

70-9641

**STARNER, Glenn Leslie, 1923-
A STUDY OF SINGLE STUDENTS LIVING IN
UNIVERSITY OWNED, ON CAMPUS APART-
MENTS AT CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY.**

**Michigan State University, Ed.D., 1969
Education, administration**

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF SINGLE STUDENTS LIVING IN
UNIVERSITY OWNED, ON CAMPUS APARTMENTS
AT CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

By

Glenn L. ^{Leslie} Starnner

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

College of Education

1969

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF SINGLE STUDENTS LIVING IN UNIVERSITY OWNED, ON CAMPUS APARTMENTS AT CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

By

Glenn L. Starner

The advantages or disadvantages of single (unmarried) students living in self-contained, University owned, on campus apartments were assessed in this study. The evaluation included the perceptions and observations of single students who experienced both apartment and residence hall living situations in the areas of their social, academic, and financial satisfactions. It further assessed the degree of academic success of these students by comparing their academic achievement with that of a control group who lived only in the residence halls. Finally, a comparison of the cost to the students and to the University of the apartment type living situation compared with a regular residence hall program was secured.

The principal source of information for the study was the perceptions and opinions of a sample of 140 senior students at Central Michigan University who lived during the 1967-68 school year in Preston Apartments at that institution. This information was secured by questionnaire. Further data was secured through interviews with

a sample of senior students who lived in a residence hall rather than in the apartment situation, by a comparison of the academic records of the two samples of students, and through interviews with University administrative officials.

The principal instrument was constructed containing thirty-five questions. Sources of item content were personal experience, literature in the field, and recommendations of student personnel workers. The questionnaire was mailed to the students in the Preston Apartment sample and an 83% return was realized.

A random sample of 161 senior students who lived in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year was selected to be compared with the Preston Apartment sample in the area of academic achievement. A comparison was made of the changes which occurred in the cumulative grade point averages of the students in the two samples.

Interviews were held with twenty-two students selected randomly from the residence hall sample. The interviews focused on five, pre-selected questions designed to secure the opinions of this sample concerning the on campus apartment living situation.

Interviews were held with members of the administrative staff at Central Michigan University to discover the cost to the University of single students living in

on campus apartments compared with a regular residence hall situation and other related administrative factors.

Findings

1. Single students living in University owned, on campus apartments at Central Michigan University reported a substantial savings over what they would have had to pay for room and board in a residence hall.
2. Administrative officials reported that, at this time, it is less expensive for Central Michigan University to construct, equip, and operate apartment type living facilities for single students than regular residence halls.
3. Administrative officials indicated no unusual problems of a disciplinary or social nature resulted from single students living in Preston Apartments.
4. Single students living in Preston Apartments reported many valuable maturing and educational experiences.
5. Single students living in Preston Apartments reported this living situation provided better study conditions and a better atmosphere for intellectual achievement than the residence halls.

6. No appreciable difference was discovered in the changes in cumulative grade point averages of the students in the Preston Apartment and the residence hall samples.
7. Enthusiastic endorsement of the opportunity to live in Preston Apartments was made by the sample of single students who lived there.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the cooperation of the students and staff members at Central Michigan University whose willing and wholehearted assistance made this study possible.

During the preparation of the dissertation, the guidance and encouragement of the writer's major advisor, Dr. Walter F. Johnson, was most helpful. In addition, members of the writer's Guidance Committee, Dr. Van Johnson, Dr. William Mann, and Dr. Edgar Schuler offered suggestions and assistance.

Finally, grateful appreciation is expressed to Kay who was willing to make many sacrifices to share in her husband's undertaking, thank you so very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
LIST OF TABLES.	v
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction.	1
Statement of the Problem.	1
Background of the Study	2
Need for the Study.	4
Scope and Limitations of the Study	5
Overview	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	8
Introduction.	8
The Early History of College Student Housing in the United States	8
The Decline of the Student Housing Movement, 1850-1890	11
Resurgence of Student Housing in the Twentieth Century	13
Changes in Student Housing During the Past Twenty Years	15
Trends in College Student Housing.	19
Summary	25
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	26
Introduction.	26
Samples	26
Instrumentation.	29
Collection of Data.	31
Analysis of the Data	33
Summary	34

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	36
Introduction	36
The Questionnaire	36
Demographic Data.	37
Social Aspects of Preston Apartmnts .	43
Academic Aspects of Preston	
Apartments.	53
Financial Aspects of Preston	
Apartments.	57
Comments of Preston Apartment	
Respondents	67
Interviews with the Residence Hall	
Sample	72
Academic Achievement of the Samples . .	80
Interviews with Administrative Officers .	85
Summary.	91
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	92
Introduction	92
Purpose of the Study	92
Methodology	93
Findings	93
The Questionnaire	93
Interviews with Students from the	
Residence Hall Sample	100
Academic Achievement of the Preston	
Apartment Sample Compared with the	
Residence Hall Sample	103
Interviews with Administrative	
Officers	104
Conclusions	106
Recommendations	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY	111
APPENDICES	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The age of the Preston Apartment respondents, September, 1967	37
2. The amount of residence hall experience reported by the respondents	38
3. The reasons given by the respondents for moving into Preston Apartments	40
4. The place of residence of the respondents during the 1968-69 school year	41
5. The reasons given by the respondents who returned to Preston Apartments for a second year.	42
6. The <u>overall</u> rating of living in Preston Apartments compared with living in a residence hall.	43
7. The opinions of the respondents as to where they felt more a part of the total University community	45
8. The organized activities participated in by the Preston Apartment respondents during the 1967-68 school year	47
9. The most important aspects of living in Preston Apartments as viewed by the respondents	50
10. The year in college the respondents recommended single students first be permitted to live in Preston Apartments	51
11. The respondents' recommendations concerning freshman students living in a residence hall.	52
12. Five living situations ranked by the respondents according to which they felt offered the <u>best</u> atmosphere for studying.	54

Table		Page
13.	Where the respondents indicated they did most of their studying during the 1967-68 school year	55
14.	Sources of financial aid reported by the respondents for the 1967-68 school year . .	58
15.	The amount of financial support contributed to the respondents by their families during the 1967-68 school year	58
16.	The estimated weekly earning of the respondents during the 1967-68 school year. .	59
17.	The estimated number of hours each week the respondents indicated they worked at a part-time job during the 1967-68 school year . .	60
18.	The average number of meals the respondents estimated they ate outside of their apartments each week during the 1967-68 school year.	61
19.	The amount of money the respondents estimated they spent on groceries each week during the 1967-68 school year	63
20.	The respondents' estimate of how much more or less it cost them to live in Preston Apartments for one semester than it did in a residence hall.	66
21.	Comments concerning Preston Apartments of a favorable nature, made by the respondents.	69
22.	The reasons given by 22 students from the interview sample for living in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year . . .	73
23.	Place of residence for the 1968-69 school year as indicated by the 22 students interviewed	75
24.	The changes in cumulative grade point averages experienced by two samples of junior students at Central Michigan University, 1967-68.	82
25.	The percentage of students in each sample whose cumulative grade point averages changed during the 1967-68 school year	83

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Letter to Students.	114
B. Preston Apartment Questionnaire	116
C. Questions Asked of the Residence Hall Sample.	125
D. Questions Asked of the Administrative Officials.	127

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Central Michigan University is a rapidly growing state university in Mt. Pleasant, Michigan. With a student population that is increasing at the rate of nearly 1,000 students each year, this University has been involved for some time in a number of building programs in the various phases of its operation. One of the most critical areas, now and in the future, is that of building student housing. It is hoped this study of one phase of the student housing program will have implications worthy of consideration as long range student housing planning continues.

Statement of the Problem

The problem to be explored in this study is to discover if an experimental student housing program, begun at Central Michigan University in September, 1967, is meeting the needs of the students involved in the program.

The purpose of the study is to evaluate some of the advantages and disadvantages of single (unmarried) students living in self-contained, University owned, on

campus apartments. This evaluation will include the perceptions and observations of single students who experienced both apartment and residence hall living situations in the areas of their social, academic, and financial satisfactions. It will further assess the degree of academic success of these students during the year they lived in the apartments by comparing their academic achievement with that of a control group who lived in the residence halls. Finally, an analysis of the cost to the students and to the University of this type of living situation compared with a regular residence hall program will be made.

It should be pointed out that the outcomes of this study will not fully determine whether or not the living experience was good or bad, but rather will provide supportive evidence as to the advisability of continuing with, or expanding, this type of student housing program in the future at Central Michigan University.

Background of the Study

The student population at Central Michigan University is expected to increase from approximately 10,000 students in 1967-68 to a maximum of 20,000 students in 1978. If the same percentage (51%) of students live on the campus then as now, this means the University's housing facilities will have to be increased from a normal occupancy of 5,100 students in 1967-68 to a normal

occupancy of close to 9,900 students in 1978. A new high rise residence hall complex is now under construction and will hopefully be ready for occupancy in the near future. This building will accommodate 1,500 students, but is only one step toward meeting future student housing needs.

At the present time there is a shortage of satisfactory, relatively inexpensive, off campus student housing facilities in the city of Mt. Pleasant. It is believed that because of the size and nature of the community it will be unlikely that more than 49 per cent of the students will be living off the campus in the future. This is approximately the percentage of students doing so now.

In September, 1967, Central Michigan University permitted 280 single students (men and women) to occupy Preston Apartments. These apartments were designed for, and formerly used as, married student housing. This was one means of meeting a temporary single student housing shortage and was to continue only until the new residence hall complex would be ready for occupancy in the fall of 1969. It was an entirely new concept in student housing facilities at Central Michigan University. The apartments had private entrances. Students were required to do their own budgeting, shopping, meal planning, cooking,

and cleaning. In effect, they were more or less "on their own" as far as living conditions were concerned.

Need for the Study

Long range planning is the way to a successful future in the area of college housing as in all other aspects of the college enterprise. Successful planning requires a constantly expanding range of information as a basis for making sound decisions which may affect the lives of students forty or more years in the future. Thirty-five or forty year building loans are not uncommon in the field of college student housing financing and many facilities have been found to be in use long after that time has elapsed. The oldest residence hall in use at the present time at Central Michigan University was constructed in 1922 and has been in use continuously for over forty-six years.

One purpose of this study is to add to the range of information available to those involved in future planning at Central Michigan University. If the apartment type living situation proves to be successful this study could have important implications for future student housing plans at that institution.

Riker (11: 9) and others have stated that flexibility and adaptability will be the keynote of tomorrow's college housing. Perhaps Central Michigan University will want to give consideration to the possibility of building

apartment type living quarters for students in the future instead of constructing more of the traditional residence halls. Perhaps some of the present residence halls should be remodeled to include apartment type facilities. Apartment units could be used by single students, married students, undergraduate students, graduate students, or by faculty members as the need changes.

Considerable interest in this study has been expressed on the part of the Housing Office and the Division of Student Personnel Services at Central Michigan University. Their complete cooperation and support in the investigation has been assured.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study will be limited to the perceptions and opinions of 140 students, almost equally divided between men and women, who spent their junior year in college living in Preston Apartments; to the opinions of a random sample of students, men and women, who elected to spend their junior year living in a traditional residence hall situation; to a comparison of the academic achievement of these two groups of students; and to opinions and facts secured from college administrators who are acquainted with the financial and social aspects of the Central Michigan University residence hall program.

All of the students involved in this study were classified as having junior status, were in good academic

standing, and were free from any form of probation at the beginning of the 1967-68 school year. The majority of these students are currently enrolled at Central Michigan University and are available for study at this time. Their academic records are available for analysis.

Because this investigation concerns only students attending Central Michigan University and their experiences in a student housing situation on that campus, any conclusions drawn from the study must be limited to the population of Central Michigan University. The investigator believes, however, the implications contained in the results could very well be of interest on other campuses.

Further limitations which are inherent in research are the instruments used in the study. Instruments used to obtain demographic data and to measure opinions and perceptions must be considered accordingly. It is quite obvious that conclusions or implications drawn from this study must be considered in that frame of reference.

Overview

The procedures used in collecting and analyzing the data are presented in the following chapters. Chapter II contains a review of the literature pertinent to the study. A detailed description of the samples and procedures used in the study will be found in Chapter III.

Chapter IV is a presentation and interpretation of the data. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations are found in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

To understand college student housing programs and current trends in the field of college student housing it is helpful to be aware of the history and philosophy of the residential housing movement in American higher education. In this chapter will be found a brief history of college student housing in the United States and a discussion of current innovations and trends in the field of college student housing.

The Early History of College Student Housing in the United States

In colonial America, English educational thought influenced the planning of the colonists who founded the first colleges. This is understandable when one realizes that most of the colonial college founders had been educated in England and wanted to establish a somewhat similar system in America. Cowley points out that with the exception of James Blair, founder of William and Mary College, who was a graduate of Edinburgh, the founders of all of the colonial colleges were either Oxford or Cambridge graduates or had been educated in England or in early

American colleges established by graduates of English colleges (3: 708). The colonists attempted in most respects to reproduce on this continent the colleges they had known back home.

Most of the early American colleges were located in what today would be considered rural settings rather than in cities. As a result, the fledgling colleges were faced with an immediate problem of where to house their students. The neighborhoods close to the new colleges could not accommodate the number of students who wished to enroll and, therefore, the colleges almost immediately began to build dormitories as a service and a convenience for students.

The founders of the colonial colleges were usually deeply religious men who saw colleges as religious institutions as well as seats of learning. These men highly prized both morality and character. Because they felt that college dormitories could provide a means for teaching social and moral values as well as a means for controlling student behavior a second reason for building dormitories was provided (12: 96). It is this latter purpose of controlling student behavior which has fomented student problems that have perplexed college administrators to this day.

Compared with present day standards, dormitory life was far from pleasant in the early American colleges. A

faculty member was usually assigned to each dormitory to live and work with the students. He would not only supervise their studies but he would also supervise conduct and attempt to "save souls" (3: 758-764). Most of the time students were required to attend religious services, sometimes as often as twice a day. Required study policies and "lights-out" rules were adopted. Doors to the dormitories were frequently locked or barred to keep students inside. Cowley reports that at the University of North Carolina the architectural design of a quadrangle was followed in designing the buildings so that an enclosure was formed which not only helped control the behavior of the students but, unfortunately, also had the atmosphere of a prison (3: 741).

Most early American colleges built dormitories of one type or another. During the period between the American Revolution and the Civil War the dormitory system grew until it was considered a leading feature of higher education in American (16: 193). In 1800 there were only 25 colleges in the United States. By the outbreak of the Civil War Frost reports that 264 had come into existence (4: 90). As new colleges were formed, dormitories were built. Most new colleges of this period were church related and were still being located in rural areas where off-campus student housing was at a premium (16: 194). It was fortunate that at this stage of the

development of colleges in America donors were available who wished to contribute visible memorials for posterity-- often college dormitories. The churches and the college faculties usually could not have found the money for this type of construction elsewhere. Throughout the history of American higher education, donors, benefactors, and friends have played an influential role in all phases of college building construction.

The Decline of the Student Housing
Movement, 1850-1890

By the mid-1800's the German philosophy of higher education was beginning to become popular in America. This philosophy held, among other things, that the college or university should only be concerned for the students while they were in the classroom. College students were adults and they should be treated as such! Under this philosophy, of course, the discipline function of the dormitory was not a proper responsibility of the college.

Couple this Germanic philosophy with the problems of student control, and embittered student-faculty relations which had arisen as a result of administering that control, and critics began to be heard who strongly denounced the student housing concept (16: 177-198). Cowley cites a number of educational leaders who were influential in causing many college dormitories to close down or be

converted to other uses during the forty year period following 1850. Typical among them were Tappan of Michigan and Eliot of Harvard. In 1850 President Tappan of the University of Michigan changed two dormitories into classroom facilities when he decided that dormitories were not necessary on his campus (3: 710). President Eliot of Harvard also was an outspoken critic of college dormitories and took a strong stand against them at his institution (3: 712).

During this period in history, as new state-supported colleges and universities were being formed they usually provided classroom space only and depended upon townspeople to provide room and board for the students. This was the era in which large state universities and large private universities began making their appearance on the American scene. These institutions had, at the time of their formation, little interest or money for providing housing facilities for their students. The large universities usually had no housing facilities whatsoever and the small liberal arts colleges that still used their dormitories were likely to do so because of a financial need rather than an educational objective.

As a substitute for dormitories during this period of time, a great many students began living in private homes and rooming houses in the vicinity of the campuses (17: 295). Other students joined fraternities and

sororities so they could take advantage of the living accommodations these groups often provided (16: 199). It was during the last half of the nineteenth century that Greek letter organizations enjoyed one of their periods of greatest growth. At this time religious organizations were also providing more and more accommodations for the students of their particular denominations.

The one area in which a number of colleges of that period did attempt to provide for student housing was for women students. Following the Civil War women were beginning to attend college in greater numbers and, for morality purposes, most institutions which accepted women students took a paternal interest in providing for their welfare (3: 761).

Resurgence of Student Housing in the Twentieth Century

Around the turn of the century, the dormitory movement began to again assert itself as a return to the "collegiate way of life." Harvard (7: 173), Yale (3: 758), Princeton (3: 759), and Chicago (3: 759) became leaders among American colleges in returning to a modification of the English residential ideal for higher education. Colleges and universities were again beginning to be seen as having a responsibility to the student outside of the classroom. At this time the Germanic

philosophy was losing support and in its place came the "whole student" philosophy of education.

The primary services which dormitories now began to provide for students were in the areas of physical housing comfort and social development. According to Cowley, housing was still provided chiefly for undergraduate students (3: 763). The "in loco parentis" philosophy was by and large accepted by the students and wanted by the parents and college officials. Dormitories were strongly viewed as control devices, however more on a parental concept than their earlier models.

Beginning around 1900, dormitory construction continued at a steady pace until a short leveling-off period occurred during the depression. It then reasserted itself until the outbreak of World War II when construction of college facilities practically ceased for the duration of the conflict (3: 763).

During World War II military units came on many campuses and the regular male enrollment was severely curtailed. As a result, men's dormitories were often taken over for the use of military personnel. It was at this time that the quonset type buildings, still found on many campuses across the country, began to make their appearance for use as additional living and training facilities for military purposes. After the end of the war many of these so called "temporary installations" were adapted

for classroom facilities and married students apartments by colleges and universities.

Changes in Student Housing During
the Past Twenty Years

Following World War II there has been a tremendous growth in higher education in the United States, both in student enrollments and in building construction. The changing philosophy of our society has made a college education desirable and within the financial reach of multitudes of young people who fifty years ago would never have considered it as a possibility.

The discovery of new methods for financing college housing facilities has helped speed the development of the student housing movement. The self-liquidating dormitory or apartment facility is one of these concepts. No longer are colleges required to look for donors or "friends" to give a memorial building to their favorite institution. It is now practical to make a student residential facility a business enterprise. The availability of federal funds has also stimulated dormitory construction throughout the country. Business corporations have also begun to make funds available which have been used for student residence purposes.

As a result of the rapid increase in college enrollments, a tremendous growth of student residence building programs, and a changing philosophy concerning college

student residential housing, a number of new concepts in student housing programs have evolved during the past two decades.

Immediately following World War II a strong emphasis began to be placed on the construction of apartment units to accommodate the ever increasing number of married students (often with children) who were finding it possible to attend college. This emphasis has continued to today, and the number of married students enrolling in institutions of higher education shows every evidence of continuing to increase in the future.

The concept of a college dormitory for housing and controlling undergraduate students has changed on most campuses to that of a college residence hall facility which provides not only living quarters, but recreational, social, and academic satisfactions as well. Residence halls are now being built with beauty, modest luxury, comfort, and learning in mind. Attractive lounges, libraries, lobbies, and classroom facilities are not uncommon in college residence halls today.

Another relatively new student housing concept which has earned widespread acceptance is that of providing co-educational facilities within the same building or in a group of interconnected buildings. It is not unusual on today's campus to find single men and women students living on separate floors or in separate wings

of the same building and sharing common lounges, lobbies, study facilities, recreation rooms, and dining halls. The policy of young men and women eating, studying, and relaxing in relatively close proximity to each other is advocated by many housing officials today where it was unheard of in the early 1900's.

Recently the living-sleeping suite concept has come into vogue in residence hall construction. Instead of a small room in which one or two students can sleep and study with a "community" bathroom somewhere down the hall, living-study suites are being built for two, four, six, or more students. These suites have semi-private bedrooms, a bathroom, and a combination living-study room which all suite mates can share. This plan has encouraged small group interaction and has enhanced the residence hall living situation for many students.

The living-learning philosophy which is currently receiving much support gave impetus to the concept of designing a housing facility which would have student living quarters, classrooms, instructors offices, auditoriums, study rooms, and other educational facilities all contained in one interconnected building or group of buildings. This arrangement adapts itself extremely well to large universities but could be used to equal advantage at smaller institutions. At the present time this idea shows much promise for future college housing planning.

The idea of a small college within a large university is not new, but as universities in this country continue to grow it may very well provide more identity for individual students and help them to make better adjustments while providing them with some of the benefits to be derived from both small college and large university situations.

During the past twenty years there has been a rapid growth in the number of students desiring cooperative (co-op) type living facilities. Co-ops are designed to help students save on their living expenses by providing cooperative living facilities. Students may do part or all of their own housekeeping, purchasing food, cooking, serving meals, and other tasks in return for reduced housing rates. While there is a wide variety in this type of arrangement, the most common types of co-ops are those which house from 20 to 40 students, have private or semi-private sleeping rooms, and have one large dining facility. Co-ops are quite common across the country and usually are much less expensive to the student than living in a regular residence hall.

One innovation in co-op living is a plan permitting single (unmarried) students to occupy college owned apartment units on the campus. While married students have been using this type of facility for some time, colleges have been slow to make the same accommodations available to single students. Perhaps their reluctance

to do so is based upon a necessity for keeping existing residence halls occupied, a desire for stronger control over student behavior, or the lack of awareness of a need for this type of student housing on their campuses.

The idea of single students living in apartments on the campus is not new. The University of Denver has had a plan of this type in operation for a number of years and other institutions, Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, Colorado State, and the University of California at Davis to list a few, have recently experimented with similar programs. This study is designed to evaluate certain aspects of the program which is now in operation at Central Michigan University.

There are many variations in residence hall programs at colleges and universities in the United States. The feeling exists today that good housing can make a significant contribution to the total education of a student and, therefore, planning and operating student housing facilities are functions of prime importance in college administration.

Trends in College Student Housing

As trends in the housing of college students are discussed it must be kept in mind that a student's place of residence is an integral part of his total educational process and often can be of tremendous importance in either his success or lack of success in college.

Student housing administrators are listening to students more than they formerly did when they are planning building or student housing programs. They have come to realize that mature students are very concerned about their housing and have much to contribute if they are consulted (8: 60).

One of the most obvious trends in the field of college student housing concerns the variety of student accommodations which are being built on many campuses today. A number of authorities have recently advocated the policy of giving college students more choice in the selection of their living quarters.

In a discussion of the apartment-type living accommodations being experimented with at the University of California at Davis, Robert Sommer recommends:

A residence hall system must meet the needs of diverse groups of students--one method is to provide a variety of facilities which maximize the students range of choice (14: 232).

Harold Riker suggests as a possible pattern, lower division students living in residence halls and centers where they have the opportunity to engage in extensive programs of group activities, educational, social, and recreational. At the same time he feels upper division students and graduate students should be given the privilege of occupying suites for two or four students with a kitchennette added--to emphasize freedom of action,

privacy, and small group activities (10: 76). Riker states:

As students mature during their college experience, their housing accommodations should be changed, as practicable, to meet new personal needs and different teaching methods (10: 76).

Robert Shaffer writes:

Most institutions feel they should provide a variety of housing types to meet the needs and satisfy the desires of a heterogeneous student body (13: 71).

A person can visit any of our larger colleges or universities and find this concept of variety in student housing facilities in operation. Naturally, as institutions decrease in size the variety of student living facilities also tends to decrease. There still are a few smaller colleges that require their students to live in residence halls for up to as much as four years, but these schools are in the extreme minority.

A trend in the construction of student housing facilities which has come into wide acceptance today is that of designing buildings with a high degree of flexibility. By this is meant, a building which is readily adaptable as needs and philosophy change.

William Caudill observed in an article in *College and University Business*:

In this fast-moving educational world nothing stands still. Accordingly, the physical plant must possess these qualities: expansibility, convertibility, and versatility (1: 55-56).

By this Caudill means that buildings should be constructed so that as needs change, the buildings can be easily remodeled to meet these changes. To Caudill, the ideal college residence facility would be able to house graduates, undergraduates, single students, married students, faculty, or others with a minor amount of modification as the need arises.

Riker affirmed Caudill's observations when he wrote:

In fact, adaptability will be the keynote of tomorrow's college housing. Already many colleges and universities are adopting coeducational housing designed so that sections of the project can be assigned to either men or women depending upon demand, and common spaces can be used by both. Apartments are being built so that they can be assigned to unmarried as well as married students, and single student's housing units are being planned so that kitchenettes can easily be added if more apartments are needed for married students (11: 9).

Another pattern in college student housing which is becoming more popular each year is that of upper class students wanting to live in small groups, perhaps apartments, either on or off-campus. While one nationwide trend today is for the development of luxurious, unsupervised, off-campus apartments financed by private builders, there is also a movement on the part of college and universities to provide apartment type living accommodations on-campus for those students who desire it. In 1965, Riker wrote:

In the United States, the trend in housing preferences of upper division students seems to be toward suite and apartment type facilities. Reasons include the search for privacy, a desire for independence and freedom from supervision, and efforts to reduce educational costs through the cooperative purchase and preparation of food. Since upperclass students are the logical group leaders and natural moderators of student group action, many colleges and universities will adopt plans for suites and apartments in future student housing. As a corollary, they will eliminate from future buildings the long noisy corridors with student rooms opening off either side, which are a classic symbol of mass education and a chronic source of discontent (9: 33).

While upper class students are being provided with more and more variety in choice of housing accommodations, there is still a strong feeling by many authorities that freshmen students should be encouraged to live in a residence hall situation (15: 12). The problem of emancipation from home does not take the same form for all students. Backgrounds vary, family experiences vary, maturity occurs at different rates, and not all college students are ready to accept academic and social freedom at the same age. Most student housing officials and student personnel administrators agree that college freshmen will benefit more from the influence of living in a residence hall situation than in not doing so (10: 76).

Today, much investigation is being done in the area of college student housing. It is of utmost importance that this continue because of the prospective growth in

college student housing programs and the rapidly changing philosophy upon which they are based. Shaffer stated:

Student housing is one aspect of higher education being subjected to intensive study. The enormous investment of capital and administrative energy to provide current and future student housing justifies such evaluation (13: 59).

The author believes that because of diverse conditions among various colleges and universities, it is of utmost necessity that every institution develop its own student housing program and not attempt to copy one that is successful on a different campus. While certain principles are universal, needs and philosophies vary from campus to campus and, therefore, student housing programs, as well as educational programs, must be unique to each individual institution.

Individual student housing facilities and programs must be based on sound educational and philosophical foundations. The inception, planning, construction, or remodeling of student housing facilities involves many people: the Board of Trustees, the President and his complete staff, parents, alumni, architects, contractors, and others. A recent, and perhaps most important, trend is to involve the students. This may very well be the most significant trend of all!

Summary

Historically, the student residence movement in American higher education has completed the cycle from a position of importance on the college scene, to relative insignificance, and back, much stronger and better than before. There is an apparent need for additional student housing facilities on most college and university campuses today, and there is every indication that this need will become more acute in the future.

Trends in college student housing programs are clearly discernable. Innovations to make the housing of students more meaningful to them are constantly being sought. Students themselves are becoming more involved in the evaluation and planning of student housing facilities and programs. The college student housing movement is apparently on the threshold of its most challenging, and hopefully most significant, era.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The major objective of the study was to analyze the opinions and perceptions of college students concerning a new concept in student housing facilities at Central Michigan University. This chapter is concerned with the composition of the samples, the development of the instruments, the methods used for collecting the data, and the procedures for analysis of the data.

Samples

The principal source of information for this study was the opinions and perceptions of a sample of 140 senior students at Central Michigan University. These subjects lived during the 1967-68 school year in Preston Apartments on the campus. When they moved into Preston Apartments in September, 1967, the students were single (unmarried), classified as juniors by the University, in good academic standing, and free from any form of University probation. The subjects had all lived previously in a regular residence hall on the campus. The subjects were almost equally divided as to sex.

The female students occupied apartments in four two-story buildings. Each apartment had a private entrance. The male students occupied three similar buildings in the same area of the campus.

The apartment buildings had formerly been occupied by married students and were located in the center of the campus. Each apartment was furnished and contained one or two bedrooms, a living room, kitchenette, closets, and a bathroom. Laundry facilities were available in each building.

The perceptions and opinions of the subjects in this sample were secured through the administration of a questionnaire prepared by the investigator.

A second sample of 161 students was selected randomly from members of the senior class who had the opportunity as juniors during the 1967-68 school year to live in Preston Apartments, but instead had elected to live in a residence hall. The subjects in the second sample matched those in the first in that they had experienced a residence hall living situation at Central Michigan University prior to September, 1967, were in good academic standing and free from any form of University probation at the time, and were eligible to live in Preston Apartments had they chosen to do so.

Using a table of random numbers, twenty-two students were selected from the second sample to be interviewed

concerning their reasons for not electing to live in Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year, and to sample their opinions with respect to their feelings about this opportunity a year and a half later. This information was obtained through structured interviews held on the campus during March, 1969.

A third source of information for the study was a comparison of the changes which occurred in the cumulative grade point averages of the students in the samples during the 1967-68 school year. This information was secured from the files of the registrar.

A further dimension to the investigation was certain kinds of information obtained through interviews with the Director of Plant Extension, the Director of Accounting, and the Director of Housing and his assistant. These people were aware of the financial aspects of the student housing program at Central Michigan University. From their records and personal opinions the cost to the University of the two types of single student residence programs, apartment and residence hall, were obtained. The Director of Housing and his assistant were also asked to give their opinions of the social aspects of single students living in Preston Apartments and to comment on any specific problems arising from that living situation.

Instrumentation

Originally, the principal instrument included thirty-six questions. The questions were designed to secure demographic data concerning the former Preston Apartment residents being studied and to get their opinions and perceptions of their apartment living experience in the areas of their social, academic, and financial satisfactions. Ideas for the questions were gathered from the following sources: discussions with residence hall staff members at Central Michigan University and Michigan State University, written statements of residence hall policies found in publications from Central Michigan University, literature in the field of college student housing, and from personal experience as a student personnel administrator at Central Michigan University.

The items were arranged into categories according to the four main areas being investigated: demographic, social, academic, and financial. A fifth category was added at the end of the questionnaire in which the subjects were asked to express any perceptions or opinions they held concerning their living experience in Preston Apartments which were not previously covered. The instrument was then evaluated and revised.

The questionnaire was given a pre-test by being administered to a group of fifteen junior students, men

and women, who had recently completed their first semester of residence in Preston Apartments. The students in this group were selected for the pre-test because they were now acquainted with the Preston Apartment living situation and were upperclassmen at the University who closely matched the sample of students being studied.

Following the pre-test, the instrument was again revised in light of the comments and responses of the pre-test sample. Several of the questions were re-written to provide greater clarity and one of the questions was eliminated when it was found to be irrelevant.

The final revision of the questionnaire containing thirty-five questions was mailed together with a cover letter to the sample of senior students selected for this study (see Appendices A and B). A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed for returning the completed form.

In addition to the construction of the basic questionnaire, two sets of questions were designed to be administered respectively to a sample of the students who elected to live in a residence hall during their junior year and to the four administrators selected for interview (see Appendices C and D).

The questions prepared to be administered to the sample of students who lived in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year were brief and open-ended. They were designed to discover whether or not these students

had actually been given the opportunity to live in Preston Apartments, why they did not choose to do so, if they were now aware of living conditions in the apartments, and, in retrospect, whether or not they now wished they had availed themselves of the opportunity to live in Preston Apartments that year. The students were assured at the beginning of the interviews that they would remain anonymous and they were encouraged to discuss any and all aspects of the Preston Apartment situation.

The questions which were prepared to be discussed with the administrative officials were also open-ended. They were designed to explore the financial aspects to the University of the Preston Apartment living situation compared with a regular residence hall program and to discover the opinions of the housing officials concerning social and behavioral conditions in the apartments. Questions concerning the costs of construction, maintenance, equipment, repair, supervision, and other related factors were brought out. Comments about special or unique problems connected with single students living in Preston Apartments and their observations of the general student response to living in the apartments were solicited from the housing officials.

Collection of the Data

On February 21, 1969, the instrument was mailed to the sample of 167 senior students enrolled at Central

Michigan University. The students were asked to complete the questionnaire and to return it by mail as soon as possible. Each envelope was coded so a follow-up could be made of those students who neglected to return their questionnaire within a reasonable length of time.

By March 6, 1969, 102 questionnaires had been returned. In an effort to secure a higher percentage of response, telephone calls were placed to as many of the students who had not yet returned their questionnaires as possible. By the following week, thirty-eight additional questionnaires had been received, making a total response of 140 (83%).

During the week of March 17, 1969, the investigator held interviews with twenty-two students randomly selected from the residence hall sample. Each of the students contacted appeared for the interview. The interviews were structured around the questions previously prepared.

During the same week the interviews with the specified college officials were held in their respective offices. A second interview was scheduled with the Director of Housing to investigate some of his responses in greater depth and to secure further information not available the first time.

The final step in obtaining data for analysis was to secure the cumulative grade point averages for the students in each sample. Grade point averages at both

the beginning and the end of the 1967-68 school year were compiled so an analysis could be made of any significant changes which had occurred.

Analysis of the Data

An analysis of the data secured during this study is presented in Chapter IV. The chapter is divided into four parts with each part covering a different phase of the investigation.

The first part contains an analysis and summation of the information secured from the Preston Apartment sample through the administration of the questionnaire (Appendix B). The answers the subjects gave to each question were tabulated and are presented in table form together with comments which were regarded as pertinent to each question.

As a validation procedure, after the responses to the questionnaire were tabulated, fourteen students (10% of the respondents) were randomly selected from that group for interview. During these interviews, questions from the questionnaire were not repeated word for word but the content of each question was covered. Sometimes the students were asked to explain further the verbal answers they gave during the interviews or to express their opinion of questions raised by the questionnaire which the investigator felt needed clarification. Oral

responses received during the interviews were almost identical to the written responses which had been received on the questionnaire.

Next are reported the interviews held with the group of twenty-two students randomly selected from the residence hall sample. The questions directed to these students were open-ended and the results are presented in table and descriptive form, together with comments they made which are pertinent to the study.

The changes which occurred in the cumulative grade point averages of the two samples during the 1967-69 school year are presented in the third part. A t-test was applied to determine whether there was a significant difference in the mean changes of the two groups.

Presented last is an analysis of the financial aspects of the construction, maintenance, and supervision of the apartment living units and the regular residence hall facilities. Observations, opinions, and comments of administrators responsible for housing students on campus are given in this section.

Summary

The information presented in this study was secured during the winter and spring of 1969. At that time, a sufficient number of senior students who had lived in Preston Apartments or a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year were available on campus to make a significant

evaluation of the Preston Apartment living situation. Both questionnaire and interview techniques were used. Data pertaining to the study was also secured by interviews with University administrators and from records in the Registrar's office.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Presented here in an analysis of the data secured in the study. This chapter is concerned with the information secured by the administration of the questionnaire to the sample of single students residing in Preston Apartments (1967-68), interviews with a random sample of students living in residence halls (1967-68), a discussion of the changes in the cumulative grade point average of the samples, and interviews with administrators on the staff of Central Michigan University.

The Questionnaire

A five-part questionnaire (Appendix B) was mailed to 167 senior students at Central Michigan University who lived in Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year. The original mailing and follow-up produced 140 responses. An analysis and discussion of these responses is presented in five parts corresponding to the main headings in the questionnaire which sought to obtain information of a demographic, social, academic, financial, and commentary nature.

Demographic Data

The purpose of this part of the questionnaire was to secure certain demographic information about the students being studied and to determine their reasons for electing to live in Preston Apartments.

The 140 respondents varied from nineteen to twenty-two years of age when they moved into Preston Apartments. Table 1 shows the age of these students by sex.

TABLE 1.--The age of the Preston Apartment respondents, September, 1967.

Age	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
19	13	17	30	21.5
20	47	40	87	62
21	10	11	21	15
22	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

Members of the sample were asked to indicate how long they had lived in a residence hall prior to moving into Preston Apartments. Their responses are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 indicates that 66 per cent of the respondents lived in a residence hall four or more semesters

before moving into Preston Apartments and that 93 per cent lived in a residence hall a minimum of two semesters or more. This amount of residence hall living experience of the Preston Apartment sample is particularly pertinent when the respondents are asked to compare residence hall and Preston Apartment living situations.

TABLE 2.--The amount of residence hall experience reported by the respondents.

Semesters	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
one	6	4	10	7
two	21	7	28	20
three	7	3	10	7
four or more	<u>38</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>66</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

No attempt was made to obtain the parents' reactions to the Preston Apartment living experiences. However, students were asked to express their opinion of their parents' reactions.

The students were asked what they believed their parents' attitude was when they first approached them with the idea of living in Preston Apartments. In response to this question, seventy-four respondents (52%)

indicated they felt it met with their parents' full approval, thirty-four (24%) stated their parents didn't care one way or the other, and thirty-one (24%) responded that they believed their parents were skeptical of the idea.

The students were then asked to give their opinion as to how they believed their parents felt today about the Preston Apartment living experience. Ninety-nine (71%) respondents stated they thought their parents' attitude toward it was "excellent," thirty-nine (27%) replied "satisfactory," and two students indicated "very questionable."

From the opinions expressed by the respondents to the two preceding questions, it is apparent they believed their parents' attitudes toward the Preston Apartment living situation improved during the 1967-68 school year. These opinions were verified during the interviews held with a sample of the respondents following tabulation of the questionnaire.

A question was included to determine where the students in the Preston Apartment sample would have wanted to live during the 1967-68 school year in Preston Apartments had not been available to them. They were asked to indicate if they thought they would have remained in a residence hall or moved off the campus in this circumstance. In reply, sixty-eight (62%) respondents stated

they probably would have moved off campus, twenty-nine (20%) reported they would likely have remained in a residence hall, and twenty-four (18%) indicated they were undecided. Men and women were equally divided in their responses to this question.

In all probability, a much larger percentage of the sample than is indicated above (20%) would have actually lived in a residence hall. The respondents who indicated they probably would have moved off the campus were not aware of the fact that, at that time, there was not enough satisfactory off campus housing available in Mt. Pleasant to accommodate that number of additional students.

To discover the main reasons why the students in the Preston Apartment sample originally wanted to live in that situation, they were asked to indicate one or more reasons which they felt most influenced their decisions to do so. Table 3 presents a summary of their responses.

TABLE 3.--The reasons given by the respondents for moving into Preston Apartments.

Reason	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
less expensive	61	62	123	88
better place to study	22	11	33	23
more privacy	46	24	70	50
fewer rules	48	54	102	73
location on campus	11	5	16	11
wanted the experience	0	6	6	4

It can be observed from Table 3 that the respondents considered the most important factors influencing their decision to move into Preston Apartments to be financial reasons (88%), a hope for fewer rules (73%), a desire for more privacy (50%), and the thought that it would provide a better place to study (23%).

The place of residence of the respondents during the 1968-69 school year is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4.--The place of residence of the respondents during the 1968-69 school year.

Place of Residence	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
Preston Apartments	37	40	77	55
off campus	24	18	42	30
married housing	6	3	9	6
another town	4	5	9	6
at home	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

While seventy-seven (55%) respondents indicated they are living in Preston Apartments during the 1968-69 school year, sixty-three (45%) stated they were living elsewhere. These students gave several reasons why they did not return to Preston Apartments for a second year. Twenty-one

are living in another place because of marriage. Twelve are student teaching in another town. Twenty-nine chose to live off campus in a private room or apartment because they felt they could have more freedom and independence. One did not return to Preston Apartments because of financial reasons.

Table 5 shows the reasons given for returning to Preston Apartments by the seventy-seven respondents who did so during the 1968-69 school year.

TABLE 5.--The reasons given by the respondents who returned to Preston Apartments for a second year.

Reason	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
financial	25	29	54	70
influence of roommates	4	19	23	30
location	10	5	15	20
"liked it there"	0	15	15	20
parental influence	2	2	4	5

Financial reasons were most often (70%) mentioned by the respondents who returned to Preston Apartments for a second year as a factor they considered to be important in making their decision to do so. The influence of roommates was indicated by 30% of the students

and was apparently of more importance to women than to men. On the other hand, the central location of Preston Apartments on campus was considered more important by men than women. The phrase "I like it there," or one of similar nature, was written in a black space left for this purpose by 20% of the women.

Social Aspects of Preston Apartments

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to secure students' perceptions and opinions of certain social aspects of living in Preston Apartments.

The students were asked to consider all factors and give their overall rating of living in Preston Apartments compared with living in a residence hall. The responses received to this question are summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6.--The overall rating of living in Preston Apartments compared with living in a residence hall.

Rating	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
very much better	45	36	81	58
better	20	31	51	36
about the same	4	1	5	4
not as good	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

The responses to this question indicate that 94% of the respondents rate living in Preston Apartments as better or very much better than living in a residence hall. Only three students felt it was not as good.

The previous question was very general, therefore the students were next given several questions of a more specific nature. The first of these pertained to personal privacy. The students were asked to indicate whether or not they felt they had experienced more personal privacy when they lived in Preston Apartments or in a residence hall. Personal privacy was defined as meaning "the chance to be alone when you wanted to be." Preston Apartments was favored over the residence halls by 128 (91%) respondents. Eight per cent of the sample reported that personal privacy was of importance to them while 20% indicated they did not consider it to be so.

The students were next asked, "Which living situation (Preston Apartments or a residence hall) was most 'homelike,' that is, the most comfortable, livable, and the place in which you felt most like home?" The respondents were unanimous in selecting Preston Apartments over the residence halls. When they were asked if they considered this factor to be of importance to them, 128 (91%) replied yes and twelve (9%) said no.

The students were more divided in their responses when they were requested to indicate in which of the two

living situations they felt more a part of "University life?" "University life" was defined as being a participant in the total University community. Table 7 presents a summary of the responses received to this question.

TABLE 7.--The opinions of the respondents as to where they felt more a part of the total University community.

Place	Men		Women		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
residence hall	23	16	36	26	59	42
Preston Apartments	12	9	0	0	12	9
no difference	<u>37</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>49</u>
Total	72	51	68	49	140	100

The table shows that 49% of the respondents stated they saw no difference in the two situations, 9% favored Preston Apartments, and 42% believed they felt more a part of the total University community when they lived in a residence hall. When some of the respondents were asked about the positions they had taken on this question, most of them who had given a residence hall as their choice stated they did so because of the number and type of planned social activities they had enjoyed while living in a residence hall. They felt that too few organized

activities were scheduled for the students living in Preston Apartments. They remarked that juniors were generally not as interested in the total residence hall program as were freshmen and sophomores but that they did miss some of the dances, mixers, discussion sessions, and other planned social activities which are common to the residence hall program. On the other hand, 49% of the respondents could see no difference in the two situations and the students from this group who were interviewed were quite satisfied with the social opportunities in Preston Apartments.

Approximately the same division occurred on the next question when the students were asked if they felt living in Preston Apartments was as conducive to participation in organized student activities as was living in a residence hall. The total responses were almost equally divided with seventy students indicating yes and sixty-nine stating no. However, twenty more men than women favored Preston Apartments which shows a definite disagreement by sex.

An examination of the responses made to the two previous questions indicates a greater percentage of women than men felt the residence hall living situation was better than Preston Apartments in reference to being a part of the total University community and in participation in organized student activities. Both the

questionnaire and the interviews revealed a much higher degree of participation on the part of men than women in some phase of the University athletic program. This was undoubtedly one factor influencing the results of the two questions.

To determine the actual amount of participation in organized activities by the students in the Preston Apartment sample, they were asked to indicate which University activities they participated in during the 1967-68 school year. Table 8 is a summation of the responses received to this question.

TABLE 8.--The organized activities participated in by the Preston Apartment respondents during the 1967-68 school year.

Activity	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
sorority or fraternity	27	38	65	47
varsity athletics	9	0	9	7
intramural athletics	37	6	43	31
band, orchestra, chorus	6	2	8	6
dramatics or debate	1	3	4	3
campus publications	2	2	4	3
student government	2	0	2	2
honorary societies	2	6	8	6
professional clubs	3	1	4	3
political clubs	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	90	61	151	111

A total of 151 student activity affiliations were reported by the 140 respondents. This is approximately one affiliation per student, however, sixteen students did not indicate any participation during the 1967-68 school year and several students listed two or three affiliations. More male participation (90) than female participation (61) was reported. It can be seen from Table 8 that this is due mainly to the large number of men who were involved in some phase of the athletic program.

The students were next requested to indicate whether or not they had experienced conflicts of a serious nature with their roommates during the 1967-68 school year. To this question thirty-one (22%) responded in the affirmative. The respondents who answered yes were almost equally divided between men and women. The following types of conflicts were mentioned: personality conflicts, failure to accept responsibility for household tasks, disagreements over food and buying of supplies, guests in the apartment at unusual hours, quiet hours, and moody and uncooperative roommates. In addition, two women reported they did not get along with roommates who were foreign students and that they "did not do things the way we are accustomed to doing them." These women lived in different buildings and were not aware of each other's responses.

Some of the above responses were discussed with the students during the validation interviews and it was

concluded that most of the problems were of a nature which could have occurred in either a residence hall, in Preston Apartments, or in an off campus living situation where students are living in close proximity to each other and must adjust to each other's personalities. The conclusion was reached that the conflicts which were reported had little or no bearing on this study.

To further explore the housekeeping aspect of living in Preston Apartments, students were asked if they felt the time spent on household tasks detracted to an appreciable extent from the time they could have spent profitably in academic or social pursuits. Household tasks were defined as including cleaning, shopping, cooking, and so forth. To this question, one man indicated a great amount, thirteen students (six men and seven women) reported to some extent, and 125 (90%) stated they felt it made no difference. Comments made by the respondents indicated that many of them regarded the household activities as a challenge, a responsibility, and a valuable addition to their total college education.

The students were given the following four aspects of living in Preston Apartments and asked to indicate which they considered to have been of most importance to them: financial, academic, personal relationships, or social life. They were told they could indicate one or more choices if they desired and that they could add any

other factors which they felt should have been included in the list. Table 9 shows the responses received to this question.

TABLE 9.--The most important aspects of living in Preston Apartments as viewed by the respondents.

Aspect	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
financial	47	45	92	66
academic	11	2	13	9
personal relationships	11	15	26	18
social life	3	3	6	4
independence (freedom)	4	5	9	6
location on campus	3	0	3	2
cooking and management	0	3	3	2

The students, responding to this question as they did when asked why they originally wanted to live in Preston Apartments and why they elected to return there for the second year if they chose to do so, gave the financial aspects of living in Preston Apartments as the factor which they considered to be of most importance to them. Evidence is presented later showing why the financial factor is apparently so important to many of the respondents.

To ascertain at what point in a college student's career the Preston Apartment sample felt undergraduate, single students should first be permitted to live in an on campus, apartment living situation the question was asked, "During what year in college do you recommend that single students first be allowed to live in Preston Apartments?" Table 10 is a summary of the responses received to this question.

TABLE 10.--The year in college the respondents recommended single students first be permitted to live in Preston Apartments.

Year	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
freshman	4	1	5	4
sophomore	40	37	77	57
junior	25	29	54	39
senior	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	69	67	136	100

Table 10 shows that nearly half again as many of the respondents (57%) are in favor of making the Preston Apartment type living facility available to sophomores as feel it should be withheld until the junior year (39%). Only 4% of the respondents to this question were in favor of making the apartments available to freshman students.

To further pursue the thinking of this sample in connection with college housing in general, they were next requested to give their opinion as to where they felt freshmen should live during their first year in college. The choice of three responses was given and the reactions of the sample are summarized in Table 11.

TABLE 11.--The respondents' recommendations concerning freshman students living in a residence hall.

Response	Men	Women	Total	Respondents
	N	N	N	%
require them to do so	25	34	59	43
encourage them to do so	36	32	68	50
let them live where they want	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	68	68	136	100

This sample overwhelmingly favored either encouraging or requiring freshmen students to live in a residence hall, and they were almost unanimous in giving both social and academic reasons for their positions. The investigator feels this is a significant response for college students to make in this day of the unpopularity of "in loco parentis" and the widespread agitation for students' rights and individual freedom. If the same question was

asked of freshmen or sophomore perhaps a different set of responses would be received.

Academic Aspects of Preston Apartments

In this part of the questionnaire, the students' attention was directed to their perceptions of the academic aspects of living in Preston Apartments.

The students were asked to express their opinion of the living situation, Preston Apartments or a residence hall, in which they felt they were more stimulated in the area of intellectual achievement. Their responses indicated that thirteen students (10%) favored a residence hall, fifty-nine students (48%) favored Preston Apartments, and fifty-six students (44%) rated both situations about the same. This question and the replies received may not appear to be significant, however, when taken in perspective with other academic data presented in this chapter they become meaningful.

Given in the questionnaire were five places in which college students at Central Michigan University can live. The students were asked to rank these places, from best to poorest, according to which they felt would provide the best atmosphere for studying. Table 12 shows how these living situations were ranked by the respondents using one point for the best and progressing to five points for poorest.

TABLE 12.--Five living situations ranked by the respondents according to which they felt offered the best atmosphere for studying.

Place	Rank	Total Points
private room off-campus	1	259
Preston Apartments	2	313
sharing an apartment off campus	3	432
residence hall	4	489
living at home	5	568

In the opinion of the respondents, Preston Apartments ranked considerably higher than the residence halls. Most of the respondents are in their final semester of college work. The pressures of graduation, graduate study, marriage, or job placement are apt to be uppermost in their minds. They are generally more mature than freshmen and sophomores. It is therefore not surprising that a private room off the campus would appeal to many of them as an ideal place in which to study. Considering the same factors, it is also understandable why the two apartment situations would be preferred to living in a residence hall or at home.

Students are often heard to remark that it is difficult to study in the residence halls because of the noise, confusion, and numbers of people coming and going and causing distractions. The next two questions were

presented to the sample to find out where they did most of their studying during the 1967-68 school year and whether or not their apartment was quiet enough so that they could study there when they wanted to.

The students were first asked where they did most of their studying during the year they lived in Preston Apartments. This question was designed to discover whether the sample studied in their apartment or whether they did most of their studying elsewhere. The responses to this question are summarized in Table 13.

TABLE 13.--Where the respondents indicated they did most of their studying during the 1967-68 school year.

Place	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
in their room	52	51	103	73
in the library	19	10	29	21
in the student center	1	5	6	4
in the room of a friend	0	2	2	2
(other)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

They were next asked, "Were your quarters in Preston Apartments quiet enough so that you could study when you wanted to?" To this question, 125 students (90%)

responded in the affirmative and fourteen (10%) replied negatively.

To secure further information concerning the answers given to the two preceding questions, during the validation interviews some of the students who had indicated they did most of their studying in the library were asked why they chose to do so. The reasons they gave are as follows: noisy record players and television sets, card parties, outsiders lounging in the apartment, "bull sessions," and roommates making too much noise. Apparently these problems were not too prevalent in Preston Apartments because over half of the group that indicated they studied in the library said they did so chiefly because of the reference books and other facilities that were available there.

The residence halls at Central Michigan University are provided with special study rooms which are available for individual and group use. At the request of the Director of Housing, the Preston Apartment sample was asked if they used these study rooms very often when they lived in a residence hall. Fifty-seven (41%) affirmative and eighty (59%) negative responses were received.

The students were then asked if they would have made use of this type of facility if it had been available to them when they lived in Preston Apartments. To this question, forty-seven (33%) gave an affirmative

answer and ninety-three (67%) responded negatively. Women students were slightly more favorable to the use of this type of facility than were men.

Since approximately 33% of the respondents indicated they would use study rooms apart from their living quarters if they were available, and 41% reported they used them when they lived in a residence hall, there is reason to believe that this type of facility in the Preston Apartment buildings would have been put to good use.

Financial Aspects of Preston Apartments

Part IV of the questionnaire was designed to secure the opinions and perceptions of the sample concerning various financial aspects of living in Preston Apartments. The first four questions pertained to each students' income and financial arrangements for attending college. The last three questions investigated the cost of living in Preston Apartments as viewed by the respondents.

The students were requested to indicate the sources from which they received financial aid during the 1967-68 school year. Table 14 shows the responses received to this question.

They were then requested to estimate how much total financial assistance they received from their families

during the 1967-68 school year. This information is reported in Table 15.

TABLE 14.--Sources of financial aid reported by the respondents for the 1967-68 school year.

Source	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
parents or family	50	42	92	66
loan	9	14	23	17
summer employment	45	56	101	73
scholarship (grant-in-aid)	22	23	45	33
part time employment (school year)	36	21	57	41

TABLE 15.--The amount of financial support contributed to the respondents by their families during the 1967-68 school year.

Amount	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
none	30	16	46	34
0-\$500	13	4	17	12
\$501-\$800	14	14	28	20
\$801-\$1100	10	14	24	17
\$1101-\$1400	2	15	17	12
over \$1400	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	71	67	138	100

It is interesting to note that one-third of the respondents indicated they received no financial help from their families during the 1967-68 school year and that two-thirds of them received \$800 or less.

Two questions were asked of the fifty-seven respondents who indicated they held part-time jobs during the 1967-68 school year.. First, approximately how much money did they earn each week, and second, how many hours each week did they work at their jobs? The answers received to these questions are summarized in Tables 16 and 17.

TABLE 16.--The estimated weekly earning of the respondents during the 1967-68 school year.

Amount	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
none	37	46	83	59
\$1.00-\$5.00	3	3	6	4
\$6.00-\$10.00	10	15	25	18
\$11.00-\$15.00	12	2	14	10
\$16.00-\$20.00	3	1	4	3
\$21.00 or more	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

The majority of the respondents (39) who held part-time jobs while attending college earned from \$6.00 to

\$15.00 each week. More men (35) than women (22) were employed part-time and, as can be seen from Table 17, forty-two of the fifty-seven students who worked part-time were employed from six to fifteen hours each week.

TABLE 17.--The estimated number of hours each week the respondents indicated they worked at a part-time job during the 1967-68 school year.

Hours	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
none	37	46	83	59
1 - 5	4	5	9	6
6 - 10	18	13	31	22
11 - 15	8	3	11	8
16 - 20	3	0	3	2.5
21 or more	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2.5</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

The following observations can be made from the information reported in Tables 14 through 17. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents (92) stated they received some financial assistance from their families during the 1967-68 school year. Seventeen per cent (23) borrowed money and thirty-three per cent (45) received scholarship or grant-in-aid assistance. During the summer, seventy-three per cent (101) of the respondents

were employed either full-time or part-time. During the school year forty-one per cent (57) held part-time jobs. Evidence from the questionnaire and the interviews indicates that the majority of the respondents did not rely completely on parental or family support during the 1967-68 school year and that a variety of other sources were used to help finance the cost of their education.

Meals are not served in the residence halls at Central Michigan University on Sunday evenings. All students are expected to provide for themselves on these occasions. The Preston Apartments sample was questioned concerning how many meals they ate outside of their apartment each week. This was explained as meaning meals at hamburger shops, restaurants, the University Center, and so forth. Table 18 shows the responses secured from this question.

TABLE 18.--The average number of meals the respondents estimated they ate outside of their apartments each week during the 1967-68 school year.

Number of Meals	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
none	23	30	53	38
1-2	32	33	65	47
3-4	15	3	18	13
5-6	2	2	4	2
7 or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	72	68	140	100

The above table shows that fifty-three of the students (38%) never ate meals outside of their apartments. When several of these respondents were asked why they did not do so, their replies indicated they thought it was a foolish waste of money to eat out when there was good food available in the apartment. Once again, a financial factor entered into their decisions. On the other hand, when several of the men were questioned as to why they had indicated they ate out on an average of one to two times each week, they were unanimous in stating they wanted variety in their meals and they became tired of eating each other's cooking and wanted a "good meal" once in a while. Apparently men at this age are not as good cooks or as conscious of budgeting and meal planning as their female counterparts. Twenty-two respondents (15%) stated that they averaged more than two outside meals each week, and this may not be very different than the residence hall pattern.

The final two questions presented to the Preston Apartment sample in this part of the questionnaire dealt with the cost of living in Preston Apartments compared with the cost of living in a residence hall.

First, to help clarify students' thinking and to focus their attention on the expenses involved in living in Preston Apartments, they were asked to estimate how much money they spent on groceries each week during the

1967-68 school year. Groceries were defined as food, milk, coffee, tea, and so forth, and did not include sundries and personal items which they would have had to buy no matter where they lived. The responses are summarized in Table 19.

TABLE 19.--The amount of money the respondents estimated they spent on groceries each week during the 1967-68 school year.

Amount	Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%
less than \$5.00	3	21	24	17
\$5.00-\$7.99	54	45	99	71
\$8.00-\$10.99	13	2	15	10.5
\$11.00-\$13.99	2	0	2	1.5
\$14.00 or more	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	72	68	140	100.0

The responses shown in Table 19 indicate that ninety-nine students (71%) believed they spent between \$5.00 and \$7.99 for groceries each week during the 1967-68 school year, and twenty-four (17%) thought they spent less than \$5.00 during the same period. More men (15) than women (2) estimated they spent over \$8.00 each week and more women (21) than men (3) reported less than \$5.00.

Each semester at Central Michigan University is seventeen weeks long. From the responses presented in Table 19, it can be calculated that 71% of the respondents estimated they spent between \$85.00 and \$136.00 for groceries each semester during the 1967-68 school year. Similarly, 17% spent less than \$85.00 and 12% spent over \$136.00 during the same period.

During the 1967-68 school year, room rent in Preston Apartments was \$187.00 per person (2: 61) each semester. Simple computation revealed that 123 respondents (88%) felt their total expenditures for room and board in Preston Apartments were less than \$323.00 each semester of that year.

During the 1967-68 school year, room and board in the residence halls at Central Michigan University cost \$429.00 each semester (2: 61). The above figures indicate a savings of at least \$106.00 each semester could be realized in the cost of room and board by students living in Preston Apartments rather than in a residence hall if they spent \$7.99 or less each week on groceries. If only \$5.00 was spent each week on groceries the savings in Preston Apartments compared to a residence hall could be as much as \$157.00 each semester.

The preceding question was included in the questionnaire to help the respondents compute the total cost of living in Preston Apartments compared with a residence

hall so they would be better able to answer the final question.

The last question in this part of the questionnaire was, "Consider residence hall room and board cost as \$429.00 each semester and rent alone in Preston Apartments as costing \$187.00 each semester. Approximately how much more or less did it cost you to live (room and board only) each semester in Preston Apartments than it did each semester in a residence hall?" The responses received to this question are shown in Table 20, p. 66.

The financial opinions expressed by the students which are presented in Tables 19 and 20 are not exact. They are estimates, arrived at one year after the Preston Apartment living experience, and should be considered as such. In this frame of reference, it is obvious that a large majority of the respondents (89%) believed it was less expensive to live in Preston Apartments than in a residence hall. Their estimates vary from under \$50.00 to over \$125.00 each semester. Over one-half (59.5%) indicated a savings to the student of as much as \$100.00 or more each semester.

Eleven per cent of the respondents felt it was more expensive to live in Preston Apartments than in a residence hall. Their estimates also vary from under \$50.00 to over \$125.00 each semester. Eleven men and four women were included in this group. A review of the questionnaires

TABLE 20.--The respondents' estimate of how much more or less it cost them to live in Preston Apartments for one semester than it did in a residence hall.

	More in Preston Apartments				Less in Preston Apartments			
	Men	Women	Total Respondents		Men	Women	Total Respondents	
	N	N	N	%	N	N	N	%
Under \$50.00	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1.5
\$50.00--\$74.99	2	0	2	1.5	15	3	18	13
\$75.00--\$99.99	5	2	7	5	10	10	20	15
\$100.00--\$124.99	2	0	2	1.5	22	9	31	21
\$125.00 or more	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>38.5</u>
Total	11	4	15	11	62	63	125	89

indicated all of this group (15) had also stated they believed they spent from \$8.00 to \$13.99 each week on groceries. Three of these respondents were among those selected for interview. Each of those interviewed commented they they probably were not good shoppers and that often they spent more than was necessary in buying expensive food and beverages. They also felt they now could be much more economical in their shopping and meal planning having had the experience of apartment living. One student said, "I'm sure we lived a bit high compared to the other folks."

It can be concluded from the responses that the majority of the respondents were conscious of good budgeting procedures and felt they were able to live in Preston Apartments in a more economical manner than they had in a residence hall.

Comments of Preston Apartment Respondents

In Part V of the questionnaire a place was provided for the respondents to make general comments pertaining to their perceptions and observations of single students living in Preston Apartments. Any comment or recommendation they desired to make was solicited. A summary of the comments made by the respondents follows.

More women (26) than men (15) made comments of a negative nature or observations which were in the form of

recommendations for improving existing conditions in the Preston Apartment living situation.

The most common (17) negative comments centered around what the respondents felt were crowded living conditions. Mentioned by the students were inadequate dresser space, closet space, storage space, and small bedrooms. A re-check of the questionnaires of these respondents indicated that twelve of the seventeen students were women and that all seventeen had lived in apartments where three students had been assigned to a one bedroom facility. No mention of overcrowding was received from the respondents in apartments where four students were assigned to two bedroom units.

A discussion with the Assistant Director of Housing revealed, particularly in the case of women students that closet and dresser space may have been a problem in the one bedroom units. However, each student actually had more total square feet of living space in their apartment than is provided for students in the residence halls.

Other comments concerning living in Preston Apartments which may be considered as being of a negative nature were as follows: slow response to requests for repairs and maintenance (7), a need for storm windows to eliminate drafts in the winter (4), lower-level apartments tended to have cold floors (4), planned social activities were inadequate (2), "outsiders" were using the laundry

facilities so regular residents couldn't use them when they wanted to (1), "Preston lacked the large-group friendliness of the dorm" (1), silverfish in the kitchen and bathroom (4), and the rent was too expensive (1).

With the exception of the respondents' concern for crowded living conditions, and only seventeen respondents complained of this, the negative statements received were of a relatively minor nature. They were of the type which could be expected from college students living in an apartment situation either on the campus or off campus.

Many more respondents (102) expressed favorable comments concerning Preston Apartments than expressed negative feelings. These positive comments have been grouped into nine general categories and are summarized in Table 21.

TABLE 21.--Comments concerning Preston Apartments of a favorable nature, made by the respondents.

Comment	Men	Women	Total Respondents
	N	N	N
less expensive	14	5	19
independence (freedom)	4	14	18
practice in homemaking	9	7	16
personal responsibility	4	9	13
convenient location	9	3	12
"homelike" atmosphere	5	3	8
personal privacy	7	1	8
flexible dining schedule	2	4	6
positive effect on grades	0	2	2

Favorable financial aspects, personal privacy, "homelike" atmosphere, and convenient location have been mentioned by the respondents in answering previous questions. It is not surprising that one-third of them wrote statements about these aspects in Part V. The other five categories, however, were not covered in the questionnaire and the comments received add further dimensions to the total evaluation of the Preston Apartment study.

Typical of the statements which have been taken from the responses received in Part V of the questionnaire are:

Statements by Men

The financial advantages were my initial reason for moving in but later the advantages of a more relaxed schedule (eating, etc.) became more important to me.

My handling of my own funds, economics of buying, housekeeping, etc. are all well learned lessons.

--these past two semesters have been the most enjoyable period of my college career. The atmosphere was restful and simulated that of one's home.

I emphasize the privacy and homelike atmosphere here which has been the greatest satisfying quality of Preston.

I lived in a residence hall, off-campus, and in Preston Apts., the latter was much more satisfying.

I feel that Preston Apartments (single) is one of the best things this University has done in the field of housing. Since I have lived in Preston, I have not had a semester below a 3.00 average.

Living in a Preston Apts. situation tests the students ability to live and get along with others. It also developed an amount of self-discipline and control in the student.

Preston gave me a more mature image of myself and, I feel, helped me become more realistic in my personal affairs.

By having the household responsibilities as in Preston we are able to learn many practical aspects of life which will help us when we leave C.M.U.

Statements by Women

I found it a great growing up experience--the trust policy is good--my point average went from a 2.36 to a 2.93. I liked it!

Preston also gives a good experience in house-keeping and cooking. It is conveniently located on campus.

I should like to add that my parents were very skeptical about Preston in the beginning, but now are very much in favor of this type of apartment.

The time spent in cooking and cleaning this apt. is equivalent to the time spent standing in line in the food commons.

The honor system makes the rules so much easier to follow. In otherwords, the University's rules are no longer irritating.

It has given me a greater feeling of independence than the dorm could.

Preston Apartments is a good transition period (especially for the guys) between the time when everything is done for you (as in the dorm) and the time when you will definitely have to be on your own.

I wanted to move off-campus but couldn't afford to pay a lot of rent--Preston was just right for what I wanted.

I saved money and had fun. It was really worthwhile for me. Everyone should have the same opportunity.

Part V of the questionnaire was forwarded to the Director of Housing at Central Michigan University for study by personnel of the Housing Office. A complete report of this study will be supplied him at a later date, however, since it was recently decided to continue the Preston Apartment housing program for one more year, it was felt that both the positive and negative comments of the respondents should be made available to him as soon as possible.

Interviews with the Residence Hall Sample

Twenty-two students were randomly selected from the residence hall sample to be interviewed during the investigation. Each of the students selected for interview lived in a residence hall situation during the 1967-68 school year and was now a senior at Central Michigan University.

At the beginning of each interview the purposes of the investigation were explained to each student. They were encouraged to make comments or raise questions concerning the investigation while the interviews were in progress. The interviews focused on five, preselected questions (Appendix C) which were directed to each student.

The students were asked why they had chosen to live in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year (when they could have lived wherever they chose), and a variety of responses were received. Some students gave more than one reason. Table 22 shows the responses received to this question.

TABLE 22.--The reasons given by 22 students from the interview sample for living in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year.

Reason	Men	Women	Total Respondents
	N	N	N
influence of friends or roommates	5	4	9
location on campus	2	4	6
parental influence	2	4	6
good study conditions	2	0	2
not a "party" atmosphere	1	1	2
liked the housemother	1	1	2
disliked idea of housekeeping	2	2	4
comfortable and convenient	2	1	3
did not apply in time	0	1	1
wanted off-campus but could not find a suitable place	1	1	2

The reason mentioned most often (9 times) during the interviews was the influence of roommates or friends.

Second in frequency of response were the aspects of the convenient location of the residence halls on campus and the influence exerted by their parents. These two reasons were each given by 6 different students. Other reasons mentioned were: the good study conditions provided by the residence halls (2), they didn't want the "party" atmosphere which they felt they might find elsewhere (2), they "liked" the housemother (2), they disliked the idea of housekeeping--cooking and cleaning (4), they felt the residence halls were comfortable and a convenient way in which to live (3), she wanted Preston Apartments but did not apply in time (1), and they wanted to move off-campus but they could not find a place they thought was suitable so they remained in the residence hall "for one more year" (2).

The students were next asked where they are living this year and why they chose to live in this particular place. Table 23 gives a summary of the answers they gave to the first part of this question.

In answering the second part of the above question, the students gave a variety of reasons for choosing to live where they do this year. The most frequent explanation was the influence of friends or roommates. This reason was mentioned by seven of the twenty-two students interviewed; five who live in off-campus apartments, one from Preston Apartments, and one male student who is

purchasing a mobile home with a friend in a local trailer court.

TABLE 23.--Place of residence for the 1968-69 school year as indicated by the 22 students interviewed.

Place of Residence	Men	Women	Total Respondents
	N	N	N
apartment off-campus	1	8	9
room off-campus	2	0	2
trailer court	2	0	2
residence hall	2	3	5
Preston Apartments	1	1	2
married student housing	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	9	13	22

The responses to this question revealed that five of the students interviewed are living in a residence hall this year. Two, both men, stated they are living in a residence hall because their parents wanted them to do so. Both indicated they would have preferred to live in a room or apartment off-campus but, since their parents were giving them financial assistance, they felt they should defer to their parents' wishes. Two other students living in a residence hall indicated they are doing so for financial reasons. They are employed as student assistants in the halls and receive their room and board

as compensation for their services. The fifth student living in a residence hall stated she stayed there all four years because she "liked the atmosphere and felt it was a comfortable, convenient way to live."

Both students who moved into Preston Apartments for the first time this year said that financial considerations were an important influence on their decision to do so. They indicated they had heard it was less expensive to live there and so far (six months) it has proved to be so. One of the students also mentioned the influence of friends and both stated they liked the central location of Preston Apartments on the campus.

Other reasons given for leaving the residence hall by one or more of the students who did so were a desire for more privacy and freedom, marriage, the fact that they wanted a change after three years of living in a residence hall, and a desire to have more responsibility for their own affairs.

It is interesting to note the number of students who indicated their plans were influenced during the junior and senior years by friends or roommates. During their junior year nine students gave this as a contributing factor and during their senior year seven so indicated. Approximately 30% (Table 5) of the seventy-seven students in the Preston Apartment sample who returned to Preston Apartments for their senior year cited the same

influence as affecting their decision as to where they would live.

All of the students in the sample being interviewed knew about the Preston Apartment opportunity for single students near the middle of the spring semester of the 1966-67 school year.

The students interviewed cited three means used by the University to disseminate information about the Preston Apartment living situation for single students during the spring of 1967: the University student newspaper carried notices on at least two occasions, notices were posted on the bulletin boards in each of the residence halls, and corridor meetings were held in residence halls at which the plan was explained and students' questions answered. From the answers given by the twenty-two students interviewed, it is apparent that during the spring semester of 1967 all sophomore students living in residence halls at the University had the opportunity to become acquainted with the Preston Apartment living proposal.

The next question was used to determine the extent to which each of the students in the interview sample was familiar with the living conditions under which single students were living in Preston Apartments. Eighteen of the students indicated they had visited in Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year several times.

Eleven reported they had friends living in Preston Apartments and had visited there as often as once a week.

Four said they had never been to Preston Apartments but they believed they were familiar with the living situation because they had heard about it from friends and acquaintances.

During the exploration of this question, the responses of the students were pursued until it was determined they were all well informed about living conditions in Preston Apartments. This was considered to be necessary if their answers to the final question were to be significant.

The last question discussed with the students in the interview sample was, "Knowing what you do now about the Preston Apartment living situation, do you think you would have liked to live there during the 1967-68 school year? Why?" To the first part of this question eleven responded yes, nine replied no, and two were undecided.

The students who indicated they would liked to have lived in Preston Apartments during their junior year gave the following reasons for their opinions: three felt it would have been less expensive than living in a residence hall, one was sure it was more "homelike," three believed it would have been a good experience to have before graduating and being completely "on their own," two were impressed by the central location of Preston Apartments

on the campus, and two thought that Preston Apartments encouraged more freedom and had a "freer atmosphere" than the residence halls.

The nine students who stated they would again elect to live in a residence hall during their junior year gave the following reasons for their positions: two students indicated they did not like to cook or take part in housekeeping activities, one felt Preston Apartments were more crowded than the rooms in the residence halls, two had friends in the residence halls and would remain living with them, one remarked about the friendly atmosphere and spirit in the residence halls and doubted if it existed in Preston Apartments, one was involved in several organized student activities and didn't feel she would have time to cook and take care of household chores, and two were "happy to have things done for them like in the dorm."

Two of the students interviewed are now living in Preston Apartments. One of them reported he wished he had been able to live there last year while the other stated she was happy in a residence hall last year but felt Preston Apartments was a good living experience for seniors.

The students in the interview sample had mixed feelings about the Preston Apartment living situation. They were almost equally divided on the question as to

whether or not, knowing the situation as they do now, they would want to have lived there during their junior year.

The reasons given for their responses were varied. The influence of roommates and friends was the most common factor in determining where these students lived during their junior and senior years. While this reason was given more often than others, some of the other factors mentioned were privacy, personal freedom, and financial considerations.

During the interviews an effort was made to not lead the students to specific answers. No student was given any indication of how other students had responded. Even with these precautions similar answers were often made by different students. The same observations can be made concerning the responses received on the questionnaire.

Academic Achievement of the Samples

This section contains a presentation of the academic achievement of the students in the Preston Apartment sample compared with the academic achievement made by a like group of students who lived in a residence hall at Central Michigan University during the 1967-68 school year.

In September, 1967, approximately 800 students, classified by the University as having junior status,

moved into the residence halls at Central Michigan University. To secure a sample of these juniors which would match as closely as possible the Preston Apartment sample, 200 students were selected randomly from the total population. The cumulative records of these students were then examined. Those considered by the University to be on any form of probation were eliminated. This left a residence hall sample of 161 students.

The cumulative grade point averages for each of the students in the Preston Apartment sample and the residence hall sample as of September 1, 1967, and June 15, 1968, were then secured from the office of the Registrar. Using this data, the changes in cumulative grade point averages during the 1967-68 school year for each of the students in both samples were computed. Table 24 (p. 82) shows the positive and negative changes which took place.

It can be seen from Table 24 that the changes in cumulative grade point averages which occurred among the students in the Preston Apartment sample varied from $+.40$ to $-.41$, while the changes in the cumulative grade point averages of the residence hall sample ranged from $+.35$ to $-.43$. The median change for both samples fell in the category of $+.03$ - $+.04$. The computed mean change of cumulative grade point averages for the Preston Apartment sample was $+.037$ and for the residence hall sample was $+.031$. This evidence would indicate little difference

TABLE 24.--The changes in cumulative grade point averages experienced by two samples of junior students at Central Michigan University, 1967-68.

Change	Preston Apartments Sample		Residence Hall Sample
	N		N
+.39-+.40	1		
+.37-+.38			
+.35-+.36	1		1
+.33-+.34			
+.31-+.32			1
+.29-+.30	1		
+.27-+.28	3		
+.25-+.26	2		1
+.23-+.24	4		2
+.21-+.22	2		5
+.19-+.20	2		1
+.17-+.18	3		2
+.15-+.16	8		8
+.13-+.14	11		5
+.11-+.12	11		11
+.09-+.10	12		10
+.07-+.08	8		16
+.05-+.06	17		14
+.03-+.04	14	--median--	9
+.01-+.02	13		12
0	4		6
-.01--.02	12		8
-.03--.04	7		10
-.05--.06	6		10
-.07--.08	5		10
-.09--.10	7		5
-.11--.12	6		4
-.13--.14	2		4
-.15--.16	3		1
-.17--.18	k		1
-.19--.20	4		2
-.21--.22	2		1
-.23--.24			
-.25--.26	1		
-.31--.32	1		
-.41--.42	1		
-.43--.44			1

between the changes in the cumulative grade point averages of the students in the two samples.

The changes in cumulative grade point averages of the Preston Apartment sample and the residence hall sample are summarized in Table 25. An inspection of this table indicates there was little difference in the percentage of each sample who raised or lowered their cumulative grade point averages during the 1967-68 school year.

TABLE 25.--The percentage of students in each sample whose cumulative grade point averages changed during the 1967-68 school year.

Change	Preston Apartment Sample		Residence Hall Sample	
	N	%	N	%
raised	113	65	98	61
remained the same	4	2	6	4
lowered	<u>58</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>35</u>
Total	175	100	161	100

The computed mean of the changes in the cumulative grade point averages of the Preston Apartment sample for the 1967-68 school year was $+.037$. The computed mean of the changes in the cumulative grade point averages of the residence hall sample was $+.031$ for the same period. A cursory inspection of this evidence and the data presented

in Tables 24 and 25 indicates the changes which took place in the two samples were nearly the same. To further analyze the degree of difference, if any, which existed in the changes in the cumulative grade point averages of the two samples during the 1967-69 school year, a t-test was used to compare the means of the changes of the two samples. Young and Veldman (19) and Guenther (5) indicate that if two groups are normal, with the same variance, then a t-test is a satisfactory statistic to use for testing hypothesis about their means. Guenther further states:

Experimental evidence seems to indicate that mild departures from the assumptions of normality and equal variances do not seriously influence conclusions drawn--provided that the sample sizes are equal or nearly so (5: 23).

The following hypothesis was formed: The mean of the cumulative grade point average changes of the Preston Apartment sample is equal to the mean of the cumulative grade point average changes of the residence hall sample. A significance level of .05 was selected and a t-test was applied to the data. At the .05 level of significance no evidence was found to reject the hypothesis that the means of the two samples were equal.

For all practical purposes, it appears there was no significant difference in the achievement, or lack of achievement, of the students in the two samples. Implications for further study in this area are made in Chapter V.

Interviews with Administrative Officers

To discover the cost to the University of permitting single students to live in University owned, on campus apartments, compared with a regular residence hall situation and other administrative factors connected with Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year, six questions (Appendix D) were asked of various administrative officers at Central Michigan University.

Interviews were held during March, 1969 with the Director of Plant Extension, the Director of Accounting, the Director of Housing, and his assistant. To clarify questions raised during the original interview, a second meeting was held with the Director of Housing and his assistant.

To determine the original cost to the University of constructing and equipping both types of facilities, the contracts and budgets for married student apartments and regular residence halls now under construction were examined and discussed with the Director of Plant Extension. Since these facilities are now in the final stages of construction, it was believed the financial aspects pertaining to them would be relevant to this study.

The residence hall complex currently under construction at Central Michigan University is a facility containing four residence halls (towers), central food-commons,

reception halls, recreation rooms, study rooms, lounges, laundry rooms, and other service facilities normally found in college residence halls.

When completed, this facility will have a normal occupancy of 1504 students. The students will occupy two bedroom suites with a private bath and connecting study-living area. Four students will be assigned to each suite.

The total budget for the residence hall project is \$8,080,000.00. This amount includes the cost of constructing and equipping the facility and all of the related expenses (insurance, architects fees, etc.). Simple computation reveals a cost of approximately \$5,383.00 per bed.

The married student apartments (100 units) now under construction are a townhouse style, with two bedrooms, and equipped comparably to Preston Apartments. Some of these apartments are already occupied and others are in various stages of completion.

The total cost of building and equipping each of the apartment units is \$11,900.00. Considering each of the units as capable of housing 4 single students (two beds in each bedroom) the per bed cost of building and equipping each unit would be \$2,975.00.

It can be observed from the above figures that at the present time it costs approximately \$2,408.00 less

per bed to build and equip student apartment (townhouse type) living units than residence halls at Central Michigan University. According to the Director of Plant Extension, this cost differential can be attributed chiefly to (1) the height of the buildings--two stories as opposed to eight stories, and (2) facilities not contained in apartments which are necessary in a residence hall complex (lobbies, recreation rooms, dining facilities, and so forth).

To determine whether or not the arrangements for financing the two types of facilities are different, an interview was held with the Director of Accounting. He stated that loans for residence halls and student apartments at Central Michigan University varied from thirty-seven years to forty-five years in length. The most recent loans for these types of facilities have averaged forty years duration. Apparently there is little difficulty in arranging loans for student housing from either the government or private sources, and the current loan situation has little bearing on this study.

Interviews were held with the Director of Housing and his assistant during which the following topics were discussed: the cost of maintenance and upkeep of the two types of student housing facilities, the cost of converting present residence hall suites to apartment type facilities, special problems arising from the Preston

Apartment living situation which are not present in the residence halls, and the response they have observed toward single students living in Preston Apartments.

Both housing officials were emphatic in stating that damage and destruction to University property has been lower in Preston Apartments during the 1 1/2 years single students have lived there than in either the residence halls or married student housing areas during the same period. They observed that single students living in Preston Apartments were quieter than families living in married housing or single students living in the residence halls. They also felt there had been fewer problems of "rowdyism and horseplay" than with students of a similar age in the residence halls.

The housing officials credited the above conduct to a feeling of maturity and responsibility on the part of the students in Preston Apartments. They stated there was much less administrative supervision in Preston Apartments than in the residence halls and they thought this factor encouraged good behavior rather than challenging the students to break rules and "see how much they could get away with." They remarked that an honor system was used with the single students in Preston Apartments and that the students apparently were better citizens as a result.

The Director of Housing has considered the possibility of converting some of the two bedroom suites in the newer residence halls into apartment type facilities for single students. He stated that, for approximately \$1,500.00, a two bedroom suite could be remodeled into an apartment with kitchenette, private bathroom, living-study room, and one bedroom. The resulting apartment would be large enough to accommodate three students. This plan has not yet officially been given consideration by the University and will not be investigated further until a more definite need is observed.

A large difference in the cost to the University of the two types of single student housing situations (residence halls and single student apartments) was pointed out by the Director of Housing. Approximately 8.3% of the income (rent) in Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year was spent on salaries of employees assigned to work in that area. Approximately 45% of the room rent received in the residence halls during the same period was spent on salaries of employees: housemother, custodian, housekeeper, student assistants, receptionists, telephone operators, etc.

The housing officials were asked if problems of a special or unusual nature had occurred as a result of single students living in Preston Apartments during the past 1 1/2 years. Both responded negatively. They

remarked that student assistants, similar to those in the residence halls, had been employed during the 1967-68 school year for Preston Apartments. The assistants were each responsible for thirty to fifty students and were employed to help maintain order in the apartments and to represent the University to the students living there. These positions were discontinued for the 1968-69 school year when it was discovered they were not needed. The Director of Housing and his assistant both expressed a desire for other student housing areas (residence halls in particular) to be as trouble free as Preston Apartments. They said the students living there were very cooperative and well behaved.

Both housing officials reported they had received many compliments and comments of a positive nature from single students living in Preston Apartments. The most common statements mentioned pertained to the financial advantages of living in Preston Apartments rather than in a residence hall and the fact that Preston Apartments was a good place for studying and learning to get along with people.

Recently it was decided to make Preston Apartments available to single students again next year. This decision was reached because of a slowness in completion of the residence hall complex now under construction. It is doubtful if more than one wing will be ready for

occupancy by September, 1969. Applications are being accepted for the 1969-70 school year in Preston Apartments and already there are more applicants than can be assigned. The Director of Housing said there has been an increase in interest over last year on the part of students and that student response to the Preston Apartment living situation has been excellent.

Summary

This chapter presented an analysis of the data secured in the study. The data was obtained by the administration of a questionnaire to a sample of single students (seniors) who lived in Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year, through interviews with a sample of single students (seniors) who lived in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year, by a comparison of the changes which occurred in the cumulative grade point averages of samples of single students who lived in the two different housing situations during the 1967-68 school year, and through interviews with college administrators acquainted with the financial and social aspects of both living situations.

A summary of the findings, together with conclusions and recommendations arising from them, will be found in, Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter the purpose of the study and the methodology used in the study are presented. The findings of the four phases of the study are summarized. Conclusions of the study are stated. Finally, recommendations to Central Michigan University are made.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to evaluate some of the advantages or disadvantages of single students living in self-contained, University owned, on campus apartments. The evaluation included the perceptions and observations of single students who experienced both apartment and residence hall living situations in the areas of their social, academic, and financial satisfactions. It further assessed the degree of academic success of these students by comparing their academic achievement with that of a control group who lived in the residence halls. Finally, a comparison of the cost to the students and to the University of this type of living situation and a regular residence hall program was made.

Methodology

The information presented in this study was secured during the winter and spring of 1969. Both questionnaire and interview techniques were used. The principal source of information for the study was the opinions and perceptions of a sample of 140 senior students which were obtained by questionnaire. Further data was secured by interviews with a sample of senior students who lived in a residence hall rather than in the apartment situation, by a comparison of the academic records of two samples of senior students, and through interviews with University administrative officials.

Findings

The findings of the study are presented in four parts: The Questionnaire, Interviews with Students from the Residence Hall Sample, Academic Achievement of the Preston Apartment Sample Compared with the Residence Hall Sample, and Interviews with Administrative Officers.

The Questionnaire

One hundred and forth responses were recieved from the mailing of a questionnaire to 167 senior students who were unmarried during the 1967-68 school year and lived in Preston Apartments.

The responses to the questionnaire revealed that in September, 1967, 83 1/2% of the respondents were under

twenty-one years of age and 93% had previously lived in a residence hall at Central Michigan University for at least two semesters.

The main reasons given by the respondents for electing to move into Preston Apartments were financial expectations (88%), the possibility of fewer rules and regulations than in the residence halls (73%), and the hope for more privacy than they had experienced while living in residence halls (50%).

Seventy-seven (55%) of the respondents returned to Preston Apartments to live during the 1968-69 school year. The most frequent reasons given for returning to Preston Apartments a second year were, "it was less expensive" (88%), and "the influence of roommates" (30%).

Sixty-three respondents (45%) reported they were not living in Preston Apartments during the 1968-69 school year. Twenty-one are living elsewhere because of marriage, twelve are student teaching in another town, and twenty-nine indicated they are living off-campus in a private room or apartment because they wanted more freedom and independence than they felt Preston Apartments could provide.

When asked to give an over-all rating of their living experience in Preston Apartments compared with their experience in a residence hall, 94% of the respondents indicated they believed that Preston Apartments was

better. Approximately 91% stated they had more personal privacy in Preston Apartments than in the residence halls and 100% reported that Preston Apartments was more "home-like." A large majority of the respondents indicated they considered the factors of personal privacy (80%) and "hominess" (91%) to be of importance to them.

The students were requested to give their opinions as to which living situation, Preston Apartments or a residence hall, made them feel more a part of the total University community. Nearly half (49%) of the respondents reported they observed no difference in the two locations while 42% gave preference to the residence halls, and 9% indicated Preston Apartments. Most of the students who favored the residence hall living situation based their responses on the fact that the residence hall program at Central Michigan University offers a number of planned social activities which they felt they missed while living in Preston Apartments. Similar responses were received when 49% indicated they believed living in Preston Apartments was not as conducive to participation in organized student activities as living in a residence hall.

To determine the amount of participation in organized student activities during the 1967-68 school year by the students, they were asked to list the organized activities in which they had participated during

that period. The 140 respondents indicated participation in a total of 151 student activities. Most frequently mentioned were Greek social organizations (47%) and intramural athletics (31%). More male participation (90 activities) than female participation (61 activities) was reported. This distribution was influenced by the greater degree of participation by men than women in some phase of the University athletic program.

Personal conflicts with roommates were reported by 22% of the respondents. Investigation revealed most of these problems were of a nature which could have occurred in a residence hall, in Preston Apartments, or in an off campus living situation and had little or no bearing on this study.

The housekeeping aspect of living in Preston Apartments was explored when the students were asked if they felt the time spent on household tasks detracted to an appreciable extent from the time they could have spent more profitably in academic or social pursuits. A majority (90%) of the respondents indicated it made no difference. To the contrary, most of the respondents regarded this responsibility as a challenge and a valuable addition to their total education.

The respondents were in favor (93%) of encouraging or requiring freshmen students to live in a residence hall. They also felt the apartment living situation

should not be made available to single students until either their sophomore year (57%) or their junior year (39%) in college. They believed that freshmen students needed the supervision and control which a residence hall situation could provide until they had established study habits and adjusted to college life. The respondents felt this normally would take about one year.

The feeling of the respondents was, after the freshman year in college, the Preston Apartment living situation was more conducive to academic pursuits than residence halls. The respondents perceived Preston Apartments as being better (48%) or equal to (44%) a residence hall in stimulating intellectual achievement. A majority of them (73%) reported they did most of their studying in their rooms and 90% indicated that apartments were quiet and conducive to studying. Approximately 33% would have used special study rooms if they had been available to them.

The most frequent reason given by the respondents for electing to move into Preston Apartments was the belief that it would prove to be less expensive than living in a residence hall or off the campus. The chief reason (88%) given by the respondents who returned to Preston Apartments for a second year for doing so was again financial. The financial advantages of living in Preston Apartments rather than in a residence hall or off the

campus are apparently considered to be important by a large number of the respondents.

It is interesting to note from where the respondents indicated they received financial support during the 1967-68 school year. Sixty-six per cent stated they received some financial assistance from their parents or families, but only 34% said they received over one-half of their total expense money from this source. Seventy-three per cent reported summer employment, 17% some form of loan, 33% scholarship or grant-in-aid, and 41% part time employment during the school year.

The students were asked to estimate the average amount of money they spent on groceries each week during the 1967-68 school year. Their responses showed an estimate of \$5.00-\$7.99 per week by 71%, less than \$5.00 per week by 17%, and \$8.00-\$10.99 per week by 10 1/2%. Two students (1 1/2%) reported they felt they spent between \$11.00-\$13.99 each week for groceries.

The students also estimated how much more or less (room and board) it cost them to live in Preston Apartments for one semester than it would have cost them to live in a residence hall for the same period. To assist them in answering this question, they were given the cost of rent in Preston Apartments and the cost of room and board in a residence hall.

Eighty-nine per cent of the respondents felt it was less expensive to live in Preston Apartments than in a residence hall. Over one-half of this group (59 1/2%) indicated an estimated savings of \$100.00 or more each semester.

Eleven per cent of the respondents believed it was more expensive to live in Preston Apartments than in a residence hall. Their estimates were as high as \$125.00 more each semester. Several of the students in this category admitted during interviews that they probably lived in a more "expensive style" than was necessary.

The questionnaire provided the students with the opportunity to make comments pertaining to their perceptions and observations of single students living in Preston Apartments. Observations of both a positive (102) and a negative (41) nature were received.

Comments of a positive or favorable nature pertained to the financial savings realized while living in Preston Apartments (19), the convenient location on campus (12), the practice and experience in homemaking (16), the feeling of personal privacy (8), the independence and freedom felt by the respondents (18), the sense of personal responsibility which was fostered (13), the positive effect on grades (2), the flexible dining schedule (6), and the "homelike" atmosphere (8).

The most common complaints or comments of a negative nature centered around what the respondents felt were crowded living conditions (17), primarily three women sharing one bedroom with a resulting shortage of closet and storage space. Other negative observations mentioned more than once were poor maintenance (7), inadequate heating (8), lack of planned social activities (2), and silverfish in the bathroom and kitchen (4). With the exception of the respondents concern for crowded living conditions for three women living in a one bedroom apartment, most of the complaints or comments of a negative nature were of the type which could be expected from college students living in any apartment situation.

In general, the comments written by the respondents were thoughtful and made in a constructive manner. A large number of recommendations (78) were made by the respondents for continuing Preston Apartments as a single student housing facility in the future.

Interviews with Students from the Residence Hall Sample

Twenty-two students from the sample of senior students who lived during their junior year (1967-68) in a residence hall were selected randomly for interview. The interviews focused on five, pre-selected questions.

The students were first asked why they had elected to live in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school

year. The reasons given most often were the influence of roommates or friends (9), the central location of the residence halls on campus (6), and the influence of their parents (6). Seven other factors (Table 22) were mentioned from one to four times each.

The students were asked where they were living this year (1968-69) and why they decided to live there. Eleven of the students stated they are living in a room or apartment off the campus, five in a residence hall, and two each in a trailer court, married student housing, and Preston Apartments. Again, a variety of reasons were given as to why they chose these places to live during the 1968-69 school year. Seven students attributed their decision to the influence of friends or roommates. Two students each mentioned the influence of their parents, financial reasons, marriage, and a desire for more freedom, privacy, independence, and responsibility.

The interviews showed the proposal for single students to live in Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year was well publicized by the University. Newspaper publicity, notices on bulletin boards in the residence halls, and group meetings in the residence halls were means used by the University to make single students acquainted with the Preston Apartment opportunity.

Each of the students interviewed was well acquainted with the Preston Apartment living situation and could

give a knowledgeable answer to the final question. This question was, "Knowing what you do now about the Preston Apartment living situation, do you think you would have liked to live there during the 1967-68 school year? Why?" To this question, eleven students responded yes, nine replied no, and two were undecided.

Various reasons were given for the affirmative answers. Three felt it would have been less expensive to live in Preston Apartments than in a residence hall, one was sure it was more homelike in Preston Apartments, two like the location of Preston Apartments on campus, two felt they would have experienced more freedom, and three believed it would have been a good experience for them to have before graduating and being completely on their own.

The students who indicated they would still have remained in a residence hall during their junior year in college gave the following reasons for their opinions: two did not like to cook, one believed the apartments were too crowded, two had friends in the residence hall and would have remained with them, one liked the residence hall spirit, one didn't have time for housekeeping, and two were "happy to have things done for them like in the dorm."

The students from the residence hall sample who were interviewed indicated mixed feelings about the

Preston Apartment living situation. The influence of friends or roommates was the factor most often mentioned as having an affect on their decisions as to where they would live. One-half of them indicated they new felt they would have liked the experience of living in Preston Apartments during their Junior year.

Academic Achievement of the
Preston Apartment Sample
Compared with the Residence
Hall Sample

A random sample of 161 senior students who lived in a residence hall during the 1967-68 school year was selected to be compared with the students in the Preston Apartment sample. A comparison was made of the changes which occurred in the cumulative grade point average of the stduents in the two samples.

The mean of the changes in the cumulative grade point averages of the Preston Apartment sample for the 1967-68 school year was $+.037$. The mean of the changes in the cumulative grade point averages of the residence hall sample for the same period was $+.031$.

A t-test was used to compare the means of the changes in cumulative grade point averages of the two samples and, at the .05 level of significance, no evi-
dence was found to reject the hypothesis that the means were equal.

Sixty-five per cent of the students in the Preston Apartment sample raised their cumulative grade point average, 2% remained the same, and 33% lowered their cumulative grade point average during the 1967-68 school year. Sixty-one per cent of the students in the residence hall sample raised their cumulative grade point average, 4% remained the same, and 35% lowered their cumulative grade point average during the 1967-68 school year.

For the purposes of this study, the above comparisons were deemed to be sufficient and it was concluded that there was no significant difference in the levels of academic achievement of the two samples.

Interviews with Administrative Officers

Interviews were held with members of the administrative staff at Central Michigan University to discover the cost to the University of single students living in on campus apartments compared with a regular residence hall situation and other administrative factors connected with single students living in Preston Apartments.

Information received from the Director of Plant Extension at Central Michigan University revealed it currently is much less expensive per bed to construct and equip apartments for single student occupancy than regular residence halls. A review of the most recent

housing contracts revealed a cost of approximately \$5,383.00 per bed to build and equip the residence hall facility now under construction. The same source indicated a cost of approximately \$2,975.00 per bed to build and equip the townhouse type apartments now being constructed. These figures show a differential of nearly \$2,400.00 less per bed to build and equip apartment type facilities. The cost differential can apparently be attributed in a large part to the size of the buildings (two stories compared with eight stories) and the extra facilities which are required for residence halls.

The Director of Accounting reported there was little or no difference in the methods of financing the two types of student housing installations, in the interest rates, or in the duration of the loans.

Another difference in the cost to the University of the two types of housing facilities pointed out by the Director of Housing was the amount of money spent for salaries of employees required to work in each area. The University spent approximately 8.3% of the income (rent) from Preston Apartments on salaries of the employees who worked there during the 1967-68 school year. During the same period, approximately 45% of the room rent in the residence halls was allocated for salaries of the employees who worked in the residence halls.

The Director of Housing reported that, for approximately \$1,500.00 each, suites in existing residence halls could be converted to one bedroom apartments with cooking facilities if a need for more units of this type becomes apparent.

The Director of Housing and his assistant both indicated that problems of a social or disciplinary nature in Preston Apartments during the past one and a half years have been minor compared with those in the residence halls. The housing officials were satisfied with the experience of single students living in Preston Apartments and felt the plan contributed much to the total residence hall program at Central Michigan University.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the findings of the study:

1. Single students living in University owned, on campus apartments at Central Michigan University were able to effect a substantial savings over what they would have had to pay for room and board in a residence hall.
2. At this time, it is less expensive for Central Michigan University to construct, equip, and operate apartment type living facilities for single students than regular residence halls.

3. Living in Preston Apartments provided valuable maturing and educational experiences for single students.
4. There is a need for a program of organized activities, similar to that in the residence halls, for single students living in Preston Apartments.
5. No unusual problems of a disciplinary or social nature resulted from single students living in Preston Apartments.
6. The Preston Apartment living situation provided better study conditions and a better atmosphere for intellectual achievement for some single students than the residence halls.
7. No appreciable difference was discovered in the changes in the cumulative grade point average of the students in the Preston Apartment and the residence hall samples.
8. Single students should have attained at least sophomore standing before they are permitted to live in Preston Apartments.
9. Freshmen students at Central Michigan University should be encouraged to live in a residence hall.
10. The opportunity to live in on campus apartments was enthusiastically endorsed by the sample

of single students who lived in Preston Apartments.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to Central Michigan University based on the findings:

1. Central Michigan University should continue to make available to single students of sophomore classification or higher the opportunity to live in Preston Apartments.
2. If the number of upperclass, single students desiring apartment accommodations on the campus increases, Central Michigan University should construct, remodel, reassign, or in some way make them available to those students.
3. A well planned program of student activities should be fostered for single students living in Preston Apartments.
4. Central Michigan University should investigate the possibility of providing community study rooms for the convenience of the residents in Preston Apartments.
5. If three women are to be housed in the one bedroom units in Preston Apartments, an effort should be made to provide more closet and storage space for their convenience.

6. Adaptability should be an important consideration when building new student housing units. Apartments should be constructed which will meet the needs of either single or married students as the demand changes.
7. Maintenance and heating problems should be handled with as much dispatch as possible.

The following recommendations are made for further research:

1. Replication of this study to additional or larger populations would provide a reliability check for the instrument as well as provide additional data to be used when future decisions are made concerning the direction student housing at Central Michigan University is to take.
2. Samples of single students living in on campus apartments and residence halls should be compared with samples of single students living in apartments off the campus in the areas of their academic and social satisfactions.
3. An analysis of the financial aspects of single students living in on campus and off campus apartments should be made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Caudill, William W. "What Makes a Campus More Than Its Buildings?" College and University Business, October, 1964.
2. Central Michigan University Bulletin. Mt. Pleasant, July, 1967.
3. Cowley, W. H. "The History of Student Residential Housing." School and Society, Vol. 40, December, 1934.
4. Frost, S. E. American Education. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962.
5. Guenther, William C. Analysis of Variance. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
6. Johnson, Jo Anne. "Residence Halls Goals and Objectives: Perceptions of Students and Staff." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.
7. Mueller, Kate H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.
8. Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Conference. The Association of College and University Housing Officers, 1967.
9. Riker, Harold C. College Housing as Learning Centers. Washington, D.C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1965.
10. ———. "The Changing Role of Student Housing." College Student Work in the Years Ahead. Edited by Gordon Klopff. Washington, D.C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1966.
11. Riker, Harold C., with Lopez, Frank. College Students Live Here. New York: The Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., 1961.

12. Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University--A History. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
13. Shaffer, Robert H., and Martinson, William D. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
14. Sommer, Robert. "Student Reactions to Four Types of Residence Halls." The Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1968.
15. Strozier, Robert M., et al. "Housing of Students." American Council on Education, Series VI, No. 14, 1950.
16. "Student Housing at the University of Iowa." A Report by the University of Iowa Housing Committee, Iowa City, July, 1967.
17. Williamson, E. G. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
18. Wren, Gilbert C. Student Personnel in College. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951.
19. Young, Robert K., and Veldman, Donald J. Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt-Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO STUDENTS



Central Michigan University

MOUNT PLEASANT, MICHIGAN 48858

In September 1967, a select group of students who had been living in the residence halls at Central Michigan University were given the opportunity to live in Preston Apartments. This was a new concept in student housing facilities at Central Michigan University. It was originally planned as a means of meeting a temporary single student housing shortage and was to continue only until the new high rise residence hall complex would be ready for occupancy in the fall of 1969.

In cooperation with the Director of Housing, we are conducting a study of the perceptions and opinions held by students who had this experience last year. You are one of the students who is being invited to give your reactions to that experience. We recognize that the perceptions and opinions held by students are quite valuable in planning future college housing facilities and we feel your reactions will contribute significantly to this study.

Enclosed with this letter is a short questionnaire which can be completed in about 20 minutes. We are asking you to cooperate with us by completing the questionnaire and returning it as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope. Your individual responses will be held in strictest confidence and will be available only to me. A summary of all the responses received, however, will be made available to the Director of Housing. At a later date I will talk with some of you in person to find out more about your experience in Preston Apartments and how you feel it compared with living in a residence hall at Central Michigan University.

We hope the results of this study will provide information of a meaningful nature which will have implications for future planning of student housing facilities. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Glenn L. Starner
Associate Dean of Students

GLS/dc

APPENDIX B

PRESTON APARTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

General Directions.

1. What is your sex?
1 male 2 female
2. How old were you when you moved into Preston Apartments in September 1967?
1 19 years old 3 21 years old
2 20 years old 4 (other) _____
3. What was your classification in college when you moved into Preston Apartments in September 1967?
1 freshman 3 junior
2 sophomore 4 senior
4. How many semesters did you live in a residence hall before you moved into Preston Apartments?
1 one 3 three
2 two 4 four or more

5. During the 1967-68 school year did you participate in any of the following activities? (Circle all that apply)

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 sorority or fraternity | 5 dramatics or debate |
| 2 varsity athletics | 6 campus publications |
| 3 intramural athletics | 7 (other) _____ |
| 4 band, orchestra, or chorus | |

6. If Preston Apartments had not been available to single students during the 1967-68 school year do you think you would have lived in a residence hall or off campus?

- | | |
|------------------|--------------|
| 1 residence hall | 2 off campus |
| 3 do not know | |

7. Listed below are several reasons students have given for electing to live in Preston Apartments. Please circle the numbers of those reasons which most influenced your decision to move there.

- 1 it appeared to be less expensive
- 2 I thought it would be a better place in which to study
- 3 I felt I would have more privacy than in a residence hall
- 4 I hoped there would be fewer rules and less supervision than in a residence hall
- 5 (other) _____

8. When you first approached your parents with the idea of living in Preston Apartments what do you feel was their attitude toward you living in that situation?

- 1 it met with their full approval
- 2 they didn't care
- 3 they were a bit skeptical
- 4 they opposed the plan

9. What do you feel is their attitude today toward your living experience in Preston Apartments?

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------|
| 1 excellent | 3 very questionable |
| 2 satisfactory | 4 unsatisfactory |

10. Where did you live during the fall semester this school year (1968-69)?

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Preston Apartments | 5 married student housing |
| 2 residence hall | 6 apartment off campus |
| 3 at home | 7 in another town |
| 4 private room off campus | 8 (other) _____ |

11. If you did not live in Preston Apartments last fall why did you decide not to return there?

- 1 marriage
- 2 financial reasons (less expensive elsewhere)
- 3 student teaching in another town
- 4 I prefer more freedom which I felt I could have by living off campus
- 5 (other) _____

12. If you did return to Preston Apartments last fall what were your chief reasons for doing so? (Circle all that apply)

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 parental influence | 3 financial |
| 2 influence of roommates | 4 (other) _____ |

PART II: Second, we would like to take a look at your perceptions of certain social aspects of living in Preston Apartments.

13. Taking all factors into consideration, please give your overall rating of living in Preston Apartments compared with living in a residence hall.

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 1. very much better | 3 about the same |
| 2 better | 4 not as good |

14. Which one of the following aspects of living in Preston Apartments do you consider to have been of the most importance to you?

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 1 financial | 3 personal relationships |
| 2 academic | 4 social life |
| 5 (other) _____ | |

15. In which living situation do you feel that you had the most personal privacy? (The chance to be alone when you wanted to be)

1 residence hall

2 Preston Apartments

Was this important to you?

1 yes

2 no

16. Which living situation was most "homelike" that is, the most comfortable, livable, and the place in which you felt most like home?

1 residence hall

2 Preston Apartments

Was this important to you?

1 yes

2 no

17. Did you experience any conflicts of a serious nature with your roommates in Preston Apartments during the 1967-68 school year?

1 yes

2 no

If you did, in what way? _____

18. Do you feel that the time and effort you spent on household tasks detracted to an appreciable extent from the time you could have spent profitably on academic or social pursuits? (Household tasks would include cleaning, cooking, shopping, etc.)

1 a great amount

2 some

3 not noticeable

19. Where did you feel more a part of "University life"; that is, being a participant in the total University community?

1 residence hall

2 Preston Apartments

3 no difference

20. All other factors being considered as equal, do you feel that living in Preston Apartments is as conducive to participation in organized student activities as living in a residence hall?

1 yes

2 no

21. Do you feel that single freshmen should live on campus in a residence hall during their first year of college?

- 1 they should be required to do so
- 2 they should be encouraged to do so
- 3 let them live where they want to

What are your reasons for this opinion? _____

22. During what year in college do you recommend that single students first be allowed to live in Preston Apartments?

- 1 freshman
- 2 sophomore
- 3 junior
- 4 senior

PART III: In this section of the questionnaire we would like to direct your attention to some of the academic aspects of living in Preston Apartments.

23. During the 1967-68 school year where did you do most of your studying?

- 1 in my room
- 2 in the library
- 3 in the student center
- 4 in the room of a friend
- 5 (other) _____

24. Were your quarters in Preston Apartments quiet enough so that you could study when you wanted to?

- 1 yes
- 2 no

If your answer was no, then why not? _____

25. How would you compare the study conditions in Preston Apartments with those you experienced in a residence hall?

- 1 very much better
- 2 a little better
- 3 about the same
- 4 not as good

26. In which living situation do you feel you were stimulated more in the area of intellectual achievement?

1 residence hall

2 Preston Apartments

3 about the same

27. Listed below are five places in which students can live. Please rank them in order (1,2,3, etc.) from the best to the poorest according to your opinion as to which place of residence would provide the best atmosphere for studying.

_____ residence hall

_____ living at home

_____ private room (off campus)

_____ Preston Apartments

_____ sharing an apartment off campus

28. The residence halls at Central Michigan University are provided with study rooms for individual and group studying. Did you use these facilities very often when you lived in a residence hall?

1 yes

2 no

Do you feel that you would have used this type of facility if it had been provided in Preston Apartments?

1 yes

2 no

PART IV: Next, we would like to have you give your opinion of some of the financial aspects of living in Preston Apartments.

29. During the 1967-68 school year approximately how much total financial support did your family contribute toward your education?

1 under \$500.00

4 \$110.00 - \$1400.00

2 \$50.00 - \$800.00

5 over \$1400.00

3 \$80.00 - \$1100.00

30. During the 1967-68 school year did you have a part-time job for which you received pay?

1 yes

2 no

31. If your answer to //30 was yes, approximately how much money did you earn each week?

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 0 - \$5.00 | 4 \$16.00 - \$20.00 |
| 2 \$6.00 - \$10.00 | 5 \$21.00 or more |
| 3 \$11.00 - \$15.00 | |

Approximately how many hours each week did you work at this job?

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1 0 - 5 hours | 4 16 - 20 hours |
| 2 6 - 10 hours | 5 21 hours or more |
| 3 11 - 15 hours | |

32. During the 1967-68 school year did you receive financial aid from any of the following sources? (Circle those that apply)

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 parents or family | 4 scholarship or grant-in-aid |
| 2 loan | 5 (other) _____ |
| 3 summer employment | |

33. Approximately how much money did you spend for groceries each week while living in Preston Apartments? Include only food, milk, coffee, tea, and so forth. Do not include sundries and personal items which you would have to buy no matter where you lived.

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1 less than \$5.00 | 4 \$11.00 - \$13.99 |
| 2 \$5.00 - \$7.99 | 5 more than \$14.00 |
| 3 \$8.00 - \$10.99 | |

34. During the 1967-68 school year, approximately how many meals each week did you eat outside of the apartment? Include restaurants, hamburger shops, the University Center and so forth.

- | | |
|---------|-------------|
| 1 none | 4 5 - 6 |
| 2 1 - 2 | 5 7 or more |
| 3 3 - 4 | |

35. Consider residence hall room and board cost as \$429.00 each semester and rent alone in Preston Apartments as costing \$187.00 each semester. Approximately how much more or less did it cost you to live (room and board only) each semester in Preston Apartments than it did each semester in a residence hall?

<u>more in Preston</u>		<u>less in Preston</u>	
1	under \$50.00	1	under \$50.00
2	\$50.00 - \$74.99	2	\$50.00 - \$74.99
3	\$75.00 - \$99.99	3	\$75.00 - \$99.99
4	\$100.00 - \$124.99	4	\$100.00 - \$124.99
5	over \$125.00	5	over \$125.00

PART V: Last, we left a space for you to make comments pertaining to your perceptions and observations of single students living in Preston Apartments. Your comments and recommendations will be given careful consideration.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS ASKED OF THE
RESIDENCE HALL SAMPLE

APPENDIX C

Questions Asked a Random Sample of the Junior Students Who Lived in a Residence Hall During the 1967-68 School Year

- I. Where did you live during the 1967-68 school year?
Why did you live there?
- II. Where are you living this year (1968-69)? Why
are you living there?
- III. Were you given the opportunity to live in
Preston Apartments last year (1967-68)?
- IV. Are you now familiar with the Preston Apartment
living situation for single students?
To what degree?
How did you become familiar with it?
- V. Knowing what you do now about the Preston Apart-
ment living situation, do you think you would
have liked to live there during the 1967-68
school year?
Why?

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONS ASKED OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS

APPENDIX D

Questions Asked Administrative Officials at Central Michigan University during Interviews Held in March, 1969

- I. What is the cost of constructing and equipping each unit of the student apartments now under construction?
- II. What is the cost of constructing and equipping the residence halls now under construction?
- III. What is the approximate cost to the University of maintenance and upkeep of the residence halls and single student apartments?
- VI. Is it feasible to convert some of the residence hall units into apartment type facilities if the need becomes obvious?
- V. Did any special or unique problems arise in Preston Apartments during the last year and a half which were brought to the attention of the Housing Office?
- VI. What are your observations of the student response to living in Preston Apartments?