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Alienation has frequently been discussed in the literature in reference to college students. Much of the alienation experienced by students is related to their sense of powerlessness within bureaucratic and impersonal institutions of higher education. As one possible means for alleviating the feelings of powerlessness among students, residential units more responsive to student needs than the traditional dormitories have been developed.

A student governed and operated experimental residential tower and two traditional residential towers located at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, served as the research sites in this study. The sample consisted of 155 white, male, freshman students.

The principal purpose of the study was to measure whether a residential unit (T-5 Project), organized to meet student needs (student governed and operated), has a significant effect on reducing the alienation level of its residents, in comparison to the effects traditional or non-student governed and operated residential units have on reducing alienation.
The Alienation Index (Turner, 1968) and the University Residence Environment Scale (Gerst and Moos, 1971) were the instruments used in gathering data. Also, questions pertaining to socio-economic status were asked. The means, standard deviations, chi-squares and F-ratios were computed to determine the significance of the difference between the residential units of this study on each of these instruments.

The statistical results, at face value, failed to provide sufficient evidence to support the general hypothesis that students in a self governed and operated residential unit are less alienated than residents in a traditionally governed and operated dormitory. Ten items of the University Residence Environment Scale did reach a significant F-ratio at the .05 probability level; consequently, a related null hypothesis was rejected. Also, one subscale of the URES, "Competition", reached a significant F-ratio. In regard to socio-economic status and its relation to the Alienation Index items and subscales, the chi-squares failed to reach statistical significance. However, an analysis of variance on the socio-economic status by residence interaction effect yielded one significant \( p < .05 \) AI subscale, "Community". Most of the statistical results were inconsistent, and in the researcher's opinion, inconclusive.

The inconsistency and inconclusiveness of the
statistical findings may be a result of unanticipated issues which occurred within the Project in the fall (for example, racial crises) and necessitated altering the planned operations (treatments) of the Project. Therefore, the researcher attempted to present a more accurate evaluation of T-5 than the statistical results alone indicated by presenting a "first year historical perspective", followed by a synthesis of the history and statistical results. The historical accounts were based on a personal log of experiences kept by the researcher (participant observer), who served as Project Director for one year (1971-1972).

The researcher's participation and observations indicated that the students in T-5 developed an awareness of the causes and solutions for preventing black students and white students from experiencing powerlessness. The students developed an increased sensitization to important community issues. For example, black students and white students learned a great deal about each other and then used these new insights to work toward resolution of community problems. Finally, one clear indication of the students' satisfaction and learning was that in spite of all the conflict that dominated the first year of the Project, through a democratic process they voted to continue the Project for another year.
In conclusion, it was the researcher's opinion, based on his observations, that the students within the Project increased their sensitization about their feelings of powerlessness, politics, racism, the administration, community development and individual versus community values, and consequently a significant amount of personal, interpersonal and community growth occurred. The fact that the T-5 Project was designed as a student governed and operated residence contributed to these learnings.
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School of Education
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University of Massachusetts
July 6, 1972
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Background of the Study

A large percentage of youth, particularly college students, have shown characteristics of loneliness, depression, pessimism and distrust. General knowledge indicating an increase in the delinquency rate, the overindulgence in and abuse of alcohol and drugs, the formation of subcultures, and the number of students withdrawing from school, are indicators of an intensification of alienation among the youth of today.

A significant number of college students who feel alienated have a sense of powerlessness in regard to themselves, others and their environments. Most colleges and universities have failed to respond in a constructive way to the causes of this alienation. Institutions of higher education have operated continuously in such a way that the feelings of powerlessness, distrust, and lack of commitment on the part of their students are increased. The following sample of conclusions was reported by the Hazen Foundation Committee in a report on higher education (1968), all of which indicate why colleges and universities have failed to alleviate alienation among their students.

First, freshmen who enter college are usually open-minded and eager to work and learn. However, because of the
impersonal, rigid, and mechanical teaching methods, the students' curiosity, creativity, and desire to learn are often hindered [Kauffman, et al., 1968, p. 13].

Second, the research available on human development and on the circumstances for proper learning and growth, has been largely ignored by college teachers and administrators [Kauffman, et al., 1968, p. 13].

Third, colleges allow very few opportunities for students to take real responsibility in planning their own lives and the future of their university [Kauffman, et al., 1968, p. 14].

Residential Units

A specific area in which colleges and universities have been relatively unsuccessful in alleviating alienation among students, especially the feelings of powerlessness, has been in on-campus residential units. Numerous dormitory situations have been operated within a bureaucratic organizational system, consisting of hierarchial structure, regularized procedure and impersonal operations. Residence hall systems have primarily functioned as basic living areas for students. Many school officials have failed to recognize that on-campus residential units can provide a significant center for encouraging and distributing responsibility to students, for helping students to increase their interpersonal effectiveness and to form reference groups, and for providing smaller communal units within larger campuses. Recently, however, attempts have been made to alter the structure and function
of residence halls in order to make them more viable living and learning centers for students.

**Alternative Residential Units and Their Characteristics**

The establishment of alternative residential environments such as living-learning units (L-L), and cluster college or residential college models has been part of the effort to increase academic as well as social emphasis within dormitory complexes. Each of these different types of alternative residences has attempted to alleviate the feelings of powerlessness, hopelessness, meaninglessness, and lack of humanistic and communal relationships prevalent among the student occupants.

The L-L, cluster or residential college offer similar structural designs, but with varying degrees of size, faculty involvement and autonomy. The L-L unit is primarily a situation in which faculty maintain strong ties with a specific residential area. Class sections meet in particular dorms and only residents of that unit are allowed to participate. The cluster or residential college models are usually semi-autonomous schools within a larger university. They generally share the primary facilities and services of the entire institution. In reference to internal elements, both have the following characteristics: 1) small in size, 2) community oriented (shared interests and experiences), 3) self-governed and self-operated, and 4) aimed at emphasizing alternative learning and teaching experiences (Gaff, 1970; Martin, 1968; Ogden, 1970).
The following are brief statements pertaining to the characteristics usually associated with alternative residential units.

Small size. Small size provides the opportunity to promote less rigidity and impersonality and to allow for internal collaboration, common objectives, continuity, consensus, and an atmosphere of community. All of these factors contribute to lessening alienation in residence halls and the larger college community. Goodman (1962), and Sanford (1967) have also hypothesized that smaller sized residence units have a positive impact on student development and identity formation.

For example, Jencks and Riesman (1969) have suggested that 500 people per residence unit is a viable number. Other authors who advocate a similar number are Newcomb (1962), Goodman (1962), and Sanford (1967).

Community. A sense of community among members of the college may contribute to the growth and development of all persons on campus. The college student is confronted undoubtedly with a significant change in his environment and may also find his personal values challenged when first arriving at college. By removing a student from his home community and familiar peer relationships, his basic security has been altered [Chickering, 1969]. Alternative residential units, such as those mentioned above can provide communities that support students, allow for their diversity,
and facilitate a habitat which can foster social-psychological safety and growth.

Various researchers have investigated the concept of community in relation to the types of residential units being examined [Gaff, 1970; Kafer, 1966; Newcomb, Brown, Kulik, Reimer and Revelle, 1969; and Pemberton, 1968]. These researchers concluded that the alternative residential models being investigated helped create a feeling of friendliness and cohesiveness, and provided greater personal attention to the students than did the larger segments of the same institution. Also, either stated or implied in their statements was the belief that the models under investigation have the potential for becoming some of the most efficient and appropriate institutional arrangements to lessen alienation in residence halls.

**Self-governance.** When referring to self-governance one is speaking usually of a social process whereby people seek, in a manner approved or accepted by all concerned, to participate in the critical decisions effecting their environment. The process of self-governance encourages optimal emphasis on local group, local initiative, local participation and responsibility, and local evaluation [Mial, 1958]. Empirical evidence to support the previous conclusions, in terms of higher educational settings, is inconclusive. However, supporting evidence based on findings from non-educational environments will be presented in Chapter II.
Alternative teaching and learning experiences. One of the primary purposes for instituting alternative residential units was to permit innovative curriculum and teaching experiences [Gaff, 1970]. Hopefully, with the addition of alternative experiences, in response to students' needs and ideas, many of the sociological problems associated with groups of students and psychological disorders of individual students would diminish.

The impact of the alternative academic styles encouraged by the L-L, cluster or residential college advocates has been investigated by various researchers [Gaff, 1970; Kafer, 1966; Meville, 1966; Newcomb, et al., 1969; Pemberton, 1968; and Olson, 1964]. As a result of being in an alternative residential situation, the researchers generally concluded that the students in alternative curriculum and teaching models do not differ from students within traditional models, in terms of academic achievement. However, they did find that students and faculty encountered closer relationships, that the students experienced a greater satisfaction with the alternative models in comparison to the conventional curriculum, that both students and faculty perceived a more scholarly atmosphere and that cultural and political interests increased among the students.

An important factor that must be considered when examining the validity of particular studies is whether or not a self-selection option was available to the students. If a
self-selection factor was incorporated, data indicating a difference between an alternative residential model and a traditional residential model might be attributable to differences prevalent before the students entered either residential arrangement. Newcomb, et al. (1969], and Kafer (1966], in regard to their research, addressed this issue and did find significant differences between the entering groups in terms of academic aptitude to do college work and amount of education desired.

Changes in learning experiences often have been accompanied by changes in living styles. These have included: the elimination of parietal hours, the establishment of coeducational living arrangements, the allowance of environmental changes within a residence complex, the encouragement of special interest floors and buildings, and the allowance of student governed and operated residential units.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to test whether a residential unit, organized to meet student needs [student-governed and operated], has a significant impact on reducing the alienation level of its residents, in comparison with the effects traditionally governed and operated residential units have on reducing alienation.
Site. John Adams Tower, the site of this research, is one of five 22-story buildings in the Southwest Residential College (SRC) located on the campus of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst (student population: approximately 22,000). SRC, the largest residential area on the campus, houses 5,200 students in 17 buildings located on a 20-acre area.

John Adams, like many residential units, was plagued with stifling and oppressive conditions. There were minimal attempts to integrate viable learning experiences within the Tower; humanistic interpersonal relationships and a sense of community within the house were negligible, and opportunities for individual or group responsibility were insufficient. This discouraging social atmosphere was matched by an environment characterized by excessive noise and wanton damage.

Development. During the fall and spring of the 1970-1971 school year, the students of John Adams Tower, along with staff members, attempted to develop a program that would appropriately attend to the personal, educational, and social needs of the students in the Tower. Their primary goal was to lessen the alienation level of the students. This researcher was a Resident Director in John Adams during the planning stages of the Project and was elected by the students to serve as the Project Director for the first year of the experimentation.
The original concerns, as perceived by the staff and the students, were for having a dormitory that would be relevant to students' needs and desires (curriculum alternatives, dormitory policies and programs, and environmental changes), conducive to creating a sense of community, and open to continual innovation and evaluation. As a result of these concerns, the following design for a residential unit was developed: the unit would be small; student governed and student operated; humanistic in interpersonal relationships; and developmental in educational philosophy and programs. The program was called the T-5 Project.

During the beginning months of the implementation of the T-5 Project (fall, 1971), unanticipated events altered the model described above. At the end of the first month of the school year, the black students of John Adams presented the Project's governing and policy making body (the Assembly) with eight demands. The Assembly recognized that the necessity for demands from the black students indicated that blatant individual and institutional racism existed in the Tower. Therefore, the Assembly decided to establish as their first priority an extensive examination of the issue of racism and consequently the academic areas of concern were not developed to the original expectations.
Hypothesis

In reference to the purpose of this investigation and in recognition of the information presented throughout this Chapter, the following general hypothesis was formulated: Students in a self-governed and self-operated residential unit (the T-5 Project) are less alienated and have more positive feelings on such variables as affiliation, support, involvement, interpersonal openness, and student influence, than the students in a traditionally governed and operated dormitory.

Justification for the Study

Projects similar to the L-L, cluster or residential college models have been evaluated by various researchers. However, the available research is primarily limited to alternative teaching and learning experiences and usually restricted to a small segment of specific schools. Many programs and experiments have been implemented without adequate evaluation procedures present at the beginning or at appropriate intervals. For example, Gaff [1970] indicated that

... one must recognize that colleges must be judged primarily on the basis of their results rather than on the basis of their intentions. Certainly it does not follow that merely because a college is preceded by the new word cluster it is necessarily any better - or any worse - than other kinds of schools ... . It is appropriate
that now, after the decade of innovation, cluster colleges be put to rigorous empirical test in order to assess their actual effects (Gaff, 1970, p. 66).

To this researcher's knowledge, no previous study has been undertaken to test the effect a student governed and operated alternative residence hall has on the alienation level of its student occupants.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THEORY AND RESEARCH

The Concept of Alienation

In order to clarify the construct "alienation" and to begin to focus on the factors of interest for this research, a general review of its causes and characteristics is presented.

Causes. Alienation is a complex psychological and sociological phenomenon. The reasons for becoming alienated, according to Keniston (1965), who studied adolescents and young adults, rest in the interaction of "psycho-socio-cultural-historical" forces and cannot be clearly understood without considering the impact of each outside and inside force.

The feelings of inadequate affiliation, support and involvement have been suggested by Levin (1960) and Thompson and Horton (1960) as contributing to one's feeling alienated. Also, Dean (1961), Seeman (1970), and Srole (1956), concluded that the feelings of powerlessness and meaninglessness were associated with the alienation syndrome. Pace (1966), Glazer (1965) and Wolin and Scharr (1965), all researched aspects of students' perceptions of the organizational structures prevalent in colleges and universities. They found that students felt powerless and that the environment was impersonal, therefore contributing to their feelings of alienation.
Characteristics. Studies by Struening and Richardson (1965) and Nettler (1957) concluded that distrust and pessimism were the principal feelings of alienated subjects. Other studies, using college students as subjects, have shown both that students who are alienated have feelings such as inadequacy, insecurity, distrustfulness, and that they tend to be apathetic (Gould, 1969; Keniston, 1968; Watts, Lynch and Whitaker, 1969). In one of his major research projects, Keniston (1965) conducted intensive clinical case studies on a selected group of high alienated and low alienated college students. His findings on the feelings of alienated college students is supported in part by the previously mentioned researchers. He stated that the alienated students characterized themselves as being confused, anxious, nervous, irritable, hostile, angry, impulsive, depressed and dejected. They say they are suspicious, lacking in will power, resentful, unfriendly, and jealous. . . . They question their ability to cope with life, they feel they are rarely themselves with other people; they describe themselves as philosophically confused and disoriented. Indeed, given any lists of "socially undesirable" characteristics, the alienated affirm that they possess them (Keniston, 1965, p. 100).

As the research cited above indicates, numerous characteristics and feelings can be related to the construct of alienation. Feelings of powerlessness have been one of the most common factors attributed to or resulting from alienation. In terms of this research, feelings of powerlessness were a major concern.
Powerlessness

Within this century the degree and feelings of powerlessness have reached destructive psychological and sociological levels for many people. The concern in this research is to examine the impact powerlessness has on peoples' behavior and attitudes.

Though not all directly related to the college student, research studies have been conducted on the causes and impact of powerlessness.

Seeman (1970), in researching the effect of powerlessness on behavior, found that as feelings of powerlessness increased, one's motivation to learn "control-relevant" information [information that would be potentially useful for managing one's own destiny] decreased, and as feelings of powerlessness decreased, one's motivation to learn "control-relevant" information increased. He based his findings on data from a variety of populations. Some of his findings are presented below.

In examining the learning patterns of inmates in a reformatory, Seeman found that control-relevant information [for example, knowledge about the parole system] was of less concern to alienated inmates than it was to nonalienated inmates.

Seeman researched the same hypothesis in relation to college students. In comparing control-relevant information, such as the students' knowledge about nuclear affairs [for
example, methods of control against radiation], to non-
control information, such as cultural events, he found that
the level of powerlessness did not influence their knowledge
of cultural matters but powerlessness did influence their
knowledge of nuclear affairs.

In discussing the implications of his findings for
education and to continue to give support to his hypothesis,
Seeman examined the conclusions of the Coleman Report on
Equality of Educational Opportunity in the United States
(1970). The report is based on elementary and secondary
students; however, it suggested that the students' sense of
powerlessness strongly affected their academic achievement.

Seeman found similar results in comparing alienated and
nonalienated people on knowledge and involvement in community
and national issues. The T-5 Project model, by permitting
students to govern and operate their own residential complex,
was attempting to decrease the sense of powerlessness among
its residents and increase the students' concern and knowledge
of "control-relevant" information within the dormitory. For
example, concern over who controls the finances in the dorm,
who formulates the rules and regulations, and who is respon-
sible for "hiring and firing" within the dorm.

Additional insight on how powerlessness can affect the
behavior of people on local and community issues can be gained
by examining the alienated voter. Levin [1960], Horton and
Thompson [1962] and Thompson and Horton (1960) concluded
that alienated voters are more apathetic and negative on local community issues than nonalienated voters. They found that the alienated voter does not vote because he believes his single vote cannot make a difference; he believes that those in power are unrepresentative, because he is generally distrustful.

The impact of powerlessness on the behavior and feelings of group members has been examined by Lewin, Lippitt, and White [1939] in their classic study on the effect of various leadership styles in determining group policies and procedures. They established three task groups of eleven-year-old boys. The leadership conditions were [a] autocratic: all policies and procedures were determined by the adult leader; [b] democratic: all policies and procedures were determined by group discussion and decision, with guidance by the adult leader; [c] laissez-faire: the adult leader was passive, with complete freedom given to the group members. The results showed significant differences between the leadership styles. In comparing democratic with autocratic leadership, it was found that hostility was thirty times greater and aggression was eight times greater in the autocratic groups. More students enjoyed the democratic groups, in comparison to the other two. Also, the quality of the tasks performed by the democratic group was far superior to the quality of the tasks of the other two groups.

The Lewin, et al. [1939] study, as well as the other
studies presented above, suggests that when people have influence, responsibility, power and support they are more satisfied, committed, and concerned about their immediate environments, their tasks, and their destinies. Also of importance to this research is that the democratic group was given "guidance" by an "adult". The T-5 Project operated with a similar structure involving this researcher as the person offering "guidance" to the students.

Bureaucracy

The bureaucratic manner of operating institutions can be a very efficient system for accomplishing certain tasks, but not for developing human potential and alleviating the feelings of powerlessness.

Blau [1968], in defining bureaucracy, lists four characteristics that provide a partial explanation why large institutions [for example, colleges and universities] fail to decrease the feelings of powerlessness among all levels of its members. Three of the characteristics can be easily associated with the governing and operating procedures of many traditional residence halls - hierarchy of authority, regularized procedures, and impersonal manner of operation.

Hierarchy of authority. This means a system which is pyramidal and has the authority vested in the individuals at the head or top of the institution. Many traditional residence halls operate with this hierarchical system. For
example, the Head of Residence or Resident Director has been defined and he functions and is perceived as the top authority figure within the unit. The lower strata (students) usually have, or perceive to have, an insignificant amount of power. A system of this nature often produces feelings of inequality and therefore results in distrust between the different strata.

Regularized procedures. Operations are governed by formal rules and regulations administered by one's superior. The purpose of this type of organizational structure is to assure uniformity in the performance of every task. Each individual in the organization has a specific role and function, consequently eliminating considerably emotional development, creativity and positive interrelationships.

Impersonal manner of operation. Due to the emphasis on efficiency, precision, and control found within bureaucratic structures, people are generally treated as objects, with little consideration for their uniqueness and emotions being exercised by the institution.

Institutions of Higher Education

Institutions of higher education proclaim through their catalogs and other propaganda devices that they have governance systems which show mutual concern, support, and respect for all groups. There have been some radical changes within the last ten years to document this. However, these
changes, or in most cases intentions, appear to have been lost or repeatedly violated. Most higher educational institutions continue to operate in a manner that perpetuates powerlessness. Jencks and Riesman [1968] wrote about the implications of university bureaucratic governance systems as follows:

... The majority of students feel completely alienated from the institution and view themselves as a transient proletariat. They have no sense of identification with the institution, no stake in improving it, and no reason for wanting in its operation except to seduce the extent to which it impinges on their lives while they are acquiring its degree [Jencks and Riesman, 1968, p. X].

As mentioned previously, when feelings of powerlessness exist, parallel with feelings of inequality, distrust begins to develop. Hochreich and Rotter (1970), using the Interpersonal Trust Scale, developed by Rotter, examined distrust among college students. They found the trust level of students, in relation to "the establishment" (for example, politics, mass media, judiciary), society (for example, hypocrisy, self-seeking characteristics of people) and their immediate environment (for example, college and university) significantly declined during the time they were in college. Wrightsman and Baker (1969) found similar results among a college student sample.

As the above research indicates, the distrust and impersonality generated by institutions and society has prevented human interaction, personal development and
individual responsibility. It has created pessimism, anxiety, aggressiveness and negative self concepts, therefore resulting in feelings of alienation among the students.

Bureaucratic governance procedures are still the rule in the residence halls on many college and university campuses. All of the conclusions drawn above are applicable to residential units. However, the impact and awareness of powerlessness and distrust is greater because of the residential proximity. Students anticipate that their residential situation will operate according to local initiative and responsibility. The reality is, however, a system that is bureaucratic and impersonal.

The research reviewed suggests that in order to govern, educate and allow for coherence, consensus, and individual choice, there must not be an undue concentration of the authority and responsibility in any of the constituencies of the administration, the faculty or the students.

An Alternative Model: The T-5 Project

As mentioned previously, the T-5 Project was established in an attempt to alleviate feelings of powerlessness, distrust and pessimism and to increase the sense of community among students in one residential complex. The International Cooperation Administration's Community Development Review (Mial, 1958) defines community development in a way that clearly indicates the anticipated direction of the T-5 Project.
... a process of social action in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action; define their common and individual needs and problems; make group and individual plans with a maximum reliance upon community resources; and supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from . . . agencies outside the community [Mial, 1958, p. 277].

Another way to understand the philosophy of the T-5 Project is to conceptualize it as an "organic systems" model [Bennis, 1969]. Bennis' alternative to the bureaucratic model (mechanical systems) which he called the "organic systems" approach, is stated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanical Systems</th>
<th>Organic Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive individual emphasis</td>
<td>Relationship between and within groups emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority-obedience relationships</td>
<td>Mutual confidence and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated and divided responsibility rigidly adhered to</td>
<td>Interdependence and shared responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict division of labor and hierarchical supervision</td>
<td>Multi-group membership and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central decision making</td>
<td>Wide sharing of responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution through suppression, arbitration and/or warfare [Bennis, 1969, p. 15]</td>
<td>Conflict resolution through bargaining and problem solving [Bennis, 1969, p. 15]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen above, the organic systems model encourages positive interrelationships, is based on trust and collaboration, and emphasizes shared responsibility and authority (power). The system also allows for creativity and flexibility. Theoretically, then, the "organic systems" model offers
a system for alleviating alienation within residence halls. As mentioned above, the T-5 Project was based theoretically on the "organic systems" model.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Research Site

The study took place at the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts. This public university is located in the small western Massachusetts town of Amherst (population 12,000). The campus had over 100 buildings and almost 22,000 students, 3,500 of whom were freshmen.

The residential units used in this study were located in the Southwest Residential College (SRC), an area of approximately 20 acres. The complex consists of 5,200 students, 1,700 of whom are freshmen. The students reside in five 22-story towers and 12 low rise residence halls.

The residential units included in this study were two high rise towers. For administrative purposes the towers were divided into three separate residence houses of 192 students each (Lower, Middle and Upper Houses). Each House contained six living floors, and a lounge which included space for a music room, a library, two informal areas, a recreation room and a kitchen and vending area. The autonomous Houses had their own governance structure, judiciary and delegates to all appropriate college committees and governing bodies, but were not necessarily student governed and operated.
Treatment and Control Residence Towers

**Treatment group: T-5 Project.** The T-5 Project was designed originally during the fall and spring of the 1970-1971 school year. The primary task group consisted of 12 students from John Adams Middle House and two staff members (including this researcher, who served as a Resident Director), one from John Adams Lower and one from Middle House. After one year of defining philosophies, goals, and strategies, John Adams Lower and John Adams Middle Houses joined as one House, the T-5 Project.

As mentioned previously, the Project grew out of the concerns of students for having a residential unit which would be relevant to student needs and desires, conducive to developing a sense of community, and open to innovation, change and evaluation. Therefore, nonbureaucratic innovations such as student self-governance and student controlled operations were developed.

**Control groups: John F. Kennedy Tower, Lower House and Middle House.** JFK Tower, located in the Southwest Residential College, was architecturally identical to the T-5 Project Tower. However, operationally it functioned as three separate houses, including JFK Lower House, Middle House, and Upper House. Each House's internal and external affairs were controlled primarily by a University staff person called a Residence Director and six undergraduate student staff members. In this researcher's opinion, JFK
Middle House had a limited concern for participatory governance, developmental philosophy and programs, building a sense of community, and establishing relevant curriculum and teaching alternatives. JFK Middle House functioned as a traditional residential hall in terms of governance, programs and living styles. Throughout the year, the students and staff of JFK Lower House exhibited much more concern for changing the dehumanizing aspects of their dormitory. However, since JFK Lower House was governed traditionally it was classified as traditional and included in the control group.

Subjects

The freshmen students accepted for the fall semester of 1971 were required to participate in an on-campus summer counseling program lasting three days. Part of their schedule included an opportunity to visit the residential areas of the campus. In Southwest Residential College a counseling period was held to describe the different living styles of the houses with vacancies, along with a tour of the area for each group of students. These sessions were led by this researcher and two assistants. During these information sessions the students were asked to complete the Alienation Index [Turner, 1968] and to give information on their socio-economic status (SES). Additional subjects were needed to increase the sample size, and therefore the
freshmen students assigned to the T-5 Project by the Housing Office were requested to complete the Alienation Index and answer socio-economic questions on their first day at the University in September. The subjects for both data collection periods were white, male, freshmen students.* Their average age was 18 years.

Instrumentation

Alienation Index [Turner, 1968]. Turner theorized that alienation exists in relation to various groups and forces in a person’s life field. Consequently, he devised an instrument which consists of nine five-item subscales, with each subscale representing a group or force associated with alienation. The subscales of his inventory are: general alienation (a feeling of hopelessness or normlessness in relation to one’s society), alienation from self, alienation from peers, alienation from family, alienation from school, alienation from work, alienation from community, alienation from legal institutions, and the alienation of youth from society (see Appendix A for explanation of scales). For this study, alienation from family, work and legal institutions were eliminated because of the unaccountable effect an alternative residential unit of the nature being investigated would have on them.

*Racial minority students were not used in this study because of the small number who were in the freshman class, therefore preventing a meaningful comparison between races.
Reliability. Turner (1972) examined the reliability of the AI using two methods. Table 1 is a presentation of the total AI inventory and subscale reliability data. These reliability coefficients are for internal reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient with a projection for 100 items using the Spearman-Brown formula. These values are based on the testing of 104 males between the ages of 16 years and 22 years. The median age was 18 years.

Table 1

Reliability Coefficients for the AI Inventory and the Nine Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Alienation</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Srole Anomie Scale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self Alienation</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Peer Alienation</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School Alienation</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Alienation</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Youth Alienation</td>
<td>(not computed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Alienation</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates the reliability of the AI subscales according to test-retest correlations of the Index. The time between tests was eight weeks.
Table 2
Test-Retest Correlations of the Subscales of the Alienation Index Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Total Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Srole</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Peer</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Youth</td>
<td>(not computed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be interpreted from the above scores, the AI is reasonably stable over a period of time [Turner, 1972, p. 3].

Validity. The validity of the AI scale has not been investigated with measures of tests which reportedly measure a similar dimension. A series of discriminant analyses have shown the overall capacity of the AI to discriminate between defineably different groups. In one such study comparing blacks and whites, a discriminant analysis on the entire scale yielded an F ratio of 5.896 (p. < .001). A series of comparisons between black gang members and black college students have shown significant differences on the subscales of the AI [see Table 3].
Table 3

Comparisons of Gang Versus Non-Gang Members on the Subscales of the AI Inventory When Controlling for Race (All Black)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>T-Tests</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gang</td>
<td>Non-Gang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.O.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Srole</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>15.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Peer</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>14.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>12.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Youth</td>
<td>(not computed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation (Total)</td>
<td>115.88</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>124.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


University Residence Environment Scale (Gerst and Moos, 1971). Along with the AI, the URES was administered to the specified research subject during the spring (1972) semester. As a result of the one testing in the spring, the results of the URES were used as ex post facto data as opposed to findings accumulated from the pre and post tests of the AI.

The scale reportedly measures the social-psychological climate of the college and university residences as perceived by the students. The scale consists of 96 statements and for the purpose of scoring is divided into the following 14 subscales: affiliation, support, involvement, interpersonal openness, social propriety, traditional social orientation, order and organization, spontaneity, variety and novelty, independence, competition, academic achievement, intellectuality, and student influence (see Appendix B for additional description of subscales). As a result of a commitment by the T-5 governing body (Assembly) to examine extensively racial issues within the Project, they were not able to develop significant academic alternatives. Therefore, the subscales of academic achievement and intellectuality were not used for the study.

The URES has been developed recently and consequently there were no available reliability or validity scores.
In fact, this research is part of a national study which is attempting to develop norms for the instrument.

**Procedures for Collecting Data**

As mentioned above, during the summer counseling period at SRC, the subjects were asked to complete the Alienation Index. Included with the AI inventory were questions pertaining to the subjects' parents' occupation and educational levels. The sample was scored and stratified according to the categories of high, moderate, and low alienation and also by socio-economic status (SES). The AI's stratification was performed in the following way. The total score that one can achieve on the AI was 180. According to previous data analysis by Turner (1968) the levels of the AI were divided into the following ranges. The students who scored lower than 120 were considered highly alienated. Those who scored from 121 to 129 were considered moderately alienated and those over 135 were considered lowly alienated.

The SES was computed by assigning designated number values to each occupational and educational level. The number values were then added and grouped according to the appropriate six status levels (Hollingshead, 1958).

Following the administration of the AI, the students were given the opportunity to select the residence hall of their choice. Through cooperation with the University
Housing Office, the students were to be guaranteed placement if their respective choice was any of the Houses to be used as research sites (T-5 Project; JFK Lower and Middle Houses). However, as a result of internal problems this did not happen in all cases. Out of the total sample, 60 students chose a specific residence hall and 21 students did not receive their choice.

In an attempt to insure approximately equal numbers of each stratification in the respective residential units, the following took place. The students who expressed no preference were scored on the AI, and as close as possible, grouped according to the above stratified criteria (high, moderate and low alienation and socio-economic status: six levels). Therefore, the possible combinations equaled 18 for each residential unit. In order to prevent sequential error, the stratified students, which when totaled equaled 89 students, were alternately placed in the treatment and control towers. The six levels of SES were collapsed to three levels (high, moderate and low).

Since the number of freshmen who took the AI during the counseling period did not provide for an adequate sample (a projected minimum of 200 students, 100 students in the T-5 Project and 50 students in both JFK Lower and Middle Houses), an additional testing session was held in the fall for the freshmen assigned by the Housing Office to the treatment and control dormitories. This testing
involved 57 students and took place on the first day freshmen students arrived at their assigned residence hall. Some of these students may have self-selected the treatment or control dormitories during the summer, but apparently chose not to visit SRC during the counseling period. The total sample included 206 freshmen; 114 students in the T-5 Project, 40 students in JFK Lower House and 52 students in JFK Middle House.

Following the initial summer and fall administration of the AI, additional testing was conducted. During March, the third month of the spring semester, the AI was administered to the subjects again. This researcher also administered the University Residence Environment Scale [Gerst and Moos, 1971] at the same time. For the spring testing the students were paid $2.50. As a result of students changing dormitories or withdrawing from the University, the total number of students diminished for the spring testing and was distributed in the following way: 92 students in the T-5 Project; 28 students in JFK Lower House; and 35 students in JFK Middle House.

As mentioned previously, the students who visited SRC during the summer counseling period had the option to select the T-5 Project as their residence hall. This situation ruled out random assignment of students to the residential units and introduced an additional source of unknown variance (experimental error). However, as a result
of the small numbers that participated in the counseling periods at SRC and because of students not being placed by the Housing Office in their requested residence halls, one could assume, _de facto_, random assignment took place. In view of the possible selection factor making a significant difference between the treatment and control dormitories, a multiple discriminant analysis on each item of the AI was performed to check for significance between the three residential units. The results indicated there was no significant difference between the residential units on the initial testing of the AI.

**Hypotheses**

The research on alternative residential units, alienation, and bureaucracy suggests several assumptions can be made in reference to this study. First, less alienation occurs when people feel affiliated, have support from their peers, can influence decisions, and can operate and think independently. Therefore, the T-5 Project was designed to alleviate among its residents general alienation, alienation from self, and alienation from community and school. And second, small, cohesive, autonomous or semi-autonomous residential programs, such as the T-5 Project, contribute to the development of a greater sense of community among people. Consequently, alienation from peers, self, and community should diminish among the student residents of T-5.
With the above information, along with an understanding of the T-5 Project and the methods of research applied in this study, the following primary hypotheses were formulated:

**Hypothesis 1.** There is no significant difference between the students of the T-5 Project (treatment group) and the students of JFK Lower and Middle Houses (the control groups) on the total score of the Alienation Index.

**Hypothesis 1a.** There are no significant differences between the T-5 Project and JFK Lower and Middle House on the items and the following subscales of the AI:

- a. alienation from society
- b. alienation from self
- c. alienation from peers
- d. alienation from community
- e. alienation from school
- f. alienation from society [youth]

As a result of the nature of the URES subscales, one would anticipate that they would relate to alienation. Also, in that the URES is a more direct measure of the environment climate within residence halls than the AI, the following secondary hypothesis was formulated:

**Hypothesis 2.** There are no significant differences between the T-5 Project and JFK Lower and Middle Houses on the items and following psycho-socio and environmental subscales of the URES:
Although no hypothesis was formulated, the researcher was also interested in gathering information on the possible relationship between the two main effects of this study, dorm and SES, and their interaction effect on the AI and URES subscales.

Analysis of Data

To test the two primary hypotheses and one secondary hypothesis in this study, the following analyses were performed. The mean and standard deviation for each item, subscale and total score were computed for the Alienation Index and the University Residence Environment Scale. In addition, the chi-square for each item and subscale were computed for the AI and URES. The chi-squares were used to determine if any statistically significant differences, beyond the probability of chance, existed between alienation scores and residential perceptions of students residing in a student governed and student operated residential unit, as opposed to students residing in a traditionally governed and operated unit. Also, a multiple discriminant analysis
was computed on the combined AI and URES subscale scores, and this was followed by univariate F-tests on each of the subscales. On the statistically significant items computed by chi-squares, univariate F-tests were performed to determine among which dormitories the statistical differences existed. In addition to testing the principal hypotheses, by using chi-square and multivariate analyses of variance, statistical significance was examined on the various effects between socio-economic status and dormitory, on the AI and URES subscales. The hypotheses of this study were stated as null hypotheses. An alpha level [probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when in fact it is true] of .05 was established for the chi-square computations and the multivariate and univariate F-ratio analyses. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences [Nie, Bent and Hull, 1970] was used for frequency counts, cross tabulations, means, and standard deviations. The multiple discriminant analyses and univariate F-tests were computed using Veldman’s Program [Veldman, 1967]. The analysis of variance program used for the socio-economic status main effect and SES by dormitory interaction was taken from Clyde [1969]. The Hollingshead’s model [1958] was used for determining the subjects’ socio-economic levels.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Hypotheses

The following results were computed for testing the hypotheses of this research.

Hypotheses 1 and 1a. There is no significant difference between the students of the T-5 Project and the students of JFK Lower House and Middle House on the items, subscales and total score of the Alienation Index.

The chi-squares computed for the items, subscales and total score of the AI failed to reach statistical significance. In addition, a multiple discriminant analysis on the combined AI and URES subscale scores yielded a nonsignificant F-ratio ($F = 0.811$). Univariate F-tests were performed on the subscales of the AI and they also failed to reach statistical significance. Consequently, no evidence was provided to reject the null hypotheses. Table 4 presents the percentages of response for each alienation level among the three groups of interest, along with the chi-squares. Table 5 presents the means and F-ratios for the subscales of the AI. The means and standard deviations for the AI items (by subscale) are listed in Appendix C.

Hypothesis 2. There are no significant differences between the T-5 Project and JFK Lower House and Middle House on the items and subscales of the URES.
Table 4

Percentage of Responses for each Subscale of the AI within each Alienation Level [High, Moderate, Low] Along with the Chi-Squares [all are non-significant]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>x^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>JFKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srolet</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S elft</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peert</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolt</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ytsolet</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienat</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P < .05
Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations and F-Ratios of the AI Subscales

[all are non-significant]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>JFKM</td>
<td>JFKL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srolet</td>
<td>2.09 .812</td>
<td>2.02 .785</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selft</td>
<td>2.04 .824</td>
<td>2.28 .750</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peert</td>
<td>1.81 .769</td>
<td>2.02 .822</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communt</td>
<td>1.95 .837</td>
<td>1.91 .853</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolt</td>
<td>2.11 .738</td>
<td>2.22 .645</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ytersolet</td>
<td>1.97 .856</td>
<td>2.00 .767</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienat</td>
<td>2.00 .864</td>
<td>2.22 .843</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-Ratio  P
0.2065  0.8157
1.2749  0.2817
0.9446  0.6068
0.4435  0.6485
0.5116  0.6063
0.2016  0.8195
1.3153  0.2705

p < .05
The computed chi-squares did indicate that a significant difference \( p < .05 \) existed between the distribution of ten individual items of the URES. Consequently adequate evidence was provided to suggest the probability of this occurrence was not based on chance, and therefore the null hypothesis at the item level was rejected. Table 6 presents the percentages of true and false responses and chi-squares for the ten significant items of the URES.

Univariate F-tests were computed on each significant item of the URES to determine between which residential groups the significant difference existed. Table 7 presents the means and F-ratios for each significant item. The means and standard deviations for all 96 items of the URES are listed in Appendix D.

**Significant URES Items**

**Student influence.** The following four items in the "Student Influence" subscale were significant:

"Around here the staff decide who gets the single rooms" [Item #016]. The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that T-5 respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other residential groups.

"The students formulate almost all the rules here" [Item #056]. The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that JFK Lower respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other residential groups.
### Table 6

Percentages of True Responses and Chi-Squares for the Significant Items of the URES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>T-5</th>
<th>JFKM</th>
<th>JFKL</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>16.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>15.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>13.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>11.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>8.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>6.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05*

"The students do not take part in staff selection" (Item #071). The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that JFK Middle respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other residential groups.

"House finances are handled exclusively by students here" (Item #075). The F-ratios comparing the groups two
Table 7
Means and F-Ratios for the Significant Items of the URES

(group comparisons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group Comparisons and F-Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-5 Mean</td>
<td>JFKM Mean</td>
<td>JFKL Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
at a time indicated that JFK Middle respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other residential groups.

Order and organization. The following two items in the "Order and Organization" subscale were significant:

"Meetings and activities follow a pretty regular schedule in the house" [Item #041]. The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that JFK Middle and JFK Lower respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than the T-5 Project group.

"House officers are regularly elected in the house" [Item #060]. The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that JFK Middle respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other groups.

Traditional-social orientation. The following two items in the "traditional-social orientation" subscale were significant:

"Some people here spend a lot of time preparing for dates" [Item #053]. The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that T-5 Project respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other groups.

"Dating is a recurring topic of conversation around here" [Item #069]. The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that T-5 Project respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other groups.
Support. The following one item in the "Support" subscale was significant:

"It is sometimes difficult to approach the house staff with problems" (Item #079). The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that JFK Lower respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other groups.

Independence. The following one item in the "independence" subscale was significant:

"People here tend to rely on themselves when a problem comes up" (Item #087). The F-ratios comparing the groups two at a time indicated that JFK Middle respondents answered "true" to this statement more often than either of the other groups.

URES Subscales

As mentioned previously, the results of a multiple discriminant analysis on the combined AI and URES subscale scores produced a nonsignificant F-ratio (F = 0.811). Univariate F-tests were also computed for each subscale of the UURES. Statistical significance was reached on one subscale - "Competition". Table 8 presents the means and F-ratios for the URES subscales.

Further univariate F-tests, among the three residential groups, on the "Competition" subscale indicated that the statistical difference was between JFK Middle and the T-5 Project (F = 5.9627; p < .05). The T-5 Project students felt there was a less competitive atmosphere.
## Table 8
Means and F-Ratios of the URES Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>T-5 Mean</th>
<th>JFKM Mean</th>
<th>JFKL Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliat</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.4730</td>
<td>0.6300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.9670</td>
<td>0.1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involmet</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>0.9859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interope</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.3168</td>
<td>0.7337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socprity</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.1214</td>
<td>0.3289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsocorie</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.9909</td>
<td>0.6246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordorg</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.7731</td>
<td>0.1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontany</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.0360</td>
<td>0.9650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varietyn</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.2291</td>
<td>0.7982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indepence</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.4661</td>
<td>0.6342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competon</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.4082</td>
<td>0.0346*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studinf1</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.5479</td>
<td>0.5848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

### Socio-Economic Status

Multivariate tests of significance were computed on the combined effect of the AI and the URES when examining the two main effects, dormitory by SES, and their interaction. In each individual computation the F-ratio failed to reach
statistical significance (Dorm: $F = 0.811$; SES: $F = 1.251$; Dorm x SES: $F = 0.961$).

In computing F-tests for each individual AI and URES subscale on the dormitory by SES interaction effect, a significant F-ratio ($F = 0.043$) was found in relation to the AI "Community" subscale. T-tests were computed to determine among which groups the significant F-ratio existed. Table 9 lists the means and standard deviations for the "Community" subscale of the three residential groups. Table 10 presents the F-ratios for the dormitory x SES interaction effect on the AI and URES subscales.

Table 9
Means and Standard Deviations for the "Community" Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES Levels</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>T-5</th>
<th>JFKM</th>
<th>JFKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI Variable Subscales</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>URES Variable Subscales</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srolet</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>Affiliat</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selft</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peert</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>Involmet</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communt</td>
<td>2.525*</td>
<td>Interope</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolt</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>Socpriy</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ytsrolet</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>Tsocorie</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienat</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>Ordorg</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spontany</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varietyn</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indepnc</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competon</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studinf1</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Table 11 presents the results of the T-tests for socioeconomic status by dormitory interaction effect ["Community" subscale].
Table 11
T-tests on "Community" Alienation by Socio-Economic Status and Dormitory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dorm SES</th>
<th>SES Groups</th>
<th>T-5</th>
<th>JFKM</th>
<th>JFKL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Med Low</td>
<td>High Med Low</td>
<td>High Med Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. N.S. N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. 2.326* N.S.</td>
<td>2.345* N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. N.S. N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFKM</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. 2.808* 3.0000*</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. N.S. N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFKL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S. N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Discussion

In examining the results of this study it is evident that the statistically significant items are few and could be interpreted as being inconclusive. As noted in Chapter IV, the AI statistical findings yielded no significant items, subscales or total score. The URES results, however, did indicate that ten individual items reached statistical significance. It should be noted, though, that the power of the URES is in identifying significant subscale scores or a relatively large number of significant items within a specific subscale. For example, four (#016, #056, #071, #075) of the ten significant URES items were part of the "Student Influence" subscale. The other six items (#041, #053, #056, #069, #079, #087) were part of six different subscales and therefore did not offer strong evidence. Consequently, the only significant URES items that are discussed in this chapter are those relating to the "Student Influence" subscale.

There was one URES subscale total score that did reach statistical significance - "Competition" [F = 5.9627; p < .05]. The subscale description of a "competitive environment" is an environment in which there is competition within any framework, for example, for grades, dates or
status. As mentioned previously, univariate F-tests found
the T-5 Project and JFK Middle significantly differing from
each other. An analysis of the means indicated that the
T-5 Project had the least competitive atmosphere, followed
by JFK Lower. This result is in support of the goals of
the T-5 Project. Additional remarks on this subscale are
included in the section of this chapter titled "Integration:
History and Statistics".

The final statistically significant information was
gathered in reference to socio-economic status (SES). The
socio-economic status by dormitory comparison produced a
significant AI subscale - "Community". Further analysis
(T-tests) indicated that a significant difference existed
between the high SES students in JFK Lower and JFK Middle.
The T-5 Project appeared to have no SES differentiating
effect. In JFK Lower a stronger sense of community was
evident among the low SES students. In JFK Middle a stronger
sense of community was evident for high SES students
than among the low SES students. In both dormitories
there was a linear effect among the three levels of SES.
Although these findings offer limited information, they
do indicate that residential units, offering different
programs, do affect freshmen students of various SES levels
in different ways.

An interpretation of the most powerful data of this
research is included in the remainder of this chapter con-
sisting of three parts. First, a brief interpretation of
the significant items of the "Student Influence" subscale is presented. Second, an historical perspective of the Project is presented as a way of giving particular attention to the critical events that influenced the direction and outcome of the Project. And third, a synthesis of the statistical and historical findings is attempted.

Interpretation of the "Student Influence" Subscale

Significant Items

As mentioned previously, the four significant items of the "Student Influence" subscale (#016, #056, #071, #075) of the URES are the most important to examine, since one of the goals of the T-5 Project was to attempt to lower the feelings of powerlessness among students. However, as indicated in Chapter IV, the statistical results for these four items suggest that the participants in T-5 experienced more feelings of powerlessness than the participants in the control units. The following are interpretations of the four significant items.

A significantly greater number of students in T-5 felt that the staff made decisions in regard to single rooms ("Around here the staff decide who gets the single rooms" Item #016). In T-5, as in other residential units, the students on each floor determine who receives single rooms. One possible explanation for the results of this item is that in T-5 there were two, and in some cases three student staff members on a floor, as opposed to one in other units,
and as part of their compensation, they were given single rooms by the members of their respective floors. Since there are only four single rooms on a floor, the students in T-5 had only one or two to offer to non-staff members and these were usually given to upperclassmen as a result of their seniority on the floor. Because the subjects in this study were freshmen, there could have been some misunderstanding or disagreement with this procedure.

A significantly greater number of students in T-5 felt that they were not involved in staff selection ("The students do not take part in staff selection" Item #071). It is interesting to note that the students in T-5 indicated a negative response to this item. The responses are in complete contradiction to the operating conditions in T-5. However, some of the following factors could have effected these results. The representatives and counselors of the T-5 Project were elected during the previous year (spring, 1971). Therefore, the freshmen students (fall, 1971) did not have the opportunity to participate in the elections. Also, the URES was administered before the students in T-5 elected new staff members for the following year. A more accurate indication of the freshmen students' understanding of the staff election process was evident when the elections for the following year found a significant number of freshmen students interested in, and eventually obtaining, staff positions.
A significantly greater number of students in T-5 felt that they had inadequate input on the formulation of rules in the dormitory and insufficient control over finances ["The students formulate almost all the rules here" Item #056; "House finances are handled exclusively by students here" Item #075]. Theoretically the students in T-5 had more direct control over rules and policies and more control over a greater amount of finances ($17,000) than either control dormitory. A proper understanding of these responses is imperative as a result of their contradiction of the theoretical base supporting the T-5 Project. An appropriate explanation can be presented best by first examining the history of the Project and then by presenting a synthesis of the statistical results and the history of the Project.

First Year of the Project (1971-1972)

The following consists of a brief account of the T-5 Project's first year of operation (1971-1972). The historical events presented were selected by this researcher as the most significant. The history is based on the personal log of experiences of the researcher, who served as the Project Director for the first year. The historical accounts of the "planning year" of the Project (1970-1971) are presented in Appendix E.
The elected representatives and student counselors of the T-5 Project returned one week before the arrival of the freshmen in order to participate in staff training program. The goals of the training program were primarily to reexamine the directions, policies and programs of the Project. Included in the training was contact with resource people within the University.

With this brief "refresher" and orientation the elected representatives and counselors proceeded to govern and operate their own community. However, as stated previously, the goal to develop innovative learning as well as living experiences was challenged immediately. During the first month (September, 1971) the black students in the Project presented the Assembly (all of whom were white) with eight demands (the specific demands are listed in Appendix F). These demands focused primarily on the lack of representation of black students on the decision making body of the dormitory (the Assembly). The anxiety and concern of the white students and black students by this unanticipated event was traumatic. For many students this was the first time they were confronted, both personally and collectively, with the issue of individual and institutional racism.

After a week of disagreements, heated discussions and personal confrontation, which resulted in significant
learning experiences, the Assembly agreed that combating institutional racism would be one of the primary goals of the T-5 Project. They felt the demands represented a much greater problem, namely racism within the Project. Therefore, in order to facilitate a positive working and living relationship between the black students and white students, the Assembly decided to concede to the eight demands, with some negotiating points involving the funding of black students on the Assembly, and over the date specified for a black floor. In order to make their intentions perfectly clear, the Assembly prefaced their reply to the demands with the following statement: "We, the T-5 Assembly, see the demands presented by the black students of the T-5 Project as an indication of more complex societal, organizational and interpersonal issues. The people of T-5, black students and white students, must begin to examine these issues, particularly within our own community [1971]."

Obviously, from this point on, the directions and concerns of the T-5 Project were radically changed. The demands and the Assembly’s decision, met varying degrees of acceptance and refusal from black students and white students. Some students objected to the "nerve of black students presenting demands". Others felt the demands were totally unjustified and only resulted from the black students’ desire to acquire dormitory positions only for the pay involved. One student on the Assembly said, "Racism is society’s problem. We should not spend time
on it." Graffiti appeared on the walls and elevators expressing some of the feelings of white students and black students. People became paranoid every time a black student and white student passed in the building.

On the other hand, there were those who agreed with and defended the Assembly's decision. They felt that racism did exist in the tower and consequently pledged themselves to a better understanding and possible resolution of the problem, not only in the Project, but in the University.

These types of contrasting behaviors continued throughout the year. The confrontative nature of the interpersonal relations between black students and white students caused the Assembly (now consisting of 12 white students and three black students) to plan a series of workshops on the issue of racism. Also, an Inter-Racial Committee was established, consisting of five black students and five white students, to examine extensively the issue of racism within the Project and to report back to the Assembly with conclusions and recommendations.

In November the first "Race Relation Lab" was conducted. An outline of the Lab can be found in Appendix F. The Lab was led by trainers from the Community Development and Human Relations (CDHR) staff (a professional University-wide staff) and by the Project Director. The Lab was primarily directed at the student staff. The expectations were
that the student staff members would plan similar programs for their own floors. When the newly elected black staff members refused to attend the Lab, confusion, frustration and hostility increased. The reason for the black students refusing to relate to white students focused around their objection to the white students' selection of COHR as the organization that would administer race relation labs in the dormitory. The black students felt the consultants (even though one was a respected member of the black community) represented a "white institution", primarily because of their entrance into the dormitory being requested by white people. Also, the Inter-Racial Committee was meeting at this time; however, the absence of the black members eventually led to the groups' refusal to meet. Throughout the year the white students and black students operated in an isolated manner. Constant fear of confrontations caused each group to discuss the issues and their plans for action independently and consequently inadequately. The proper communications and resolutions lost as a result of this were significant. An example of this behavior is clearly seen in remarks such as "how can we deal with racism if the blacks are not present?". The response of the black members to this question was "It is your problem, whitie, not ours."

Frequent heated discussions, miscommunications and unclear incidents between the black students and the white students resulted in many people reaching a point of complete
refusal to deal with the issue of racism. As one white student said to this researcher, "We are sick of hearing about it and sick of dealing with it."

In spite of the racism, other projects were beginning in the dormitory, but the atmosphere of tension, confusion and apathy about racism was evident and consequently delayed their completion. Also, within the Assembly, internal conflict between white students and black students at times reached a point that made its role disfunctional, vis-à-vis the original model.

As a result of the first semester's activities, the semester break was highly appreciated. However, following the break another major issue occurred.

Spring 1972

The second semester brought questions that were important in terms of a student governed and operated dormitory. Also, as might have been anticipated, a "white backlash" surfaced.

At the beginning of the second semester a group of white students demanded that a referendum be held to reconsider the black people's demands. One of the issues that "sparked" the demand for a referendum involved the Assembly's selection of the 11th floor as a black students' floor for the 1972-1973 academic year. It was felt that the decision was arrived at in an unrepresentative manner and consequently caused the 11th floor to declare themselves
as independent from the T-5 Project. Many other floors began to question seriously the representativeness of the Assembly, consequently considering secession from the Project. Intensive meetings between the black students and white students resolved the issue and the 11th floor rescinded their decision to secede from the Project. The decision reached stated that the floor would become a black students' floor on a phase-in basis, with no students being forced to leave at any time during the present year or the following year, but as openings do occur they were to be filled by black students. Because of the large student turnover on the 11th floor the percentage of black students was immediately 50 percent. Consequently, it was decided at a floor meeting that the floor would examine the impact of such a floor on the different races and on the floors' cohesiveness and racial awareness. If the outcome and attitudes were favorable the floor would remain bi-racial.

Unfortunately, the floor became a hotel for the white students, for as one student indicated, "We are just waiting for the semester to end. We do not want to face the entire issue again."

As a result of the clear dissatisfaction with the governance structure of the Project, the Assembly decided to call a "community meeting". Over 100 students appeared at the meeting. The issues raised involved the following: the lack of proper representation in the Assembly, the
inadequate lines of communication to the residents of the tower about relevant issues, the poor attendance of some floor representatives at the weekly meetings of the Assembly, the lack of student participation in making dorm decisions, the insufficient number of students on dorm committees, and the disagreement about the handling of the race issues. It is interesting to note that similar questions were raised in the initial development of the idea of a student governed and operated residential unit.

Before the referendum on the black students' demands was taken, a group of black students and white students went to every floor to explain and discuss the racial conflicts in the dormitory. The referendum itself was declared void as a result of being 50 votes short of the two-thirds majority necessary to be a valid vote. However, a majority of the students who voted supported the Assembly's decisions.

During the remainder of the second semester members of the Project worked in the following areas: additional racism workshops were administered at the floor level by student staff members; a major effort was made to complete environmental projects within the Project; and most importantly, major efforts were made to reexamine the goals, operating procedures, constitution and job descriptions for the coming year. Extensive time periods were allotted for Assembly representative and counselor elections,
followed by the selection of a Project Advisor (previously called Project Director) for the coming year.

Integration: History and Statistics

As has been seen in the historical review of the first year of the Project, students were continuously faced with situations that increased their awareness of racism, politics, administration, and individual and group values. Consequently, the educational growth (cognitive and affective) was substantial. The attempt now is to focus on some of these significant events and learning experiences, thereby adding a different perspective to the previous statistical results.

Bureaucracy

In permitting students to govern and operate their residential unit it was expected that powerlessness would decrease and a sense of community would increase. However, the machinery of impersonalized bureaucracy developed within a model produced to promote democracy and proper representation. The Assembly of T-5, as a result of conflict and constant pressure, unknowingly, permitted their governance body to reach a point of generating feelings of powerlessness, inequality and distrust among the students in the Project. For example, they became unresponsive authorities and impersonal regulators of the Project - local
initiative became "Assembly initiative" and local responsibility and power remained in the Assembly's chambers. The statistical findings on the items of the "Student Influence" subscale (URES) indicate this. In relation to Bennis' "organic systems" model the Assembly violated every factor of the model except for one: "Conflict resolution through bargaining and problem solving." The questions and confrontations faced by the students were similar to those faced by their past "authorities". However, as opposed to just confronting without resolving, the students within the Project chose to deal with conflict through flexible, responsive and creative ways. As mentioned in the historical accounts, upon noticing conflict and dissatisfaction the Assembly called a community meeting, reexamined their operations and goals, and remained flexible enough to change many of their operations. These changes took place without altering their basic commitment to a democratic rather than a laissez-faire type government.

Another point that should be mentioned is the openness and involvement of the members of the Project that a student governed and operated residential unit generated. Political groups and dissatisfied factions developed throughout the year. Contrary to the AI and URES findings indicating a minimum effect on the feelings of powerlessness, this researcher observed increasing involvement among students in the Project. For example, as mentioned
previously, many of the new members of the Assembly were freshmen. Also, many of the students that served on committees were freshmen (for example, seven of the ten members on the Inter-Racial Committee were freshmen).

The longitudinal stability and responsiveness to its constituents by the T-5 Project appear to be positive factors in support of the effectiveness and appropriateness of student governed and operated residential units.

Implications of the Racial Issues

The historical accounts presented earlier concerning the racism issues clearly indicate the impact they had on the direction of the Project. However, the interesting point to explore is not the reasons black people in general feel alienated or powerless (though it is important and something many students learned throughout the year), but what stimulated the black students to confront the Assembly in T-5, as opposed to the central administrative personnel who are stronger and more influential. One possible answer to this question is that the black students, like other students could for the first time in this large University identify a local community government of their own peers. They could see the powers the Assembly had and consequently confronted them for a more proper representative and responsive use of the power, especially in regard to black students' needs and interests. Again, the ramifications of the surfacing of the black students' issues were much
greater than just reexamining the governance system. However, the additional learning and awareness that took place in T-5 would possibly not have happened if a governance structure was not both identifiable and responsive.

An additional area to be addressed in order to clarify the statistical results of the research is to examine briefly the effect of the racism issues on students' behavior and attitudes. As mentioned earlier, the reactions to the black students' demands were mixed. Some people may have become more racist, others less, but one thing that apparently did happen was an increased awareness concerning community issues. The students were continually faced with defining their attitudes and values in terms of peer relationships and reference groups, thereby significantly affecting the cohesiveness of the Project. In the researcher's perception, the above factors contributed to a community understanding and eventually led to a community that encouraged emphasis on local group, local initiative, local participation and responsibility and local evaluation (Mial, 1958). These factors could have contributed significantly to the feelings of less competitiveness in the Project as indicated in the statistical findings.

The racial issues documented in the history of the T-5 Project presented another critical implication for programs in higher education. The T-5 Project was
formulated by, and primarily for, white, middleclass students. For example, there were no black students on the planning committee, and as evident by the black demands [see Appendix F], no black students holding any of the decision making or policy formulating positions in the dormitory. The T-5 Assembly failed to appropriately recognize the different races, cultures, and environmental backgrounds of students within the tower. In T-5, the black students represented a group of students with unique needs, desires, attitudes, interests, ambitions and values. And, consequently, felt an unequal distribution and use of power within the Project. As the T-5 students came to realize, the interests of black students within the Project could not be adequately or authentically represented by white students. The black student confrontation of the Project Assembly forced the white students to face such questions as how can people (particularly minority people) be represented, at what levels, and by whom. These same questions present a challenge to any program in higher education that functions within a heterogenous student body.

**The Role of the Project Director**

During the first months of the Project, the Director's responsibilities were not clearly defined. Administrative personnel outside the Project saw him as the contact to receive and distribute information in the House. The
students, as a result of being part of a traditional governance structure during the previous year (1970-1971), continued to see him as the person representing power and authority in the dormitory. Also, in time of rapid change and turmoil the students saw him as the appropriate person for intervention.

As the first year of the Project evolved, it became apparent that if the Project was ever going to reach its goal completely of being student governed and operated, the role of Project Director must be clearly defined. The issue was therefore openly discussed and it was decided that the Project Director, hence, Project Advisor, would withdraw from direct participation in dormitory affairs and act as a consultant whenever called upon. This would permit students to "shoulder" the responsibilities for the activities of the Project. However, this transition did not occur immediately. The communication and teaching process necessary to convince students and University personnel of the shift in the decision making authority for the Project was a frustrating but necessary task. It is worth mentioning that the students did not decide to proceed without "adult" consultation or guidance for the remainder of the first year or for the following year and continued to consult with the Director throughout the first year. The increased awareness of racism, politics, administration and individual and group values for the
student leaders, students in general, and the Project Director, in the midst of calm and conflict, speaks directly for the continuance of a project of this nature and for the support and encouragement it must be given.
Summary

Purpose. The principal purpose of this investigation was to examine the following:

Whether or not a residential unit, organized to meet student needs (student governed and operated), has a significant impact on reducing the alienation level of its residents, in comparison with the effects traditionally governed and operated residential units have on reducing alienation.

A student governed and operated experimental residential tower (T-5 Project) and two traditional residential towers (JFK Lower and Middle Houses) located at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, served as the research sites in this study. The sample consisted of 155 white, male, freshman students. Most of the initial data were collected during the summer 1971 freshman counseling sessions. However, in order to increase the sample size the instruments were administered to another group of freshmen the day they arrived on campus in September. The subjects were given the Alienation Index [AI] [Turner, 1968] during both testing periods. Also, in an attempt to gather socio-economic status [SES] information, the subjects were requested to give information about their parents' occupation and
educational levels. The initial summer testing was used to establish that the three sites had relatively equal distributions of the AI levels (high, moderate and low) and SES (six different levels). Retest data was collected during the spring semester of the 1971-1972 academic year. At this testing the subjects were administered the AI, and in addition, the University Residence Environment Scale (Gerst and Moos, 1971).

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference between the students of the T-5 Project (treatment group) and the students of JFK Lower and Middle Houses (control groups) on the total score of the Alienation Index.

Hypothesis 1a. There are no significant differences between the T-5 Project and JFK Lower and Middle Houses on the items and following Alienation Index subscales.
   a. alienation from society
   b. alienation from self
   c. alienation from peers
   d. alienation from community
   e. alienation from school
   f. alienation from society (youth)

A secondary null hypothesis constructed for this investigation was the following:

Hypothesis 2. There are no significant differences between the T-5 Project and JFK Lower and Middle Houses on the items and following psycho-socio, environmental scales of the URES:
a. affiliation
b. support
c. involvement
d. interpersonal relations
e. independence
f. student influence
g. variety and novelty
h. social propriety
i. traditional social orientation
j. order and organization
k. spontaneity
l. competition

Although no hypothesis was formulated, the researcher also gathered information on the possible relationship between the SES by dorm interaction effect on the AI and URES subscales.

Treatment of Data

The analysis of the data was conducted as follows. The mean, standard deviation, and chi-square were computed for each item and subscale of the AI and URES and for the AI total score. Then a multivariate F-test was performed on the combined AI and URES subscales. The subscales were examined further by computing univariate F-tests for each AI and URES subscale. On the ten significant URES items univariate F-tests were performed in order to determine between which groups the significant differences existed. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance were also computed for the AI and URES subscales in regard to the main effects, dorm and SES, and their interaction.
Conclusions

The statistical analyses conducted in this research provided evidence that could make one reject the general hypothesis that there is a significant difference between the treatment and control groups in relation to alienation. The chi-squares did not reach statistical significance for the items and subscales of the Alienation Index. Also, the multiple discriminant analyses and univariate F-tests failed to reach statistical significance for the AI subscales. The data computed on the URES yielded only ten items (total of 96 items in the URES) that reached statistical significance. Also, one subscale of the URES - "Competition" - was found to be significant. It can be stated that "chance" would produce such a minimal number of statistically significant items. The results appear to be consistent, inconclusive and basically non-supportive of the student governed and operated model that was investigated. However, when the statistical results, significant and non-significant, are integrated with an "historical perspective" of the Project, a more accurate evaluation of T-5 is presented than the statistical results alone indicated.

The historical accounts of the T-5 Project suggest that the individual and group awarenesses that developed in relation to the causes, solutions and preventions of black students and white students experiencing powerlessness was significant. The students were involved continually with
evaluating the power within the dormitory: who controlled it and how it was used. And, as a result of the evaluation, the students gained more power and they developed a greater concern and perception of the lack of power they had prior to the establishment of the Project. Also, the students in T-5 developed an increased sensitization to important community issues. For example, as a result of the activities in the Project, black students and white students reexamined the nature of their perceptions about, and relations with, each other. Another uniqueness of the T-5 Project was that the students not only defined their individual and organizational problems, but made a maximum effort to rely on the community’s strengths to resolve the issues. Due to the above situations, it is probable that a significant amount of individual and group learning resulted within the T-5 Project.

As Gaff (1970) suggested, innovative programs within colleges and universities must be evaluated on the results rather than their intentions. In this researcher’s opinion, the merits of T-5 and its need for continuance and support can be attested by examining closely the learning that took place in terms of the increased political, organization, social and individual awareness of the T-5 students.
Implications for Future Research

The limitations of this study could hopefully be avoided or controlled in future research.

First, as noted previously, many established experimental units attract students with characteristics which are significantly different from other students. Therefore, it becomes difficult to account for behavior and attitude changes as a result of "treatment". The sample used in this research resulted from a very confusing but unavoidable procedure. As a result of having minimal control over the number of students visiting Southwest Residential College and the placing of the freshmen in the residential units, the sample was small in number and could not be classified either as a totally random or as a self-selective group. In order to obtain the greatest validity from future research results, it is important that the subjects be classified as representing some criterion (random, self-selective, or selected).

Second, the combination of tests used in this research appeared to be inadequate for measuring the alienation levels of college freshmen in the context of this study, that is, residential units. The AI, though a sensitive and adequate instrument for measuring alienation, was not directly related to residential situations. However, it was thought by this researcher that the URES would fill the
void. In examining the AI and URES items and subscales the researcher anticipated a high correlation between the two instruments. This, however, was not found to be true. It would be of interest for future researchers to develop an alienation scale that would be directed specifically towards residential units. For example, one possible area to explore is to alter Turner's Alienation Index items to be more applicable to living situations, activities and relationships. In direct relation to the proper selection of instruments, questions arise as to the type of research performed in higher education and how the research methods and criteria for evaluation are established. In this research the use of direct questionnaires was found to be threatening and objectionable, and to create a sense of powerlessness among some students in the research. It would be appropriate for future researchers to examine less obtrusive techniques to replace or supplement direct and relevant questionnaires. Also, in future studies, the openness characterized by the researcher in terms of the research findings, purposes, values, risks, and use of the results is imperative. Finally, in order to avoid a threatening and impersonal atmosphere, the researcher must encourage students to participate in formulating the criteria to be evaluated, thereby creating a situation where students are more apt to follow the established criteria in their daily decisions and perform the evaluation themselves.
Third, in future testing of alienation in residence halls, it would be beneficial to examine members of each class within a dormitory. Freshman students usually have a difficult time adjusting to their new environment and with identifying and participating with dormitory governance. To gain a more accurate evaluation of the impact of totally student governed and operated residential units would probably require a study of all classes or a longitudinal study over a four-year period. Also, in measuring the impact of student governed and operated residential units on alienation and student perceptions, it would be of value to examine and compare the attitudes and behaviors of the students performing the governance and operations with those students whom they are representing.

In conclusion, as a result of the numerous uncontrollable variables present throughout the first year of T-5, it would be difficult for one to duplicate the study. And, as suggested, not advisable with the same instruments. However, it is this researcher’s opinion that the evaluation of the impact of alternative residential programs, by some appropriate and effective means, is critical and necessary in higher education. College personnel must go beyond judging activities and programs on faith. It was partially to serve the end of thorough and systematic evaluation that this study was undertaken.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

SUBSCALE DESCRIPTIONS AND
THE SCORING KEY OF THE ALIENATION INDEX

THE ALIENATION INDEX INVENTORY WITH
SOCIAL-ECONOMIC STATUS QUESTIONS
AI INVENTORY

Subscale Descriptions, Items and Scoring Key
(True = Alienation; False = Non-alienation)

1. General alienation core concept:

The attempt here is to assess the degree to which a person feels that the world is an unfriendly place and that he is separated from it. The five items attempt to get at feelings of hopelessness and normlessness, as well as feelings of estrangement from the society at large.

1. In spite of what some people say, things are getting worse for the average man. [True]

2. It is hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future. [True]

3. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. [True]

4. There is little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man. [True]

5. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on. [True]

2. Self alienation core:

It is difficult to separate negative self perception from the "alienation from self", but in the latter the issue is mainly the degree to which the individual perceives himself and his behavior as ego alien. There should be an indication of the individual's perception of a discrepancy between his ideal self and present self.

1. I have not lived the right kind of life. [True]

2. There is very little I really care about. [True]

3. I am usually bored no matter what I am doing. [True]

4. I don't seem to care what happens to me. [True]

5. I do things sometimes without knowing why. [True]
3. Alienation from family:

The attempt here is to determine the degree to which the individual perceives the family as making negative to neutral judgments about his behavior or about him as a person. One major issue is whether the individual considers himself an integral part of the family structure. A second major issue is whether the individual sees the family as having values which are his.

1. No one in my family seems to understand me.  [True]

2. Most of my relatives are on my side.  [False]

3. My parents often object to the people I go around with.  [True]

4. I don't have anything in common with my family.  [True]

5. I don't care about most members of my family.  [True]

4. Alienation from peers:

The major group involved is the age peer group. However, within the age group there are important distinctions. Although there is a general concept of peers, the following should be involved: girls, gang peers, non-gang peers. The issue is the degree of involvement and perception of common values.

1. I have nothing in common with most people my age.  [True]

2. My way of doing things is not understood by others my age.  [True]

3. It is safer to trust no one - not even so-called friends.  [True]

4. Most of my friends waste time talking about things that don't mean anything.  [True]

5. In my peer group most of the guys don't understand me.  [True]

5. Alienation from community:

The attempt here is to determine the extent to which the individual feels that formal community agencies represent his interests and values.
1. I feel that most of the people in my neighborhood think about the same way I do about most things. (False)

2. I have never felt that I belonged in my neighborhood. (True)

3. Adult neighborhood organizations don’t speak for me. (True)

4. I feel that there are many good things happening in my neighborhood to improve things. (False)

5. My neighborhood is full of people who care only about themselves. (True)

6. Alienation from legal agencies:

   The attempt here is to determine the extent to which the individual feels that legal institutions do not represent his interests and values.

   1. A person who commits a crime should be punished. (False)

   2. Laws are made for the good of a few people, not for the good of people like me. (True)

   3. It would be better if almost all laws were thrown away. (True)

   4. It is OK for a person to break the law if he doesn’t get caught. (True)

   5. In court I would have the same chance as a rich man. (False)

7. Alienation from school and education core:

   The major issue here is whether the individual sees education as having meaning and importance to him or to his future. It may be important to differentiate an attitude of alienation based on past experience and that based on expectations of relevance of education to later life.

   1. School does not teach a person anything that helps in life or helps to get a job. (True)

   2. School was a waste of time. (True)

   3. School is just a way of keeping young people out of the way. (True)
4. Most of the stuff I was told in school just did not make any sense. [True]

5. I liked school. [False]

8. Alienation from work core:

One major issue here is the extent to which working as such is something which the individual sees as positive. A second issue involves the individual's feeling that he will be appropriately rewarded. A third issue is the extent that working satisfies both primary and secondary needs.

1. Any man who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of making it. [False]

2. The kind of work I can get does not interest me. [True]

3. To me work is just a way to make money - not a way to get any satisfaction. [True]

4. I have often had to take orders on a job from someone who did not know as much as I did. [True]

5. Most foremen and bosses just want to use the worker to make bigger profits. [True]

9. Youth alienation core:

This is an adaptation of "general alienation" with the focus on youth in society. The scale alienation items are adapted to this change. There are two issues: attitudes towards society and attitudes towards self as a young person. [This scale can also be modified for blacks by changing the words "young people" to "black people".]

1. In spite of what some people say, things are getting worse for young people. [True]

2. It is hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for young people in the future. [True]

3. Nowadays young people have to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. [True]

4. There is little use in young people (my age) writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of young people. [True]
5. These days young people [my age] don't really know who they can count on. [True]
A I INVENTORY

Here are some statements that people have different feelings about. They have to do with many different things. Read each sentence and decide whether you:

STRONG AGREE (1), AGREE (2), DISAGREE (3), or STRONGLY DISAGREE (4).

For example: The main problem for young people is money. (Suppose that you "strongly agree" with that statement. Then you would darken #1.)

There are no right or wrong answers. Just indicate how you really feel. If you wish to change your answer, erase the one you selected and darken the answer you prefer.

1. In spite of what some people say, things are worse for the average man.
2. I have not lived the right kind of life.
3. No one in my family seems to understand me.
4. I have nothing in common with most people my age.
5. Most of the people in my community think about the same way I do about most things.
6. A person who commits a crime should be punished.
7. School does not teach a person anything that helps in life or helps to get a job.
8. Any person who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of making it.

9. These days young people don’t really know who they can count on.

10. It is hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

11. There is very little I really care about.

12. Most of my relatives are on my side.

13. My way of doing things is not understood by others my age.

14. I have never felt that I belonged in my community.

15. Laws are made for the good of a few people, not for the good of people like me.

16. School is a waste of time.

17. The kind of work I can get does not interest me.

18. There is little use in young people my age writing to public officials because often they aren’t really interested in the problems of young people.

19. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

20. I usually feel bored no matter what I am doing.

21. My parents often tell [told] me they don’t [didn’t] like the people I go [went] around with.

22. It is safer to trust no one - not even so-called friends.
23. Community organizations don't speak for me.  
24. It would be better if almost all laws were thrown away.  
25. School is just a way of keeping young people out of the way.  
26. To me work is just a way to make money - not a way to get any satisfaction.  
27. In spite of what some people say, things are getting worse for young people.  
28. There is little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.  
29. I don't seem to care what happens to me.  
30. I don't have anything in common with my family.  
31. Most of my friends waste time talking about things that don't mean anything.  
32. There are many good things happening in my community to improve things.  
33. It is OK for a person to break a law if he doesn't get caught.  
34. I have often had to take orders on a job from someone who did not know as much as I did.  
35. It is hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for young people in the future.  
36. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.  
37. I do things sometimes without knowing why.
38. I don't care about most members of my family.

39. In the group that I spend most of my time, most of the guys (or girls) don't understand me.

40. My community is full of people who care only about themselves.

41. In a court of law I would have the same chance as a rich man.

42. I like school.

43. Most foremen and bosses just want to use the worker to make bigger profits.

44. Nowadays young people have to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

45. Most of the stuff I am told in school just does not make any sense to me.

What is (was) your father's usual occupation

What is (was) your mother's usual occupation

What education level has your father completed

What education level has your mother completed

*If you have any questions about the use of this test please feel free to call Bill Laramee at your convenience; phone: 6-4566.
APPENDIX B

SUBSCALE DESCRIPTIONS AND SCORING OF THE UNIVERSITY RESIDENCE ENVIRONMENT SCALE

THE UNIVERSITY RESIDENCE ENVIRONMENT SCALE
UNIVERSITY RESIDENCES ENVIRONMENT SCALE (URES)

Subscales Descriptions, Items and Scoring Key of the URES

The following is a list of the scales which compose the URES and a short definition of each scale.

**Affiliation**: Degree of social interaction and feeling of friendship in the house.

Most of the people in this house know each other very well. [True]

People in the house often do something together on weekends. [True]

People around here don’t often go out of their way to be with one another. [False]

**Support**: Extent of manifest concern for others in the house; efforts to aid each other with academic and personal problems; general emotional support.

The people here are often critical of others in the house. [False]

People around here are not very considerate of the feelings of others. [False]

Trying to understand the feelings of others is considered important by most people in this house. [True]

People here are concerned with helping and supporting one another. [True]

It is sometimes difficult to approach the house staff with problems. [False]

People here try to make others feel secure. [True]

**Involvement**: Degree of commitment to the house, the people in it; may also be called spirit or commitment.

There is a feeling of unity and cohesion here. [True]

This is a rather apathetic house. [False]

Very few things around here arouse much excitement or interest. [False]
In this house there is a strong feeling of belongingness. [True]

Very few people here participate in house activities. [False]

Most people here have a strong sense of loyalty toward the house. [True]

Interpersonal Openness: The degree to which open, honest interpersonal communication occurs in the house.

People here tell others about their feelings of self-doubt. [True]

In this house people rarely show affection for one another. [False]

Around here people tend to hide their feelings from one another. [False]

Most people here tell one another their personal problems. [True]

Social Propriety: The degree to which formality and "proper" social conduct are a part of the house climate.

Behaving properly in social situations is not considered important here. [False]

Most people here know and use the commonly accepted rules of social conduct. [True]

Around here people are not interested in upholding social conventions. [False]

Behaving correctly in public is pretty unimportant in this house. [False]

People around here don’t worry much about how they dress. [False]

Traditional Social Orientation: Stress on dating, going to parties, and other "traditional" heterosexual interactions.

Nearly everyone here tries to have a date on weekends. [True]

Few people in this house go on dates. [False]

In this house dating is not important. [False]
Having exchanges and parties is a high priority activity in this house. [True]

In this house people would rather go on a date than do something with others in the residence. [True]

Some people here spend a lot of time preparing for dates. [True]

People here consider other types of social activities to be more important than dating. [False]

Dating is a recurring topic of conversation around here. [True]

Being popular with the opposite sex is not very important here. [False]

Order and Organization: Amount of formal structure or organization in the dorm; neatness, messiness.

House finances are handled in a pretty loose fashion. [False]

Around here the staff usually sets an example of neatness and orderliness. [True]

The house officers function in a somewhat haphazard manner. [False]

The jobs of house officers are not clearly defined. [False]

Meetings and activities follow a pretty regular schedule in the house. [True]

House officers are regularly elected in the house. [True]

This is a pretty disorderly house. [False]

There is a great deal of confusion during dorm meetings. [False]

House procedures here are well established. [True]

House activities are pretty carefully planned here. [True]

Spontaneity: Impulsive and spur of the moment activities; parties, etc. Unplanned activities.

Around here there is a minimum of planning and a maximum of action. [True].
There are a lot of spontaneous social activities here.  
(False)

Things rarely "just happen" around here.  (False)

There is a methodical quality about this house.  (False)

**Variety and Novelty:** Trying out of new activities; ideas, ways of dress, or organization, etc.; number and variety of new activities and ideas; partly creativity.

New approaches to things are often tried here.  (True)

Innovation is not considered important here.  (False)

The people here seem to be doing routine things most of the time.  (False)

There is a sense of predictability about this house.  (False)

Constantly developing new ways of approaching life is important here.  (True)

In this house people often do unusual things.  (True)

Doing things in a different way is valued around here.  (True)

**Independence:** Independence of thoughts and actions by individuals; acting in diverse ways without social sanction.

Around here people try to act in ways that will gain the approval of others in the house.  (False)

People in the house tend to fit in with the way other people do things here.  (False)

People here tend to check on whether their behavior is acceptable to others in the house.  (False)

People here pretty much act and think freely without too much regard for social opinion.  (True)

People here tend to rely on themselves when a problem comes up.  (True)

**Competition:** Competing with one another for grades, dates, status of any sort. The casting of many activities into a competitive framework.

In this house people don’t try to be more "cool" than others.  (False)
People here try to appear more intellectual than others in the house. [True]

People don’t try to impress each other here. [False]

People who have lots of dates, tend to let others in the house know. [True]

Intellectual one-up-manship is frowned upon here. [False]

Around here discussions frequently turn into verbal duels. [True]

People here always seem to be competing for the highest grades. [True]

In this house people tend not to compete with each other. [False]

People around here are always trying to win an argument. [True]

**Academic Achievement**: Extent to which strictly classroom achievement and concern are prominent in the house. [This is differentiated from intellectuality.]

People around here tend to study long hours at a stretch. [True]

People around here hardly ever seem to be studying. [False]

Most people plan activities other than studying for weekends. [False]

Around here studies are secondary to most other activities. [False]

People here work hard to get top grades. [True]

In the evening many people here begin to study right after dinner. [True]

Most people here consider studies as very important to college. [True]

Around here people who are "academic grinds" are looked on with amusement. [False]

Around here people don’t let studies interfere with the rest of their life. [False]
**Intellectuality**: Extent to which scholarly, intellectual and cultural activities and interests are manifest in the house (to be distinguished from strictly academic emphasis on grades, studying, etc.).

The people in this house generally read a good deal of intellectual material other than class assignments. [True]

People around here talk a lot about political and social issues. [True]

Around here people tend not to value ideas for their own sake. [False]

There is a good deal of concern about intellectual awareness in this house. [True]

The people here are generally pretty interested in cultural activities. [True]

People here very rarely discuss intellectual matters. [False]

Discussions around here are generally quite intellectual. [True]

The people in this house do not have a great deal of intellectual curiosity. [False]

There is not much appreciation here for classical music, art, literature, etc. [False]

**Student Influence**: Extent to which the students (not staff or administration) control the running of the dorm, rule formulation and enforcement, control of money, staff, food, rooming policies, etc.

The staff here decide whether and when the residents can have visitors of the opposite sex in their rooms. [False]

Rules about social conduct are sometimes enforced by the staff. [False]

Around here the staff decide who gets the single rooms. [False]

Students enforce house rules here. [True]

The staff here have the last say about student discipline. [False]
The students formulate almost all the rules here. (True)

The students here determine who their roommates will be. (True)

The students here determine the times when meals will be served. (True)

The students do not take part in staff selection. (False)

House finances are handled exclusively by students here. (True)
University Residence Environment Scale

(Form R2)

This questionnaire asks you how you see the psychological "atmosphere" of your dormitory. Different university houses seem to have unique climates, and this questionnaire is an attempt to systematically understand how university students see their living units. We think that by comparing the views of students in various houses at different campuses, the creation of more satisfactory buildings and house programs will be facilitated.

INSTRUCTIONS

On the following pages there are a number of statements about university residence. Please answer every statement, do not leave any blank. Please use a pencil for your responses and erase completely any changed responses. Please decide for each item whether the statement is mostly True or mostly False for your house.

Some of the statements make the distinction between "staff" and "student". For these items, "staff" are faculty, administration personnel, graduate or undergraduate assistants living in the house. It would be appreciated if both staff and students complete this questionnaire.

Use the second attached answer sheet to record your responses by marking 1 for True and 2 for False for each statement you feel is True or False. Make sure the question number is the same as the answer number for each statement as you respond to it.

PLEASE DO NOT MARK ON THIS BOOKLET

Copyright, 1969, 1971, Marvin S. Gerst and Rudolf H. Moos
1. Most of the people in this house know each other very well.
2. People here are concerned with helping and supporting one another.
3. Behaving properly in social situations is not considered important here.
4. Most people here know and use the commonly accepted rules of social conduct.
5. The staff here decide whether and when the residents can have visitors of the opposite sex in their rooms.
6. The people here are often critical of others in the house.
7. Around here people try to act in ways that will gain the approval of others in the house.
8. Nearly everyone here tries to have a date on weekends.
9. Rules about social conduct are sometimes enforced by the staff.
10. The people in this house generally read a good deal about intellectual material other than class assignments.
11. People around here are not very considerate of the feelings of others.
12. People in the house tend to fit in with the way other people do things here.
13. People around here tend to study long hours at a stretch.
14. In this house people don’t try to be more cool than others.
15. New approaches to things are often tried here.
16. Around here the staff decide who gets the single rooms.
17. People around here talk a lot about political and social issues.
18. People here tell others about their feelings of self-doubt.
19. House finances are handled in a pretty loose fashion.
21. Innovation is not considered important here.
22. Around here people tend not to value ideas for their own sake.

23. In this house people rarely show affection for one another.

24. There is a good deal of concern about intellectual awareness in this house.

25. Around here the staff usually sets an example of neatness and orderliness.

26. People here try to appear more intellectual than others in the house.

27. People don’t try to impress each other here.

28. People around here hardly ever seem to be studying.

29. The people here seem to be doing routine things most of the time.

30. The house officers function in a somewhat haphazard manner.

31. There is a feeling of unity and cohesion here.

32. This is a rather apathetic house.

33. Around here there is a minimum of planning and a maximum of activities.

34. The people here are generally pretty interested in cultural activities.

35. People around here tend to hide their feelings.

36. People in the house often do something together on weekends.

37. The jobs of house officers are not clearly defined.

38. In this house dating is not important.

39. Having exchanges and parties is a high priority activity in this house.

40. People who have lots of dates tend to let others in the house know.

41. Meetings and activities follow a pretty regular schedule in the house.
42. Trying to understand the feelings of others is considered important by most people in this house.

43. In this house people would rather go on a date than do something with others in the residence.

44. Intellectual one-up-manship is frowned upon here.

45. The staff here have the last say about student discipline.

46. Very few things around here arouse much excitement or interest.

47. Few people in this house go on dates.

48. People here tend to check on whether their behavior is acceptable to others in the house.

49. There are a lot of spontaneous social activities here.

50. Most people here tell one another their personal problems.

51. There is a sense of predictability about this house.

52. Most people plan activities other than studying for weekends.

53. Some people here spend a lot of time preparing for dates.

54. People here pretty much act and think freely without too much regard for social opinion.

55. Around here discussions frequently turn into verbal duels.

56. The students formulate almost all the rules here.

57. Around here people are not interested in upholding social conventions.

58. Around here studies are secondary to most activities.

59. People here always seem to be competing for the highest grades.

60. House officers are regularly elected in the house.

61. Behaving correctly in public is pretty unimportant in this house.

62. People here consider other types of social activities to be more important than dating.
63. In this house there is a strong feeling of belongingness.
64. The students here determine who their roommates will be.
65. People here work hard to get top grades.
66. People here very rarely discuss intellectual matters.
67. The students here determine the times when meals will be served.
68. This is a pretty disorderly house.
69. Dating is a recurring topic of conversation around here.
70. Very few people here participate in house activities.
71. The students do not take part in staff selection.
72. Constantly developing new ways of approaching life is important here.
73. In the evening many people here begin to study right after dinner.
74. There is a great deal of confusion during dorm meetings.
75. House finances are handled exclusively by students here.
76. People around here don't worry much about how they dress.
77. Discussions around here are generally quite intellectual.
78. House procedures here are well established.
79. It is sometimes difficult to approach the house staff with problems.
80. Most people here have a strong sense of loyalty toward the house.
81. Being popular with the opposite sex is not very important here.
82. The people in this house do not have a great deal of intellectual curiosity.
83. In this house people tend not to compete with each other.
84. In this house people often do unusual things.
85. Things rarely "just happen" around here.
86. People around here are always trying to win an argument.
87. People here tend to rely on themselves when a problem comes up.
88. Most people here consider studies as very important in college.
89. People here try to make others feel secure.
90. Around here people who are "academic grinds" are looked on with amusement.
91. People around here don’t often go out of their way to be with one another.
92. There is not much appreciation here for classical music, art, literature, etc.
93. Doing things in a different way is valued around here.
94. There is a methodical quality about this house.
95. House activities are pretty carefully planned here.
96. Around here people don’t let studies interfere with the rest of their lives.
APPENDIX C

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR THE ALIENATION INDEX
Table 12
Means and Standard Deviations
for the Alienation Index
(all non-significant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>T-5 Project Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>JFK Middle Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>JFK Lower Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srole 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srole 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srole 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srole 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srole 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self t</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer t</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commun t</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School t</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTSrole 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTSrole 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTSrole 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTSrole 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTSrole 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTSrole t</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienat</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
APPENDIX D

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE UNIVERSITY RESIDENCE ENVIRONMENT SCALE
Table 13
Means and Standard Deviations for the University Residence Environment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>T-5 Project</th>
<th>JFK Middle</th>
<th>JFK Lower</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable No.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable No.</th>
<th>T-5 Project Mean</th>
<th>T-5 Project S. D.</th>
<th>JFK Middle Mean</th>
<th>JFK Middle S. D.</th>
<th>JFK Lower Mean</th>
<th>JFK Lower S. D.</th>
<th>All Mean</th>
<th>All S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*041</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable No.</th>
<th>T-5 Project Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>JFK Middle Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>JFK Lower Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>All Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*053          | .804             | .399 | .514            | .507 | .536           | .508 | .690     | .464 |
| 054          | .337             | .475 | .314            | .471 | .286           | .460 | .323     | .469 |
| 055          | .337             | .475 | .429            | .502 | .357           | .488 | .361     | .482 |
*056          | .184             | .390 | .343            | .482 | .429           | .504 | .265     | .443 |
| 057          | .707             | .458 | .771            | .426 | .714           | .460 | .723     | .449 |
| 058          | .696             | .463 | .629            | .490 | .643           | .488 | .671     | .471 |
| 059          | .837             | .371 | .829            | .382 | .993           | .315 | .845     | .363 |
*060          | .228             | .422 | .571            | .502 | .179           | .390 | .297     | .458 |
| 061          | .576             | .497 | .600            | .497 | .500           | .509 | .568     | .497 |
| 062          | .663             | .475 | .571            | .502 | .464           | .508 | .606     | .490 |
| 063          | .620             | .488 | .743            | .443 | .714           | .460 | .665     | .474 |
| 064          | .250             | .435 | .257            | .443 | .357           | .488 | .271     | .446 |
| 065          | .739             | .442 | .371            | .502 | .750           | .441 | .703     | .458 |
| 066          | .587             | .495 | .600            | .497 | .607           | .497 | .594     | .493 |
| 067          | .783             | .415 | .743            | .443 | .786           | .418 | .774     | .419 |
| 068          | .554             | .500 | .714            | .458 | .571           | .504 | .594     | .493 |
*069          | .674             | .471 | .371            | .490 | .500           | .509 | .574     | .496 |

*p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable No.</th>
<th>T-5 Project</th>
<th>JFK Middle</th>
<th>JFK Lower</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
APPENDIX E

PLANNING YEAR HISTORY OF THE T-5 PROJECT
Planning Year History of the T-5 Project by William Laramee and James Scharfenberger

Planning Year: 1970-1971. As mentioned previously, the original concerns of the T-5 Project were for having a dormitory that would be relevant to students' needs and desires (curriculum alternatives, dormitory policies and programs, environmental changes), conducive to creating a sense of community and open to continual innovation and evaluation. As a result of these concerns, the following design for a residential unit was developed: the unit would be small; student governed and student operated; humanistic in way of interpersonal relationships; and developmental in terms of educational philosophy and programs.

The first T-5 Project proposal was formulated by student and staff members of John Adams Middle and by the Resident Director of John Adams Lower House. The plan called for ways to meet the mandates expressed above. One of the most crucial points made on the proposal was the suggestion for an all-tower, student governed and operated, system.

The initial plan called for the elimination of the present three house system and the three Residence Director positions. In place of the traditional hierarchial system, there was to be a tower Assembly. The Assembly would be comprised of one elected representative from each floor (eighteen). It would also control the budget (totaling over $17,000, including salaries), legislate all programs
and policies (as directed by their constituents), have the power of appointment and removal, and be the legitimate voice and representative with the entire University.

"...Thus went the plan. The strategy was more difficult. Grassroot politics is a difficult and easily strained business. Gathering three Houses together would be akin to attempting to consolidate the three New England states..." (Scharfenberger, 1970, p. 4).

Thus far the students involved were all from John Adams Middle House. The first major obstacle occurred when students approached the other Houses (John Adams Lower and Upper Houses) to break the inertia of tradition. Both Lower and Upper House questioned the Project for various reasons. However, the primary reason centered around the mistrust and contempt for "outsiders" attempting to push a completed project into their respective Houses. "Middle House attempted to change a traditional system by operating in a traditional manner. They had accepted the leadership of the Project without forseeing the necessary total involvement of the other Houses during the conceptualization of the proposal. The other Houses were followers without any apparent opportunity for leadership." (Scharfenberger, 1970, p. 6). In an attempt to effectively and appropriately reach Lower and Upper Houses, different approaches and improved communication networks were examined during the first semester.
The second semester began with people more willing to negotiate and compromise. The Resident Directors of Lower and Middle Houses held a joint Organizational Development Lab (O.O.) for the staffs of their respective Houses. The students of Upper House preferred not to participate, despite the fact that they had shown a previous interest in the Project. The T-5 proponents would regret taking Upper House for granted, as will be evident later.

The O.O. Lab generated much positive and negative response. An attempt was made to examine common problems without mention of solutions. The students then broke into groups to expand on the problems and to suggest methods of operation for dealing with them. Following two months of numerous meetings the necessary documents were formulated.

In March, 1971, a Tower vote was taken on the incorporation of the T-5 Project and its constitution, and was passed. However, two weeks after the original vote, the twenty-first floor (Upper House) petitioned for a new vote claiming that the election procedure was "tantamount to coercion". The residents of Upper House expressed concerns over losing their identity, were opposed to the counseling program proposed for the T-5 Project because of "touchy feely" orientation, and decided that they were against any form of government. Following a hearing and re-vote, Upper House voted themselves out of the Project.

It was decided that Lower House and Middle House would
attempt the pilot program as planned. Two students from each floor were chosen from each floor, one to perform counseling and community development functions and the other to serve on the Assembly. Also, a Project Director was selected [this researcher] to assist the students during the first year of operation.
APPENDIX F

BLACK STUDENT DEMANDS

RACE RELATIONS LAB: OUTLINE
BLACK DEMANDS

As a result of racial incidences in this dorm, the black students of T-5 are making the following "demands" on the T-5 Assembly:

1. Three black students be placed on the T-5 Assembly as at-large representatives.

2. Three black students be placed on the security staff of the dorm within one month.

3. Black students be given an equipped office for counseling and meeting purposes.

4. White students on the Assembly and within the dorm begin to deal with their racist attitudes and behaviors.

5. Black representatives be placed on all committees operating within the dorm.

6. Black students be given proper notification of events within the dorm and of the Assembly meetings.

7. Black students be designated a floor within the dorm to be occupied by black students by January 1, 1972.

8. Black students be represented on all panels established for the purpose of interviewing people for positions within the dorm.
Date of Lab:

Time:

Place:

Trainers:

Trainees:

Goals of Workshop

Awareness: Summary

1. To become more aware of one's own feelings/attitudes relative to the problem of racism.

2. To become more aware of the origin of one's feelings/attitudes relative to racism.

3. To become more aware of the feelings/attitudes of others in relation to the problem of racism.

4. To become more aware of the effect of one's attitudes or one's behavior relative to racism.

Expanded Description:

In this segment of the lab/workshop, the focus shall be that of attempting to increase the general knowledge of the trainees relative to the dynamics of racism. Essentially, through the use of a questionnaire format or movie and small group discussion, an attempt will be made to equip the trainees with a more comprehensive understanding of racism and how it functions in a university community. This
increased understanding, it is hoped, will lead to increased competency in dealing with the problem.

The above content will then be directed to the dormitory context. Specifically, the trainees will be processing their own attitude and values as they relate to the issue of racism and their roles in the dormitory. Through this process it is hoped that the trainees will be able to establish how they can work most effectively and consistently to deal with the problem of racism as seen by them on their given floor. The vehicle for starting this process shall be a written description of a dormitory situation (value clarification exercise) which will be processed by the trainees.

Action: Summary

1. To develop one's confidence in acting upon the problem of racism.

2. To expand one's ability to individually act creatively to counteract racism.

Expanded Description:

In this segment of the workshop, the trainers will assist the trainees in developing specific action strategies relative to the problem of racism to be implemented on the various floors in the dormitory. Along with this, a follow-up and support mechanism will be developed to assess the
effectiveness of these strategies. Force field analysis (diagnostic methodology) will be used in this segment of the lab.

Assumptions

The primary assumption of the workshop is that there is not one answer to solving the problem of racism in the university dormitory context. Instead, there are several alternative strategies which might be effectively applied to the problem. As such, the trainers will serve as resources to assist the participants in exploring perceptions and alternative strategies for dealing with racism. Another assumption is that the trainees themselves possess some important knowledge of the problem of racism to the workshop. Thus, the workshop will function on the combined input of all the workshop participants.

Group Size: Twenty to forty participants.

Materials Utilized:

I. Film: "Confrontation: Dialogue in Black and White"

II. Large Newsprint

III. Reaction Sheets

IV. Operationalization Sheets

V. Magic Markers

Physical Setting:

An informal atmosphere with large enough floor area for large group to break up into sub-groups.
Activities:

I. Film showing

II. Finding Group Exercise

III. Value Story

IV. Operationalization of racist and non-racist dormitory (Force field analysis)

V. Action and Strategy Development
REACTION SHEET

1. What part[s] of the film had the most impact on me?
   What does that say about me?

2. From watching the film, I became aware of [or learned] . . . . . . .

3. Four different feelings I had during the film were . . .
   A.
   B.
   C.
   D.
   Which feeling was the most significant? Expand on this feeling in 1 - 2 sentences - what evoked this feeling?
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