

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 112

HE 003 271

AUTHOR Chase, Clinton I.; Wolosin, Myrna A.
TITLE Contrasting Attitudes of Dormitory and Apartment Residents.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 33p.; Indiana Studies in Prediction No.18
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Housing; *College Students; Dormitories; *Higher Education; Housing; Housing Needs; *Housing Patterns; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to discover the attitudes that distinguish apartment-dwelling students from dormitory residents at Indiana University. The study appears to support the following conclusions. Apartment dwellers see independence as a major factor in their choice of residence. They also believe that apartments are more convenient than dormitories and less expensive. Further, apartment occupants appeared not to have adapted to dormitory residence as a "home." On the other hand, dormitory dwellers are less concerned about independence, are less pressed by the restrictions imposed by dormitory regulations, do not see apartments as convenient, and have adapted to dormitories on a "home" basis. While the press for independence appeared more conspicuously in apartment occupants, detachment more often characterized dormitory residents. It therefore may be useful for the University (a) to consider on-campus housing arrangements that could accommodate students' emerging independence, and (b) to ferret out the detached student and enlist his greater involvement in the University scene. (Author/HS)

ED 066112

AUG 02 1972

INDIANA UNIVERSITY / 1972

*Contrasting Attitudes of Dormitory
and Apartment Residents*

INDIANA STUDIES IN PREDICTION

NUMBER EIGHTEEN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing

HE 003 201

Indiana Studies in Prediction No. 18

CONTRASTING ATTITUDES OF DORMITORY
AND APARTMENT RESIDENTS

by

Clinton I. Chase
Myrna A. Wolosin

Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Problem	1
Procedure	1
Results	2
Factor Analytic Data	20
Summary	29

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Survey Items and Responses (in percents) of the Dormitory (D) and Apartment (A) Residents	3-9
2. Items That Make Up Factor I	21
3. Items That Make Up Factor II	22
4. Items That Make Up Factor III	23
5. Items That Make Up Factor IV	24
6. Items That Make Up Factor V	25

CONTRASTING ATTITUDES OF DORMITORY
AND APARTMENT RESIDENTS

The Problem

With the relaxing of University regulations regarding student housing many students have left the campus to take up residence in their own apartments. While apartment residence clearly appeals to a significant subset of the student population, it clearly does not appeal to all. What are some of the opinions, attitudes, etc., that distinguish apartment-dwelling students from dormitory residents? Do students living off campus feel more isolated from activities? Do they feel remote from University facilities? Are there clear differences in the way dormitory residents and off-campus residents see the non-academic side of the University? This study was undertaken to see how the attitudes of these groups differed in regard to conditions typically associated with one's residence.

Procedure

Initially the job was one of building an instrument for assessing attitudes. A list of circumstances involving residence was made; then, Likert-type statements were

built around these circumstances. This instrument was mailed to a random selection of students listed in the Red Book (the campus student directory) in the spring of 1971. A sixty-eight percent return was received. There were 124 dormitory dwellers and 40 apartment residents.

The responses of the two groups of students were initially analyzed without regard to age or sex. However, at that point it was noted that dormitory dwellers were significantly younger than apartment residents. Differences between the two groups could be maturational differences alone. Therefore, the data were reanalyzed using only information on 20-year-old and older respondents. In this group there were 63 who lived in dormitories, 38 who lived in apartments.

Results

The results of the analysis based on older students only are reported in Table 1. Here each student is followed by five categories of agreement: strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, strongly agree. The percent of dormitory dwellers who chose each of these categories is given first, followed by the percent of apartment dwellers.

Chi square was used to test the differences in patterns of responses provided by the two groups. (The calculations were made on actual frequencies of choices,

Table 1. Survey Items and Responses (in percents) of the Dormitory (D) and Apartment (A) Residents (SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, U=Undecided, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree, χ^2 =Chi Square value)

	SA	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
1. My closest friends are those with whom I share my living quarters.	D	22.6	43.5	6.5	14.5	12.9
	A	39.5	15.8	5.3	28.9	10.5
	Total	29.0	33.0	6.0	20.0	12.0
2. I think of my residence as a home away from home.	D	22.2	46.0	12.7	11.1	7.9
	A	44.7	39.5	2.6	5.3	7.9
	Total	30.7	43.6	8.9	8.9	7.9
3. My roommates encourage good study habits.	D	6.9	27.6	25.9	22.4	15.2
	A	18.4	34.2	18.4	13.2	15.8
	Total	11.5	30.2	22.9	18.7	16.7
4. If I lived elsewhere I would spend more time on my school work.	D	11.1	15.9	17.5	34.9	20.6
	A	2.6	13.2	26.3	18.4	39.5
	Total	7.9	14.9	20.8	28.7	27.7
5. Living where I do there are good opportunities for being involved in University activities.	D	6.3	54.0	20.6	15.9	3.2
	A	2.6	28.9	13.2	34.2	21.1
	Total	5.0	44.6	17.8	22.8	9.9

Table 1, continued

6. My living arrangements allow me to feel quite independent.		SA	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
	D	23.8	50.8	7.9	7.9	7.9	
	A	60.5	23.7	7.9	5.3	2.6	
	Total	37.6	40.6	7.9	6.9	6.9	14.65
7. It is easy for me to reach any other place or building on campus.		SA	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
	D	14.3	49.2	7.9	19.0	9.5	
	A	15.8	44.7	7.9	21.1	10.5	
	Total	14.9	47.5	7.9	19.8	9.9	0.21
8. I would like to live here at least for another semester.		SA	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
	D	17.5	27.0	17.5	15.9	22.2	
	A	15.8	23.7	23.7	23.7	13.2	
	Total	16.8	25.7	19.8	18.8	18.8	2.41
9. Living with other people hampers my personal style.		SA	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
	D	7.9	9.5	19.0	44.4	19.0	
	A	7.9	15.8	13.2	36.8	26.2	
	Total	7.9	11.3	16.8	41.6	21.8	2.18
10. I often participate in campus activities.		SA	A	U	D	SD	χ^2
	D	4.8	23.8	12.7	44.4	14.3	
	A	2.6	10.5	13.2	39.5	34.2	
	Total	4.0	18.8	12.9	42.6	21.8	6.96

TABLE 2. CONTINUED

11. When problems come up I talk with my roommate about them.	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²	
	D	41.7	13.3	16.7	21.7		
	A	28.9	10.5	15.8	10.5		
	Total	15.3	38.8	12.2	16.3		17.3
12. There are too many restrictions on people who live in University housing.	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²	
	D	30.2	9.5	7.9	31.7		19.0
	A	18.4	28.9	28.9	15.8		7.9
	Total	25.7	16.8	15.8	25.7		14.9
13. Apartments are more convenient places to live than dorms or frat houses.	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²	
	D	14.3	17.5	28.6	30.2		7.9
	A	36.8	36.8	13.2	13.2		0.0
	Total	22.8	24.8	22.8	23.8		5.0
14. It is easy to get to know people in residence halls.	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²	
	D	15.9	60.3	6.3	12.7		4.8
	A	15.8	50.0	18.4	13.2		2.6
	Total	15.8	56.4	10.9	12.9		4.0
15. Dorms are fine for the first year or two in college.	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²	
	D	19.0	57.1	11.1	7.9		4.8
	A	28.9	50.0	10.5	10.5		0.0
	Total	22.8	54.5	10.9	8.9		3.0

Table 1, continued

16. My type of living arrangement is less expensive than another type would be.		SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
	D	6.3	23.8	15.9	27.0	27.0	
	A	36.8	34.2	7.9	15.8	5.3	
Total	17.8	27.7	12.9	22.8	18.8	21.71	
17. Caring for an apartment takes too much time.		SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
	D	11.1	20.6	25.4	30.2	12.7	
	A	0.0	8.1	13.5	59.5	18.9	
Total	7.0	16.0	21.0	41.0	15.0	13.45	
18. It is not easy to feel at home in a dorm.		SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
	D	14.3	22.2	11.1	44.4	7.9	
	A	13.2	44.7	21.1	18.4	2.6	
Total	13.9	30.7	14.9	34.7	5.9	11.27	
19. The university provides sufficient facilities for recreation.		SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
	D	11.1	42.9	19.0	23.8	3.2	
	A	23.7	39.5	7.9	15.8	13.2	
Total	15.8	41.6	14.9	20.8	6.9	8.56	
20. I am pleased with the open visitation policy.		SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
	D	22.2	38.1	11.1	3.2	25.4	
	A	27.0	29.7	24.3	10.8	8.1	
Total	24.0	35.0	16.0	6.0	19.0	9.17	

21. I would prefer living here if I could take my meals elsewhere.

	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
D	19.4	14.5	22.6	33.9	9.7	
A	2.7	8.1	18.9	40.5	29.7	
Total	13.1	12.1	21.2	36.4	17.2	11.53

22. Often I take courses on my roommates recommendation.

	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
D	1.7	13.3	18.3	45.0	21.7	
A	2.6	15.8	18.4	50.0	13.2	
Total	2.0	14.3	18.4	49.9	18.4	1.25

23. I feel isolated from the University.

	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
D	4.8	14.3	17.5	49.2	14.3	
A	5.3	23.7	18.4	42.1	10.5	
Total	5.0	17.8	17.8	46.5	12.9	1.72

24. I would rather study in the library than in my own room.

	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
D	9.5	50.8	7.9	20.6	11.1	
A	10.5	47.4	13.2	23.7	5.3	
Total	9.9	49.5	9.9	21.8	8.9	1.74

25. People I live with often keep me informed about what is happening on campus.

	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
D	11.3	22.6	46.8	16.1	3.2	
A	13.5	21.6	35.1	18.9	10.8	
Total	12.1	22.2	42.4	17.2	6.1	3.15

Table 1, continued

26. When you live in a fraternity or sorority you do not have a chance to meet many different types of people.	D	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²		
		A	19.0	9.5	54.0	12.7			
	Total	SA	A	U	D	SD	5.95		
		A	10.1	0.0	52.6	21.8			
	27. I spend so much time on classwork that I don't have much of a chance to socialize.	D	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²	
			A	25.4	28.6	6.3	34.9		
		Total	SA	A	U	D	SD	5.11	
			A	0.0	27.0	37.8	13.5		
		28. The University is quite flexible about dormitory and other on-campus housing regulations.	D	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
				A	32.3	22.6	24.2	14.5	
Total			SA	A	U	D	SD	2.49	
			A	13.2	26.3	26.3	7.9		
29. People where I live have a certain esprit de corps.			D	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
				A	51.6	27.7	21.0	4.8	
	Total		SA	A	U	D	SD	6.42	
			A	15.8	15.8	18.4	13.2		
	30. My activities at I.U. are not as varied as I would like.		D	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
				A	51.6	17.7	21.0	4.8	
		Total	SA	A	U	D	SD	6.42	
			A	15.8	15.8	18.4	13.2		

Table 1, continued

	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
31. It would be pleasant to have a wider circle of friends.	D	14.3	17.5	12.7	3.2	
	A	52.4	11.1	13.9	11.1	
	Total	52.5	15.2	13.1	6.1	3.19
		13.1				
	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
32. Students who live in apartments are exploited by landlords.	D	22.2	44.4	11.1	7.9	
	A	39.5	15.8	18.4	2.6	
	Total	28.7	33.7	13.9	5.9	11.45
	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
33. It would be nice to have smaller University housing units.	D	25.8	30.6	11.3	6.5	
	A	21.1	39.5	5.3	2.6	
	Total	24.0	34.0	9.0	5.0	2.68
	SA	A	U	D	SD	X ²
34. There is not enough of a range in housing cost.	D	31.7	22.2	11.1	1.6	
	A	31.6	13.2	21.1	0.0	
	Total	31.7	18.8	14.9	1.0	3.22

10

not on percentages.) On eleven of the 34 statements clear differences in the pattern of endorsement (significant beyond the .05 level) existed between the housing groups. In three more statements differences were likely to have existed (significant $.05 < p < .10$). Items in which clear differences occurred were 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 32 with possible differences in items 4, 19, and 20. Each of these items deserves separate comment.

The first item analyzed was number 1,

"My closest friends are those with whom I share my living quarters."

Although a sizeable group of both dormitory and apartment residents tended to agree with this statement, the distribution of responses for apartment people was more strikingly bimodal. Almost four out of ten strongly agreed with the statement, but nearly three out of ten disagreed. It appears that dormitory dwellers tend to choose close friends for roommates, while some apartment residents do but others do not.

The next significant item was number five,

"Living where I do there are good opportunities for being involved in University activities."

Over half of the apartment dwellers responded in the disagree or strongly disagree categories whereas more

than half of the dormitory dwellers agreed with the statement. This item becomes significant in that dormitory dwellers appear to feel they can easily become involved in University activities, whereas apartment dwellers felt it was more difficult for them to become involved. It is also interesting, however, to notice that more than fifteen percent of dormitory dwellers also disagreed with the item, indicating that a significant number of students who lived on campus did not feel that it was easy to become involved in campus activities.

Item 6 was the next item in which significant differences were found between dormitory dwellers and apartment residents. This item says,

"My living arrangements allow me to feel quite independent."

Both living groups tended to agree with this item. However, 60 percent of the apartment residents strongly agreed, while only 24 percent of the dormitory dwellers felt this way. However only half of the dormitory people did agree with the statement. It appears that both groups felt reasonably independent, but apartment residents felt this more certainly than did dormitory students. It is also significant to notice that 17 percent of the dormitory people fell into disagreement categories. Although most dormitory residents felt independent, a significant subset of them did not.

12

Item 11 was the next to be analyzed. It states,

"When problems come up I talk with my roommate about them."

Both residence groups tended to agree with this statement, but a somewhat larger proportion of apartment people than dormitory dwellers strongly agreed. Also one out of five dormitory occupants strongly disagreed with the item. The greater tendency for apartment residents to agree with the item may be due to their not having other regular student contacts from which confidential friends may be selected.

The next item of significance was item number 12 which says,

"There are too many restrictions on people who live in University housing."

Students who lived in dormitories tended to divide into two camps on this item, whereas students who lived in apartments tended to agree with, or be undecided about, this statement. Almost a third of the dormitory residents strongly agreed with this statement, while another third disagreed and another fifth of them strongly disagreed. Clearly some disagreement exists among dormitory dwellers as to how many restrictions people must endure in University housing. Much more commonality of opinion appears to exist among apartment residents on this question.

Item 13 also showed significant differences between apartment and dormitory residents. This item states,

"Apartments are more convenient places to live than dormitories or fraternity houses."

Dormitory residents tended to disagree with or be undecided about this item. Four out of ten dormitory residents fell in the disagreement categories, while 73 percent of the apartment occupants fell into agreement categories. Although apartment residents were clearly more enthusiastic about the conveniences of apartments than were dormitory residents, it is interesting to note that 13 percent of the apartment people did not see real convenience in apartment living.

The next significant item was item number 16. This item says,

"My type of living arrangement is less expensive than another type would be."

Dormitory residents tended to disagree with this statement while apartment occupants tended to agree. Over half of the dorm dwellers fell into the disagreement categories while only a fourth of them chose an agreement category. It appears that although dormitory students largely believe they do not have the least expensive living arrangements, a fair minority of them do believe that their residence is the least expensive. Similarly,

14

although 70 percent of the apartment occupants believed they had the lowest cost residence, 15 percent disagreed that this was true. Nevertheless, it appears that the bulk of the students would agree that apartments are less expensive than living in dormitories.

Item 17 says,

"Caring for an apartment takes too much time."

Dormitory dwellers appear to be uncertain about this. A fair number of their responses fell into each response category. However, four out of five apartment residents responded in the disagreeing categories. These responses are reasonable in that dormitory occupants, not having the experience of apartment living, have not clearly made up their minds; while apartment dwellers have tried it and found it manageable.

The next item that produced a significantly different pattern of responses between the two groups was number 18:

"It is not easy to feel at home in the dorm."

Dormitory residents tended to disagree, although 22 percent agreed, while apartment occupants tended to agree, although 18 percent disagreed. The attitudes about how "homey" dormitories are appear to be about opposite between the two groups of students being compared.

Item 21 says:

"I would prefer living here if I could take my meals elsewhere."

Dormitory dwellers spread their responses across all categories, while apartment occupants tended to concentrate theirs in the disagreement positions. There appears to be a range of feeling about dormitory meals, but apartment people seem to find meals satisfactory.

The last item which produced a significant difference between dormitory and apartment residents was item 32 which states,

"Students who live in apartments are exploited by landlords."

Students who lived in dormitories tended to be undecided about this statement, although a conspicuous 22 percent strongly agreed with it. However, students who lived in apartments tended to agree with the statement with 60 percent of them falling into the agreement categories. Nevertheless, 18 percent of the apartment dwellers reported that they disagreed with the statement that students are exploited by landlords.

This completes the number of items in which there were clear differences between dormitory dwellers and apartment residents. The next three items produced probable differences, although the response patterns do not diverge between the two groups as markedly as was

16

true of the previous 11 items. The first item in this group was item number four:

"If I lived elsewhere I would spend more time on my schoolwork."

Both residence groups tended to disagree with this statement, but dormitory dwellers were less in accord in their agreement than apartment residents. Over 11 percent of the dorm people strongly agreed with the statement, compared with only three percent of the apartment residents who strongly agreed.

Item 19 also very nearly produced significantly different patterns of responses between dormitory and apartment occupants. The item says:

"The University provides sufficient recreation."

In each residence group part of the students agreed, part disagreed. However, the tendency to agree was slightly stronger for apartment than for dormitory dwellers. Thirteen percent of the dormitory people strongly disagreed with the statement compared to only seven percent of the apartment occupants.

Item 20 was the last item to be noted as approaching divergent distribution of responses between the two residence groups. This item says:

"I am pleased with the open visitation policy."

Both residence groups largely agreed with this statement; however, a conspicuous 25 percent of the dormitory dwellers strongly disagreed. Apparently a significant subset of dormitory occupants are not satisfied with open visitation.

The items just cited indicate differences in opinions of dormitory dwellers and apartment residents. What is also interesting to note in this study is the range of topics in which there are no differences among the two groups. The opinions reported on these items are opinions which can be thought of as generally characterizing students regardless of their residences. For example, there was no difference between apartment and dormitory dwellers in the extent to which they feel their residences are homes away from home. Both groups tended to agree with that statement, although apartment dwellers agree more profoundly than do dormitory dwellers. There was also no difference between the groups in the extent to which their roommates encourage good study habits. Both groups appeared to have good and bad roommates in this regard. Both groups felt that it was easy to reach other places or buildings on the campus from their residences; but neither group clearly decided that they wanted to live in their present residences for an additional semester. A significant subset of both groups

18

felt that living with other people hampered their personal style although most students disagreed with this idea. Although dormitory dwellers claimed to participate more in campus activities than apartment residents did, both groups agreed that they did not often get into activities. Both groups felt that it was easy to get to know people in the residence halls. Also, both groups tended to agree that dormitories are fine for their first year or two in college.

Both dormitory and apartment residents tended not to take courses on their roommate's recommendations, and both groups tended to have a feeling of isolation at the University, although this feeling appeared to be somewhat more distinct among dormitory dwellers than among apartment residents. This tendency, though, did not produce a significant divergence in response patterns between the two groups on this particular item.

Both groups preferred to study in a library rather than study in their own rooms. Both groups appeared to be undecided about whether the people with whom they live keep them informed on campus happenings. Also, a significant part of both groups felt that they did not spend so much time on class work that they had no chance for social activities. They also agreed that fraternities and sororities provide opportunity to meet different types of people.

Both groups were somewhat undecided as to whether the University was quite flexible about dormitory and other campus housing regulations. Also, most students believed there is a certain esprit de corp where they live, but a significant three out of ten responded in disagreement categories.

The majority of students appeared to prefer more variation in their activities. Sixteen percent of the apartment dwellers strongly agreed with this statement, "My activities at I.U. are not as varied as I would like." Another third of the apartment residents and over half of the dormitory dwellers agreed with this statement. It is significant, however, to note that in both groups approximately one out of five disagreed that their activities were not as varied as they would like. Similarly, in both groups there was general agreement that it would be pleasant to have a wider circle of friends. Two-thirds of the students marked agreement categories for this item. In spite of the fact that student encounters regularly occur in the University, many students feel short on friends.

Both housing groups tended to agree that it would be nice to have smaller University housing units, and both groups tended to disagree that there is not enough range in housing costs. The large dormitory and the limited range of housing from which to select appeared to carry negative valences for the students surveyed.

Factor Analytic Data

In most questionnaires or psychological examinations more than one basic behavioral domain threads its way through the data. A scheme has been devised for sorting out these basic behavioral domains and for identifying the variables that participate in each behavioral domain. This technique is called a factor analysis. Therefore the data in the present questionnaire were submitted to factor analysis to determine what basic components of attitude could be identified in the questionnaire responses. This procedure was then expanded to see which of these behavioral domains were most characteristic of the apartment dwellers and which were most characteristic of the dormitory residents.

A principal components analysis was used with a varimax rotation. With this method five factors were extracted. The first factor was labeled "Social Involvement" and was characterized by active living within a residence with sharing among people who live in the residence. The items that load significantly with this factor are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Items That Make Up Factor I

Item	Loading*
1. My closest friends are those with whom I share my living quarters.	.64
2. I think of my residence as a home away from home.	.63
5. Living where I do there are good opportunities for being involved in University activities.	.44
7. It is easy for me to reach any other place or building on campus.	.55
8. I would like to live here at least for another semester.	.44
11. When problems come up I talk with my roommate about them.	.58
19. The University provides sufficient facilities for recreation.	.62
20. I am pleased with the open visitation policy.	.42
25. People I live with often keep me informed about what is happening on campus.	.41
30. My activities at I.U. are not as varied as I would like.	-.46

*The factor loadings associated with each of the statements are correlations of the statement with the factor. A positive loading indicates that as more of the factor exists, the greater the tendency to agree with the statement, while a negative loading means that as more of the factor is present, the greater the tendency to disagree. These loadings are provided in an effort to help the reader to further understand the content of behavior that is characterized by each factor.

22

The second factor appeared to be "Social Avoidance." This factor was characterized by withdrawal from other people and sensitivity to social restrictions. The items that load significantly on this factor are given on Table 3.

Table 3. Items That Make Up Factor II

Item	Loading
3. My roommates encourage good study habits.	-.30
4. If I lived elsewhere I would spend more time on my schoolwork.	.31
8. I would like to live here at least for another semester.	-.42
12. There are too many restrictions on people who live in University housing.	.73
13. Apartments are more convenient places to live than dorms or frat houses.	.58
17. Caring for an apartment takes too much time.	-.69
20. I am pleased with the open visitation policy.	-.37
27. I spend so much time on classwork that I don't have much of a chance to socialize.	-.44
28. The University is quite flexible about dormitory and other on-campus housing regulations.	-.69
34. There is not enough of a range in housing cost.	.51

The third factor was called an "Uninvolved 'Dormo-
phyle.'" The behavior characterized by this factor
involves absence from campus activities and localizing
of functions in the student's room. The items that load
significantly on this factor are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Items that Make Up Factor III

Item	Loading
11. When problems come up I talk to my room- mate about them.	.34
13. Apartments are more convenient places to live than dorms or frat houses.	-.45
15. Dorms are fine for the first year or two in college.	.30
17. Caring for an apartment takes too much time.	.42
21. I would prefer living here if I could take my meals elsewhere.	.45
22. Often I take courses on my roommates recommendation.	.49
23. I feel isolated from the University.	.42
30. My activities at I.U. are not as varied as I would like.	.56
31. It would be pleasant to have a wider circle of friends.	.61
32. Students who live in apartments are exploited by landlords.	.39

24

The fourth factor was identified as "Press for Independence," and the significant items are given in Table 5. Behavior under this factor was characterized by general avoidance of basic controlling mechanisms.

Table 5. Items That Make Up Factor IV

Item	Loading
3. My roommates encourage good study habits.	-.49
4. If I lived elsewhere I would spend more time on my schoolwork.	.55
5. Living where I do there are good opportunities for being involved in University activities.	.38
6. My living arrangements allow me to feel quite independent.	-.70
9. Living with other people hampers my personal style.	.41
11. When problems come up I talk with my roommate about them.	-.38
15. Dorms are fine for the first year or two in college.	-.37
16. My type of living arrangement is less expensive than another type would be.	-.60
25. People I live with often keep me informed about what is happening on campus.	-.33
32. Students who live in apartments are exploited by landlords.	-.38

The last factor was identified as "Detachment," and behavior here is characterized by a lack of involvement in activities, avoidance of people, a feeling of isolation, and lack of esprit de corps. The items that load on this factor are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Items that make up Factor V.

Item	Loading
5. Living where I do there are good opportunities for being involved in University activities.	-.54
8. I would like to live here at least for another semester.	-.35
9. Living with other people hampers my personal style.	.41
10. I often participate in campus activities.	-.54
14. It is easy to get to know people in the residence halls.	-.51
18. It is not easy to feel at home in a dorm.	.63
20. I am pleased with the open visitation policy.	.34
22. Often I take courses on my roommates recommendation.	-.31
23. I feel isolated from the University.	.50
24. I would rather study in the library than in my own room.	.35
29. People where I live have a certain <u>esprit de corps</u> .	-.54

Each student's responses were converted into a score for each factor. In this manner for every student five factor scores were generated. Comparisons between dorm dwellers and apartment residents on each factor could then be made by use of the F test.

The F test for scores on Factor I produced an insignificant value of .377. There is apparently no difference between dormitory and apartment dwellers in the extent to which they demonstrate the behaviors characterized as "Social Involvement."

Similar results appeared for the F test of scores on Factor II. The resulting value of 2.518 was also insignificant, indicating that the two living groups are not expected to be different in the behaviors that go into making up "Social Avoidance."

Differences did appear between the living groups on the last three factors, although these differences were more convincing for Factors IV and V than for Factor III. The F test of scores for Factor III produced a value of 3.348, significant between the five and ten percent level. Mean factor scores* for the groups were apartment .2323, dormitory -.1401. These values suggest

*For these factor scores the grand mean is zero. The larger the value on the positive side, the more the factor is present; the larger the value on the negative side, the less the factor is present.

that it is more likely to find the "Uninvolved 'Dormophile'" in apartments than in dormitories. Looking at the above mean factor scores and at the items that load on Factor III, one may wish to speculate that there are at least some apartment residents who view dormitories with some favor. It's often greener on the other side of the fence.

The F test for scores on Factor IV produced a value of 30.573, significant beyond the one percent level. The factor score means were apartment .6258, dormitory -.3775. The apartment residents appear more often to demonstrate the behaviors that characterize the factor "Press for Independence."

The F test of scores of the last factor produced a value of 12.665, again significant beyond the one percent level. The factor score means were apartment -.4352, dormitory .2625. Persons who evidence the factor labelled "Detachment" appear more likely to be in dormitories than in apartments.

Of the differences that appeared between the two residence groups, the differences in Factors IV and V are the most reliable. What might this mean for University policy?

Factor IV, "Press for Independence," appears to suggest that the late adolescent preoccupation with

independence is more common among apartment than dormitory residents. This may well be one reason students have moved into apartments. Possibly reserving a dormitory for upperclassmen who would establish their own regulations for its operation would be attractive to a significant group of these students.

Factor V, "Detachment," was more characteristic of dormitory than apartment residents. Students in apartments appear to continue their involvement with creating a social role, while a portion of the dormitory residents appear to have become passive to this problem. For example, dormitory residents generally agreed that there were opportunities to become involved in campus activities (item 5); however, this statement received a negative loading for Factor V, which characterizes dorm more than apartment residents. It appears that although opportunity is available for involvement, a significant thread of uninvolved weaves its way through the behavior of many dormitory occupants. How to break these students from their mold of detachment may be a significant problem for the dormitory administration.

Summary

The study appears to support the following conclusions. Apartment dwellers see independence as a major factor in their choice of residence. They also believe that apartments are more convenient than dormitories and less expensive. Further, apartment occupants appeared not to have adapted to dormitory residence as a "home." On the other hand dormitory dwellers are less concerned about independence, are less pressed by the restrictions imposed by dormitory regulations, do not see apartments as convenient, and have adapted to dormitories on a "home" basis.

While the press for independence appeared more conspicuously in apartment occupants, detachment more often characterized dormitory residents. It therefore may be useful for the University (a) to consider on-campus housing arrangements that could accommodate students' emerging independences, and (b) to ferret out the detached student and enlist his greater involvement in the University scene.