

ABSTRACT

PAUL, M.P. A comparison of perceptions of the quality of life in the residence halls at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse by gender (2002) and over a five year time period (1998-2002). Master of Science in Education, College Student Development and Administration, December 2003, 75pp. (N. Nicklaus)

This study used the Quality of Life survey distributed in 1998, 2000, and 2002 to determine whether or not there was a significant difference in the perceptions of the students living in the residence halls with regard to their residency. Additionally, the 2002 survey results were analyzed for differences in perceptions based upon gender. The Quality of Life survey was distributed annually by the Office of Residence Life to all students living in the residence halls at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. It was discovered that no statistical difference existed ($p < 0.05$) between the perceptions of male and female residents for four out of the five variables. In the second part of the study, it was found that a statistical difference did exist ($p < 0.05$) between the perceptions of residents during the years of 1998, 2000, and 2002 for 4 out of the 5 variables. Continued investigation is important in areas such as the perceptions of the students by year in school, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, and specific living environment.

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE
RESIDENCE HALLS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-
LA CROSSE BY GENDER (2002) AND OVER A FIVE
YEAR TIME PERIOD (1998-2002)

A THESIS PRESENTED
TO
THE GRADUATE FACULTY
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION
COLLEGE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

BY
MELISSA A. PAUL
DECEMBER 2003

COLLEGE OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION,
RECREATION, AND TEACHER EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

THESIS FINAL ORAL DEFENSE FORM

Candidate Melissa A. Paul

We recommend acceptance of this thesis in partial
fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the
degree:

Masters of Science in Education - College Student
Development and Administration

The candidate has successfully completed the thesis final
oral defense.

<u>John Nicholas</u>	<u>CSDA</u>	<u>11/19/03</u>
Signature of Thesis Chairperson	Department	Date
<u>Mary E. Valachi</u>	<u>CSDA</u>	<u>11/19/03</u>
Signature of Committee Member	Department	Date
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>PSYCH</u>	<u>11/19/03</u>
Signature of Committee Member	Department	Date

This thesis is approved by the College of Health, Physical
Education, Recreation, and Teacher Education.

<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12-1-03</u>
Associate Dean, College of HPERTE	Date
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12-16-03</u>
Director of University Graduate Studies	Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express appreciation to all those who supported, guided, and encouraged me during the thesis writing process. Without their help, this process would not have been as enjoyable or educational.

I am especially thankful for my committee members—Dr. Nick Nicklaus, Dr. Mary Beth Vahala, and Dr. Betsy Morgan. It was a pleasure working with these individuals and I am grateful for all their help and patience. In addition, special thanks to Dr. Nick Nicklaus for his role, not only as my thesis chair, but as a supervisor and mentor.

I would also like to thank my family, Carl, colleagues, and all those who work within the Office of Residence Life. Thanks for listening and for believing in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Need for the Study	5
Hypotheses	7
Assumptions	8
Limitations	8
Definition of Terms	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Assessment	12
Person-Environment Interaction Theories	20
Gender Differences	24
Summary	27
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	29
Subject Sample	29
Data Collection	29
Statistical Treatment	32

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	34
Comparison of Means by Gender	35
Comparison of Means by Year	36
Implications	40
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	42
Summary	42
Conclusions	44
Recommendations	45
REFERENCES	48
APPENDICES	49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Total Number of Completed and Returned QOL Surveys by Year	35
2. Mean Perception Scores of Male and Female Students Living in the Residence Halls	36
3. Mean Perception Scores of Students Living in the Residence Halls in 1998, 2000, and 2002	39
4. Bonferroni's Pairwise Comparisons of 1998, 2000, and 2002 Mean Perception Scores	40

LIST OF APPENDICIES

APPENDIX	PAGE
A. Office of Residence Life Mission Statement	49
B. 2002 Quality of Life Survey Cover Letter	51
C. 2002 Quality of Life Survey	54
D. 2000 Quality of Life Survey	59
E. 1998 Quality of Life Survey	64
F. Questions Used in Gender Comparison (2002)	69
G. Questions Used in Comparison Over Time (1998-2002)	73

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The mission statement of the Office of Residence Life (ORL) at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (UW-L), during this study, was as follows:

The University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Residence Life Program is an integral part of the University's educational and student development services. We provide reasonably priced and well maintained living/learning environments which are designed to foster community, self growth, responsibility, respect for others, leadership, and positive citizenship (Appendix A).

Although the first residence hall--Wilder Hall--at UW-L opened in 1952, ORL did not oversee living accommodations on campus until 1966. Prior to that time, the Dean of Men and Dean of Women oversaw on-campus housing (Baynes, 1987). During this study, the department housed nearly 2,900 students--more than 35% of the student body at UW-L. The break down of the resident body was as follows: 1,690 freshmen (619 men, 1,071 women), 834 sophomores (269 men, 565 women), 195 juniors (73 men, 122 women), 125 seniors (65 men, 60 women), and 32 graduate students/others (18 men, 14 women).

In addition, there were 109 paraprofessional staff members (resident assistants and desk managers), 11 professional staff members (hall directors), and three graduate assistants (assistant hall directors) that lived and worked within the 11 residence halls. There were 190 residents, included in the count, who also served as front desk workers or assistant housekeepers. Additionally, there were personnel who worked within ORL who did not live within the residence halls. These included six central staff members, two program assistants, two to four graduate assistants (office graduates), one part-time computer staff member, seven computer interns, and 15 housekeepers.

Students who lived within the residence halls generally spent a large amount of time in their living environment since there were 168 hours in a week and only 15 to 18 hours were spent in class. ORL took the opportunity to positively affect college students since this was an important time in these students' lives.

College student development theory described changes and development that students often go through during their college years. Arthur Chickering said that college students move to some degree through the following vectors: (1) developing competence, (2) managing emotions, (3)

moving through autonomy towards interdependence, (4) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (5) establishing identity, (6) developing purpose, and (7) developing integrity (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Another prominent theorist, Alexander Astin (1984), stressed the role of student involvement in development. Astin argued that for student learning to occur, students needed to actively engage in their environment. Along with its student affairs practitioners, ORL provided services, programs, and facilities to help students through this time of growth and to guide them towards making positive decisions.

Since its formation, one of ORL's strengths was its student-focus and commitment to providing quality services and programs. Evaluation was the tool that helped the organization understand whether that quality was being actualized and also addressed any issues within a particular wing or cube community, hall, or the organization at large. One way that ORL evaluated its specific residence life program and assessed the needs of students living in the residence halls was through the annual Quality of Life (QOL) survey (see Appendices C, D, and E). The QOL survey was a quantitative and qualitative

instrument containing questions about students' perceptions of their living environment. The central and professional staff annually chose questions that they felt were important to the mission of the organization. Since so many individuals had a hand in creating questions and could benefit from the feedback, the survey grew in length and more categories were added.

Statement of the Problem

QOL information was valued by ORL and it was used to better understand the student population they served and to determine residents' opinions of their living environment. At the time of this study, information collected was mostly used for informal discussions by individual hall directors and their immediate supervisors. These discussions included how the organization and individual residence halls were doing in meeting the needs of students and providing a living/learning environment. The results were also used to provide further feedback and evaluation of the professional staff, graduate assistants, paraprofessional staff, and hall leaders. Usually, 2 or 3 items were pinpointed for discussion as well as areas that could be improved for the following semester.

Although the QOL survey was a useful tool, it wasn't used to its full potential. The information was not looked at by gender, year in school, type of living environment, specific groups of students, or regularly compared over a number of years to ascertain trends.

Purpose of the Study

The QOL survey provided information about students' opinions with regard to their experience living in the residence halls. The purpose of this study was two-fold. First, to do a more in-depth analysis of information collected from the 2002 survey. Second, to do a comparison of data collected over time. This study concentrated on the influence of gender on perceptions of students living in the residence halls according to the 2002 survey responses and how the organization's feedback has compared biannually since 1998.

Need for the Study

ORL was committed to selecting and keeping qualified individuals on staff whether it was central (director, assistant directors, leadership and education coordinator, and program assistants), professional (hall directors), or paraprofessional (resident assistants and desk managers) in order to carry out its mission. In pursuit of carrying out

this mission, there were a number of changes in recent years.

First, there were changes to the central staff in the last 10 years. The area of leadership and education was expanded into a full-time position. This was previously an added responsibility of an assistant director in charge of 5 west-area residence halls and technology for the organization. Due to a retirement, another reorganization occurred as well. Rather than have three assistant directors in charge of personnel and programs in three areas, responsibilities were shifted such that two assistant directors covered these responsibilities. This vacancy allowed for the creation of an assistant director position that was strictly in charge of facilities and overseeing the housekeepers. This was previously an added responsibility of the assistant director in charge of operations and staff selection.

Also in the past 6 years, changes were made in the residence halls. Three residence halls specialized to become freshmen year experience, substance-free, and coed by every other room halls. Visitation changed as well and went from overnight guests being allowed only on weekends to 24 hour/7 days a week and determined more by roommates

than by the organization. Roommate agreements became a larger priority too as well as updating facilities, improving the Residence Life Information Services and Residential Network, improving desk operations through technology and increasing services offered, and improving programs to meet the changing times and student population. One of the focuses of this study was to investigate if student perceptions changed over recent years. Also, it was important to examine if the needs of female and male residents were being equally met and if any additional needs should be focused on in the future.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study in null form were as follows:

1. There were no significant differences in reported perceptions between women and men living in the residence halls.
2. There were no significant differences in reported perceptions of students living in the residence halls during the years of 1998, 2000, and 2002.

Assumptions

This study had the following assumptions:

1. Answers were accurately and honestly reported by the students surveyed. They were not under any pressure or excessive stress while filling out the survey.
2. Consistency in timing and administration of surveys throughout the residence halls from 1998 to 2002.
3. The same instructions were given to each professional staff member for their specific residence hall and to each resident as an attachment to the survey.

Limitations

This study had the following limitations:

1. Generalizability beyond the UW-L campus or the student body as a whole. The QOL questions are specific to ORL and the students living in the residence halls.
2. Over the past 5 years, the QOL survey was modified. Questions were added, changed, or deleted based on changes in programs, facilities, and services provided by the organization and the interests of the central and professional staff for any given year. Thus, some questions could not be used in this study based on this inconsistency.

3. Sanford Hall, coed by every other room, could not be included in the gender portion of this study. Each resident assistant in Sanford Hall had both male and female residents and due to the fact that there were no gender specific questions on the survey, information given by males and females could not be separated.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in this study:

Central Staff - The director, assistant directors, and Leadership and Education Coordinator for ORL.

Desk Manager - A student who lived in each residence hall and supervised the front desk operations.

Floor/Hall Leaders - Students that were involved in hall governance, Residence Hall Association Council (RHAC), National Residence Hall Honorary (NRHH), or assisted with floor activities.

Graduate Assistants - Graduate students who assisted ORL and advised RHAC and NRHH (office graduates) or who worked and lived within the three larger residence halls (assistant hall directors).

Paraprofessional Staff - Students who lived in the residence halls and were resident assistants (98) or desk

managers (11). Six to 13 resident assistants and one desk manager lived and worked in each residence hall.

Professional Staff - Hall directors who worked and lived in each residence hall.

Resident - A student who lived in the residence halls excluding paraprofessional staff members.

Resident Assistant - One student who lived in each wing or cube community within a residence hall and helped residents adjust to college life and ORL carry out its mission.

Residence Hall - On campus housing designed for college students.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Americans have traditionally had a special relationship with their institutions of higher education. The relationship often involved financial support but also entered the realm of the emotional. Alumni frequently used the words loyal, faithful, love, and giving when describing their lifetime bond to an undergraduate college or university (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

The fact that a social institution could produce such enthusiastic and generous support attested to the generally high regard in which Americans held postsecondary institutions in this country. And, as a matter of fact, the population expected colleges and universities to accomplish great things. Educational expectations included such things as:

transmitting the intellectual heritage of Western civilization; fostering a high level of verbal and mathematical skills; developing an in-depth understanding of social, cultural, and political institutions; facilitating one's ability to think reflectively, analytically, critically, synthetically, and evaluatively; developing one's value structures and moral sensibilities; facilitating personal growth and self-identity; and fostering one's sense of career

identity and vocational competence (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p.1).

Additionally, there was the less lofty but fully appreciated goal of socializing students for effective functioning in the middle class in American society (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

The fact that until recently American postsecondary education enjoyed such a lengthy tradition of public and private support was conceivably one strong indicator of the general belief that undergraduate education did, indeed, accomplish these goals. But to what degree could these beliefs be substantiated (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991)?

Assessment

Assessment and evaluation have been used regularly in a variety of settings and staff within higher education has seen the value of these tools as well. These two concepts, assessment and evaluation, while routinely used as interchangeable concepts, are different. Komives and Woodard (1996, p.416) have defined assessment as a "systematic basis for making inferences about the learning and development of students." Assessment measured both academic achievement and personal development but personal development—usually self-confidence, tolerance for

diversity, and motivation—had generally been placed behind cognitive learning. Many times these attributes were automatically assigned to student affairs.

Evaluation, on the other hand, generally addressed issues of efficiency and effectiveness of the campus environment. It was thought that improvements or changes in students could come about through their interactions with these environments. Evaluation included assessment but may have included components that measured staff performance and the quality of noneducational programs and facilities as well (Komives & Woodard, 1996).

Assessment emerged as a national phenomenon in higher education around the mid 1980s due, in part, to questions about the quality of higher education. Parents expressed concern especially because they were seeking greater value for their tuition dollars. Also legislators, governors, and other government officials wanted to know more about how well education was doing its job. The National Governor's Association, as much as any group, helped this movement take off because of its shared vision that assessment was a catalyst for improving quality (Erwin, 1991).

Assessment existed for three primary reasons: political, economic, and educational. Political forces perceived weaknesses in higher education and began to question whether the substantial expenditures in this area were necessary. In the past, the importance of higher education was automatically accepted; even during tough economic times, higher education fared well against other state needs. More recently, limited state resources—coupled with competing demands for the same pool of funds—caused governors and legislators to think twice about allocating greater amounts of funds to higher education. Some members of the public believed that higher education received its fair share in the past and that other sectors of education should have their turn and receive like attention (Erwin, 1991).

But perhaps the most significant reason for political support of assessment in higher education was that state officials wanted to know where the money went and how well it was being spent. For a number of years, the influx of students gave strong support to increased funding. Even in those times though, educational administrators found financial support for bricks and mortar easier to obtain than that for educational programs. Often legislators or

college board members, typically business persons, sought to draw parallels between outputs from the business world and outputs of education. The benefits of education were complex and educators needed to continue to explain and try to document these benefits. Erwin asked (1991, p.3), "What did students gain from the college experience? What evidence of learning and development existed?"

Assessment was also desired in order to guarantee a well-trained labor force to support regional, state, and local economies. Competition from other areas of the world and the need for better technological refinement were sufficient challenges to keeping our country economically viable. Education was the means for training and preparing individuals who in turn would use their talents in economically useful work (Erwin, 1991).

A third key purpose for assessment came from within higher education. It was the conclusion of several reports that institutions of higher education were not as effective as they could be and pushed for curricular reforms. In general, these reports questioned the quality of education, called for the assessment of student development, challenged us to think more broadly about the goals of education, and suggested that we compare a student's

academic success with their involvement on campus. In addition, present assessment methods within higher education were suspect and lacked credibility. For instance, the number and quality of institutional resources were only indirect measures. These measures, such as square footage or percent of faculty with doctorates, may not have been sufficient benchmarks for students' learning and development; though, one would presume that these measures of resources would be positively correlated to more direct measures of student learning and development. Other existing methods, such as grades, no longer had the credibility that they had in the past. The meaning and validity of grades varied significantly within academic programs, and too much between programs, for their widespread application as outcomes in institutional assessment (Erwin, 1991).

An additional purpose for assessment laid in the public's desire to know more about higher education and what it offers. Citizens needed to understand what a college degree and the college experience represented and that it represented more than just increased future earnings and technical training. Educators have incorrectly assumed that the public understood the many

meanings of education. But it was with the clear statement of what education was about, program by program and across all programs, which added to the public's understanding of its functions (Erwin, 1991).

These four purposes for assessment would probably continue to receive the majority of media attention in the future. From the point of view of faculty or student affairs professionals, however, possibly the most important purpose for assessment was to bring about curricular and program improvement. Faculty and student affairs staff would be most motivated to partake in and to carry out studies of effectiveness because of the benefits for their programs and students (Barr & Desler, 2000; Erwin, 1991).

Assessment was generally used for improvement (sometimes referred to as formative evaluation) and also accountability (often called summative evaluation) within institutions of higher education. Formative evaluation feedback was used to improve, or "form," education. Summative, on the other hand, was used to make decisions about overall contribution of a program or individual. These decisions typically resulted in resource allocations or continuance at the institution. In formative evaluation, the standard question was "How could we improve

our programs/students/staff?"(Erwin, 1991, p.7). In summative evaluation, the questions asked were "Should we reward our students? Should we continue our programs? Should we promote our staff?" (Erwin, 1991, p.7).

In addition, assessment in student affairs can be used to help the organization and its clients. Assessment has helped with regard to strategic planning in order to help organizations examine their mission, purpose, long-range goals, relationship to their environment, share of the market, and intentions with other organizations. It has also helped to define goals and objectives and point to critical issues or problems that hindered organizations from achieving their goals (Barr & Desler, 2000).

Assessment had many purposes and uses but was it expected to last? Would it fade away like some other issues in higher education? Trend followers could remember the issues of student access and equality during the 1960s and 1970s but the theme of subsequent decades was quality. The extreme concentration on assessment may or may not have continued in the future; however, its effects would last because of the permanency of events that have already taken place (Erwin, 1991).

First, assessment was likely to continue in some form because many policies and laws were in place. "Assessment can provide systematic information, which can be critical in helping policy and decision-makers make valid judgments about policy, decide on important issues, and make decisions about resource allocations" (Barr & Desler, 2000, p.254). Also, the federal government via the Secretary of Education had declared that assessment of students would be a part of all accreditation association standards in addition to individual state initiatives. This was a move to consider education quality and not just resources or inputs to the process. Inputs such as the number of library books or background of faculty or staff were key but only within the context of how much students learned and developed (Erwin, 1991).

Second, a number of states have allocated resources to cover assessment costs or to reward favorable assessment outcomes. For instance, Washington and Virginia have infused permanent funds into institutional operating budgets to pay for tests, personnel, and other assessment-associated expenses. There were also funding incentives that provided rewards for institutions to demonstrate increasing effectiveness in Colorado and Tennessee. These

funds certainly created an expectation that assessment should continue in the future (Erwin, 1991).

Furthermore, it was expected that assessment would continue for the simple purpose of accountability. The practice of accountability was routine throughout the world and it was realistic to expect that it would continue rather than desist. In essence, evaluation was built into most public programs and higher education was one of the final areas to follow suit (Erwin, 1991).

Person-Environment Interaction Theories

College and university campuses were considered to be a special environment and this environment was often taken into consideration in order to create the best educational experience for students. These theories gave background to why environments may be important to consider when assessing programs and the needs of students.

Environments referred to physical, social, organizational, fiscal, or instrumental entities. Any of these environments may have had an impact on student learning and development and therefore, there were several person-environment interaction theories that tried to explain human behavior (Komives & Woodard, 1996).

The equation $B = f(P \times E)$ was the foundation on which the understanding of student development was based. The formula, introduced by Kurt Lewin in 1936, stated that behavior (B) was a function (f) of the interaction (\times) of person (P) and environment (E). In order to understand why people behaved as they did and to facilitate their development, factors such as their characteristics, background, and developmental level needed to be examined. Also, it was necessary to explore factors related to the environment were necessary to explore such as where the person was living, studying, or working. But most importantly, the interaction between these variable needed to be considered (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998).

Since the initial introduction of the person-environment interaction theory, different models emerged within this type of theory. The most relevant to the study of change among college students were physical, human aggregate, and perceptual models (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Physical theories and models centered on the external, physical environment, whether natural or man-made, and how it shaped behavior by encouraging certain kinds of activities while limiting or making other kinds impossible.

Possibly the most developed theory within this grouping was Roger Barker's theory of "behavior settings." According to Barker, environments selected and shaped people's behavior in any given setting, tending to influence them in similar ways despite their individual differences (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Human Aggregate models described an environment and its influences in terms of aggregate characteristics (i.e., socio-demographic characteristics, goals, values, attitudes) of the people who inhabited it. Alexander Astin and John Holland were prominent theorists in this area but Holland's work on vocational choice attracted the most attention and underpinned a significant body of research on college students (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Holland argued that choosing a vocation was a manifestation of personality: "The choice of an occupation was an expressive act which reflected the person's motivation, knowledge, personality, and ability" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p.40). The theory rested on four working assumptions. First, people could be categorized into one of six theoretical types: realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, or conventional. Second, six "model environments" were

consistent to the six individual types. The environments were determined by the personality types of the dominant individuals. Third, people looked for those environments that allowed them to use their skills, exercise their attitudes and values, and play desirable roles. Finally, the interaction of personality and environment determined behavior. Where the individual's personality pattern was similar to the pattern of others who define the environment, stability was likely.

In perceptual models, definitions of the environment were linked in some form to the individual student's perception and interpretation of the external world, whether behavioral or psychosocial. One of the most prominent researchers in this area was Rudolph Moos. Moos focused on the social climate's influences on people. Social climate was considered to have three general dimensions including relationship (involving interpersonal relations among the people in the environment), personal (growth opportunities afforded by the environment), and system maintenance and change (involving behavioral expectations within the environment, the control it exercised over its occupants, and the way in which it responded to change) (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

These theories showed how crucial an environment, especially the living environment, and its interactions with the individual student can be in determining behaviors and perceptions.

Gender Differences

Formal research on the differences between college men and women was relatively new at the time of this study. The following research findings gave background to why gender may be important to consider when assessing programs and the needs of students.

Several theorists in the twentieth century singled out women as a group and portrayed their experience as inferior and qualitatively different from that of men. Before Carol Gilligan's *In a Different Voice* where she raised questions about voice, difference, and women's and men's development, human development theorists--in general--did not see women as a group worthy of psychological study. For example, Sigmund Freud neglected to include women in his research and, therefore, they were characterized as deficient and dysfunctional. Also, research conducted on moral development by Lawrence Kohlberg omitted women but findings were generalized to both women and men. Kohlberg concluded that women were unable to reach the same developmental

pinnacle as their male counterparts (Evans et al., 1998; Gilligan, 1998).

Gilligan was influenced by both psychological and cognitive-structural theorists. For instance, Freud recognized that women experienced ethics in a different way than men and that unlike men, women's experience was influenced by feelings and emotions. Jean Piaget revealed sex differences in children's play. He found that girls were less structured when setting game rules than boys. Erik Erickson uncovered the inadequacy of separation as the model and measure of development. He also helped Gilligan understand the complex bonds between people and their history and how psychology and politics intermingle with social history and life history to expand our understanding of what makes us human (Evans et al., 1998; Gilligan, 1998).

A more modern influence of Gilligan's research was Jean Baker Miller, one of the first women to make a case for a gender-based developmental perspective. "Miller legitimized women's experience by coaching the relational aspects of women's lives in a positive psychological frame" (Evans et al., 1998, p.188). Paradoxically, she also revealed that women keep a large part of themselves out of

relationships in order to sustain connection with others (Evans et al., 1998; Gilligan, 1998).

Each of these psychologists built increasing evidence for Gilligan that although women were measured by male norm, their differences made them different, not deficient. Although all had an influence, a cognitive psychologist and Gilligan's professor, Kohlberg, had the most influence on her research. As a doctoral student at Harvard, she studied the relationships between moral reason and action and discovered a form of moral reasoning that she believed to be different from the reasoning expressed by Kohlberg. Using Kohlberg's language, Gilligan called the pattern of reasoning identified by him as the "justice voice" and named the moral orientation discovered through stories of women contemplating abortion as having a "care voice" (Evans et al., 1998; Gilligan, 1998).

There was also evidence of gender differences with regard to Holland's research. He found that women were more likely to be Social types and less likely to be Realistic types. Holland argued that differences found between men and women were due to socialization. He stated that "tests do not 'slot' people; people incorporate

values, goals, and competencies from the culture and 'slot' themselves" (Holland, Powell, & Fritzsche, 1994, p.53).

In addition, there was research on the conditional effects of college on student's sex or gender role attitudes, although to a large extent it was indirect. For instance, women's attitudes and values were consistently shown to be more liberal and less sexist than men's. These differences were present at the point of admission, during the college years, and upon graduation, even when diverse background characteristics were controlled (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Summary

The college and university environment was one where special bonds were made and learning and development occurred. This environment was not immune from criticism and scrutiny though. In recent decades, institutions of higher education assessed and evaluated their programs and students in order to measure development and effectiveness, recognize areas for improvement, plan strategically for the future, pinpoint goals and objectives, and allocate resources.

Also, there were many factors that could be considered when determining how to best serve college students and

produce learning and development. Two factors discussed in this study include environment and gender. These factors may be important to consider when assessing programs and the needs of students.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the influence of gender on perceptions of students living in the residence halls and how the 1998, 2000, and 2002 survey results compared. The following chapter describes the study's subject sample, data collection methods, and statistical treatment.

Subject Sample

All students living in UW-La Crosse residence halls were surveyed during the second or third weeks of November. The annual sample consisted of approximately 1,700 women and 1,100 men ($N = 2,800$). All subjects participated in the study on a voluntary basis and respondents were assured anonymity.

Data Collection

The Quality of Life (QOL) survey was a quantitative instrument with questions in 8 categories: self, wing/cube community, resident assistant, hall director, assistant hall director (did not apply to all residents), hall governance, front desk, and hall environment (see

Appendices C, D, and E). The 2002 survey had an additional category--miscellaneous. Participants were asked to respond to each item using a 5 point Likert scale: (A) very true, (B) often true, (C) sometimes true, (D) seldom true, or (E) not true at all. Each item was related to the students' perceptions of themselves, the residence life staff, or their living environment.

All professional staff members were given QOL surveys and cover letters with supplemental questions on the backside (see Appendix B) (cover letters for 1998 and 2000 were not available during this study) for each of their hall residents. The surveys were then coded by hall with a resident assistant or desk manager code so the results could be tabulated by wing/cube and hall as well as for the entire organization. Since the survey also served as a feedback instrument for staff performance, it was suggested that the student staff switch floors or have a floor leader help in the administration. The surveys were distributed at floor meetings held during the second week of November and in order to maximize return rate, it was encouraged that the students complete the surveys immediately and return them that same evening. Surveys were returned to the professional staff before Thanksgiving break and given

to the Director of Residence Life at the beginning of the next week. The surveys were then sent to the Informational Technology Services department for scanning and analysis.

Surveys were separated by their resident assistant code which allowed for analysis by gender. However, Sanford Hall-coed by room-could not be used in this portion of the study because their resident assistants had both male and female residents.

For this study, only responses in the following 5 categories were reviewed: self, wing/cube community, resident assistant, hall director, and hall environment. For the gender analysis (using 2002 survey responses) (see Appendix F), the following number of questions were taken into account in each category: self-6 questions, wing/cube community-10 questions, resident assistant-20 questions, hall director-12 questions, and hall environment-16 questions. For the comparison over time, only questions that were consistent over the three years (1998, 2000, and 2002) (see Appendix G) within these categories were taken into account. For this analysis, the following number of questions were used within each of the categories: self-5 questions, wing/cube community-6 questions, resident

assistant-16 questions, hall director-11 questions, and hall environment-5 questions.

Statistical Treatment

Although the original survey was in a standard Likert format, the results from the survey were only available in a frequency format where the number of individuals responding to each response was provided. Given the overall number of participants, these summary data were used.

First, all A (very true) responses were totaled together within each category for both the gender and time portions of the study. Subsequently, all the B (often true), C (sometimes true), D (seldom true), and E (not true at all) responses were totaled within each category. Two questions, 1 and 15, were reverse coded for the gender analysis and 15 was reverse coded for the comparison over time. Each cumulative score within the category was then divided by the number of questions in each category. In addition, the mean score for each letter response (A, B, C, D, or E) within the category was weighted by a value based on the letter response given-5 for A, 4 for B, 3 for C, 2 for D, and 1 for E-in order to derive a mean score across the category.

Second, a t-test ($p < 0.05$) was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the 2002 survey responses between men and women in each category. For comparison over time, a univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) ($p < 0.05$) was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in responses among 1998, 2000, and 2002 survey responses. In addition, a post hoc test, Bonferroni ($p < 0.0167$), was used to compare across paired-sample means. These consisted of three comparisons: 1998 vs. 2000, 1998 vs. 2002, and 2000 vs. 2002.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of gender on perceptions of students living in the residence halls and how the Office of Residence Life's feedback compared over a five year period. This chapter describes the study's results and implications.

Annually, approximately 2,900 residents lived in the residence halls at UW-L. Table 1 showed the number of residents who completed and returned the QOL survey over the five year period. Two analyses were done to detect differences in perceptions based on gender and over time. Analysis for the gender portion of this study was based on data collected from the 2002 survey completed by subjects in 10 out of the 11 residence halls. Data from men and women living in Sanford Hall, coed by room, were not used in this analysis. Analysis for the time portion was based on all subjects who completed and returned the QOL survey during the 1998, 2000, and 2002 administration.

Table 1. Total Number of Completed and Returned QOL Surveys
by Year

Year	Surveys
2002	2189
2000	2182
1998	2316

Comparison of Means by Gender

A t-test was used to determine any gender differences in mean perception scores for five variables including self, wing/cube community, resident assistant, hall director, and hall environment. A significant difference was found in only one of the five variables—perceptions of the wing/cube community. No significant differences were found for perceptions of self, resident assistant, hall director, or hall environment (see Table 2).

Based on these findings, the first null hypothesis—there were no significant differences in reported perceptions between men and women living in the residence halls—was accepted for four out of the five variables. These findings showed that although there are inherent

differences between men and women, the perceptions of male and female residents were about equally positive for their living environment.

Table 2. Mean Perception Scores of Male and Female Students Living in the Residence Halls

Variable	Gender	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Self	Male	3.56	1.21	0.74	1431.44	0.46
	Female	3.52	1.28			
Wing/Cube	Male	3.68	1.05	2.12	1945.00	0.03*
	Female	3.57	1.06			
Resident Assistant	Male	4.36	0.89	-1.25	1950.00	0.21
	Female	4.41	0.91			
Hall Director	Male	3.70	1.31	-0.40	1340.15	0.69
	Female	3.72	1.40			
Hall Environment	Male	3.99	1.07	-1.83	1904.00	0.07
	Female	4.08	1.07			

* ($p < .05$)

Comparison of Means by Year

An ANOVA (univariate) test was used to determine any differences in mean perception scores among the 1998, 2000, and 2002 survey responses. Significant differences were

found in four out of the five variables—perceptions of self, Resident Assistant, hall director, and hall environment. No significant difference was found for perceptions of the wing/cube community (see Table 3).

A post hoc test, Bonferroni, was also used to compare across paired-sample means. Bonferroni pairwise comparisons revealed that there was indeed a significant difference over time in four out of the five categories (see Table 4).

Based on these findings, the second null hypothesis—there were no significant differences in reported perceptions of students living in the residence halls during the years of 1998, 2000, and 2002—was rejected for four out of the five variables. These findings showed that the perceptions of students living in the residence halls have fluctuated over the past four years for their living environment

A post hoc test, Bonferroni, was also used to compare across paired-sample means. Bonferroni pairwise comparisons revealed that there was indeed a significant difference over time in four out of the five categories (see Table 4).

Based on these findings, the second null hypothesis—there were no significant differences in reported perceptions of students living in the residence halls during the years of 1998, 2000, and 2002—was rejected for four out of the five variables. These findings showed that the perceptions of students living in the residence halls have fluctuated over the past four years for their living environment.

Table 3. Mean Perception Scores of Students Living in the Residence Halls in 1998, 2000, and 2002

Variable	Year	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig.
Self	1998	3.65	1.33	2	5.41	0.005*
	2000	3.72	1.31			
	2002	3.59	1.3			
Wing/Cube	1998	3.7	1.09	2	2.42	0.09
	2000	3.64	1.11			
	2002	3.64	1.05			
Resident Assistant	1998	4.44	0.84	2	4.62	0.01*
	2000	4.37	0.91			
	2002	4.42	0.86			
Hall Director	1998	4.14	1.18	2	51.37	0.00*
	2000	3.96	1.26			
	2002	3.72	1.37			
Hall Environment	1998	3.73	1.27	2	93.86	0.00*
	2000	4.12	1.01			
	2002	4.13	0.97			

* ($p > .05$)

Table 4. Bonferroni's Pairwise Comparisons of 1998, 2000,
and 2002 Mean Perception Scores

Variable	Pair	Sig.
Self	1998 & 2000	0.26
	1998 & 2002	0.32
	2000 & 2002	0.003**
Wing/Cube	1998 & 2000	0.19
	1998 & 2002	0.16
	2000 & 2002	1.00
Resident Assistant	1998 & 2000	0.015**
	1998 & 2002	1.00
	2000 & 2002	0.05
Hall Director	1998 & 2000	0.00**
	1998 & 2002	0.00**
	2000 & 2002	0.00**
Hall Environment	1998 & 2000	0.00**
	1998 & 2002	0.00**
	2000 & 2002	1.00

**($p < .0167$)

Implications

One implication of this study was that ORL can be confident that they were equally meeting the needs of both their male and female residents. Also, the department can be confident in their efforts to improve facilities over the past four years since the hall environment questions

were mostly facilities based. They can continue with future plans for facility improvements without reservation. But because of ORL's student-focus and commitment to providing quality, the organization needs to ask questions about decreases regarding perception scores—especially the continuous decrease in the perceptions of hall directors by students.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined (1) differences in perceptions between male and female residents of their living environment during the fall of 2002 and (2) differences in residents' perceptions of their living environment biannually from 1998 to 2002. This chapter includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for this study.

Summary

The Office of Residence Life (ORL) has used the Quality of Life (QOL) survey for over 20 years as an evaluation tool for the organization. The overlying problem that was addressed in this study was that the QOL survey was not used to its full potential. The results were not being evaluated by a number of the demographic or environmental factors that may affect residents. In addition, the results were not compared over a number of years to discover trends. This was especially important since there were significant changes within the organization. Thus, the purpose of this study was two-fold. First, analyze the 2002 survey results by gender and

second, to compare data collected bi-annually from 1998 to 2002.

The hypotheses for this study in the null form were as follows:

1. There were no significant differences in reported perceptions between women and men living in the residence halls.
2. There were no significant differences in reported perceptions of students living in the residence halls during the years of 1998, 2000, and 2002.

This study focused on the following variables contained in the QOL survey: self, wing/cube community, resident assistant, hall director, and hall environment. A t-test revealed that there were no statistical differences between mean perception scores of male and female residents for four out of the five QOL variables. Therefore, the first hypothesis was accepted for four out of the five variables. On the other hand, an ANOVA test revealed that there were statistical differences between mean perception scores among the 1998, 2000, and 2002 survey responses for four out of the five QOL variables. Therefore, the second hypothesis was rejected for four out of the five variables.

Conclusions

Based on the results and findings in this study, the following was concluded:

1. Men and women had an equally positive experience living in the residence halls at UW-L for four out of the five variables. So although there were inherent differences between male and female residents, the ORL staff was equally meeting the needs of both genders overall.
2. Male residents' perceptions of their wing/cube community were more positive than their females counterparts. This maybe due to the inherent differences in the way that men and women formed relationships. Also, it appeared from individual question scores that females may be more sensitive to noise during quiet hours and desire more weekend programming.
3. Generally, residents' perceptions of their living environment were positive. All perception scores were above 3.50 which meant that the overall resident population perceived questions to be sometimes to always true.
4. The positive perception of questions in the self area fluctuated. It appeared from individual question scores that the number of residents who planned to return to the

residence halls remained consistent but there was a substantial decrease in residents' positive perception that the halls added to their educational experience and personal development.

5. Residents, overall, had a very positive perception of their resident assistant. Perception scores in this area fluctuated during the five year period but they were the highest found in this study.
6. The positive perception of the hall director continuously decreased over the past five years. This may be due to changes in personnel or changing needs of residents.
7. Positive perceptions of the hall environment increased substantially during the five year period. This increase seemed to be strongly linked with the replacement of laundry and computer facilities. On the other hand, the positive perception of one's safety within the halls seemed to decrease slightly.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by the researcher:

1. Resident assistants with female residents should pay particular attention to sense of community, weekend programming, and noise levels during quiet hours since

women rated these areas less positively than their male counterparts.

2. The decrease in positive perceptions of hall directors should be examined further by ORL in order to meet the needs of the current resident population. Additional information could be retrieved from residents via focus groups or further survey questions.
3. The QOL results should be compared annually to previous survey results. This could be a responsibility of a graduate assistant in ORL. The comparisons could then be used in making future decisions regarding personnel, services, programs, and facilities.
4. Specific questions should be examined more closely where changes have occurred within the department such as facilities improvements and personnel and program changes. This can help determine how these changes have affected residents and whether they are perceived positively.
5. The results should be analyzed more in-depth by hall environmental factors. Residence hall environments at UW-L include all female, first year experience, coed by every other room, substance-free, international and upperclassmen, handicap accessible, and general large and

smaller halls. These environments should be looked at further to understand their benefits and influence on the populations they serve.

6. Finally, demographic questions should be added to the QOL survey in order to better understand specific groups of students and their experience living in the residence halls. Examples include gender, year in school, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 297-308.
- Barr, M.J., Desler, M.K., & Associates (2000). The handbook of student affairs administration (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baynes, M.J. (1997). The history of the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Housing Operation, with special emphasis on the hall director position. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, 1987.
- Chickering, A., & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and identity (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Erwin, T.D. (1991). Assessing student learning and development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gilligan, C. (1998). In a different voice. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Holland, J.L., Powell, A.B., & Fritzsche (1994). The self-directed search (SDS) professional user's guide. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Komives, S.R., Woodard, D.B., Jr., & Associates (1996). Student services: A handbook for the profession (3rd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF RESIDENCE LIFE MISSION STATEMENT

Office of Residence Life Mission Statement

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE
RESIDENCE LIFE PROGRAM IS AN INTEGRAL PART
OF THE UNIVERSITY'S EDUCATIONAL AND STUDENT
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES. WE PROVIDE REASONABLY
PRICED AND WELL MAINTAINED LIVING/LEARNING
ENVIRONMENTS WHICH ARE DESIGNED TO FOSTER
COMMUNITY, SELF-GROWTH, RESPONSIBILITY,
RESPECT FOR OTHERS, LEADERSHIP,
AND POSITIVE CITIZENSHIP.

Office of Residence Life Mission Statement

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

RESIDENCE LIFE PROGRAM IS AN INTEGRAL PART
OF THE UNIVERSITY'S EDUCATIONAL AND STUDENT
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES. WE PROVIDE REASONABLY
PRICED AND WELL MAINTAINED LIVING/LEARNING
ENVIRONMENTS WHICH ARE DESIGNED TO FOSTER
COMMUNITY, SELF-GROWTH, RESPONSIBILITY,
RESPECT FOR OTHERS, LEADERSHIP,
AND POSITIVE CITIZENSHIP.

APPENDIX B

2002 QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY COVER LETTER

November 2002

Dear Resident:

As we annually evaluate our hall environments and our staff, your input serves as a valuable and important component.

By taking a few minutes to complete this survey, you will be contributing to the improvement of your living environment and the Office of Residence Life. This survey is completely anonymous; the answer sheet has been pre-coded for computer reading. Please use a Number 2 pencil to fill out the answer sheet and be careful to mark only the desired spaces to prevent computer error. Your written comments are confidential.

On the reverse side of this letter are several short answer, supplemental questions. You are asked to complete these questions and return them along with your computerized survey.

Please follow the directions and return the survey in a timely manner. We must receive all surveys by 4:00 p.m. on Friday November 15, 2002. If you have additional comments or would like to provide further feedback, please contact your hall director.

Thank you for your time and comments!

Sincerely,

Dr. Nick Nicklaus
Director of Residence Life

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

What do you like about living in your hall?

What changes, if any, need to be made to improve the residence hall living environment?

What can be done in the Residence Halls to enhance your academic success at UWL?

What would you like to see your hall staff (Hall Director, Assistant Hall Director, Resident Assistants, Desk Manager) implement in your hall?

Of the hall/wing/cube programs that you have attended, which ones have you enjoyed? Why?

What types of programs would you like to see planned? Include wing/cube, hall, and campus programs.

APPENDIX C
2002 QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY

UW-LA CROSSE RESIDENCE HALL SURVEY

Directions: Using a #2 pencil, fill in the circle on the answer sheet that most accurately reflects your response to each question--

A = Very true B = Often true C = Sometimes true D = Seldom true
E = Not true at all Blank = Not Applicable

SELF

1. I go home/away for the weekends.
2. I believe that living in a UW-L residence hall has added to my educational experience and personal development.
3. I plan to return to the residence halls next year.
4. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate.
5. I confront others directly when their behavior is adversely affecting me.
6. I feel there are adequate places to study in my hall.

WING/CUBE COMMUNITY

7. I am satisfied with the weekend programming provided in my hall.
8. I enjoy living on my cube/wing.
9. I am satisfied with the cleanliness of my wing/cube.
10. I feel I am an accepted member of my community.
11. There is a strong feeling of respect for one another's individuality and beliefs within my community.
12. I am satisfied with the noise level in my hall during quiet hours.
13. Members of my floor community encourage one another to behave responsibly.
14. I am satisfied with the sense of community on my cube/wing.
15. I would like to see more programs and activities on my cube/wing.
16. My cube/wing environment is conducive to academic study and success.

RESIDENT ASSISTANT

17. My RA is generally available to me on the wing/cube.
18. My RA is helpful in providing answers to my questions.
19. My RA communicates policies of the hall to me in a clear and effective manner during wing/cube meetings.

20. My RA has a positive attitude toward the wing/cube.
21. My RA has made an attempt to get to know me.
22. My RA enforces university and hall policies and procedures fairly and consistently.
23. My RA handles situations on the floor in a mature and responsible manner.
24. My RA encourages me to confront inappropriate behavior.
25. My RA abides by University and Hall policies.
26. My RA is accepting of different backgrounds and values and respects the individuality of wing/cube members.
27. My RA is open to feedback and receptive of varying points of view.
28. My RA follows up on items in a timely manner.
29. My RA encourages residents to participate in cube/wing and hall programs/activities.
30. My RA has used effective publicity for the programs he/she has presented on my wing/cube.
31. I have participated in a program/programs that my RA has presented this semester.
32. I have made an effort to get to know my RA.
33. My RA is a leader on the wing/cube.
34. My RA is approachable.
35. My RA helped build the community on my floor.
36. My RA is doing a good job and I am satisfied with his/her performance.

HALL DIRECTOR

37. I know who the Hall Director is for my hall.
38. I have made an effort to get to know my Hall Director.
39. My Hall Director recognizes me as a resident of my Hall.
40. I feel comfortable approaching my Hall Director with concerns.
41. When I talk to my Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.
42. My Hall Director deals with me fairly, consistently and effectively.
43. My Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.
44. My Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.
45. My Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.
46. I have a positive relationship with my Hall Director.
47. I feel my Hall Director works to meet the needs of students.

48. I feel my Hall Director is a positive advisor to Hall Council.

*ASSISTANT HALL DIRECTOR -- *Answer #49 to #56 if you live in Angell, Coate or Hutchison Hall, otherwise continue on to #57

*49. I know who the Assistant Hall Director is for my hall.

*50. I would feel comfortable approaching my Assistant Hall Director with concerns.

*51. When I talk to my Assistant Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.

*52. My Assistant Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.

*53. My Assistant Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.

*54. My Assistant Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.

*55. I have a positive relationship with my Assistant Hall Director.

*56. I feel my Assistant Hall Director is a positive advisor to Hall Council.

HALL GOVERNANCE

57. I am aware of when and where Hall Council meets.

58. I am aware of who my Hall Council Executives are.

59. I am aware that I can attend Hall Council.

60. I am aware of events sponsored by Hall Council.

61. I know who my cube/wing representatives of Hall Council are.

62. My Hall Council representatives keep me informed of Hall Council activities and important issues in the hall.

63. Hall Council serves an important function in the hall.

64. I participate in/or support Hall Council activities/programs.

65. I am aware of the Residence Hall Association Council (RHAC) and what it does.

FRONT DESK

66. The front desk provides accurate, clear information.

67. The front desk provides equipment that meets my needs.

68. The front desk workers are helpful and friendly when I use the front desk services.

69. The desk hours (9am to midnight, Sunday-Wednesday, 9am to 3am, Thursday, Friday, Saturday) meet my needs.

HALL ENVIRONMENT

- 70. I am satisfied with the lounge facilities provided in my hall.
- 71. I feel safe living in my residence hall.
- 72. The general maintenance and repair work in my residence hall seems to be done satisfactorily.
- 73. I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the common areas in my building.
- 74. I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the bathrooms on my floor.
- 75. There are adequate computer facilities in my hall.
- 76. There are adequate laundry facilities in my hall.
- 77. I am satisfied with the cable TV reception in my hall.
- 78. I am satisfied with the Residence Life Movie Channel.
- 79. I am satisfied with the loft rental system.
- 80. I am satisfied with the visitation policies in the residence halls.
- 81. I use my University e-mail account.
- 82. I participate in the University's recycling efforts.
- 83. I found my interactions with the staff in the Office of Residence Life helpful.
- 84. I study 2-3 hours outside of class for every hour I spend in class.
- 85. Overall, I enjoy living in my hall.

Answer the following questions as follows: If Yes, fill in circle "A" If No, fill in circle "B"

- 86. I am currently employed on campus.
- 87. I am currently employed off campus.
- 88. I am aware of where to take my recyclable materials.
- 89. I have been to visit the Office of Residence Life.
- 90. I found the on-line ResNet computer registration process satisfactory.
- 91. I have my own personal computer in my room.
- 92. I am interested in living in a residence hall during the 2003 J-Term (January 6-24)

APPENDIX D
2000 QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY

UW-LA CROSSE RESIDENCE HALL SURVEY

Directions: Using a #2 pencil, fill in the circle on the answer sheet that most accurately reflects your response to each question--

A = Very true
 B = Often true
 C = Sometimes true
 D = Seldom true
 E = Not true at all
 Blank = Not Applicable

SELF

1. I am currently employed on campus. - If yes, mark "A"
If no, mark "B"
2. I am currently employed off campus. - If yes, mark "A"
If no, mark "B"
3. I go home/away for the weekends.
4. I am satisfied with the weekend programming provided in my hall.
5. I enjoy living on my cube/wing.
6. I believe that living in a UW-L residence hall has added to my educational experience and personal development.
7. I plan to return to the residence halls next year.
8. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate.
9. I confront others directly when their behavior is adversely affecting me.
10. I feel there are adequate places to study in my hall.
11. I am interested in living in a substance free hall.

WING/CUBE COMMUNITY

12. I am satisfied with the cleanliness of my wing/cube.
13. I feel I am an accepted member of my community.
14. There is a strong feeling of respect for one another's individuality and beliefs within my community.
15. I would like quiet hours to be observed on my cube/wing.
16. Members of my floor community encourage one another to behave responsibly.
17. I am satisfied with the sense of community on my cube/wing.
18. I would like to see more programs and activities on my

- cube/wing.
19. My cube/wing environment is conducive to academic study and success.

RESIDENT ASSISTANT

20. My RA has used effective publicity for the programs he/she has presented on my wing/cube.
21. I have participated in a program/programs that my RA has presented this semester.
22. I have made an effort to get to know my RA.
23. My RA is a leader on the wing/cube.
24. My RA is helpful in providing answers to my questions.
25. My RA is generally available to me on the wing/cube.
26. My RA enforces university and hall policies and procedures fairly and consistently.
27. My RA encourages me to confront inappropriate behavior.
28. My RA handles situations on the floor in a mature and responsible manner.
29. My RA abides by University and Hall policies.
30. My RA communicates policies of the hall to me in a clear and effective manner during wing/cube meetings.
31. My RA has a positive attitude toward the wing/cube.
32. My RA has made an attempt to get to know me.
33. My RA encourages residents to participate in cube/wing and hall programs/activities.
34. My RA is approachable.
35. My RA helped build the community on my floor.
36. My RA is accepting of different backgrounds and values and respects the individuality of wing/cube members.
37. My RA is open to feedback and receptive of varying points of view.
38. My RA follows up on items in a timely manner.
39. My RA is doing a good job and I am satisfied with his/her performance.

HALL DIRECTOR

40. I know who the Hall Director is for my hall.
41. I have made an effort to get to know my Hall Director.
42. My Hall Director recognizes me as a resident of my Hall.
43. I feel comfortable approaching my Hall Director with concerns.
44. When I talk to my Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.
45. My Hall Director deals with me fairly, consistently and effectively.

- 46. My Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.
- 47. My Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.
- 48. My Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.
- 49. I have a positive relationship with my Hall Director.
- 50. I feel my Hall Director works to meet the needs of students.
- 51. I feel my Hall Director is a positive advisor to Hall Council.

***ASSISTANT HALL DIRECTOR -- *Answer #49 to #56 if you live in Angell, Coate or Hutchison Hall, otherwise continue on to #57**

- *52. I know who the Assistant Hall Director is for my hall.
- *53. I would feel comfortable approaching my Assistant Hall Director with concerns.
- *54. When I talk to my Assistant Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.
- *55. My Assistant Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.
- *56. My Assistant Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.
- *57. My Assistant Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.
- *58. I have a positive relationship with my Assistant Hall Director.
- *59. I feel my Assistant Hall Director is a positive advisor to Hall Council.

HALL GOVERNANCE

- 60. I am aware of when and where Hall Council meets.
- 61. I am aware of who my Hall Council Executives are.
- 62. I am aware that I can attend Hall Council.
- 63. I am aware of events sponsored by Hall Council.
- 64. I know who my cube/wing representatives of Hall Council are.
- 65. My Hall Council representatives keep me informed of Hall Council activities and important issues in the hall.
- 66. Hall Council serves an important function in the hall.
- 67. I participate in/or support Hall Council activities/programs.
- 68. I am aware of the Residence Hall Association Council (RHAC) and what it does.

FRONT DESK

- 69.The front desk provides accurate, clear information.
- 70.The front desk provides accurate, clear information.
- 71.The front desk provides equipment that meets my needs.
- 72.The front desk workers are helpful and friendly when I use the front desk services.
- 73.The desk hours (9am to midnight, Sunday-Wednesday, 9am to 3am, Thursday, Friday, Saturday) meet my needs.

HALL ENVIRONMENT

- 74.I am satisfied with the lounge facilities provided in my hall.
- 75.I feel safe living in my residence hall.
- 76.The general maintenance and repair work in my residence hall seems to be done satisfactorily.
- 77.There are adequate computer facilities in my hall.
- 78.There are adequate laundry facilities in my hall.
- 79.I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the common areas in my building.
- 80.I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the bathrooms on my floor.
- 81.I am satisfied with the service and television stations in my hall.
- 82.I am satisfied with the Residence Life Movie Channel.
- 83.I am satisfied with the loft rental system.
- 84.I am satisfied with the visitation policies in the residence halls.
- 85.I use my University e-mail account.
- 86.I participate in the University's recycling efforts. - If yes, mark "A" If no, mark "B"
- 87.I am aware of who my housekeeper is.
- 88.I have been to visit the Office of Residence Life. -If yes, mark "A" If no, mark "B"
- 89.I found my interactions with the staff in the Office of Residence Life helpful.
- 90.I have my own personal computer in my room. -If yes, mark "A" If no, mark "B"
- 91.Overall, I enjoy living in my hall.

APPENDIX E

1998 QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY

UW-LA CROSSE RESIDENCE HALL SURVEY

Directions: Using a #2 pencil, fill in the circle on the answer sheet that most accurately reflects your response to each question--

A = Very true
 B = Often true
 C = Sometimes true
 D = Seldom true
 E = Not true at all
 Blank = Not Applicable

SELF

1. I enjoy living on my cube/wing.
2. I believe that living in a UW-L residence hall has added to my educational experience and personal development at UW-L.
3. I plan to return to the residence halls next year.
4. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate.
5. I confront others directly when their behavior is adversely affecting me.
6. I feel there are adequate places to study in my hall.
7. I would be interested in living in a nonsmoking area or hall.

WING/CUBE COMMUNITY

8. I feel I am an accepted member of my community.
9. There is a strong feeling of respect for one another's individuality and beliefs within my community.
10. I would like quiet hours to be observed on my cube/wing.
11. Members of my floor community encourage one another to behave responsibly.
12. I am satisfied with the sense of community on my cube/wing.
13. I would like to see more programs and activities on my cube/wing.
14. My cube/wing environment is conducive to academic study and success.

RESIDENT ASSISTANT

15. I have made an effort to get to know my RA.
16. My RA is a leader on the wing/cube.

17. My RA delegates responsibility to other residents.
18. My RA is helpful in providing answers to my questions.
19. My RA is generally available to me on the wing/cube.
20. My RA enforces university and hall policies and procedures fairly and consistently.
21. My RA encourages me to confront inappropriate behavior.
22. My RA handles situations on the floor in a mature and responsible manner.
23. My RA abides by University and Hall policies.
24. My RA communicates policies of the hall to me in a clear and effective manner during wing/cube meetings.
25. My RA has a positive attitude toward the wing/cube.
26. My RA has made an attempt to get to know me.
27. My RA encourages residents to participate in cube/wing and hall programs/activities.
28. My RA is approachable.
29. My RA helped build the community on my floor.
30. My RA is accepting of different backgrounds and values and respects the individuality of wing/cube members.
31. My RA is open to feedback and receptive of varying points of view.
32. My RA follows up on items in a timely manner.
33. My RA is doing a good job and I am satisfied with his/her performance.

HALL DIRECTOR

34. I know who the Hall Director is for my hall.
35. I have made an effort to get to know my Hall Director.
36. My Hall Director recognizes me as a resident of my Hall.
37. I feel comfortable approaching my Hall Director with concerns.
38. When I talk to my Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.
39. My Hall Director deals with me fairly, consistently and effectively.
40. My Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.
41. My Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.
42. My Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.
43. I have a positive relationship with my Hall Director.
44. I feel my Hall Director works to meet the needs of students.

*ASSISTANT HALL DIRECTOR -- *Answer #49 to #56 if you live in Angell, Coate or Hutchison Hall, otherwise continue on to #57

- *45.I know who the Assistant Hall Director is for my hall.
- *46.I would feel comfortable approaching my Assistant Hall Director with concerns.
- *47.When I talk to my Assistant Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.
- *48.My Assistant Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.
- *49.My Assistant Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.
- *50.My Assistant Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.
- *51.I have a positive relationship with my Assistant Hall Director.

HALL GOVERNANCE

- 52.I am aware of when and where Hall Council meets.
- 53.I am aware that I can attend Hall Council.
- 54.I am aware of events sponsored by Hall Council.
- 55.I know who my cube/wing representatives of Hall Council are.
- 56.My Hall Council representatives keep me informed of Hall Council activities and important issues in the hall.
- 57.Hall Council serves an important function in the hall.
- 58.I participate in/or support Hall Council activities/programs.
- 59.I am aware of the Residence Hall Association Council (RHAC) and what it does.

FRONT DESK

- 60.The front desk provides accurate, clear information.
- 61.The front desk provides equipment that meets my needs.
- 62.The front desk workers are helpful and friendly when I use the front desk services.

HALL ENVIRONMENT

- 63.I am satisfied with the lounge facilities provided in my hall.
- 64.I feel safe living in my residence hall.
- 65.The general maintenance and repair work in my residence hall seems to be done satisfactorily.
- 66.The shower facilities provide an adequate level of privacy.

- 67. There are adequate computer facilities in my hall.
- 68. There are adequate laundry facilities in my hall.

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONS USED IN GENDER COMPARISON (2002)

UW-LA CROSSE RESIDENCE HALL SURVEY
Questions used in gender comparison.

A = Very true B = Often true C = Sometimes true D =
Seldom true E = Not true at all Blank = Not Applicable

SELF

1. I go home/away for the weekends.
2. I believe that living in a UW-L residence hall has added to my educational experience and personal development.
3. I plan to return to the residence halls next year.
4. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate.
5. I confront others directly when their behavior is adversely affecting me.
6. I feel there are adequate places to study in my hall.

WING/CUBE COMMUNITY

7. I am satisfied with the weekend programming provided in my hall.
8. I enjoy living on my cube/wing.
9. I am satisfied with the cleanliness of my wing/cube.
10. I feel I am an accepted member of my community.
11. There is a strong feeling of respect for one another's individuality and beliefs within my community.
12. I am satisfied with the noise level in my hall during quiet hours.
13. Members of my floor community encourage one another to behave responsibly.
14. I am satisfied with the sense of community on my cube/wing.
15. I would like to see more programs and activities on my cube/wing.
16. My cube/wing environment is conducive to academic study and success.

RESIDENT ASSISTANT

17. My RA is generally available to me on the wing/cube.
18. My RA is helpful in providing answers to my questions.
19. My RA communicates policies of the hall to me in a clear and effective manner during wing/cube meetings.
20. My RA has a positive attitude toward the wing/cube.
21. My RA has made an attempt to get to know me.
22. My RA enforces university and hall policies and procedures fairly and consistently.
23. My RA handles situations on the floor in a mature and

- responsible manner.
24. My RA encourages me to confront inappropriate behavior.
 25. My RA abides by University and Hall policies.
 26. My RA is accepting of different backgrounds and values and respects the individuality of wing/cube members.
 27. My RA is open to feedback and receptive of varying points of view.
 28. My RA follows up on items in a timely manner.
 29. My RA encourages residents to participate in cube/wing and hall programs/activities.
 30. My RA has used effective publicity for the programs he/she has presented on my wing/cube.
 31. I have participated in a program/programs that my RA has presented this semester.
 32. I have made an effort to get to know my RA.
 33. My RA is a leader on the wing/cube.
 34. My RA is approachable.
 35. My RA helped build the community on my floor.
 36. My RA is doing a good job and I am satisfied with his/her performance.

HALL DIRECTOR

37. I know who the Hall Director is for my hall.
38. I have made an effort to get to know my Hall Director.
39. My Hall Director recognizes me as a resident of my Hall.
40. I feel comfortable approaching my Hall Director with concerns.
41. When I talk to my Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.
42. My Hall Director deals with me fairly, consistently and effectively.
43. My Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.
44. My Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.
45. My Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.
46. I have a positive relationship with my Hall Director.
47. I feel my Hall Director works to meet the needs of students.
48. I feel my Hall Director is a positive advisor to Hall Council.

HALL ENVIRONMENT

62. I am satisfied with the lounge facilities provided in

- my hall.
63. I feel safe living in my residence hall.
 64. The general maintenance and repair work in my residence hall seems to be done satisfactorily.
 65. I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the common areas in my building.
 66. I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the bathrooms on my floor.
 67. There are adequate computer facilities in my hall.
 68. There are adequate laundry facilities in my hall.
 69. I am satisfied with the cable TV reception in my hall.
 70. I am satisfied with the Residence Life Movie Channel.
 71. I am satisfied with the loft rental system.
 72. I am satisfied with the visitation policies in the residence halls.
 73. I use my University e-mail account.
 74. I participate in the University's recycling efforts.
 75. I found my interactions with the staff in the Office of Residence Life helpful.
 76. I study 2-3 hours outside of class for every hour I spend in class.
 77. Overall, I enjoy living in my hall.

APPENDIX G

QUESTIONS USED IN COMPARISON OVER TIME (1998-2002)

UW-LA CROSSE RESIDENCE HALL SURVEY

Questions used in 1998, 2000, and 2002 departmental feedback comparison.

A = Very true **B = Often true** **C = Sometimes true** **D = Seldom true**
E = Not true at all **Blank = Not Applicable**

SELF

1. I believe that living in a UW-L residence hall has added to my educational experience and personal development.
2. I plan to return to the residence halls next year.
3. I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my roommate.
4. I confront others directly when their behavior is adversely affecting me.
5. I feel there are adequate places to study in my hall.

WING/CUBE COMMUNITY

6. I enjoy living on my cube/wing.
7. I feel I am an accepted member of my community.
8. There is a strong feeling of respect for one another's individuality and beliefs within my community.
9. Members of my floor community encourage one another to behave responsibly.
10. I am satisfied with the sense of community on my cube/wing.
11. I would like to see more programs and activities on my cube/wing.
12. My cube/wing environment is conducive to academic study and success.

RESIDENT ASSISTANT

13. My RA is generally available to me on the wing/cube.
14. My RA is helpful in providing answers to my questions.
15. My RA communicates policies of the hall to me in a clear and effective manner during wing/cube meetings.
16. My RA has a positive attitude toward the wing/cube.
17. My RA has made an attempt to get to know me.
18. My RA enforces university and hall policies and procedures fairly and consistently.
19. My RA handles situations on the floor in a mature and responsible manner.
20. My RA encourages me to confront inappropriate behavior.
21. My RA abides by University and Hall policies.

22. My RA is accepting of different backgrounds and values and respects the individuality of wing/cube members.
23. My RA is open to feedback and receptive of varying points of view.
24. My RA follows up on items in a timely manner.
25. My RA encourages residents to participate in cube/wing and hall programs/activities.
26. I have made an effort to get to know my RA.
27. My RA is a leader on the wing/cube.
28. My RA is approachable.
29. My RA helped build the community on my floor.
30. My RA is doing a good job and I am satisfied with his/her performance.

HALL DIRECTOR

31. I know who the Hall Director is for my hall.
32. I have made an effort to get to know my Hall Director.
33. My Hall Director recognizes me as a resident of my Hall.
34. I feel comfortable approaching my Hall Director with concerns.
35. When I talk to my Hall Director, he/she listens to and considers what I have to say.
36. My Hall Director deals with me fairly, consistently and effectively.
37. My Hall Director has a positive and helpful attitude toward residents.
38. My Hall Director is supportive of residence hall activities.
39. My Hall Director responds to messages in a timely manner.
40. I have a positive relationship with my Hall Director.
41. I feel my Hall Director works to meet the needs of students.

HALL ENVIRONMENT

62. I am satisfied with the lounge facilities provided in my hall.
63. I feel safe living in my residence hall.
64. The general maintenance and repair work in my residence hall seems to be done satisfactorily.
65. There are adequate computer facilities in my hall.
66. There are adequate laundry facilities in my hall.