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The purpose of this investigation was to identify differences among the services offered to students in residence halls as a function of the organizational structure of housing. The population studied consisted of those colleges and universities which are listed on the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO) mailing list. A questionnaire was the instrument used to survey the institutions listed by the ACUHO organization, and it attempted to gather four types of data: reporting channels for the chief housing officer, reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member within housing, services/programs offered to students in residence halls, and demographic. Questionnaires were field tested and then mailed to 617 chief housing officers listed on the ACUHO newsletter mailing list. The total return rate was 55.1% or 340 questionnaires.

Reporting channels for chief housing officers, reporting channels for lowest level full-time professional staff members, and each of 17
specific services/programs offered to students in residence halls were analyzed by chi-square in relation to full-time Institutional enrollment, total design capacity for single student housing, ACUHO region, institutional nature (public or private), and type of institution (two-year or four-year). No statistically significant results were found in relation to reporting channels for the chief housing officer. However, significant results were obtained for reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member within housing and 5 of the 17 specific services/programs offered to students in residence halls. Discriminant function analysis between the services/programs and reporting channels for both the chief housing officer and the lowest level full-time professional staff member within housing also yielded significant results.

The research demonstrates that there are differences as well as similarities among the housing organizations studied with regard to services/programs offered to students in residence halls. Those chief housing officers who report directly to the university chief business officer rather than to the chief student affairs officer scored consistently lower on most of the service/programming variables included in the study. Also, higher service/programming scores were consistently recorded in those instances where the lowest level full-time professional staff member reported to an assistant housing officer for programming. Those services/programs receiving the greatest perceived emphasis among the respondents included staff selection, student staff development, and personal/social counseling. Those services/programs receiving the least perceived emphasis among the respondents included cooperative student housing, accredited course instruction by
professional and paraprofessional staff, and service to the local community. These data indicate that the delivery of services/programs to students in residence halls is clearly enhanced by the inclusion of an assistant housing officer for programming within a housing organization whose chief officer has a reporting channel to the institutional chief student affairs officer.
Throughout the twentieth century within higher education in the United States the idea that residence hall living experiences can add substantial value to the student's collegiate learning experiences has surfaced frequently (Riker, 1965; Mueller, 1961; Adams, 1968; Chickering, 1969). This postulate, which continues to arise today, has been evidenced in a variety of ways around the country, beginning with the early programs of William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago, Jacob Schuman of Cornell, Andrew West of Princeton, and Abbot Lawrence Lowell of Harvard (Powell, Plyler, Dickson, & McClellan, 1969).

The residence hall living experiences which college officials spoke of during the early 1900's collectively contributed to what was then called a "total educational experience." This idea has been maintained over the years and still includes such concepts as enriched living and study conditions, greater opportunities for student refinement of social skills, and even an increased level of democratization of the schools themselves. In a residence hall milieu which encompassed such an expanded view of residence hall purposes, students learned more effective personal, social, and societal skills as well as the technical or academic skills already stressed in the curriculum of the day. This point of view, which emerged in the early 1900's, has now spread and flourishes widely throughout the country.
Today "residence hall programs" are discussed rather than the more austere "dormitory life" of the past.

A look at the various organizational structures found in the college housing operations of the past reveals two distinctly different approaches (Powell, Plyler, Dickson, & McClellan, 1969):

a. Those which were primarily oriented toward housekeeping

b. Those which were more oriented toward providing service to students in addition to basic housekeeping tasks

While traditional line organizations were sufficient enough to provide for the housekeeping oriented dormitories, new and more complex line and staff organizations were developed for the more student service oriented residence halls which evolved under the "total educational experience" banner. Do such distinctly different organizational structures for housing exist today? This study will address this question along with the resultant services provided or not provided for students under each type of structure.

Rationale

For students from diverse backgrounds and with varied skills and interests to live in close physical proximity in residence halls is an educational value in and of itself. The residence hall is indeed an intensified human relations laboratory and can be a valuable learning experience as well (Riker, 1965).

In the fall of 1930 Harvard opened the first two of seven "enriched" dormitories (Lowell, 1930) and thereby inaugurated the "Harvard House System" (Lowell, 1931). In 1969 Harvard opened its eighth such "house" while soliciting funds for two more. It is widely believed at Harvard (Sanford, 1967; Vreeland, 1970) that students at
all academic levels and faculty members associating together in these residential units can do much to educate each other in positive ways that are not included in the formal college curriculum. With such an expanded view of the "total educational experience" being put forth at Harvard and other universities, one expects to see such feelings as student dissatisfaction, loneliness, and ambivalence decrease drastically as students strive to make progress in their search for enhanced self and identity (Sanford, 1967). While extracurricular activities have traditionally been thought of as auxiliary, in reality they have been of primary significance for many students (Katz, 1968). In the light of this information, the implication is that structured residence hall experiences can provide an exciting and varied vehicle for new learning opportunities for college students.

In order to carry out a sound "educational program" in residence halls, an effective and facilitating staff would seem necessary. While backers of a "hotel" type of administration of residence halls may view student services staffs as ancillary, a "total learning" approach to administration would call for specially trained personnel with varied teaching, counseling, and administrative skills needed to meet the needs of college students today.

What staffing patterns or organizational structures are then most frequently found when "total education" is the goal? Within the pyramidal, hierarchical organizational structure of a division of housing, which staff (and what kind, and how many) provide what types of services for students? By researching these questions the writer hopes to determine whether certain organizational structures stand out as being more effective in meeting certain organizational goals.
If a programming emphasis of service to students is emphasized by a division of housing in addition to the housekeeping approach, certain organizational structures may be pinpointed as being a more effective delivery vehicle for such service.

**Statement of the Problem**

Although there exist significant amounts of data relating to the services provided to students in residence halls (Chickering, 1969; Chickering, 1974; Katz, 1968; DeCoster & Mable, 1974; Sanford, 1967; Leyden, 1966) and to the various organizational structures of housing (Hallenbeck, 1976; Riker, 1966; Millett, 1962; Riker, 1965) no studies have apparently been conducted which consider these variables together in detail. This study, therefore, has as its principal purpose the investigation of the relationship between the various organizational structures found in housing throughout the United States and the resultant services subsequently provided to the students residing under those different structures.

**Research Questions**

The present study has attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What types of general organizational relationships exist today between housing divisions and the central college administration? More specifically, is it a business affairs relationship, a student affairs relationship, both, or some other type of relationship?

2. What types of internal organizational structures are present within college housing divisions today?

3. What services or programs do various housing division personnel perceive they provide for their students?

4. Does a particular pattern of student services or programs distinguish among either the internal or general types of housing organizations?
Definition of Terms

Services provided to students in residence halls are defined as that collection of supervised and coordinated student programs which housing staff members support within their particular residence hall system.

General organizational structure of housing is defined as that set of administrative relationships which are formally prescribed for the interactions between the housing division and the college or university hierarchy external to housing.

Internal organizational structure of housing is similarly defined as that set of administrative relationships which are formally prescribed for the interactions within the housing division itself.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The present chapter is divided into four sections: (1) History of Residence Hall Services, (2) Research Studies Concerning Residence Hall Services, (3) History of Residence Hall Organization, and (4) Research Studies in Residence Hall Organization.

History of Residence Hall Services

The colonial history of college housing in the United States was marked by early adventures which modeled American university housing on the British systems at Oxford and Cambridge. The residence halls of those early days were often barren "dormitories" which provided students with room and board and live-in tutors--little else. Thus, the American system did deviate somewhat from the British model which, on the other hand, espoused the idea that a student's place of residence was a "vital part of his college experience" (Powell, Plyler, Dickson, & McClellan, 1969).

The colleges of the colonial period were also rather isolated, located away from large towns and private housing so consequently most students enjoyed the rather Spartan austerity of the "collegiate living experience." Dormitory services for students at this time generally consisted of religious programs, close conduct supervision, and live-in tutors in addition to food and lodging.
Later, in the mid 1800's with the growth of cities and an increase of private housing closer to the college campus, more students began on their own to leave the much maligned dormitories and turn to more comfortable quarters with fewer restrictions. By this time also there was a diminished attention to regulation of students' religious and moral activities on the part of faculties. There then arose a number of organized, secular programs which provided students an acceptable (and nondestructive) way to expend their energy. Perhaps the fact that many administrators of this time had studied at German universities, rather than British ones, helped foster the turn away from college dormitories. As a consequence, with fewer occupants (some halls were actually refitted for academic use), the dormitories of the 1850's continued to offer only the primary services of room and board in contrast to the higher quality environment of room, board, and programs.

One major exception to the above situation did exist at the colleges for women. Because of the prevailing view that refined ladies in the mid 1800's ought to be protected, college housing did just that. Restrictions on social as well as academic life were plentiful and closely resembled those imposed on the men of the colonial era. Services for these women were perhaps best characterized by the dormitory housemother who gave approval to a gentleman caller only after close attention to both his appearance and his moral background.

A sharp turn toward college housing again took place in the early 1900's. Noted educators such as Andrew West and William Rainey Harper began to express concern for the "total education" of the student (Powell, Plyler, Dickson, & McClellan, 1969). In addition to the more comprehensive consideration given the student's "total
education," a practical answer to the problem of student rowdyism in the community was also needed. Thus, colleges again turned to residence halls as a means of exercising greater control on student behaviors, but also injected their housing systems with the new spark of concern for a student's "total educational experience". The result then was a system of physically improved residence halls, in contrast to what had become substandard private housing, and a vehicle to teach national democratic ideals in the college as well.

The increased intellectual concerns apparent in the 1920's were reflected by extensive discussions in the residence halls regarding socialism, communism, and academic freedom, in addition to the ever popular topics of sex and drinking. With the collegiate residence halls now intended to function as places where extra-class life might find more wholesome expression, a whole new vista of opportunities opened for the college student of the day.

Possibly the most notable of the early twentieth century programs was the Harvard house system. These houses were a series of residence hall units whose students benefitted from a purposefully enriched educational environment. The Harvard house was unusually lavish when first opened in 1930. Each resident usually had a private bedroom and shared a bath and living room (usually with a fireplace) with up to three roommates. Each student had the benefit of such community rooms as the music room, the dark room, the pool room, a 10,000 to 15,000 volume house library, and the dining hall. Here a student could profit from the sage counsel of the master (who administered the house), the senior tutor (local dean of students since 1952), and approximately one dozen resident tutors. These scholars were also
joined by other nonresident tutors and a dozen or more senior associates or faculty members. So successful was this program that in 1959, Harvard opened its 8th such residential house, and at the same time sought funding for numbers 9 and 10 (Brownell, 1952; Sanford, 1962). The Harvard houses provided the American collegiate scene with its first bold attempt to foster greater intellectual community rather than a continuance of what had become simply a collection of professional scholars and preprofessional hopeful scholars.

Other programs, some similar to the Harvard house plans and others building on the expanded intellectual opportunity concept put forth at Harvard University, began to appear across the country. Residential experiments were tried at Antioch College, Iowa State University, Michigan State University, and Stephens College (Brouwer, 1949; Leyden, 1966). In addition, residence hall programs and services provided the basis for improving the living conditions of new students at Ohio State University (Wrigley, 1945) and for a House Fellow program at the University of Wisconsin (Williamson, 1949).

The educational values of residence halls, program organization, academic classes in the residence halls, and staff personnel were discussed and implemented from 1900 to 1930 (Clarke, 1925; Lloyd-Jones & Smith, 1938). These programming concepts were expanded during the years 1930 to 1950 to include counseling (Orme, 1950; Hardee, 1955; Sifferl, 1950) and a more complete range of educational opportunities for the student. At the residential colleges and universities the primary vehicle for this expansion of services for the student was the university residence hall. Residence halls were achieving greater recognition as an untapped collegiate resource for educational purposes.
Their potential for enriching the educational experiences of students seemed limitless; and academic, social, and recreational programs sponsored by residence hall systems began to appear complementing what was already being offered in the classrooms of the academy (Riker, 1965).

Not only did the 1950's usher in an era where social activities could be sponsored by and provided for residence hall students, but these years also provided a time when some residence hall administrators were prompted to look at their halls as intellectual as well as social and disciplinary instruments. This administrative orientation spawned the beginning of a whole new array of expanded residence hall programs and services for students.

Research Concerning Residence Hall Services

Although much has been written about residence hall programs and the impact which these programs have upon college students, there have been relatively few empirical studies but several descriptive ones.

It was already recognized that the residence halls provided a fertile ground for leadership development and human growth (Klopf, Felsted, & Hawley, 1952), but the next decade brought both new complexity and additional refinement. In 1962, a call was made (Hardee, 1962) for improved research data to help foster the development of new student affairs programs including those conducted in the residence halls. Perhaps this call for research, and others like it in large and small universities across the country, led to the mushrooming literature which developed around residence hall programs in the 1960's and 1970's.
The 1960's seemed to provide "no time for youth," and Katz and Chickering appeared to bring the problem of this point of view into much sharper focus. In one study, greater opportunities for social and intellectual development seemed necessary (Katz, 1968) and in another study, alternatives for the creation of residential environments to maximize student growth and development were described (Chickering, 1969). These ideas led to closer study of residence hall learning environments.

In a four-year study which traced freshmen to their senior year, it was demonstrated (Rago, 1969) that residence hall programs do have a positive and significant impact on the undergraduate's personal development. Further support for this point of view was provided by an additional longitudinal study (Astin, 1973) which suggested that:

Campus living, as opposed to living at home with parents, produces significant positive benefits in five major areas: educational progress, plans and aspirations, personal behavior, attitudes and values, and satisfaction with the college experience. (pp. 206-207)

More recently, extensive studies have been undertaken (Chickering, 1974; Welty, 1976) to compare commuting and residence hall students. Chickering found that commuters and on-campus residents begin their college careers at essentially unequal points. Later, as the resident students further develop, the gap between them and the commuters grows. The diversity of experiences and the access to college personnel in the residence hall setting, Chickering felt made personal growth more likely for the residence hall student. In addition, Welty (1976) found that not only did residence hall students differ from commuter students initially, but that "they also grow on selected measures of intellectual and personal growth in their freshman year to a greater degree than do their commuting counterparts" (p. 467).
The basis for any opinion about the impact of residence hall services on students must ultimately be the programs or services offered within the hall. Consequently, case studies have resulted in much more specific programmatic data. Such studies have included the Harvard house system, student cooperatives, groups and group counseling, living/learning sections, leadership development programs, assignment programs, visitation programs, coeducational programs, and a variety of additional programs.

House Systems

The first program studied was the Harvard house system and included an in-depth discussion of this system. Specific attention was given house goals and objectives, the history of house organization, and the activities planned within the houses (Lowell, 1930). Later studies included a discussion of the plan as conceptualized by the president of the institution (Lowell, 1931). Methods which hopefully could provide a true higher education community brought further attention to the house system at Harvard University (Brownell, 1959) and also to Stephens College (Leyden, 1966). At Stephens College a house plan similar to that instituted at Harvard University provided an example of interdisciplinary study and flexibility in the development of a totally integrated living/learning program. Included in a favorable study of this system was a year-by-year development of the house plan including summary and appraisal comments by Lewis Mayhew.

Another study, however, seems to dispute the claims made in behalf of the total educational impact of residence hall programs (Vreeland, 1970). Vreeland conducted a longitudinal and comprehensive
study of the Harvard house system taking particular notice of the Harvard house student's values and attitudes. Her analysis included:

1. Study of house records
2. Interviews with house masters, tutors, and formal and informal leaders
3. Attitude and value measures administered

Vreeland concluded that the attitudes and values of the students were not affected by the house structure (tutors, masters, activities, and other student residents), but that freshman attitudes and values nevertheless did change with time. Her results also indicated that more active students changed no more than those students who were less involved in residence hall activities and that the academic sector of the university exerts a more powerful influence on student attitude and value change than do even a student's closest friends.

Cooperative Living Arrangements

Cooperative living arrangements have existed throughout the contemporary history of residence halls (Nielson, 1937). Designed to minimize cost and to effect less expensive housing for those students willing to share the chores necessary for day-to-day group living, the co-op has found a place on many campuses.

A cooperative program for home economics students at Iowa State University (Sheldon, 1938) was one of the first such programs studied. About that same time a historical view of college cooperatives was also presented (Nielson, 1937). Nielson paid particular attention to a discussion of the Idaho University plan in which he felt were some basic principles of administration for a cooperative residence hall. Favorable experiences within a cooperative house at the University of
Iowa were also studied (Berger, 1939) along with other descriptive studies of the programs at the University of Washington (Albrecht, 1937) and Boston University (Franklin, 1933).

Counseling

The addition of counseling services to residence hall programs was yet another significant event in the collegiate housing scene. In one article, Lind (1946), a faculty member, discussed the degree of impact a residence hall may have on the social and learning environment of a student. He then went further to urge the improvement of counseling services offered students through the use of residence hall counselors. Later (Ohlsen, 1951) a rating scale was developed by residence hall staff and students to assist in the evaluation of counseling services offered through residence hall counselors. As group counseling developed on the college campus, Depauw University initiated discussion groups in the residence halls in order to deal with issues of critical concern to the students there (Brown, 1971). Further development of the group movement in counseling resulted in a proliferation of growth groups, sensitivity groups, T-groups, and others established for one purpose or another. More recently, one empirical study (Brown, 1971) revealed that using student to student (peer) counselors in the residence hall setting did have a positive impact on the academic adjustment of potential college dropouts.

Living/Learning

In the early 1960's the literature began to reflect some theoretical positions which proposed that life in student housing had direct and positive effects on a student's educational outcomes. The effect
of residence hall life on academics was explored (Ferber, 1962), a "total education experience" was proposed at Stephens College (Leyden, 1962) and eventually full-fledged "living/learning" units were discussed as they existed at Michigan State University (Olson, 1964).

Later, at the University of Texas, a living/learning honors seminar approach was developed for application to collegiate residence halls (Blanton, Peck, & Greer, 1964). In this study, an experimental residence hall was compared to a conventional hall. Blanton's results indicated that a "significant number" of students in the living/learning honors program showed higher academic grades than students in the conventional hall.

At Michigan State University, Blackman (1965) did a descriptive commentary on the first living/learning residence hall there and gave additional information about the effects of combining academic and living environments. Other studies on this subject were conducted at Michigan State University (Olson, 1965; Dressel, 1970; Adams, 1967) as well as at Catholic College (Creeley, 1966) and Centennial College along with the University of Nebraska (Brown, 1972).

Leadership Training

Another aspect of residence hall life which could be utilized especially well was the abundance of opportunities for student leadership development. Not only were there leadership positions open for resident student staff, but also for those interested in student government, social and recreational planning, volunteer work, and the broad area of leadership training itself. In terms of leadership development,
a campus program was designed and applied as an academic course to explore group leadership in any type of living situation (Onthank, 1936). A leadership training program was described as it existed at Stephens College (Omer, 1944) as was another, at the University of Oklahoma, which applied specifically to early involvement of freshmen in a residence hall leadership training program (Truex, 1952).

An evaluative study of residence hall programs was made in the 1960's using criteria which had been determined representative of success in the teaching field (MacLean, 1965). This study indicated that the value of a residence hall program to prospective teachers lay in the area of human relations rather than in any particular process.

At the University of Florida (Lynch, 1969) the freshman advisor program was favorably perceived by staff and students as an aid to freshmen adjustment to student life.

Also at the University of Florida, a student volunteer program for residence halls was developed (McBride, 1973). This program, which utilized informal helpers to assist in the student orientation process, provided for academic credit for those students enrolled in the program. The characteristics of those highly effective student volunteers were explored (Holbrook, 1972) as compared to those who tended to be somewhat ineffective or highly ineffective. Student helper effectiveness was predicted rather well using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1959) scores.

Assignment

Special groupings of students have often been assigned to live together and subsequently studied to determine what effect such living
arrangements have had on their educational development. One such study dealt with the pros and cons of housing athletes together in residence halls (Louchs, 1963) while others dealt with special honors sections or houses (Kaplan, Mann, & Kaplan, 1964; DeCoster, 1966).

Additionally, at the University of Oregon, the relative educational and adjustment values of assigning students of all class levels together in one residential unit were compared to those derived from separate assignment patterns for freshmen and upper-class students (Beal & Williams, 1968). At another school, students who had at least three of their classes together were housed in the same residence (Larsen & Montgomery, 1969). This study did not reveal any significant difference between the specially assigned students and other students with regard to attitude toward the university or student instructor relationship.

Roommate compatibility was closely studied as well (Lozier, 1970), but results failed to substantiate the hypothesis that matching roommates according to educational-vocational goals and extracurricular plans created significantly fewer roommate changes.

Many positive effects upon the educational development of students were found to be a result of homogeneous groupings (Caple & Snead, 1971). Homogeneous groupings of engineering students as compared to randomly assigned and nonresidence hall engineering students (Taylor & Hanson, 1971) were seen favorably, for instance.

Visitation

Residence hall programs allowing for periodic visits by members of the opposite sex in student rooms have added another dimension to residence hall programming. Most data collected on this topic have
been in the form of surveys and have been initiated in an effort either
to establish visitation policies and procedures or to expand already
existing ones. One such survey (Wilson, 1967) collected data about
room visitation, including areas approved for visitation, maximum hours,
frequency of use, and supervisory practices. The Association of College
and University Housing Officers (ACUHO) Research and Information
Committee, in 1969, conducted a survey of the entire ACUHO membership
in regard to visitation policies (Riker, 1969). In that survey, 177
of 262 respondents indicated that their institutions permitted visita-
tion in student rooms within the residence halls.

Later, 24-hour options came under study (Dunn & Rickard, 1977).
In this study, 17 institutions with 24-hour visitation programs were
surveyed. Responses were categorized by sex, class, and residence
hall style. Results indicated that the advisability of 24-hour visita-
tion was less for freshmen, sophomores, and women than for juniors,
seniors, and men.

Coeducational Living

Coeducational residence halls, like coeducational colleges and
universities, were an inevitable reality on the American collegiate
landscape. With coeducational living meaning anything from opposite
sex assignments to alternate rooms, to men and women being assigned
to separate wings on floors of the same residence hall complex, the
literature abounded with studies.

At Michigan State University, a questionnaire was distributed to
residents to assess their feeling about the coeducational experience
(Olson, 1963) and at the University of Illinois a discussion of both
the coeducational program and the physical facilities was reported (Hornick, 1963). Both studies indicated positive resident attitudes toward the coeducational living experience.

Ten coeducational residence hall programs were studied in yet another manner focusing on programs, physical facilities, and student responses (Imes, 1966). In this study it was concluded that the advantages of coeducational residence halls outweighed the disadvantages.

Administrative and counseling personnel generally were proven to be positive in their views of coeducational housing at 16 small colleges (Locher, 1972). In this study it was indicated that student attitudes toward coeducational housing do not affect admissions, adverse alumni reactions are few, and incidents of personal counseling have not increased.

A theoretical rationale for coeducational residence halls in Texas was discussed (Duncan, 1972) and implications for co-ed halls then in the planning stages were highlighted (Corbett & Sommer, 1972), especially at the University of California at Davis.

Analysis of the educational value of coeducational residence halls was addressed by other writers. In one effort, it was suggested that a co-ed hall can lead to an environment contributing to the total development of the student (Brown, Winkworth, & Braskamp, 1973). In another, the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was used to assess growth toward self-actualization (Schroeder, 1972). In the latter study, students found to exhibit least growth toward self-actualization were males living in single sex halls.
Other Programs

A variety of other programs has been offered by residence hall personnel over the years. Included among these were experiments providing close proximity housing for French students at Mt. Holyoke College (Lind, 1946) and academic centers for international education (Fraser, 1966). Programs utilizing television for lecturing and programming (Cooke, 1966) have also been tried. Listening centers with telephone carrels at Ohio State University (Overholt, 1967), and special housing for vocational or other interest groups (Davison, 1964) have been undertaken as well.

Student self-governing boards or residence hall governments have also been developed to provide leadership and learning experiences. One such program was evaluated at Indiana University and total commitment to the concept of student governance was urged as a result (Cahill, 1967). Another study analyzed possible relationships between self-governance on the one hand and alienation and student perceptions on the other (Laramee, 1972). Results of this study were not conclusive.

The concept of faculty participation in residence hall activities was yet another area explored. In regard to such faculty participation, one study recommended procedures to increase meaningful student/faculty interaction (Borland, 1971).

Still another project included an attempt to bridge the "generation gap" by sponsorship of an intergenerational coalition at Syracuse University (Garrow, 1970). It was felt in this study that perhaps young and old living in residence halls together could help build positive intergenerational relationships.
In addition, special academic advising programs have been initiated within the residence hall service umbrella at the University of Iowa (Sander, 1964) and other schools as well.

**History of Residence Hall Organization**

Residence hall organizational structures have traditionally tended to reflect the emphasis various university leaders place upon the educational value of their housing systems. Among some of the earliest writings found, for example, was one which presented a plan for making residence halls a truly intellectual experience (Check, 1936). This plan included the combining of intellectual and social activities, and, by bringing both faculty and resident fellows into the halls in an informal setting, it was hoped that this new educational experience could prosper. This type of approach was a significant departure from those which provided a staff organization to meet only the basic requirements of maintaining order and providing beds and board.

Another article provided yet further insight into developing trends towards utilization of residence halls for educational purposes (Plank, 1937). This report advocated including counseling and educational services within the residence hall organization at the University of Minnesota-Minneapolis. Later, C. Gilbert Wrenn (1951) dedicated a portion of his writing to the description of broad organizational principles which could be applied to residence hall management based on the personal development of the individual students.

In subsequent years, attention was devoted to the informal organization of university residence halls, helping determine that informal student/staff groups can aid the formal group processes of the organization (Crafts, 1959).
In 1959, residence hall organization was described as being a proper subdivision of college student personnel services (Millett, 1962). This point of view added strength to the arguments of those who believed in the educational value of residence halls. As residence hall organizations more frequently became subdivisions of college student personnel, student staff assumed a more important educational role as well (Powell, Plyler, Dickson, & McClellan, 1969).

Later, a visionary look at the future provided some new insights for residence hall organization. Here Greenleaf (1969) addressed herself to a clear overall view:

The roles of residence hall staff will be redefined to place emphasis upon student self-discipline, self-responsibility, and educational interaction. Fewer but better prepared professional staff members will be expected to facilitate the development of educational programs, to provide counseling for individual growth, to administer a program integrating facilities and personnel into a unified educational sub-system of the institution to evaluate results as a basis for educational and administrative decisions. (p. 69)

Speaking of particular staff and organizational changes to take place in the near future, Greenleaf noted that:

1. Campuses using housemothers in residence halls will continue to find them difficult to secure.

2. Mature undergraduates are no more available. Campus pressures have led many to say "my senior year I want to live on my own without any responsibilities." Academic programs are making it more difficult to assume hall jobs. Student teaching, business internships, and cooperative programs take seniors off-campus.

3. The residence hall staff of the 1970's will not be counting the minutes girls are late, taking minor disciplinary action, or serving as judge and jury. Instead they will have major responsibility to provide:

   a. A climate challenging students to the broadest possible education.
b. Guidance, counseling and challenges to assist each student to develop his unique personality and identity and to achieve to his fullest capacity.

c. Educational and recreational experiences in the halls where students spend 60 to 65 percent of their time.

d. Housing services integrated with the educational objectives of the college.

e. Research and evaluation of programs as a basis for allocation of staff and facilities for the maximum achievement of the institutional objectives. (pp. 70-71)

The approach of Greenleaf, that of housing as a subsystem of the educational institution, was further advocated from an organizational standpoint by others (Elliot, 1972; Barak, 1973) as the systems approach gained credence among America's educators.

From its beginnings, the educational role of housing has grown and prospered to the point where it is presently an important part of the higher education system. The single-building Colonial colleges of early America provided the seed ideas for educational "innovation" two centuries later. Today, the total education of the college student can be effectively advanced by the efforts of a responsive residence hall organization of professional educators.

Research Studies in Residence Hall Organization

According to a profile (Hallenbeck, 1976) of ACUHO housing officers, responsibilities for chief housing officers include:

- Management: 89.70% of institutions reporting
- Programming: 64.24% of institutions reporting
- Maintenance: 46.06% of institutions reporting
- Custodial: 44.85% of institutions reporting
- Food Service: 32.12% of institutions reporting

These figures indicate that substantial time and attention are currently being given to administrative responsibilities within the
member institutions of ACUHO. Today, rather refined organizational 
structures, including elaborate student and professional staff per-
sonnel, are a large part of the residence hall scene in our major 
colleges and universities. But such large scale organizational struc-
tures with accompanying far reaching responsibilities have not always 
been the case.

As universities and their objectives have changed throughout 
American history, so have residence hall staffing patterns and the 
research supporting these patterns. While some research has dealt 
specifically with women's halls (Whiteside, 1957), other types have 
dealt with men's residence halls (Crane, 1961), and yet a third type 
has taken a more general approach (Dowse, 1960). Other research, more 
theoretical in nature, described the organization of residence hall 
staffs within the framework of the larger institutional organization 
(Ayers & Russel, 1962; Shaffer & Ferber, 1965; Skorpen, 1966; Bacon, 
1966) and some were especially aimed at evaluation of specific organi-
zational structures (Fairchild, 1963).

Professional staffing patterns have been discussed in both descrip-
tive and comparative fashion. The status and roles of hall staff were 
described in some studies (Kilbourn, 1960; Mangus, 1972) while quali-
fications, training, and duties of staff were discussed in others 
(Horle & Gazda, 1963; Rowe, 1970).

Student staffing patterns were discussed and compared in other 
 studies. Graduate student positions in residence halls were scruti-
nized by a national survey (Erney, 1949) with specific attention given 
to their roles and functions at various colleges (Allen, 1953; Sutley, 
1967; Howell, 1971; Blake, 1972). Undergraduate student staff received
similar attention as their roles were explored and described at Michigan State University (Marquardt, 1961), in small private colleges (Dixon, 1970), and at two major universities in Florida (Greenwood, 1972). More theoretical discussions were also undertaken to describe optimal utilization of these staff personnel to achieve institutional objectives in an educational sense (Aceto, 1962; Greenleaf, 1967; Cloaninger, 1969). Even unpaid student helpers may play a part in support of paid student staff as evidenced by a program at the University of Florida (Holbrook, 1972; McBride, 1973).

However, there are several in-depth studies which deserve special attention from both a theoretical and a functional standpoint. Among the first to write definitively of residence halls as instruments or vehicles of higher education was Riker (1956). In one of his earlier major treatments (Riker, 1956) some attention was given to ideas which could develop more effective organization. During the time leading up to Riker's discussion, widely diverse organizational structures abounded, developing apparently out of expediency. The most common type found then was a divided organization characterized by autonomous responsibility divided among the business office, the dean of men, and the dean of women. The business office in these organizations was typically in control of budgets, finances, housekeeping, and food services, while the deans supervised room assignments, discipline, activities, and staff personnel for their assigned areas of responsibility.

A second type of organization discussed by Riker was the single-line organization. With this type of arrangement either the business affairs officer or the dean of students maintained control. It was
found that the business officer was more frequently in charge at the larger institutions, while the dean of students was responsible for housing at the smaller colleges.

The third type of structure described by Riker was the centralized organization. With this organization the chief housing officer was directly responsible for the overall functioning of the residence hall system. In this instance, the chief housing officer reported to both the business office and the student personnel office. The larger institutions (enrolling more than 1,000 students) were more likely to evidence this type of organization than were the smaller institutions. A 1953 survey of housing administrations in 238 colleges and universities revealed that 186 claimed divided organizations, 27 were single-line organizations, 17 were centralized organizations, and 8 were others which could not really be categorized.

In this same work, Riker also reviewed four types of housing staffs. Perhaps the most common type consisted of housemothers, each in charge of a hall and attending mainly to housekeeping functions with some attention to student conduct and social functions. The second was headed by a faculty member (sometimes assisted by additional student staff) concerned primarily with student life. A third type consisted of undergraduate or graduate student staff concerned with conduct and activities. The fourth type, less frequently found prior to the mid 1950's, was staff which utilized trained student personnel workers who served as full-time professional administrators in the halls.

Later, after about a decade of prolific growth in college student enrollments and widespread residence hall construction, Riker again
devoted some special attention to discussion of residence hall organizations (Riker, 1965). Wherever student housing existed, Riker felt that housing staff could be categorized as being either "administrative, management, or personnel staff." According to him, these categories, and the emphasis placed on each, directly influenced the educational effectiveness of student housing. Of special importance was the personnel staff which could help enliven prospects for residence halls as learning centers, as opposed to a less effective arrangement where minimally trained staffs only served to handle administrative difficulties.

Some Descriptive Models

Some of the literature clearly pointed to the belief that organizational structures influenced the roles residence educators are able to play. In reports over the past decade, the COSPA Commission on Professional Development (1972) described three models for potential use in the housing area of student development. The first of these was the Administrative Model, in which the college vice president or dean of students was responsible for the operation of residence halls. Secondly, the Consultative Model was described where a director or consultant headed a housing organization and primarily provided environmental study services to collegiate administrative officers with special focus on the residence-hall system. The third model described was an Academic Model used to integrate the teaching and student development functions of the college or university.

In another detailed study of large university housing organizations and their operations (Hakes, 1968), five basic organizational patterns were described. These patterns were described in terms of
the relationship of the housing officer to the dean of students or the college business manager:

1. Student personnel office responsible for all aspects of residence halls
2. Business office responsible for all aspects of residence halls
3. Dual cooperation between the personnel office and the business office
4. A centralized program with the chief housing officer responsible to both the business office and the personnel office
5. A general pattern into which phases of all of the above were used and no particular pattern was apparent

This study attempted to determine how well each organizational pattern accomplished its philosophical objectives and what strengths and weaknesses were perceived by its operational staff. Hakes found that, of the institutions surveyed, 17% fell under the first category, 7% under the second category, 45% under the third category, 22% under the fourth category, and 9% under the fifth. In an attempt to pinpoint the most effective administrative pattern, Hakes used four criteria:

1. Adequate facilities
2. Student personnel emphasis
3. Effective business operations
4. Future expansion plans

Hakes concluded from his study, comparing the four patterns, pattern 4, with its unified housing division, comes closest to optimal achievement of the stated standards. This unified housing approach provides a unity of action which other patterns do not seem able to achieve. The answer to effective housing administration appears to lie in a unified housing program organized into one office. (p. 44)
At Purdue University, a centralized pattern of residence hall administration (responsible to the business manager) was established and called the "Stewart Plan" (Stewart, 1961). This plan called for the person who was charged with both the financial and programming functions to have overall responsibility for management of housing. The rationale was straightforward:

No residence unit on any campus should be operated solely to produce revenue. It should serve an educational purpose or it should not be on a college campus. Too often academicians think that the business office knows nothing about education and is thoroughly unqualified to think about any process relating to it. On the other hand, there are business officers who believe that members of the faculty know nothing about finance and therefore should not be consulted on anything that involves a financial management problem. As a result, many university housing operations have two or three managements -- a financial management, a social management and perhaps an educational or counseling management -- and in most of such cases the overall program is not successful.

We let it be known at the outset that our Purdue halls are under the direction of one management and that the manager has the responsibility of meeting the financial program as laid down, along with the responsibility of giving the maximum educational and social program within the limits of the residence hall income. (p. 5)

Residence hall educational and management responsibilities were also combined under one administration at the University of Wisconsin (Meyerson, 1966) where five reasons were cited as a basis for doing so:

1. Effective communications are expedited when clear and singular lines of organization and responsibility are established. Problems of communications relating to simple misunderstandings, the margin of human error and timeliness are all reduced as the number of people responsible for directing communications are well coordinated and receive direction from one source.

2. There is a positive relationship between sound management and successful educational programming. The student who is satisfied with the physical plant, food
services, and rate structure is likely to identify with and participate in the educational program. One advantage of fusing educational and management responsibilities is to ensure the development of a total program with proper balance and attractiveness to the resident student.

3. Sound management practices, including selection and assignment of staff, training, delegation, evaluation and promotion, are all more feasible when responsibilities are clearly delineated and staff personnel have responsibility for the total residence hall program in their respective area.

4. The staff with dual responsibilities develops a total perspective of the housing operation. This perspective results in a harmonious and coordinated team effort, an effort characterized by an open exchange of ideas, understanding of one another's problems, and a realization of the need for shared decision making.

5. The ever increasing college housing program demands of its administrators diverse management and student personnel skills. Leadership in student housing must come from personnel who are experienced and trained in all phases of the operation. At Wisconsin, the staff, through their training and execution of responsibilities, learn the complete nature of the housing program and are better prepared to guide human effort and manage physical plant. (p. 64)

Additional support for dual responsibility to both student affairs and business affairs can be gained from some thoughts on the matter by Kate Mueller. She believed that while it may seem to some people that management of students is the only concern of student personnel, housing costs are so closely related to student personnel services that the separation of student management and business management in either theory or practice is never feasible (Mueller, 1961).

Another possible answer was offered by E. G. Williamson (1964) when he concluded that:

If we are to be accepted as relevant in the educational sciences, we must have clearly identified intellectual and professional competence. Otherwise, we will continue to be thought of as being irrelevant, although necessary, at a subprofessional level. (p. 144)
The challenge has been clearly described. Residence hall educators must do a better job of identifying, in the fiscal arena, the educational scope and value of their programs; and, further, these educators must determine which organizational structures are the best vehicles to implement those educational programs.

Three ACUHO Surveys

Three past ACUHO surveys have done much to portray the status of housing and food service organizations. In 1958, the ACUHO research committee, headed by Ruth Donnelly, submitted the first report based on data gathered over a two-year period. Along with the survey questions and answers which were gathered from 85 of the member institutions, organizational descriptions and individual job descriptions were also included (Donnelly, 1958). As a result, three major aspects of housing operations were described:

1. Size and scope of their existing housing organizations
2. Organization charts
3. Job descriptions of the four or five top people in each organization plus the salary ranges for these people, when supplied

The trend reported at that time was one which appeared to be toward some type of joint responsibility for the housing program of both the business officer and the student personnel dean. In these cases, the chief housing officer was responsible to both the dean of students and the business officer. Other types found frequently included those in which the housing director reported to the dean of students and those in which the housing director reported to the business officer.
The second ACUHO survey, completed ten years after the first, was presented in 1968 (Edwards, 1968). Organizations in this study were similarly classified in three categories:

1. Chief housing officer reports to dean of students or university vice-president for student affairs
2. Chief housing officer reports to comptroller or business manager
3. Chief housing officer reports to both the office for student affairs and business manager

Results indicated a shift away from the patterns described by the first study. As of 1968, the arrangements of joint responsibility to both the student personnel dean and the business officer seem to have lost popularity. Respondents indicated a fairly even distribution along organizational lines, as approximately 40% were directly under the dean of students, 40% were directly under the business manager, and 20% were under both. Examples of each of the three organizational types are presented in Appendix C.

The third study (Hallenbeck, 1976) conducted in 1976, looked at four organizational types:

1. Chief housing officer reports to chief student affairs officer
2. Chief housing officer reports to chief business officer
3. Chief housing officer reports to both the chief student affairs officer and the chief business officer
4. Chief housing officer reports to some other administrator(s) not listed

Of those chief housing officers responding approximately 59% indicated that they reported to their chief student affairs officer, 14% reported to their chief business affairs officer, 9% reported to both their chief student affairs officer and their chief business
affairs officer, and 18% reported to some other administrator(s) not listed. These results indicate a continued shift toward organizational patterns which emphasize the student affairs aspect.

Also worth noting is the surprising 18% of organizations which could not be listed in any of the first three categories. Yet many of the organizations listed in this category indicated that the "other" position to which they were accountable fell within the student affairs or student services area of their institutions. Therefore, it appears that an overwhelming number of housing departments are currently a part of the student affairs or student services divisions at their particular colleges or universities.

Responsibilities of the chief housing officers (reported in abbreviated form earlier), and hence the span of influence of the organizations, revealed the following:

1. Management (93.5%) - room assignments, facility maintenance, renovations, and custodial supervision
2. Budget (83.4%) - budget preparation, payroll, and purchasing
3. Student Life (16%) - social/educational programming, student staff, student government, and discipline
4. Off Campus Housing (65.9%) - advising students about housing not owned by the institution
5. Family Housing (47.5%) - assignments, maintenance, and programming
6. Food Service (24%) - menu planning, food preparation, and hiring
This descriptive study assessed the nature of college and university housing organizations across the country and the subsequent range of services or programs provided students living within various types of such organizations. College and university housing division authorities who are members of the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO) were asked to complete a questionnaire (Appendix B) and to return it to the researcher. Data from the questionnaires pertaining to services were related to data from the various organizational types found in housing divisions in an attempt to ascertain whether different organizational types offer different services for students.

While significant data exist relating to the services provided to students in residence halls (Chickering, 1969; Katz, 1968; DeCoste & Mable, 1974; Chickering, 1974; Leydon, 1966; Sanford, 1967) and to the various organizational patterns of housing divisions (Riker, 1965; Riker, 1966; Millett, 1962; Hallenbeck, 1976), no studies have been conducted which consider these variables together.

More specifically, the purpose of this investigation was to explore:

1. The current nature of internal housing organizational structures

2. The current external organizational relationships between housing divisions and the college structure at large
3. The current nature and variety of services which college housing divisions provide for their students.

4. Whether or not a relationship exists between housing organizations (external or internal) and the nature and variety of services which are subsequently provided for their respective student residents.

Hypotheses

A review of the professional literature related to the services offered to students in residence halls has shown great diversity among colleges and universities as they have attempted to provide students with enriched living environments (DeCoster & Mable, 1974). The services provided have included house systems, student cooperatives, personal and group counseling, living/learning sections, leadership development programs, visitation programs, coeducational living programs, career counseling, social programming, and a variety of other programs.

The literature also reveals the existence of three basic organizational types of housing divisions with their differences characterized essentially by their respective reporting channels. They are:

1. Those reporting to college business officers
2. Those reporting to college student affairs officers
3. Those reporting to both business and student affairs officers (Hallenbeck, 1976)

The primary aim of this study has been to assess the nature and scope of residence hall services as a function of the housing organizational type. The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. No significant differences of general organizational structure will exist between college and university housing divisions as they relate to the college administration at large.

   a. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and full time institutional enrollment (Question 1, Appendix B).
b. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and the total design capacity of single student housing (Question 2, Appendix B).

c. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and ACUHO region (Question 3, Appendix B).

d. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and the nature of the institution (Question 4, Appendix B).

e. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and the type of institution (Question 5, Appendix B).

2. No significant differences of internal organizational structure will exist among college and university housing divisions.

a. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and full-time institutional enrollment (Question 1, Appendix B).

b. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and the total design capacity of single student housing (Question 2, Appendix B).

c. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and ACUHO region (Question 3, Appendix B).

d. No significant difference will exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and the type of institution (Question 5, Appendix B).

3. No significant difference will exist in the number and type of services provided for students among various college and university housing divisions.

Eighty-five subnull hypotheses were constructed to analyze this question. The methodology for construction of each subnull hypothesis was identical to those stated in Hypotheses 1 and 2. Consequently,
each of the 17 individual programs (Questions 32 to 48, Appendix B) was tested for significant differences in comparison to full-time institutional enrollment (Question 1, Appendix B), design capacity of single student housing (Question 2, Appendix B), ACUHO region (Question 3, Appendix B), institutional nature (Question 4, Appendix B), and type of institution (Question 5, Appendix B).

4. No significant differences exist between the general organizational structures of housing divisions (Question 8, Appendix B) and the number or type of services which they provide for students living within their residence hall systems (Questions 32 to 50, Appendix B).

5. No significant differences exist between the internal organizational structures of housing divisions (Question 18, Appendix B) and the number or type of services which they provide for students living within their residence hall systems (Questions 32 to 50, Appendix B).

Sample

Participants in the study consisted of the 617 housing directors whose institutions are listed on the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO) newsletter mailing list. The decision to use the ACUHO membership group was based upon its recognized professional leadership in the collegiate student housing area and the fact that this sample group most nearly represents the national population of collegiate housing organizations. The nine ACUHO regions include:

2. California (California, Hawaii)
3. Intermountain (Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming)
4. Upper Midwest (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin)
5. Southwest (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)
6. Great Lakes (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio)
7. Northeast (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Quebec, Rhode Island, Vermont)
8. Mid-Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia)
9. Southeast (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia)

Measurement

The Survey of Housing Services and Organizational Structures (SHSOS - Appendix B) was sent to the housing directors of all ACUHO member institutions. This questionnaire was designed by the researcher and was based in part upon the 1976 Survey of Housing and Food Service Organizations questionnaire used by Hallenbeck (1976). In addition to gaining basic housing organizational information as in Hallenbeck's survey, the SHSOS also provided data dealing with the emphasis given to both responsibilities assigned to staff and services provided for students in residence halls as perceived by the ACUHO members.

Content validity of the questionnaire was demonstrated by both expert opinion and later by a field test. Four members of the University of Florida Counselor Education faculty and one member of the University of Florida Educational Administration faculty were asked to judge whether the survey would or would not provide sufficient and accurate information regarding both college housing organizational structures and resultant services provided for students. The researcher then made some modifications to the originally proposed survey as a result of suggestions received. These modifications included clarifying various areas of job responsibilities and more
precisely stating the services provided for students in residence halls.

Next, a field study was conducted by the researcher. The revised questionnaires were distributed to housing personnel at Indiana University, Florida Atlantic University, South Georgia College, and the University of Florida. As a result of the field study, additional refinements were made to the survey which helped to more precisely clarify the information desired.

Procedure

During the spring of 1977, surveys, including a self-addressed stamped envelope, were sent to all ACUHO member institutions included on the mailing list of the ACUHO Newsletter. After one month, the return rate was found to be an acceptable 55.1%.

Approximate time required for completion of the survey was 20 to 30 minutes.

Following the return of the surveys to the researcher, responses obtained were transferred to the General Purpose Answer Sheet (Appendix D). The information on the answer sheets, based on fall, 1976 data, was then optically scanned by computer and stored on cards. Narrative data supplied on the surveys were separately compiled.

Analysis of Data

Analysis of Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 was conducted via an IBM 370 computer using the chi-square mathematical function and was tested at the .05 alpha level of significance.

Analysis of Hypothesis 1 included five comparisons of the resulting distribution of responses to Question 8 with the distribution of responses to Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
Analysis of Hypothesis 2 included five comparisons of the resulting distribution of responses to Question 18 with the distribution of responses to Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Analysis of Hypothesis 3 included 19 comparisons of the resulting distribution of responses to Questions 32 through 50 with the distribution of responses to Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 were likewise analyzed on an IBM 370 computer using a discriminate function subroutine with application of Wilks lambda and were also tested at the .05 alpha level of significance.

Analysis of Hypothesis 4 included comparisons of the resulting distribution of responses to Question 8 with the distribution of responses to Questions 32 through 50.

Analysis of Hypothesis 5 included comparisons of the resulting distribution of responses to Question 18 with the distribution of responses to Questions 32 through 50.

In addition, a distribution profile was obtained for each of Questions 1 through 56.

Limitations of Study

In any evaluation of the results of this study, it should be recognized that one of its basic limitations is that it reflects only the chief housing officers' perceptions of their respective organizational structure and services to students.

There may also be some differences between stated theory and actual practice among the respondents to the questionnaire. For the purposes of this study, therefore, the perceptions of the respondents should be understood clearly as what each perceives their
organizational structure and services to be. This phenomenon can perhaps be more clearly understood when one considers that a chief housing officer with a student affairs orientation may perceive his program from a reference point different from a chief housing officer with a business affairs orientation. The student affairs officer places greatest emphasis on student services while the business affairs officer places financial stability as his greatest concern.

Another possible limitation of the study is that of 617 surveys mailed, only 340 were returned to the researcher. Thus, although a large sample, the responses of those who volunteered to participate in the study may not represent the situation of the entire 617. Therefore, the results of this study may not be generalizable to the ACUHO membership as a whole.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that some respondents may not have fully understood or completed the survey and the information gathered from them may then be somewhat limiting.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Results of the investigation are presented in this chapter according to the methodology described in Chapter III. In general, the purpose of this study was to identify differences in the services or programs provided to students in residence halls as a function of the organizational structure of housing. For this purpose the group studied was composed of those colleges and universities which are included on the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO) newsletter mailing list.

On June 8, 1976, questionnaires were mailed to chief housing officers of all those colleges and universities included on the ACUHO newsletter mailing list.

Of the 617 questionnaires mailed, 340 were returned between June 15, 1976, and July 21, 1976, resulting in a mail return rate of 55.11%. All respondents completed the questionnaire, omitting only those items which did not apply to their particular institution.

Demographics

Of the 340 respondents, 17 (5.2%) were from the Northwestern Region, 26 (7.9%) were from the California Region, 19 (5.8%) were from the Intermountain Region, 43 (12.1%) were from the Upper Midwest Region, 27 (8.2%) were from the Southwest Region, 49 (14.9%) were from
the Great Lakes Region, 71 (21.6%) were from the Northeast Region, 31 (9.4%) were from the Mid-Atlantic Region, and 46 (14.0%) were from the Southeast Region.

Responses from public institutions numbered 212 (63.7%) and responses from private institutions numbered 121 (36.3%). Of the 340 respondents, 7 (2.1%) were from two-year institutions and 318 (97.9%) were from four-year colleges and universities.

Data Analysis

Contingency or cross-tabulation tables were constructed to examine each of the dependent variables in relation to the independent variable. Chi-square or discriminant function analysis was calculated to determine the presence of any statistically significant relationships. For the purpose of this study, a level of significance of .05 or better was considered adequate to reject the null hypothesis. If a null hypothesis consisted of more than one variable for which a chi-square was calculated, that particular null hypothesis was rejected when 50% or more of the subnull hypotheses were rejected by significant chi-square analysis. If a null hypothesis was rejected by significant chi-square analysis, a large sample posthoc comparison test was calculated to explore the source of the effects.

Null Hypothesis 1

In general, Null Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be no significant difference between college and university housing divisions as they relate to their respective at-large college administrations (Question 8, Appendix B). A total of five cross-tabulations were conducted to test this hypothesis. Null Hypothesis 1(a) indicated
that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer and full-time institutional enrollment (Question 1, Appendix B). The test for independence in this instance yielded a chi-square of 15.92181 with 9 degrees of freedom, not significant at the .05 level (see Table I). Although the chi-square analysis failed to reject the subnull hypothesis at the .05 level, it should be pointed out that results were significant at the .10 level. Additionally, some important information was gained. Of the respondents, 194 (58.6%) chief housing officers indicated that they reported to the chief student affairs officer, 37 (11.2%) indicated that they reported to the chief business affairs officer, 31 (9.4%) indicated that they reported to both the chief student affairs officer and the chief business affairs officer, and 69 (20.8%) indicated that they reported to some other university officer not listed. These results indicate relative stability when compared to the study done recently by Hallenbeck (1976):

Chief housing officer reports to chief student affairs officer (58.98%)

Chief housing officer reports to chief business affairs officer (13.82%)

Chief housing officer reports to both chief student affairs officer and chief business affairs officer (8.75%)

Chief housing officer reports to some other university officer not listed (18.43%) (p. 6)

Null Hypothesis I(b) indicated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and the total design capacity of single student housing (Question 2, Appendix B). Of the 330 respondents, 90 (27.3%) were from institutions with a total design capacity of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel</th>
<th>0-999 (n=22)</th>
<th>1,000-4,999 (n=117)</th>
<th>5,000-9,999 (n=87)</th>
<th>Over 10,000 (n=105)</th>
<th>Total (n=331)</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Analysis of Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel by Full-Time Institutional Enrollment
0 to 999 students, 142 (43.0%) were from institutions with a total design capacity of 1,000 to 2,999 students, 49 (14.8%) were from institutions with a total design capacity of 3,000 to 4,999 students, and 49 (14.8%) were from institutions with a total design capacity of over 5,000 students. Null Hypothesis 1(b) was accepted (see Table 2).

Null Hypothesis 1(c) stated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and the ACUHO region of the reporting institution (Question 3, Appendix B). Table 3 shows that there were no significant differences among the groups. Of the 327 respondents the regional breakdown was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Region</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Region</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermountain Region</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest Region</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Region</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Region</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Region</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic Region</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Region</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis 1(c) could not be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Null Hypothesis 1(d) indicated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and the institutional nature (Question 4, Appendix B). Of the 331 respondents, 212 indicated that they served in public institutions and 119 indicated that they served in private institutions. Null Hypothesis 1(d) was accepted (see Table 4).

Null Hypothesis 1(e) indicated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the chief housing officer (Question 8, Appendix B) and the type of institution (Question 5,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel</th>
<th>0-999 (n=90)</th>
<th>1,000-4,999 (n=142)</th>
<th>5,000-9,999 (n=49)</th>
<th>Over 10,000 (n=49)</th>
<th>Total (n=311)</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Analysis of Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel by Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing
Table 3

Analysis of Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel by ACUHO Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel</th>
<th>NW (n=17)</th>
<th>CA (n=26)</th>
<th>IMT (n=19)</th>
<th>UMW (n=42)</th>
<th>SW (n=27)</th>
<th>GL (n=48)</th>
<th>NE (n=71)</th>
<th>MA (n=31)</th>
<th>SE (n=46)</th>
<th>T (n=309)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $X^2=30.00571$, DF=24, Sig=.1846
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel</th>
<th>Public (n=212)</th>
<th>Private (n=119)</th>
<th>Total (n=331)</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B). Included among the 328 responses were 7 from two-year institutions and 316 from four-year institutions. It is worth noting that no respondents from two-year institutions indicated that their reporting channels were to either the chief business affairs officer or both the chief student affairs officer and the chief business affairs officer. Null Hypothesis 1(e) was not rejected (see Table 5).

Since none of the five subnull hypotheses for Null Hypothesis 1 was rejected, Null Hypothesis 1 was accepted.

**Null Hypothesis 2**

In general, Null Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be no significant differences of internal organizational structure among college and university housing divisions (Question 18, Appendix B). Null Hypothesis 2(a) stated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and full-time institutional enrollment (Question 1, Appendix B). Table 6 reveals a significant chi-square for this subnull hypothesis. Respondents indicated that a large percentage (49.5%) of their lowest level full-time professional staff members reported directly to the chief housing officer. Lowest level full-time professionals who reported to the assistant housing officer for administration numbered 8 (2.6%), those who reported to both the assistant housing officer for administration and the assistant housing officer for programming numbered 18 (5.8%), and those who reported to some other housing officer numbered 109 (35.0%). Null Hypothesis 2(a) was rejected at the .05 level of significance.
Table 5

Analysis of Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel by Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Housing Officer Reporting Channel</th>
<th>Two-Year (n=7)</th>
<th>Four-Year (n=316)</th>
<th>Total (n=323)</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6

Analysis of Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Staff Member Reporting Channel by Full-Time Institutional Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Reporting Channel</th>
<th>0-999 (n=20)</th>
<th>1,000-4,999 (n=104)</th>
<th>5,000-9,999 (n=84)</th>
<th>Over 10,000 (n=103)</th>
<th>Total (n=311)</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Housing Officer$^a$</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration$^a$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming$^a$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both$^a$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other$^a$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Indicates interaction effects
Null Hypothesis 2(b) stated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and the total design capacity of single student housing (Question 2, Appendix B). Table 7 indicates that the lowest level full-time professionals in those institutions with less total design capacity for single student housing tend to have reporting channels directly to the chief housing officer (76.8%). On the other hand, the lowest level full-time professionals at those institutions with greater total design capacity for single student housing tend to have reporting channels to some other housing officer not listed (61.2%). Null Hypothesis 2(b) was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 2(c) indicated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and the ACUHO region (Question 3, Appendix B). While Table 8 indicates that no significant difference exists, it is interesting to note that of the 25 respondents from the California Region, 5 of these (20%) indicated that the lowest level full-time professional reported to the assistant housing officer for programming. This percentage differs substantially from the range of 3.7% to 11.8% found within each of the other eight ACUHO regions. Null Hypothesis 2(c) was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 2(d) stated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and the institutional nature (Question 4, Appendix B). Of the 311 respondents included, 206 indicated that they served in a public institution and
Table 7
Analysis of Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Staff Member Reporting Channel by Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Reporting Channel</th>
<th>0-999 (n=82)</th>
<th>1,000-4,999 (n=132)</th>
<th>5,000-9,999 (n=48)</th>
<th>Over 10,000 (n=49)</th>
<th>Total (n=311)</th>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Housing Officer(^a)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Indicates interaction effects
Table 8
Analysis of Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Staff Member Reporting Channel by ACUHO Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Reporting Channel</th>
<th>NW (n=17)</th>
<th>CA (n=25)</th>
<th>IMT (n=18)</th>
<th>UMW (n=43)</th>
<th>SW (n=27)</th>
<th>GL (n=45)</th>
<th>NE (n=62)</th>
<th>MA (n=27)</th>
<th>SE (n=44)</th>
<th>T (n=308)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Housing Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $X^2=36.03586, DF=32, Sig=.2852$
105 indicated that they served in a private institution. In public institutions, 89 (43.2%) of the lowest level full-time professional staff members reported directly to the chief housing officer while in private institutions some 65 (61.9%) did so. Null Hypothesis 2(d) was rejected at the .05 level of significance (see Table 9).

Null Hypothesis 2(e) stated that no significant difference would exist between reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Question 18, Appendix B) and the type of institution (Question 5, Appendix B). Table 10 does not indicate a significant chi-square at the .05 level. Yet, of the seven two-year institutions reporting, five (71.4%) indicated that their lowest level full-time professional staff member reported directly to the chief housing officer. This percentage compared with 144 (48.6%) of the 296 respondents from four-year institutions who indicated a reporting channel to some other housing officer not listed. Null Hypothesis 2(e) was accepted.

Since three of the five subhypotheses (60%) to Null Hypothesis 2 were clearly rejected, Null Hypothesis 2 was rejected. There were statistically significant differences between reporting channels for lowest level full-time professional staff members with respect to full-time institutional enrollment, total design capacity of single student housing, and institutional nature.

Null Hypothesis 3

In general, Null Hypothesis 3 stated that there would be no significant difference in the number and type of services provided for students among the various college and university housing divisions.
Table 9

Analysis of Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Staff Member Reporting Channel by Institutional Nature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Reporting Channel</th>
<th>Public (n=206)</th>
<th>Private (n=155)</th>
<th>Total (n=311)</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Housing Officer $^a$</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration $^a$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming $^a$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both $^a$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ indicates interaction effects
Table 10

Analysis of Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Staff Member Reporting Channel by Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Reporting Channel</th>
<th>Two-Year (n=7)</th>
<th>Four-Year (n=296)</th>
<th>Total (n=333)</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Housing Officer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The services provided for students included 17 specific programs: social programming, recreational programming, academic programming, accredited course instruction by professional and paraprofessional staff, academic advising, career counseling, personal/social counseling, student government advising, service to the local community, referrals to other institutional agencies, student leadership training, staff selection, student staff development, cooperative student housing, special interest "houses," living/learning sections/houses, and new student orientation (Questions 32 to 50 respectively, Appendix B). Of these 17 specific programs, 5 proved to be significantly different by at least one measure: academic programming (by ACUHO region), accredited course instruction (by total design capacity of single student housing and also by institutional nature), student government advising (by ACUHO region), living/learning sections/houses (by total design capacity of single student housing), and special interest houses (by total design capacity of single student housing and also by ACUHO region). Tables 11 to 17 may be referred to for specific data relating to these 5 programs. Table 18 reflects the data pertaining to the remaining 12 programs which were not found to be significant. Since only 5 of the 17 specific programs (29.4%) indicated any significant differences at the .05 level, Null Hypothesis 3 was accepted.

**Null Hypothesis 4**

In general, Null Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be no significant difference between the general organizational structures of housing divisions (Question 8, Appendix B) and the number or type
Table II

Analysis of Academic Programming by ACUHO Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Programming</th>
<th>NW (n=17)</th>
<th>CA (n=26)</th>
<th>ITM (n=19)</th>
<th>UMW (n=43)</th>
<th>SW (n=27)</th>
<th>GL (n=49)</th>
<th>NE (n=71)</th>
<th>MA (n=31)</th>
<th>SE (n=46)</th>
<th>T (n=329)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Indicates interaction effects
Table 12
Analysis of Accredited Course Instruction by Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredited Courses Instruction</th>
<th>0-999 (n=91)</th>
<th>1,000-2,999 (n=142)</th>
<th>3,000-4,999 (n=50)</th>
<th>Over 5,000 (n=49)</th>
<th>Total (n=332)</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates interaction effects
### Table 13

**Analysis of Accredited Course Instruction by Institutional Nature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredited Course Instruction</th>
<th>Public (n=212)</th>
<th>Private (n=121)</th>
<th>Total (r=333)</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No $^a$</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes $^a$</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Indicates interaction effects
### Table 14
Analysis of Student Government Advising by ACUHO Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Government Advising</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>ITM</th>
<th>UNW</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>(n=27)</td>
<td>(n=49)</td>
<td>(n=71)</td>
<td>(n=31)</td>
<td>(n=46)</td>
<td>(n=329)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No  | 2   | 2   | 2   | 0   | 8   | 7   | 13   | 3   | 11   | 48   |
| Yes | 15  | 24  | 17  | 43  | 19  | 42  | 58   | 28  | 35   | 231  |

Note. $X^2=18.20090$, DF=8, Sig=.0196

*Indicates interaction effects
Table 15

Analysis of Special Interest Houses
by Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Interest Houses</th>
<th>0-999 (n=91)</th>
<th>1,000-2,999 (n=142)</th>
<th>3,000-4,999 (n=50)</th>
<th>Over 5,000 (n=49)</th>
<th>Total (n=332)</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Indicates interaction effects
Table 16

Analysis of Special Interest Houses by ACUHO Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Interest Houses</th>
<th>NW (n=17)</th>
<th>CA (n=26)</th>
<th>ITM (n=19)</th>
<th>UMW (n=43)</th>
<th>SW (n=27)</th>
<th>GL (n=49)</th>
<th>NE (n=71)</th>
<th>MA (n=31)</th>
<th>SE (n=46)</th>
<th>T (n=329)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $X^2=22.71632$, DF=8, Sig=.0037
Table 17
Analysis of Living/Learning Section/Houses
by Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living/Learning Section/Houses</th>
<th>0-999 (n=91)</th>
<th>1,000-2,999 (n=142)</th>
<th>3,000-4,999 (n=50)</th>
<th>Over 5,000 (n=49)</th>
<th>Total (n=332)</th>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes^a</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes^a</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Indicates interaction effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Full-Time Institutional Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing</th>
<th>ACUHO Region</th>
<th>Institutional Nature</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Programming (n=333)</td>
<td>.7586</td>
<td>.9534</td>
<td>.4384</td>
<td>.8936</td>
<td>.8574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Programming (n=333)</td>
<td>.5621</td>
<td>.9127</td>
<td>.3184</td>
<td>.8968</td>
<td>.8512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising (n=333)</td>
<td>.5496</td>
<td>.3896</td>
<td>.2683</td>
<td>.6852</td>
<td>.8117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling (n=333)</td>
<td>.8525</td>
<td>.0582&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.1661</td>
<td>.4552</td>
<td>.6472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Social Counseling (n=333)</td>
<td>.0572&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.3590</td>
<td>.9653</td>
<td>.9225</td>
<td>.8069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Full-Time Institutional Enrollment</td>
<td>Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing</td>
<td>ACUHO Region</td>
<td>Institutional Nature</td>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to the Local Community (n=333)</td>
<td>.4416</td>
<td>.4086</td>
<td>.1135</td>
<td>.1877</td>
<td>.4090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to Other Institutional Agencies (n=333)</td>
<td>.7945</td>
<td>.8476</td>
<td>.6260</td>
<td>.1521</td>
<td>.5555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership Training (n=333)</td>
<td>.4195</td>
<td>.4627</td>
<td>.2466</td>
<td>.9839</td>
<td>.6198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Selection (n=333)</td>
<td>.4154</td>
<td>.6784</td>
<td>.5743</td>
<td>.8968</td>
<td>.5282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Student Housing (n=333)</td>
<td>.4286</td>
<td>.9516</td>
<td>.6991</td>
<td>.3414</td>
<td>.3057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Full-Time Institutional Enrollment</td>
<td>Total Design Capacity of Single Student Housing</td>
<td>ACUHO Region</td>
<td>Institutional Nature</td>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>.1136</td>
<td>.8668</td>
<td>.7115</td>
<td>.4057</td>
<td>.6318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=333)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Other</td>
<td>.6266</td>
<td>.9430</td>
<td>.9233</td>
<td>.6629</td>
<td>.6628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=333)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Other</td>
<td>.1479</td>
<td>.5172</td>
<td>.9659</td>
<td>.5642</td>
<td>.2354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=333)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSignificant at .10 level
of services/programs which they provide for students living within their residence hall systems (Questions 32 to 48, Appendix B). Table 19 reflects the mean scores for each of the four chief housing officer reporting channels: to the chief student affairs officer, to the chief business officer, to both the chief student affairs officer and the chief business officer, and to some other college or university officer not listed. Seven factors proved of significant worth as discriminators in combination. The most powerful single discriminating effects resulted from the service/program of student staff development. Others which were of significance in combination were (in order of contribution): staff selection, student government advising, recreational programming, referrals to other institutional agencies, new student orientation, and academic programming. Table 20 shows the best classification matrix which resulted from the use of service/programming scores as predictors of general organizational type. In the ideal situation service/programming scores could be used to accurately predict the general organizational structure of housing divisions characterized by reporting channels of the chief housing officer. Null Hypothesis 4 was rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Null Hypothesis 5

In general, Null Hypothesis 5 stated that there would be no significant differences between the internal organizational structures of housing divisions (Question 18, Appendix B) and the number or type of programs/services which they provide for students living within their residence hall systems (Questions 32 to 48, Appendix D).
Table 19

Mean Number of Services/Programs Offered to Students as a Function of the Reporting Channel of the Chief Housing Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chief Student Affairs Officer</th>
<th>Chief Business Officer</th>
<th>Both 1 and 2</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=156)</td>
<td>(n=30)</td>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=271)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 33 Recreational Programming</td>
<td>3.5449</td>
<td>3.2667</td>
<td>3.3571</td>
<td>3.1579</td>
<td>3.8598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 34 Academic Programming</td>
<td>2.9423</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.7857</td>
<td>2.8596</td>
<td>2.8598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 35 Accredited Course Instruction by</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.9667</td>
<td>1.7857</td>
<td>1.8246</td>
<td>1.9373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Paraprofessional Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 36 Academic Advising</td>
<td>2.4551</td>
<td>2.4667</td>
<td>2.4643</td>
<td>2.4211</td>
<td>2.4502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 37 Career Counseling</td>
<td>2.8449</td>
<td>2.3667</td>
<td>2.3929</td>
<td>2.2807</td>
<td>2.4539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 39 Student Government Advising</td>
<td>3.4423</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>3.3214</td>
<td>3.5088</td>
<td>3.4723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 40 Service to the Local Community</td>
<td>2.1603</td>
<td>2.1333</td>
<td>2.0357</td>
<td>2.1404</td>
<td>2.1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 41 Referrals to Other Institutional</td>
<td>3.6026</td>
<td>3.1000</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>3.4035</td>
<td>3.5018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Chief Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
<td>Both 1 and 2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 42 Student Leadership</td>
<td>3.4808</td>
<td>3.0667</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>3.3684</td>
<td>3.4133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 43 Staff Selection</td>
<td>4.4744</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>4.4286</td>
<td>3.9123</td>
<td>4.3173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 44 Student Staff</td>
<td>4.3526</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>4.1429</td>
<td>3.6772</td>
<td>4.1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 45 Cooperative</td>
<td>1.7756</td>
<td>1.8667</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>1.5070</td>
<td>1.7638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 46 Special Interest</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
<td>2.3929</td>
<td>2.1228</td>
<td>2.3137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 47 Living/Learning</td>
<td>2.4231</td>
<td>2.0667</td>
<td>2.1429</td>
<td>2.2281</td>
<td>2.3137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section/Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 48 New Student</td>
<td>3.6731</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
<td>3.3214</td>
<td>3.2207</td>
<td>3.5535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level (in combination)
Table 20

Classification Matrix of Reporting Channel
for Chief Housing Officer by Predicted Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group Membership</th>
<th>Group 1 (n=156)</th>
<th>Group 2 (n=30)</th>
<th>Group 3 (n=28)</th>
<th>Group 4 (n=57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Student</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affairs Officer</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Business Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both 1 and 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percent of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 41.70%
Table 21 reflects the mean scores for each of the 17 specific programs listed for each of the five lowest level full-time professional staff member reporting channels: to the chief housing officer, to the assistant housing officer for administration, to the assistant housing officer for programming, to both the assistant housing officer for administration and the assistant housing officer for programming, and to some other housing officer not listed. Ten factors proved of significant worth as discriminators in combination. The most powerful single discriminating effects resulted from the service/program of recreational programming. Others which were of significance in combination were (in order of contribution): staff selection, academic advising, special interest houses, accredited course instruction by professional and paraprofessional staff, student staff development, service to the local community, referrals to other institutional agencies, personal/social counseling, and career counseling. Table 22 shows the best classification matrix which resulted from the use of service/programming scores as predictors of internal organizational type. In the ideal situation, service/programming scores could be used to accurately predict the internal organizational structure of housing divisions as characterized by reporting channels of the lowest level full-time professional staff member. Null Hypothesis 5 was rejected at the .05 level of significance.
Table 21
Mean Number of Services/Programs Offered to Students as a Function of the Reporting Channel of the Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Staff Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chief Housing Officer</th>
<th>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration</th>
<th>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming</th>
<th>Both 1 and 2</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=123)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=93)</td>
<td>(n=258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 34 Academic Programming</td>
<td>2.6374</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>3.1905</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>2.7849</td>
<td>2.6643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 35 Accredited Course Instruction by Professional and Paraprofessional Staff</td>
<td>1.8455</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
<td>2.4762</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>1.8817</td>
<td>1.9341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 36 Academic Advising</td>
<td>2.4797</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>2.0625</td>
<td>2.4946</td>
<td>2.4457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Chief Housing Officer</td>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration</td>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming</td>
<td>Both 1 and 2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 37 Career Counseling(^a)</td>
<td>2.4553</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>2.3810</td>
<td>2.6250</td>
<td>2.4409</td>
<td>2.4574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 39 Student Government Advising</td>
<td>3.4472</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>3.9048</td>
<td>3.9375</td>
<td>3.4086</td>
<td>3.4884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 40 Service to Local Community(^a)</td>
<td>2.1057</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>2.1905</td>
<td>2.19375</td>
<td>2.2043</td>
<td>2.1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 41 Referrals to Other Institutional Agencies(^a)</td>
<td>3.5285</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>3.4839</td>
<td>3.4839</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 42 Student Leadership Training</td>
<td>3.4390</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>3.4762</td>
<td>33.4375</td>
<td>3.4086</td>
<td>3.4186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 43 Staff Selection(^a)</td>
<td>4.4472</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>4.6875</td>
<td>4.0860</td>
<td>4.3101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 44 Student Staff Development(^a)</td>
<td>4.3008</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>4.1875</td>
<td>3.9355</td>
<td>4.1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 45 Cooperative Student Housing</td>
<td>1.7886</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.7619</td>
<td>1.8125</td>
<td>1.7419</td>
<td>1.7732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Chief Housing Officer</td>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration</td>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming</td>
<td>Both 1 and 2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 46 Special Interest Houses</td>
<td>2.3008</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>2.9375</td>
<td>2.1290</td>
<td>2.3140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 47 Living/Learning Section/Houses</td>
<td>2.2683</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.1935</td>
<td>2.3140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 48 New Student Orientation</td>
<td>3.5122</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.8095</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>3.5591</td>
<td>3.5620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level (in combination)*
Table 22

Classifier or Matrix of Reporting Channel for Lowest Level Full-Time Professional Staff Member by Predicted Group Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group Membership</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1 (n=123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Housing Officer</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Housing Officer for Programming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both 2 and 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percent of "predicted" cases correctly classified: 35.66%
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this investigation was to identify differences in the services offered to students in residence halls as a function of the organizational structure of housing. The population studied consisted of those colleges and universities which are listed on the Association of College and University Housing Officers (ACUHO) newsletter mailing list. In the opinion of this researcher, knowledge of which organizational structures most frequently provide specific services to students is essential for both current and future housing professionals. Clarification of real service differences among the various housing organizational types appears necessary so that housing professionals can make intelligent choices regarding which organizational structure to adopt for specific service goals and objectives.

Both continuing and new chief housing officers concerned with national organizational and service programming trends should be well informed concerning the differences in services offered to students among the various housing divisions. Knowledge of such differences in service programs may provide the basis for a more effective organizational structure to deliver those services to students which the housing professional places in high priority. In the opinion of the researcher, a lack of coordination between some of the goals of housing divisions (the services offered to students) and the organizational
structure implementing those goals has resulted in a diminished effectiveness of professional housing programs.

**Subjects and Design**

College and university residence halls have a long and distinguished place in the history of the American college. The ACUHO was selected as the organization to survey because of its stature among housing professionals and its national membership. A questionnaire was the instrument used to survey the institutions listed on the ACUHO newsletter mailing list. The questionnaire attempted to gather four types of data: reporting channels for the chief housing officer, reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional, services/programs offered to students in residence halls, and demographic. Questionnaires were field tested and then mailed to 617 chief housing officers at institutions listed on the ACUHO newsletter mailing list. The total return rate was 55.1% or 340 questionnaires.

**Analysis and Results**

Each of the dependent variables (full-time institutional enrollment, total design capacity of single student housing, ACUHO region, institutional nature, and type of institution) was examined in relation to the independent variables (reporting channel for the chief housing officer, reporting channel for the lowest level full-time professional, and each of 17 specific services/programs offered to students in residence halls). A chi-square was calculated to determine statistical independence between groups. When appropriate, a large sample posthoc comparison test was calculated to explore the source of the effects. Frequencies and percentages for each of the variables were examined.
No statistically significant differences among general organizational structures of housing divisions were found with respect to total design capacity for single student housing, ACUHO region, institutional nature, or type of institution (Null Hypothesis 1).

The areas of internal organizational structure of housing divisions which were found to have statistically significant differences with respect to reporting channels for the lowest level full-time professional staff member (Null Hypothesis 2) were full-time institutional enrollment, total design capacity of single student housing, and the institutional nature. Those areas for which no statistical independence were found were ACUHO region and the type of institution.

While the data analysis for Hypothesis 1 did not provide sufficient evidence for rejection of the hypothesis, data analysis for Hypothesis 2 did provide substantial evidence for its rejection at the .05 level. The data related to Hypothesis 1 do, however, closely relate to the findings of Hallenbeck (1976) and serve to indicate the stability of the current ACUHO reporting channels of institutional chief housing officers. Data related to Hypothesis 2, on the other hand, do indicate that the lowest level full-time professional staff members in larger public institutions with greater design capacity for single student housing tend to report to a representative of the chief housing officer rather than to the chief housing officer. In private institutions, however, the lowest level full-time professional staff members report more frequently to the chief housing officer.

With regard to the 17 specific programs included in the analysis of Hypothesis 3, 5 proved to be significantly different on at least one measure: academic programming (by ACUHO region), accredited
course instruction (by total design capacity of single student housing and also by institutional nature), student government advising (by ACUHO region), living/learning sections/houses (by total design capacity of single student housing), and special interest houses (by total design capacity of single student housing and also by ACUHO region). Although the data analysis for Hypothesis 3 did not provide sufficient evidence for rejection at the .05 level, some importance can be attached to the programming differences among housing organizations at institutions of varying size and nature, along with those located in different ACUHO regions.

Discriminant function analysis of the services/programs offered to students in residence halls as they relate to the general organizational structure of housing divisions revealed that seven specific programs taken in combination can serve as predictors of general organizational structure. The seven programs (in order of decreasing contribution) were student staff development, staff selection, student government advising, recreational programming, referrals to other institutional agencies, new student orientation, and academic programming.

Discriminant function analysis of the services/programs offered to students in residence halls as they relate to the internal organizational structure of housing divisions also revealed significant differences. In this instance, the 10 factors (in order of decreasing contribution as predictors) taken in combination were recreational programming, staff selection, academic advising, special interest houses, accredited course instruction by professional and paraprofessional staff, student staff development, service to the local community,
referrals to other institutional agencies, personal/social counseling, and career counseling.

Conclusions

This study demonstrated that there are differences as well as similarities among the housing organizations studied with regard to services/programs offered to students in residence halls. Also, it is apparent that even when significant differences do exist, no particular organizational group(s) is consistently different from the others.

Null Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

None of the subnull hypotheses for general organizational structure (Hypothesis 1) could be rejected at the .05 level. Yet the data gained in this study clearly substantiate the findings of Hallenbeck (1976) obtained over a year ago.

With three of the five (60%) subnull hypotheses for Hypothesis 2 being rejected, some statistically significant data were obtained. In terms of the variables of full-time institutional enrollment, total design capacity of single student housing, and institutional nature (public vs. private), it appears that a single factor— that being the number of full-time professionals—might be emerging. Greater numbers of students enrolled in an institution and housed in university residence halls (both more likely in the larger public institutions) apparently and obviously result in additional levels of staffing between the lowest level full-time professional and the chief housing officer.

Analysis associated with Hypothesis 3 indicates that some interactions, though not statistically significant, may be existent
primarily between the types of services/programs offered to students in residence halls and the total design capacity of single student housing along with ACUHO region and institutional nature. Perhaps these results, like those associated with Hypothesis 2 are at least partly reflective of additional numbers and/or levels of housing professional staff. Those programs which received the greatest organizational emphasis (on a 5 point scale, 5 indicating the greatest emphasis) by respondents as a whole were staff selection (4.3173), student staff development (4.1587), and personal/social counseling (3.6790), while those which received the least organizational emphasis included cooperative student housing (1.7638), accredited course instruction by professional and paraprofessional staff (1.9373), and service to the local community (2.1402).

Discriminant analysis completed in relation to Hypotheses 4 and 5 reveals several noteworthy points. The first is that some service/programming factors used as discriminators for Hypotheses 4 and 5 are more effective than others. Of the 13 specific factors included as predictors, 9 were used as predictors for only one hypothesis or the other. In order of contribution, those services/programs which served as predictors (41.7%) of reporting channels for the chief housing officer included student staff development, staff selection, student government advising, recreational programming, referrals to other institutional agencies, new student orientation, and academic programming. Each of these services/programs occupies a position of prominence in a professional viewpoint which places emphasis on student services and university-wide issues. On the other hand, those factors (in order of contribution) which served as predictors (35.66%) of
lowest level full-time professional staff member reporting channels included a predominance of factors of greater local and individual concern: recreational programming, staff selection, academic advising, special interest houses, accredited course instruction by professional and paraprofessional staff, student staff development, service to the local community, referrals to other institutional agencies, personal/social counseling, and career counseling. As with the study done by Hallenbeck (1976), this researcher found most respondents who wrote in answers in the "Other" category for chief housing officers' reporting channel did so naming some other student affairs officer, such as the dean of students, the dean of student services, or the dean of student development. Should these responses be included with those of the chief student affairs officer, the predictability of a student affairs reporting channel would be enhanced by nearly 57 additional cases, a substantial percentage of those included in the data analysis (20.58%).

Implications

Chief housing officers who wish to design or redesign their organizational structure to deliver specific services/programs to students may find it helpful to know which organizational structures currently do so. Several results of this investigation seem relevant to chief housing officers. First, those chief housing officers who report directly to the chief business officer rather than the chief student affairs officer scored consistently lower on all of the service/programming variables except for academic advising, student government advising, and cooperative student housing. Second, higher service/programming scores were recorded in those instances where the lowest
level full-time professional staff member reported to an assistant housing officer for programming. Those services/programs which were emphasized in this instance included: social programming, recreational programming, academic programming, accredited course instruction by professional and paraprofessional staff, student government advising, referrals to other institutional agencies, student leadership training, special interest houses, and living/learning sections/houses. Third, these data indicate that the delivery of services/programs to students in residence halls is clearly enhanced by the inclusion of an assistant housing officer for programming within a housing organization.

The results of this investigation apparently provide the first baseline data available relating to the status of services/programs within the ACUHO organization. While such data for organizational status have been available in the past and have been useful in determining organizational trends over the years, similar data have not been available in the service/programming area. Perhaps this study will provide the information which can help determine future trends in this vital area of concern to the professional housing educator.

Recommendations for Further Research

Uniform instrument(s) or means of gathering data should be developed and periodically revised by ACUHO to gain organizational and service/program information which can be useful to the housing educator in the field. Such information would serve to keep housing professionals more fully informed regarding both the perceived emphasis given to student services/programs and the organizational types used as delivery vehicles for these services. Data from the field should then be gathered on a regular basis (every 5 to 10 years is suggested)
in order to provide useful up-to-date information. Should special situations arise, national in scope, perhaps more frequent sampling would be advisable.

Additional research is also advisable to explore the impact of various student staff organizations upon the service/program area. It seems probable that student staff could have a significant impact upon service/programming efforts conducted within the residence hall setting.

Further, the area of student perceptions of residence hall services/programs should be researched. By doing so, the housing educator could base service/program decision making upon extensive student and staff input.

Additional research regarding services/programs offered to students in the residence halls would prove invaluable to the housing educator in the years immediately ahead.
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO ACUHO MEMBER

Dear ACUHO Member:

I would deeply appreciate your taking 15 or 20 minutes from your schedule today to respond to the accompanying survey. The responses you make on this survey will enable the researcher to provide the ACUHO organization with current data not only about our state of organizational development as has been done in the past, but also about our level of programming services to students and any correlations which may exist between organization type and programming services. The implications of a correlational relationship are of course, considerable, and results of this study will therefore be published and/or made available to the ACUHO membership at large.

More specifically, this study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What types of organizational relationships exist today between housing divisions and the college administration at large?
2. What types of internal organizational structures are present within college housing divisions today?
3. What services or programs do various housing division personnel perceive they provide for their students?
4. Does a particular pattern of services or programs distinguish among the housing organization types?

This study has been approved and is sponsored in part by the ACUHO Research and Information Committee.

Data from each institution will be coded to insure the confidentiality of responses and no attempt will be made to compare or evaluate the program of any college or university.

Thank you very much for your help on this project.

Sincerely,

Raymond L. Holbrook
Residence Life Coordinator
Graham Area
West Campus
APPENDIX B
SURVEY OF HOUSING SERVICES
AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

Your institution

In supplying this information, please use Fall, 1976 as the reference point.

Identifying Information

1) Your full-time institutional enrollment:
   ____ a) 0 to 999  ____ c) 5,000 to 9,999
   ____ b) 1,000 to 4,999  ____ d) Over 10,000

2) Total design capacity of single student housing:
   ____ a) 0 to 999  ____ c) 3,000 to 4,999
   ____ b) 1,000 to 2,999  ____ d) Over 5,000

3) Your ACUHO region:
   ____ a) Northwest  ____ f) Great Lakes
   ____ b) California  ____ g) Northeast
   ____ c) Intermountain  ____ h) Mid-Atlantic
   ____ d) Upper Midwest  ____ i) Southeast
   ____ e) Southwest

4) Your institutional nature:
   ____ a) Public  ____ b) Private

5) Type of institution:
   ____ a) Two-Year  ____ b) Four-Year
Organizational Information

6) Your chief housing officer's title:
   ___ a) Director of housing  ___ c) Director of residence life
   ___ b) Director of housing and food services  ___ d) Other __________

7) Housing operations and residence life are separate functions and report to different college administrative offices.
   ___ a) Yes  ___ b) No

8) To whom does your chief housing officer report?
   ___ a) Chief student affairs officer  ___ c) Both 1 and 2
   ___ b) Chief business officer  ___ d) Other __________

Please rank in order of emphasis, those areas for which your chief housing officer has overall responsibility. (Use numbers from 1 to 7, with 1 being most important.)

9) ___ Administration (overall coordination of day-to-day activities, room transfers, assignment, meetings)

10) ___ Management (facility maintenance, renovation, custodial supervision)

11) ___ Student life (social/recreational/educational programming, resident assistant staff, residence hall government, discipline)

12) ___ Budget (budget preparation, payroll, purchasing)

13) ___ Food (menu planning, food preparation, hiring)

14) ___ Family housing (assignment, maintenance, programming)

15) ___ Off-campus housing (advising students about housing not owned by your institution)
16) What is the title of your lowest level full-time professional staff member (employed on a 40-hour/week basis), primarily responsible for programming/counseling?

___ a) Assistant director
___ b) Residence hall counselor
___ c) Residence life coordinator
___ d) Counselor-teacher
___ e) Hall advisor
___ f) Head resident
___ g) Resident manager
___ h) Other ____________________________

17) For how many students is this staff member responsible?

___ a) 0 to 200
___ b) 200 to 400
___ c) 400 to 600
___ d) Over 600

18) To whom does this lowest level full-time professional staff member report?

___ a) Chief housing officer
___ b) Assistant housing officer for administration
___ c) Assistant housing officer for programming
___ d) Both 2 and 3
___ e) Other ____________________________

Please rank in order of emphasis, those areas for which your lowest level full-time professional staff member has responsibility. (Use numbers from 1 to 7, with 1 being most important.)

19) ___ Administration (overall coordination of day-to-day activities, assignment, meetings)

20) ___ Management (room transfers, facility maintenance, renovation, custodial supervision)

21) ___ Student life (social/recreational/educational programming, resident assistant staff, residence hall government, discipline)

22) ___ Budget (budget preparation, payroll, purchasing)
23) Food (menu planning, food preparation, hiring)
24) Family housing (assignment, maintenance, programming)
25) Off-campus housing (advising students about housing not owned by your institution)

26) Does your housing organization employ graduate assistant level staff?
   a) No                       b) Yes
   ____________

27) If your housing organization does employ graduate assistant level staff, are these persons
   a) Salaried                b) Nonsalaried
   ____________

28) For how many students is this graduate level staff person responsible?
   a) 9 to 99                 c) 200 to 400
   b) 100 to 199              d) Over 400
   ____________

29) Does your housing organization employ undergraduate assistant level staff?
   a) No                       b) Yes
   ____________

30) If your housing organization does employ undergraduate assistant level staff, are these persons
   a) Salaried                b) Nonsalaried
   ____________

31) For how many students is this undergraduate level staff person responsible?
   a) 0 to 50                 c) 100 to 200
   b) 51 to 99               d) Over 200
   ____________

Service Information

Of the programs your organization handles, please indicate the emphasis you perceive you give to each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32) Social programming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Recreational programming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Academic programming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) Accredited course instruction by professional and paraprofessional staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) Academic advising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) Career counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Personal/social counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Student government advising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Service to the local community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) Referrals to other institutional agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) Student leadership training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) Staff selection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) Student staff development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) Cooperative student housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) Special interest &quot;Houses&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) Living/learning section/houses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48) New student orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51) Do you have a visitation policy (periodic visits by members of the opposite sex) in residence halls which consist of one room accommodations (bedroom visitation)?

   a) Yes    b) No

52) Do you have a co-educational housing program in residence halls which consist of one room accommodations?

   a) Yes    b) No
53) If yes to Question 52, does it consist of same area, different building?
   ____ a) Yes  ____ b) No

54) If yes to Question 52, does it consist of the same building, different floors?
   ____ a) Yes  ____ b) No

55) If yes to Question 52, does it consist of same floor, different rooms?
   ____ a) Yes  ____ b) No

56) Do you feel that your current organizational pattern best suits the philosophical objectives of your organization?
   ____ a) Yes  ____ b) Questionable  ____ c) No

57) If you answered "Questionable" or "No" to Number 56 above, what would you recommend?

58) Which (if any) factors are limiting your ability to develop any of the above programs to the level of your preference?

59) Please feel free to express any thoughts you may have on the items listed above.

60) If one is available, please send an organizational chart for your housing organization, including any details necessary to show relationships of the housing organization to the total institutional organization.

Raymond L. Holbrook
Residence Life Coordinator
Graham Area Office
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32612

Your cooperation in this study is greatly appreciated.
APPENDIX C
SAMPLE ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS

Business Affairs Officer

Dean of Students

Vice President of Business Affairs

Director Auxiliary Services

Director of Housing

Head Cashier

Manager Married Housing
Manager Apartment Living
Manager Helaman Halls
Manager Deseret Towers
Manager Off Campus
Manager Housing Office
Organization Chart
Both Student Affairs Officer
and
Business Affairs Officer

Dean of Students

Associate Dean of Students

Residence Hall Directors

Student Assistants

Dean of Administration

Director of Housing

Business Manager

Custodial

Maintenance

Off-Campus Housing

Faculty Housing
### Instructions

- Use pencil only - No. 2 or softer.
- Do not make any stray marks.
- Make all responses dark, glossy and complete as shown in these examples.
- Mark your name and identification number on the other side if you are requested to do so.
- Do not make any marks in this shaded area.
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