live off-campus he also accepts the same obligations and responsibilities of any member of the community and the appropriate law enforcement agency is the civil authority for such things as narcotics, damages and safety. I feel the university like any responsible "citizen" should convey illegal observations to the civil authority. However, the choice for off-campus housing would seem to place the burden of communication on the student and parent.

Table 77--Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>I would have to answer some of these questions in terms of the specifics (facts, individuals) of the individual case. All cases should not be treated alike. After all, that's why we are working on our advanced degrees--to be competent in doing so.</p> <p>Those questions pertaining to LSD and Drugs, etc., - violations by students should be reported by the university to the police but only when it becomes apparent there are conditions which exist that threaten the community and other members of the community. A person living off-campus must be made to take full responsibility for his actions and the university must educate him toward assuming that responsibility in every way it can.</p> <p>The university should be involved with off-campus housing. Surely, all we read about the effect of non-academic culture and behavior and values is relevant to off-campus living. However, behavior can not be controlled by regulations; it can be affected by entirely new kinds of programs which we have yet to develop.</p> <p>I would be in favor of setting up the university as a <u>service</u> agent to help students and the community but not put in a final decision taking position in any one of these areas.</p>

Table 77-Continued

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>In responding to questions 1-64, I have made the assumption that the university's authority over students and student housing should be limited to those students who live on campus, those aspects of student behavior which occur when the student is in direct contact with the university campus community, and, on the other hand, that students who choose to live off-campus must learn to deal with landlords and apartment managers in a manner which would be necessary if they were not a student.</p> <p>I realize that there may be many inconsistencies in my answers. I have many "mixed emotions" about off-campus housing. I am both unclear and unsure of where the university's responsibility does lie, <u>if it</u> has any responsibility. If the university could rely on "external agencies" within the community (e.g. fire inspector, sanitation department, law enforcement agencies, etc.) I would say that the university would-should provide more services and facilities for off-campus students - although these should not be in the residence halls.</p> <p>Any student convicted under civil law should be on a probationary status with the university until his "obligation to society" has been settled.</p>

Table 77--Concluded

Item No.	Item	Comments
65	Additional comments, questions or references respondents might have to a particular question.	<p>My gosh, Pat! This is the first time I've really had to do some thinking about some of these areas. <u>Thanks!</u> (Anxious to see the results!) I would agree that the institution should be involved in matters which affect the welfare of the individual --but not to the extent that they become involved as a financial agent. If a student chooses to live off-campus they must also be willing to accept the responsibilities unique to that situation.</p>

SUMMARY

This chapter has been presented in three parts: Part One is an analysis of the data, Part Two is an analysis of the demographic information and Part Three is a presentation of the data collected in the open-ended question given to each participant in the study. To enhance the reader's interpretation of the data, the items found in Part One were grouped into four main categories: community relations, parent-university relations, student personnel services, and regulatory and law enforcement.

In order to test the hypotheses statistically they were converted into their null form. Null Hypothesis I was intended to determine the differences in perceptions of the sample groups with regard to the university's responsibility toward students' off-campus living situation. In comparing the responses of the sample groups, significant differences at or beyond the .05 level of confidence appeared on sixty-two out of sixty-five items included in the questionnaire. Null Hypothesis II was intended to determine the differences in perceptions of parents and their children (students in study) with regard to the university's responsibility toward students' off-campus living situation. In comparing the responses of the student-parent sample, differences at or beyond the .05 level of confidence appeared on fifty-seven out of the sixty-five items included in the questionnaire. A discussion of each item was presented.

Part Two of this chapter presents the demographic information collected on the parent sample. The items were listed and a discussion on each item was presented.

Part Three lists the responses received on the open-ended question given to each participant in the study.

A summary of the findings along with the conclusion and implications for further study are found in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Problem

The primary purpose of the study was to (a) compare the perceptions of parents, students, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators with respect to the university's responsibility toward the off-campus students' living situation and (b) compare the perceptions of parents and students with respect to the university's responsibility off-campus. Five sample groups were identified for the purpose of determining whether there was any relationship between membership in a group, and the perception of the university's responsibility in the off-campus students' living situation. The five sample groups were (1) faculty, (2) parents, (3) apartment owners, (4) student personnel administrators and (5) students.

The study was conducted during the fall term of 1967. At that time the instrument which was used to compare perceptions was mailed to the sample populations. Responses from the sample groups ranged from 86 per cent to 100 per cent, with a total sample return of 93 per cent.

The Design and Procedure of the Study

A 65 item questionnaire, based on the concerns, problems, and responsibilities commonly associated with off-campus housing, was

designed to obtain individual perceptions. The items were divided into four functionally defined areas: (1) community relations, (2) student personnel services, (3) parent-university relations, and (4) regulatory and law enforcement. On each item individuals were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed that the issue presented in the item was the responsibility of the university. Responses were indicated on a six point scale. The statistic chi square was used in analyzing the data and the .05 level of confidence was used to determine statistical significance. In those instances, however, where significant differences in perceptions among the comparison groups were found at the .01 level of confidence, this difference was reported also.

Findings and Conclusions

Findings of the study will be reported in the following way: First, those functionally identified areas where there was agreement among the (a) students, parents, apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators' sample and (b) student-parent sample will be discussed. Second, those functionally identified areas in which there was statistical difference among the (a) students, parents, apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators' sample and (b) the student-parent sample will be discussed. The findings will be reported under the following four headings: Community Relations, Parent-University Relations, Student Personnel Services, and Regulatory and Law Enforcement.

Areas of General Agreement

Based on the responses to the items in Table 3, it may be concluded that in a very limited way there was agreement among students, parents, apartment owners, faculty, and student personnel administrators with respect to the university's responsibility toward the students' off-campus living situation. In only two instances (Item 3, providing study lounges on campus for the off-campus student and Item 8, providing a list of students seeking roommates) did all of the sample groups agree. Both of these items came from the functionally defined area of student personnel services.

Based on the responses to the items in Table 3, it can be seen that the parent-student sample also agreed only in a limited way with respect to the university's responsibility toward the off-campus student.

The most agreement between parents and students were in those items containing student personnel services. For example, parents and students alike believed the university had a responsibility for: (1) providing a list of students seeking roommates, (2) providing bail bond for students arrested, (3) providing legal counsel for students arrested, (4) keeping a lawyer on retainer for students' use, (5) permitting off-campus students to use residence hall facilities, and (6) permitting students, after their freshman year to live where they choose. It should be noted that all sample groups were in agreement with more items relating to student personnel services than items in the other areas (ie., community relations, parent-university relations, or regulatory and law enforcement). The above discussion represents

the areas of general agreement while the following areas are those where statistical differences appeared.

Areas of Difference

Community Relations

Students, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators, with few exceptions, disagreed with parents with regard to the university's responsibilities off-campus in the area of community relations.

Parents, for example, tended to believe that the university has a responsibility for (a) acting as consultants for off-campus building and approving apartment managers, (b) requiring or providing uniform rental contracts, and (c) acting as arbitrator and an interested third party in all off-campus leasing conflicts. Students, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators did not feel that the university should be involved in these areas. It is not surprising that parents believed that the university should be involved in the rental agreements in light of the fact that many apartment owners require parents as co-signers for off-campus students' apartment contracts. Perhaps parents feel that the university will protect their interests.

The responsibility for inspection of off-campus dwellings for proper safety and sanitary conditions and the assessment of damages to off-campus units by the university was viewed by parents as the university's responsibility. Apartment owners, students, student personnel administrators and faculty, on the other hand, most often felt that the

university should not have responsibility for these areas.

Apartment owners did differ from students, faculty, parents and student personnel administrators when it came to the issue of holding students from registration and the distribution of their grades for damages and/or rental debts for off-campus apartments. Apartment owners favored a position of holding students and not distributing their grades whereas the other groups disagreed with this position. This can be seen as an expected position by the apartment owners because if the university withheld students and their grades, the apartment owner would have a lever of control over the student and it would guarantee the apartment owners collection of delinquent accounts.

All of the sample groups agreed that the university should establish some kind of council of apartment owners, university staff and city officials to arbitrate off-campus housing problems. This was one of the few areas of agreement among the sample groups in the area of community relations. Apartment owners and parents favored a position of informing the university of disorderly parties causing a public disturbance and of having the university disperse such parties. Faculty, students and student personnel administrators strongly believed that this was not the university's responsibility and the university should not be informed of and involved in dispersing disorderly parties causing a public disturbance.

It can be concluded that parents feel that the university has some responsibility to be involved in (a) the approval of off-campus apartment managers, (b) the rental agreement between apartment owner and students, (c) being informed of and dispersing disorderly parties in the community and (d) the inspection of off-campus dwellings for proper

safety and sanitary conditions. The students, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators in the study favored a position of not having the university assume responsibility in these areas.

In comparing the parent-student sample it was evident that parents and students differed greatly with regard to the amount of university involvement they felt that the university should assume in a student's off-campus living situation. Parents and students differed in the area of having the university assume responsibility for (a) the selection and hiring of managers, (b) providing or requiring rental agreements, (c) acting as third party and final arbitrator in contract disputes, (d) inspecting off-campus dwellings, (e) assessing damages, (f) withholding students from registration, and (g) dispersing disorderly parties.

For the area of community relations it can be concluded that parents hold the greatest expectations of involvement and responsibility for the university in the students' off-campus living situation. Students and faculty hold the least expectations for the university in this area. Student personnel administrators' and apartment owners' expectations fell midway between these two positions with both groups tending to be more in sympathy with the faculty-student position.

Parent-University Relations

In reviewing the results of the parent-university relations items it was immediately apparent that the sample groups differed greatly with respect to their perceptions of the university's responsibility in this area. A polarizing effect seemed to take place, with parents and

apartment owners taking one extreme and students taking the other. Faculty and student personnel administrators' responses generally fell somewhere between these two positions.

Parents and apartment owners strongly agreed that the university has the responsibility to contact parents when students are (a) using LSD and marijuana, (b) arrested and/or convicted of civil law, (c) co-habiting, and (d) withdrawing from school because of pregnancy. Students, on the other hand, strongly disagreed in all of these areas and felt that this was not the university's responsibility.

Only on one issue did parents, apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators generally agree. This was the issue of the single female student under 21 withdrawing from the university because of pregnancy. In this situation the four groups favored contacting parents when the student was withdrawing.

Faculty and student personnel administrators tended to agree with students (that parents should not be contacted) in regard to students' arrest and co-habitation. On the other hand, in the areas of a student's conviction of a civil crime and the use of narcotics, faculty and student personnel administrators tended to agree with apartment owners and parents that parents should be contacted. In neither case, however, was there a strong position taken by either group in favor of contacting or not contacting parents. Student personnel administrators and faculty took their strongest position on the item dealing with student co-habitation. Both groups firmly support a position of not contacting parents when students are known to be co-habiting.

It can generally be concluded from the responses that parents and apartment owners expect the university to contact parents with regard

to the items found in this area. Students strongly oppose this position and feel that parents should not be contacted. Faculty and student personnel administrators fall between these two positions, and agree or disagree more with regard to the individual item. Generally, it can be said that faculty tend to support the position taken by parents on these issues whereas student personnel administrators generally tend to support the students position.

Student Personnel Services

Of the 14 items in the section defined as Student Personnel Services, students, parents, faculty, student personnel administrators and apartment owners all agreed on four items, and disagreed on two items. The majority of all the sample groups agreed that the university should (a) provide lunchroom facilities on campus for the off-campus student, (b) encourage the development of a formal student government, (c) provide an advisor for this group and (d) publish a list of apartments not meeting university standards. On the other hand, the sample groups disagreed that the university has a responsibility to (a) screen and match possible roommates for vacancies, and (b) provide bail bond for students arrested. Student personnel administrators and parents were more often in favor of encouraging the development of a student government and providing an advisor than were the students, apartment owners and faculty.

Apartment owners, faculty, and student personnel administrators all agreed that the university should not be responsible for providing (a) an attorney to give legal advice to students arrested (b) legal counsel for students arrested and (c) bail bond for students arrested.

Students agreed with these groups with respect to providing bail bond and making legal counsel available to students. Parents disagreed that legal counsel and bail bond should be offered. On the other hand, both parents and students agreed with providing legal advice and feel that this should be the university's responsibility.

The majority of students, parents, apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators agreed that the university should publish a list of apartments not meeting university standards, yet none of these groups favored a position of having the university screen and match possible roommates for off-campus living. Parents, apartment owners, faculty, and student personnel administrators were in favor of having the university provide home owners insurance for the off-campus student, but not in favor of a special orientation program for incoming transfer students. Students did not see the need for a special orientation program or insurance for the off-campus student. Parents were the only group in favor of having the university provide student lockers on campus for the off-campus student. They also were the only group which favored having university physicians available to visit a student's off-campus living quarters. Students and parents agreed that the off-campus student should have access to on campus residence hall facilities. Apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators disagreed on this issue.

Student personnel administrators indicated strong disagreement with respect to (a) allowing the off-campus student the use of residence hall facilities and (b) having the university physician make visits to the off-campus residences. The majority of students, parents, apartment owners and student personnel administrators were generally in

favor of a formal or informal course in apartment living. Faculty were divided on this item with a majority of them disagreeing that such a course was needed.

In reviewing the items found in the functionally defined area of student personnel services, two trends immediately came to the attention of the author. First, the greatest number of no opinion responses were registered in this area. Second, the sample groups were more divided with respect to selecting one particular response or position of agree, disagree, or no opinion. Except for a few items, the percentage of a particular sample group selecting a position of agree or disagree was smaller for this area than the other three areas included in this study.

In comparing the responses of parents and students, the majority of both groups chose the same response on nine out of the fourteen items. They chose different responses on five items. The majority of parents were in favor of providing (a) a special orientation program for the off-campus transfer student, (b) storage lockers on campus for the off-campus student, and (c) a university physician for home visitation. Students did not agree with their parents with respect to these items. Students did favor having the university provide (a) home owner's insurance to cover fire, theft and damage to the personal belongings of the off-campus student, and (b) legal counsel for the off-campus student. The majority of parents disagreed with students with respect to these items.

Except for the above differences, parents and students generally were in agreement with regard to the university's responsibility for providing the student personnel services included in this section.

In reviewing this area it can be concluded that parents and

students generally indicated the greatest concern for having the university accept the responsibility for providing the student personnel services discussed in this section. On the other hand, faculty showed the least concern for these services. The position of student personnel administrators and apartment owners in this section fell between the positions of parents, students, and faculty. Except for some isolated items, generally the samples did not take as firm a stand on the items found in this area as they did in the parent-university relations, community relations, and regulatory and law enforcement areas.

Regulatory and Law Enforcement

In reviewing the results of the regulatory and law enforcement items, it was immediately apparent that the sample groups differed greatly with respect to their perceptions of the university's responsibility in this area. Although the groups differed with respect to their responses in this area they generally agreed on five out of the twenty-one items.

Students, parents, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators were inclined to disagree with the idea of the university having no housing regulations for students. They also disagreed with the idea of allowing students, after their freshman year, to live off-campus in housing of their choice without parents' consent. On the other hand, the majority of these sample groups indicated that after their freshman year, students should be allowed to live in off-campus housing of their choice with parents' consent. It would appear from these results that all of the sample groups favor having housing regulations for freshman students and allow students, after their freshman

year, to make their own housing choice with their parents approval.

The majority of all of the sample groups disagreed with forbidding members of the opposite sex to enter students' living quarters off-campus. At the same time they all favored having the apartment owners notify the proper law enforcement agency when student parties are causing a public disturbance.

Students tended to disagree with parents, apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators on six out of the twenty-one items found in this area. Parents, apartment owners, faculty and student personnel administrators indicated that the university should (a) contact the proper law enforcement agency when the university is aware of violations of civil law, (b) contact the proper law enforcement agency in cases where residences are known places of narcotics use, (c) report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency, (d) report the use of marijuana to the proper law enforcement agency, and (e) inform students of the state laws with respect to the use of LSD and marijuana. On the other hand, fifty per cent or more of all of the students who responded disagreed with respect to the above items. Faculty members showed an appreciable amount of disagreement on the items pertaining to reporting the use of marijuana and informing students of the state laws with respect to the use of LSD and marijuana. It should be noted that between thirty and forty per cent of all of the students responding indicated agreement with the items.

It appears from these results that there is a sizeable percentage of students who disagree with parents, faculty, apartment owners, and student personnel administrators with respect to the violation of civil

law and the use of marijuana and LSD, but by no means did an overwhelming majority of students disagree.

Apartment owners and parents were inclined to agree that students should be disciplined for co-habitation or for renting apartments for party purposes only. Students, faculty, and student personnel administrators did not seem to be too concerned about these two issues. Students and faculty were more often in disagreement about disciplining students for co-habitation and not letting students rent apartments for party purposes than were the student personnel administrators.

Parents tended to disagree with students, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators on four issues. Parents were inclined to indicate that the university should (a) place apartments "off limits" when not meeting university standards, (b) take disciplinary action against students off-campus, arrested and convicted, (c) have authority to require students to move out of off-campus apartments, and (d) have some regulations which prohibit the use of alcohol in off-campus student housing. Although apartment owners disagreed with parents on all of these issues, they were fairly divided with regard to their responses. A sizeable percentage of apartment owners sided with parents on most of these issues. It should be noted also that a large percentage of faculty and student personnel administrators sided with parents with respect to the university placing "off limits" those apartments that have not met established university standards.

Parents and students tended to disagree with respect to the university having regulations prohibiting co-habitation off-campus, placing homes "off limits" for discrimination and giving the university the

right to place off-campus dwellings "off limits" to students. Parents were more often in favor of having regulations prohibiting co-habitation and giving the university the right to place some units "off limits" to students. Students, on the other hand, felt the university should have no regulations against co-habitation and should not have the right to place dwellings "off limits". Apartment owners, faculty, and student personnel administrators were quite divided on these issues. Apartment owners tended to be more concerned with respect to placing units "off limits" for cases of discrimination than were parents, student personnel administrators or faculty. Faculty and student personnel administrators tended to be more equally divided (agreement or disagreement) with respect to giving the university the right to place units "off limits" and having units placed "off limits" for discrimination. Apartment owners and student personnel administrators more often supported the parents' position regarding regulations which prohibit co-habitation. Faculty most often tended to support the students by agreeing that there should be no regulations which prohibit co-habitation.

In comparing the responses of students and parents, the majority of both groups agreed on only four items. Parents and students felt that the university should have some housing regulations and were generally against allowing students, after their freshman year, the option of moving into housing of their choice without parents' consent. At the same time both groups were in favor of allowing students, after their freshman year, to move into housing of their choice, if they had parents' consent. Both groups felt that the responsibility for notifying the local law enforcement agency in cases where parties were causing a public disturbance should be entrusted to the apartment owners.

The three areas where the greatest amount of disagreement was evident between parents and students was (a) the placing of apartment units "off limits," (b) the co-habitation by off-campus students, and (c) allowing students off-campus to rent apartments for party purposes only. Parents strongly agreed that the university should have the right to place units "off limits" for not meeting established university standards. Students, however, felt that this was not the university's responsibility. Parents felt strongly that the university should have regulations which prohibit co-habitation and that students co-habiting should be disciplined. Students felt that the university should not be concerned and that it has no responsibility with regard to the co-habitation issue. Students firmly believe that the university should allow students to rent apartments for party purposes only. Their parents, however, firmly disagreed on this matter. In summary, parents and students tended to disagree on the majority of the items found in this section.

It can generally be concluded from the responses to the questions found in the regulatory and law enforcement area that the same polarization seemed to take place as was true in the parent-university relations area.

Parents and apartment owners were at one extreme maintaining the greatest expectations of involvement and responsibility for the university in the regulatory and law enforcement area. Students, on the other hand, were at the other extreme with the least expectations for the university in this area. The position of student personnel administrators and faculty on this section fell between the positions of parents and students. The faculty's position tended more in the

direction of the stand that students held, whereas the student personnel administrators' position tended more toward the stand of the apartment owners and parents. Over all, student personnel administrators and faculty tended to support the position of apartment owners and parents more often than they tended to support the position of the students.

Implications for Further Study

This study concerned itself with students, parents, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators at Michigan State University. Perceptions of these selected groups with respect to the University's responsibility off-campus at other institutions would be helpful. Differences based on (a) the educational philosophy of the school, (b) the comparison of the student body, (c) the geographical location of the institution, (d) whether it is a public or private institution, and (e) the size of the school might be very apparent.

A study utilizing in-depth interviews with these selected groups to gain further insight into the causes for difference in their perceptions would be helpful in the further understanding of the opinions these groups have regarding University policy formulation for the off-campus student.

It would be helpful if an institution using the same sample groups would carry on a longitudinal study over a period of years and compare the results to see if any changes in perceptions take place.

A broader study might be conducted utilizing the total student community (i.e., students living in Residence Halls, Fraternities, Cooperatives, and Supervised Off-Campus Housing). It might also be

helpful to isolate the student sample by class standing as well as place of residence. Using the same instrument, a study might be conducted where student and parent populations were selected by their socio-economic position and geographic location in the state.

All of the above deviations from this present study would be most helpful in furthering the institution's understanding of what expectations parents, students, faculty, apartment owners and student personnel administrators have for the University with respect to regulating the off-campus student's living situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "A Handbook For Students," Michigan State University, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs in cooperation with Associated Students of Michigan State University. 1968.
2. American Council on Education. Housing of Students. Vol. 14, No. 14, Series 6. Washington D. C.: American Council on Education, July 1950.
3. Association of College and University Housing Officers. 1965 Report on Noninstitution-Owned Housing. Report of the Off-Campus Housing Committee on Student Housing. Ferris State College, Michigan: Association of College and University Housing Officers. 1965.
4. Bakken, Clarence J. "The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work" No. 2 in the Student Personnel Series. American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D. C. 1961.
5. Blackwell, Thomas E. College Law - A Guide for Administrators. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education. 1961.
6. Brewer, Anita. "Court Orders Students to Live in Dormitory." The Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. II, No. 3 p.1, 1967.
7. Brookover, W. B. "Research in Teacher and Administrator Roles." Journal of Educational Sociology. 29:2-13, 1955.
8. Butts, R. Freeman. A History of American Education. New York: Henry Holt, 1953.
9. Castleberry v. Tyler Commercial College, 217 S. W. 1112. 1920.
10. Citizens Committee on Higher Education. Remember the "War Babies?" Report of the Michigan Coordinating Council for Public Higher Education. Michigan Citizens Committee on Higher Education. 1963.
11. Cowley, H. W. "The History of Student Residential Housing." School and Society. Vol. 40, No. 1040: 705-712, 758-64, 1934.

12. Crookston, Burns B. "A Study of Attitudes Concerning University Relationships with Students." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs. Vol. 5, No. 2: 134-139, Oct. 1967.
13. Division of Student Activities, Vice President for Student Affairs Office. Off Campus Housing Report on Student Housing for Fall Term 1966. Report of the Off Campus Housing Office. Michigan State University: Division of Student Activities. Vice President for Student Affairs Office. 1966.
14. Downie, M. N. and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
15. Dua, Prem S. "A Survey of Attitudes Toward Student Visitation to Off-Campus Private Quarters." National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors Journal. Vol. 30. No. 1: 17-20. 1966.
16. Everest v. McKenny, 195 Michigan, 649, 1917.
17. Gott v. Berea College 156, Kentucky 376, 161 S. W. 204, 1913.
18. Gross, Neal C., Ward S. Mason and A. W. McEachern. Explanations in Role Analysis. New York: Wiley, 1958.
19. Hoyt v. Trustees, 96 California 442, 1943.
20. Joint Commission on Housing Standards. "Student Housing Standards-Recommended Minimum Health and Safety Standards for Noninstitutionally Owned Student Housing." Student Medicine. Vol. 10, No. 3: 363-393, 1962.
21. Kerlinger, Fred. Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
22. Leonard, Andrews Eugenie. Origins of Personnel Services in American Higher Education, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1956.
23. McClellan, Stephen D., "An Analysis of How the Role of Law Has Affected Specific Relationships Between Public Universities and Their Students." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1967.
24. McCullough, Mabelle G. "Safety in Off Campus Housing for Students." Proceedings of the Twelfth National Conference on Campus Safety. Mount Pleasant, Michigan, 1965. Safety Monographs for Colleges and Universities. No. 20: 86-89, 1965.
25. Mueller, Hevner Kate, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

26. National Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs. Institutional Policies on Controversial Topics. Report of the N.A.S.P.A., Division of Research and Publications. Monograph No. 1 January 1968. N.A.S.P.A. 1968.
27. Neal, Ruth. "Counseling The Off-Campus Woman Student." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 36:342-3, 1958.
28. Neal, Ruth. "Women Off-Campus." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 40: 31-5, September, 1961.
29. Newcomb, T. M. Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press, 1950.
30. Nieman, L. J. and Hughes, J. W. "Problems of the Concept of Role -- a Resurvey of the Literature." Social Forces. 30:141-49, 1951.
31. Nonnamaker, Eldon Roy. The Role of the Enrollment Offices at Michigan State University. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1959.
32. Office of the President, University of Michigan. Student Housing, Report of the President's Commission on Off-Campus Housing. The University of Michigan, November 1965: Office of the President, University of Michigan, 1965.
33. Opp, B. Carl. "Colleges Look to Outer Space." College and University Business. 29:23-27, 1960.
34. Pafford, B. C. "Student Housing Survey." The Journal of the American College Health Association. 14:182-185, February, 1966.
35. Prusak, E. Ralph. "The Off-Campus Student." Journal of College Student Personnel. 2:2-9, 1960.
36. "Room-mates" Esquire September 1967, p. 94-98.
37. Sarbin, T. R. "Role Theory." Handbook of Social Psychology. Volume I. G. Lindzey, editor. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1954. pp. 223-258.
38. Scott, Anne F. "A Perspective On Student Activism." Duke Alumni Register, Vol. 53, No. 5 August 1967.
39. Shaffer, H. Robert and William D. Martinson. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education Inc., 1966.
40. Sindler, Allan P. "Sindler Commission Report," Cornell Daily Sun, October 4, 1967 p. 7-8.

41. Sprunger, Ben and Patrick Byrnes Smith. "A Study of Off-Campus Housing Practices at Ten Randomly Selected State Universities" Orient. Vol. 3, No. 2: 1968.
42. Titus, Chester R. Legal Relationships Involved in Off Campus Housing. Report to the Off Campus Housing Committee Association of College and University Housing Officers. 1960.
Association of College and University Housing Officers. 1960.
43. Tombaugh, Richard, and Patrick Byrnes Smith. "A Survey of Off-Campus Housing Practices in the Western Conference (Big Ten) Institutions." Orient. Vol. 3, No. 2: 1968.
44. Turabian, Kate L. Students Guide for Writing College Papers. "Phoenix Books"; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
45. "Unstructured Relations," Newsweek, September 1967, p. 78.
46. Walters, Mary. History of Mary Baldwin College. Va. McClure Co. 1942.
47. Westfall, James N. "Off-Campus Housing." The Journal of the American College Health Association, 14:118-121, December 1965.
48. Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

APPENDIX

November 1, 1967

Dear

As off-campus housing advisor and a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University, I am conducting a study of perceptions of the University's responsibility for students living off campus. Having worked in the off-campus housing area for four years, and after discussing with students their various problems and the role the University should play in these problems, I believe that such a study would be of great value to both the student and the University. This study will involve perceptions of parents, students, faculty members, apartment owners, and student personnel administrators.

In order that the study may be of most assistance to students and the University the data should be collected during the fall term. A tentative deadline has been established for November 22. Your prompt attention to this project, and the return of the questionnaire will be appreciated. Please return your response to this office in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Patrick B. Smith
Assistant Director
Student Activities Division
Off-Campus Housing Office

November 22, 1967

Dear

Recently I mailed a questionnaire to a random sample of students, parents, apartment owners, and faculty regarding the opinions of these groups as to the responsibility of the University towards the student's off-campus living situation. Since I have not received your response I am enclosing a duplicate questionnaire for you to fill out and forward to me.

The date for compiling the results has been extended to December 4, 1967, therefore it would be helpful if you would return the enclosed questionnaire by that date. In order for this research to be of benefit to the student and to the University your response is needed and very important to the success of this research project.

The time and effort you take in filling out and returning the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. If you have already filled out and returned the questionnaire please disregard this letter.

Sincerely,

Patrick B. Smith
Assistant Director
Student Activities Division
Off-Campus Housing Office

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

PARENT'S EDUCATION: Level attained

FATHER: Elementary, 1-8 years_____	College, 2 years_____
High School, 4 years_____	College, 4 years_____
Did not finish High School_____	Graduate Degree_____
MOTHER: Elementary, 1-8 years_____	College, 2 years_____
High School, 4 years_____	College, 4 years_____
Did not finish High School_____	Graduate Degree_____

QUESTIONNAIRE FILLED OUT BY: Father_____ Mother_____ Both_____ Guardian_____

POPULATION OF HOME TOWN: 0-1,000_____	10,000-25,000_____
1,000-5,000_____	25,000-75,000_____
5,000-10,000_____	75,000-300,000_____
	Over 300,000_____

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME: \$3,000-\$5,000_____	\$10,000-\$15,000_____
(per year) \$5,000-\$10,000_____	\$15,000-\$20,000_____
	Over \$20,000_____

SIZE OF FAMILY:_____ Number of children in College_____

(Members)

HOW MUCH MONEY DO YOU, AS PARENTS, CONTRIBUTE TO EACH CHILD IN COLLEGE?

\$0-\$500_____ \$500-\$1,000_____ \$1,000-\$1,500_____ Over \$1,500_____

FATHER'S OCCUPATION: _____

MOTHER'S OCCUPATION: _____

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Division of Student Activities
Office of Student Affairs

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD THE
STUDENT'S OFF-CAMPUS LIVING SITUATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gain your opinion with respect to the University's responsibility toward the student's off-campus living situation. The results of this questionnaire will be confidential and used for research purposes only. At no time will your name ever appear in relation to this study.

For purposes of this questionnaire, University responsibility is defined as "the responsibility entrusted to the judgment of the University for developing and supervising student programs and for regulating the students' behavior." Off-Campus housing is defined as "those dwellings, primarily apartments that are not part of Michigan State University's organized housing program. These dwellings are unsupervised and unapproved by the university." Selected areas related to the off-campus living situation have been chosen and are listed as numbered statements 1 through 65. In answering the questionnaire you should determine the extent to which you think the area in question should be entrusted to the university as its responsibility. An open-ended question will be provided at the end of the questionnaire for additional comments or to help you qualify any particular response you may have. Please number appropriately any question on which you wish to comment. PLEASE DO NOT SIGN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

In answering the questionnaire only one response should be selected and circled from the following scale:

Strongly agree
(SA)

Agree
(A)

Disagree
(D)

Strongly disagree
(SD)

No opinion or comments
(N)

- SA A D SD N 1) Physicians from the University health center should make home calls to student residences off campus.
- SA A D SD N 2) University personnel should assess and arbitrate damage costs in off-campus housing charged to students by apartment owners to determine fairness of charges.

- SA A D SD N 3) In addition to the off-campus student apartment study facilities, study lounges on campus should be provided for the off-campus student.
- SA A D SD N 4) The University should provide uniform rental agreements for all off-campus housing.
- SA A D SD N 5) The University should not issue grades to students who have off-campus housing debts.
- SA A D SD N 6) The University should contact parents when students are known to be using LSD.
- SA A D SD N 7) The University should have a home owner's insurance policy covering fire, theft, damage to personal belongings, for off-campus students.
- SA A D SD N 8) The University should provide a list of students seeking roommates.
- SA A D SD N 9) The University should provide a special orientation program for off-campus transfer students.
- SA A D SD N 10) The University should provide an advisor from the student personnel staff to advise off-campus student government.
- SA A D SD N 11) The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency in cases where residences are known places of narcotics use.
- SA A D SD N 12) The University should provide bail bond for students arrested.
- SA A D SD N 13) The University should take disciplinary action against an off-campus student when the student is arrested and convicted for a violation of a civil or criminal law.
- SA A D SD N 14) The cost of printing the off-campus rental contracts should be the responsibility of the University rather than the apartment owner.
- SA A D SD N 15) University personnel should assess and arbitrate repairs charged to apartment owners by students to determine fairness of charges.
- SA A D SD N 16) The University should have the right to place some off-campus dwellings "off-limits" to students.
- SA A D SD N 17) Apartment owners should notify the University when off-campus student parties are causing a public disturbance.

- SA A D SD N 18) The University should not permit a student to register for a subsequent term until damage claims and/or rental debts submitted by apartment owners are paid.
- SA A D SD N 19) Off-campus apartment plans should be approved by the University architect before being built.
- SA A D SD N 20) Any student, after the freshman year, should be allowed to live off-campus in housing of his choice without his parents' consent.
- SA A D SD N 21) The University should discipline off-campus students for co-habitation (i.e., single members of the opposite sex living together).
- SA A D SD N 22) The University has the responsibility to involve students, apartment owners, and parents in the formulation of off-campus housing policies.
- SA A D SD N 23) The University should establish a council of students, apartment owners, university staff, and city officials to arbitrate off-campus housing problems.
- SA A D SD N 24) University personnel should inspect off-campus dwellings and enforce state and city housing codes.
- SA A D SD N 25) The University should have no regulations concerning the students' off-campus housing situations.
- SA A D SD N 26) The University should contact parents when students are known to be using marijuana.
- SA A D SD N 27) The University should publish a list of apartments not meeting established University standards.
- SA A D SD N 28) The University should notify parents of off-campus students under 21 when they are convicted of a violation of civil law by the civil authorities.
- SA A D SD N 29) The University should require uniform rental contracts for all off-campus housing.
- SA A D SD N 30) When a single female under 21 years of age, living off-campus, is pregnant and withdrawing from the University, the University should notify the student's parents.
- SA A D SD N 31) The University has the responsibility to inform students of state laws when the University has reason to believe that marijuana is being used off-campus.

- SA A D SD N 32) The University should notify parents of off-campus students when they are arrested.
- SA A D SD N 33) Storage lockers on campus should be provided by the University for the off-campus student.
- SA A D SD N 34) When students are prosecuted for civil offenses, the University should provide legal counsel for the student.
- SA A D SD N 35) The University should not be involved in any way in off-campus housing rental contracts between students and apartment owners.
- SA A D SD N 36) The University should inform parents of off-campus students co-habiting.
- SA A D SD N 37) Any student, after the freshman year, should be allowed to live off-campus in housing of his choice with his parents' consent.
- SA A D SD N 38) Apartment owners should notify the local law enforcement agency when off-campus student parties are causing a public disturbance.
- SA A D SD N 39) The University should encourage the development of a formal student governing council for off-campus students.
- SA A D SD N 40) The University has the responsibility to inform students of state laws when the University has reason to believe that LSD is being used off-campus.
- SA A D SD N 41) The University should have the authority to require students to move out of off-campus apartments.
- SA A D SD N 42) The University, rather than the apartment owner, should hire and pay resident managers in off-campus student apartments.
- SA A D SD N 43) University personnel should be involved as consultants in the planning of off-campus apartment buildings.
- SA A D SD N 44) The University should have no housing regulations for students (first year residence hall requirement, off-campus approved supervised housing).
- SA A D SD N 45) The University should offer a formal and/or informal course in apartment living, money management, food purchasing, etc.

- SA A D SD N 46) A lawyer should be kept on retainer by the University to give off-campus students legal advice.
- SA A D SD N 47) University personnel should inspect and approve all off-campus student housing for proper sanitation standards.
- SA A D SD N 48) University personnel should be a third party and final arbitrator in all rental contracts used by students in off-campus housing.
- SA A D SD N 49) Lunchroom facilities should be provided on campus for off-campus students carrying their lunches.
- SA A D SD N 50) University personnel should inspect and approve all off-campus student housing for proper safety standards.
- SA A D SD N 51) University personnel should screen and approve managers living in residence in all off-campus student housing.
- SA A D SD N 52) The University should have no regulations which prohibit co-habitation by off-campus students.
- SA A D SD N 53) The University should have no regulations which prohibit the use of alcohol in off-campus student housing.
- SA A D SD N 54) The University should break up off-campus student parties when they become disorderly.
- SA A D SD N 55) The University should not allow students to rent an apartment for party purposes only.
- SA A D SD N 56) The University should declare "off-limits" homes or apartments which discriminate for reasons of race, creed, or color.
- SA A D SD N 57) The University should not hold in escrow damage deposits and the last month's rent of off-campus students living in apartments.
- SA A D SD N 58) Apartments not meeting established University standards should be placed "off-limits."
- SA A D SD N 59) The University should screen and match possible roommates for vacancies in off-campus apartments.
- SA A D SD N 60) The University should report the use of marijuana by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency.

- SA A D SD N 61) The University should contact the proper law enforcement agency when it is aware of violations of civil law.
- SA A D SD N 62) The University should report the use of LSD by off-campus students to the proper law enforcement agency.
- SA A D SD N 63) The University should not allow members of the opposite sex in students' living quarters off-campus.
- SA A D SD N 64) Off-campus students should be permitted to use residence hall facilities (e.g., laundry, study, recreation).
- 65) If you have any additional comments, questions, or references to a particular question, please feel free to discuss them below.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293105501203