DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 748   EC 060 609

AUTHOR   Hughes, Stephen G.
TITLE   Student Residence Hall Life: A Review of Literature,
                Research, and Experience Pertinent to Planning
                Residence-Based Programs for Post-Secondary Deaf and
                Hearing Students.
INSTITUTION   National Technical Inst. for the Deaf, Rochester, N.
                Y.
PUB DATE   Jun 73
NOTE   58p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Aurally Handicapped; College Students; *Exceptional
                Child Education; Identification (Psychological); Peer
                Relationship; *Research Reviews (Publications);
                *Residential Programs; Residential Schools; Staff
                Role; Student Behavior; Student School Relationship;
                Technical Education; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS   *National Technical Institute for the Deaf

ABSTRACT
                Reviewed in the paper are studies on college and
university living, facts and proposals from persons cognizant of
residential living, and information about present residential
accommodations of students at the National Technical Institute for
the Deaf (NTID). The aim of the paper is given to be collecting
previously unknown data about housing of deaf students before NTID
residential facilities are completed. Students in residence halls are
said to engage in self selection of peers and to exhibit seemingly
inappropriate changes of life style in their search for identity. It
is maintained that manipulative procedures, such as having a
residence hall serve in loco parentis, have been only moderately
effective and tend to inhibit the self deterministic peer process.
Residence hall potential for reducing student isolation is said to
depend on the hall's capacity to encompass formal and informal
activities of students and to provide staff that function as a common
ground between the institution and student needs. The residence hall
is seen as realistically contributing to the peer process and to
educational goals when it is based on the living learning center
concept. The concept is discussed in terms of integration of all
activities and assimilation of deaf and hearing students into a
common peer culture through the use of trained student personnel as
staff members. Questions related to student life in residence halls
based on the concept revolve around the extent of academic input
required, an arrangement between the residence hall and the physical
education department to provide recreational and competitive
activities, and a reallocation of professional and administrative
responsibilities. (MC)

ED 084748

08 060 609

STUDENT RESIDENCE HALL LIFE: A REVIEW OF
LITERATURE, RESEARCH, AND EXPERIENCE PERTINENT
TO PLANNING RESIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMS FOR
POST-SECONDARY DEAF AND HEARING STUDENTS

by

Stephen G. Hughes
Research Assistant
Division of Developmental Education

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology

June, 1973

INTRODUCTION

In just a few years, the student population of NTID will have expanded
from an initial 70 to the intended full enrollment of 750 full-time deaf
students and about 50 full-time equivalent interns or trainees. The
residential facilities presently under construction to accommodate this
student body represent, like the whole of NTID), an entirely unique
opportunity to meet the great needs of higher education for the deaf in
this country. Insofar as NTID has no real precedent, information about
the housing of deaf college students in a predominantly hearing environ-
ment is practically non-existent. This paper is an attempt to help
remedy that deficiency by correlating and summarizing three bodies of
information: 1) available literature about college and university
residential living; 2) facts and proposals gathered from persons experienced
in the relevant areas of concern; and 3) information about the present
residential accommodations for NTID students.

The information gathered from the above sources is organized into four
related topics. "Residence hall impact" describes the way a college
residential environment may affect students' lives. "Deaf-hearing inter-
action" describes the general outlines of a deaf-hearing environment as
it might occur in a residence hall. "Residence hall staffing" deals
with possible ways of implementing an appropriate residential environment
through staff functions. "Physical facilities" briefly discusses the
possible effects on students of the physical structure of a residential
environment.

- i -

In the course of bringing together information on residence halls, certain documents and a number of proposals for residential facilities and programs emerged as particularly relevant. These have been included as appendices. (Vol. II)

Although I am indebted to a great many people in NTID for the support and assistance they have given me in bringing this report together, any faults in fact or error are entirely my own. I am especially grateful to Dr. Youst for his direction and criticism. Sue Weegar has generously contributed her time to much of the research and has kindly allowed the inclusion of her thesis in the appendix.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I

Documents

      A Program in Employability Orientation
      Outline of Residence Hall Research Project
      A Training Program for Student Personnel

Proposals

RESIDENCE HALL IMPACT

During the last decade the critical role of residence hall life in

determining the success of a student's college experience has come to

be widely recognized.   As Chickering describes it (1969):

> Residence Hall arrangements either foster or inhibit
> development of competence, purpose, integrity, and
> freeing interpersonal relationships, depending on the
> diversity of backgrounds and attitudes among the
> residents, the opportunities for significant exchange,
> the existence of shared intellectual interests, and
> the degree to which the unit becomes a meaningful
> culture for its members. (157)

The extent to which the residence hall can influence student growth

derives from the now well-documented fact that a residential environment

functions in much the same way as a community to constrain and direct

the attitudes and behavior of resident-members (Katz, 1968; Chickering,

1969; Newcomb and Feldman, 1969).

The influence of a residential community is brought about by 1) the

pressures exerted through informal subcultures or peer groups that

develop out of the affinities and needs that certain members have for

one another and the group, and 2) the impact of formal and informal

structured activities and programs in the residence hall.

Manipulation of Peer Group Influences

It is often contended that students learn as much from their peers in

college as they do in the formal educational environment.   Because the

principle vehicle of inter-student influence is the peer group (Sanford, 1962; Hartshorn, 1963; Wilson, 1966; Whittaker, 1969), many experimental efforts have been directed at determining whether peer groups can be structured or their influences manipulated to effect certain behavioral and educational goals.

At its simplest, a peer group may be defined as "any set of two or more students whose relationships to one another are such as to exert an influence upon them as individuals" (Newcomb, 1967, p. 469). The two general conditions which are thought to lead to the probable formation of student peer groups are: 1) propinquity, and 2) similarities of backgrounds, attitudes, and interests (Maissoneuve and Palmade, 1962; Warr, 1964; Newcomb, 1967). Attempts to manipulate peer group influences have been mainly concerned with bringing together groups of students having similar attitudes and interests, probably because the personal background of any given student is too difficult to accurately delineate and hence control. On the whole, the results of such experimentation have not been entirely consistent or conclusive.

Homogeneous Groups

DeCoster (1966, 1968) twice tested groups of high academic ability students. When comparing them to randomly assigned student groups he found that the high-ability students displayed greater academic achievement and overall satisfaction with their college experience. He also found that randomly distributed high-ability students seemed to have a positive effect on the academic achievement of the lower-achievement

students with whom they were grouped. Astin (1963), however, in a
somewhat more comprehensive test of high-ability students randomly
sampled from 76 colleges and universities, concluded that "continued
exposure to a peer group of unusually high intelligence has a detrimental
effect on the self-confidence and ambition of students" whether they are
high or low ability students (p. 224).

A number of experiments with groups of students having the same academic
or vocational interests has been conducted with only slightly more
promising results (Davison, 1965; Elton and Bate, 1966; Morishima, 1966).
Such groups did not appear to positively influence the academic achieve-
ment of their members, although a certain increase in academic interests
or "Scholarly Orientation" was noted. Brown (1968) has provided one of the
more recent and authoritative statements about the effect of grouping students
of like academic interests in a residence hall. Two dormitory floors
were populated with 55 students each in a one-to-four ratio of Humani-
ties-to-Science students. Two more floors of 55 students each were
populated with the opposite ratio of Humanities-to-Science students.
The students were pretested on Thinking Introversion and Theoretical
Orientation Scales and several sociometric questionnaires. It was
determined that "propinquity and similarity of academic-vocational goals
were important factors in determining friendship patterns" (p. 556).
(Brown's conclusions regarding the differences in attitudes, interests,
and personalities of students in different academic-vocational groups
had been previously documented by Teeban, 1954; Sternberg, 1955; and
Holland, 1965.) After testing the students on the Omnibus Personality

Inventory, Brown concluded that "the dominance of a vocational group had significant impact on the feelings about college major, satisfaction with college and social interaction".

Although the effect of homogeneous interest grouping upon similar vocational-academically oriented students tested by Brown seems to be established, it is questionable whether propinquity is a key variable in this effect. Huntley (1965) conducted a four year longitudinal test of 1,027 students at Union College (who were not necessarily living together) and discovered that the personality traits which characterized initial entrance into a major tended to be reinforced and become more homogeneous over time as the students remained in their chosen fields.

The effect of segregating freshmen from other undergraduates has been found to be positive in terms of personal and social growth but not measurable in terms of academic achievement (Beal and Williams, 1968; Schoemer and McConnell, 1970). The evidence supporting the desirability of freshman housing derives less from specific tests of freshman - upperclassman segregation than it does from the available information concerning the kind of differences which exist between freshmen and other undergraduates in college. One of the most significant, accelerated, and perhaps difficult periods of change and adjustment for a college student occurs during the first few weeks or months of his college career (Lehman, 1962; Wallace, 1966; Centra, 1967). Given this and the fact that entering freshmen tend to have a more positive and receptive attitude toward college than do older students (Stern, 1966; Gordon,

1967; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969) freshman housing might provide a unique
opportunity to give incoming students supportive direction and a strong
positive impetus in their college career through special orientation
and exposure to role models.

Co-educational Groups

A number of articles have appeared recently evaluating various co-
educational efforts (Gerst and Moos, 1961; Greenleaf, 1962; Schroeder
and Lemay, 1963; Corbette and Sommer, 1972; Brown, Winkworth and
Baskamp, 1973). Co-educational housing is still a relatively novel effort,
and the present lack of sophisticated evaluation is compounded by the
probable difficulty of obtaining reliable responses on tests dealing
with sex-related attitudes or behavior. It is worth noting that the
concensus of opinion, impressionistic though it may be, is that mixed-
sex residential environments are conducive to a more relaxed, stable,
and perhaps mature student life-style.

Compatible Roommates

Because of the interest of some universities in expediting roommate
compatibility, several experiments have tried to distinguish the
significant variables and interaction effects of various kinds of
compatible roommate relationships (Hall and Willerman, 1963; Crew and
Giblette, 1965; Pace, 1970). Most of these tests, however, focused on
only one or two variables as predicting roommate compatibility. Gehring
(1970) has pointed out the complexity and virtual impossibility of pre-
dicting roommate compatibility with replicable success, and showed that

roommates with a host of similar characteristic variables (academic, sociometric, personal) were no more or less compatible than roommates with dissimilar variables.

On the whole, the best general conclusion that could be drawn from the literature treating the manipulation of residence hall environments is that, all things being equal, the grouping together of students of like characteristics or needs can have a measurable effect on the course of their development. More specifically, there is some evidence that homogeneous "major" housing, co-educational housing, and freshman housing might have a positive effect on the college experiences of the students involved.

The ambiguity of these conclusions can be generally ascribed to the relative novelty of studies of residence hall environments and hence the unsophisticated state-of-the-art. In much the same way that the developmental theories concerned with student life often neglect to distinguish between the effects of sociological and psychological interests or influences (Feldman, 1969), the literature dealing with residence hall impact often fails to distinguish between the effects of peer group influence and the effects of the implied interest group influence. Student change in a peer group is attributable to the press of group interests on the student -- although he may not have brought this set of interests to the group or previously subscribed to all of them. Student development in an interest group derives from the effects of the students' singular commitment (as opposed to group involvement) to a definable set of

interests such as science or the humanities (Huntley, 1965; Feldman and
Newcomb, 1969). This failure to distinguish between peer and interest
group influence relates to the more basic failure to factor out the
effects of mere propinquity in the multivariate study of group activity
and life. Even when peer associations or housing assignments are
random, unintended, and even undesirable, the mere fact of living
together has a measureable effect on the attitudes and activities of
students in a residential setting (Seigle and Seigle, 1957; Severinsen,
1970).

This latter finding points to a general oversight which can help explain
the prevailing inconsistencies among generally single-criterion tests
of peer influence as well as the greater student satisfaction with
college experience noted in most of the peer group studies. The principal
variable in positive and effective peer group interaction is probably
self-selection. Non-manipulative studies of peer groups (Homans, 1950;
Lofland, 1969) deal with groups of persons who have chosen to act
together. A contrived or assigned peer group lacks this element and
the influence of the group on the members thus will depend upon the
extent of de facto self-selection. Vreeland (1965), in a comprehensive
study of Harvard "houses" found that student attitudinal development was
related more to their involvement with academic or personal activities
than to their "house" involvements. The students involved simply chose
their group affinities elsewhere than in the residential context.

Directing Student Life

If it can be accepted that self-selection in the absence of strong

compulsion is a most important principle of effective peer group formation

and influence, then residence h lls programs might more properly be seen

as facilitating the process of self-selection and capitalizing on it

when it does occur. Viewed as such, the residence hall should first

provide an appropriate and stimulating atmosphere for the formation of

student peer groups, and should then attempt to direct these groups toward

desirable attitudes and activities.

As such, residence hall impact would facilitate and compliment rather

than implement, the student's learning experiences.

One of the most obvious ways to augment the student's experiences

in the residence hall is to establish programs which complement class-

room activities. Brown (1968) conducted what was probably one of the

better documented attempts at programming residents' life. A "discussion

program" was established on several science and humanities dominated

floors, while several other similar floors went without the program.

Using the Omnibus Personality Inventory and several questionnaires in a

pre-posttest format, Brown determined that the effect of the program

was to reinforce the existing patterns of activities and ideas. Inter-

estingly enough, there was no attempt to determine the effect of the

discussion program on academic achievement. Taylor (1970) did attempt

to measure the effect of a residence program of homogeneous housing and

tutoring on freshmen and found that, compared to non-program residents,

the students involved had a significantly higher cumulative achievement.

The literature appears to emphasize that there is no a priori guarantee that an enrichment program will contribute to the quality of the student's college experience. Chickering (1970) in a two-year longitudinal study at seven colleges, found that changes in the cultural sophistication of students was attributable to college climate, student traits, peer group relationships, educational practices, and student-faculty relationships; but that it was not measurably affected by involvement in aesthetic or literary extracurricular activities.

Based on the literature surveyed it seems reasonable to suggest that the quality and appropriateness of any co-curricular activity or program will determine its degree of effectiveness. A case in point is the evidence concerning student-faculty relationships. Several attempts have been made to determine the effect of degrees of student-faculty contact on student attitudes and academic achievement in the context of a program or series of controlled circumstances. The appropriateness to the kind of student involved (Meyer, 1965; Feinberg, 1972) and the quality of the contact (Newcomb, 1967; Alberti, 1972) determined effectiveness of contact in the studies noted. In each case, the frequency of contact did not result in significant differences.

The most comprehensive proposals for providing appropriate residential environments and effective co-curricular programs have appeared in the literature dealing with the idea of the residence hall as a "living-learning center" (Clareq, 1967, 1970; Riker, 1965, 1969). As Riker (1969) describes it, college housing should serve as an integral part

of the educational effort, and as such "the educational function of
college housing is to help students grow as human beings" (5). Speci-
fically, "the residence hall should be utilized as a means for providing
opportunities that will enable students to act out, question, and apply
concepts developed via the formal academic.encounter" (Clareq, 1970,
p. 44).

The concept of residence halls serving as living-learning centers has
been implemented and evaluated in a number of instances in recent
years (Astin, 1967, 1970; Centra, 1967, 1968; Pemberton, 1968; Rockey,
1969; Riker, 1969; Ladd, 1970; Dressel, 1971; Shaw, 1972; Student Housing,
1972). The schools in which reported living-learning programs were imple-
mented included Michigan State University, Wesleyan University, Yale,
Toronto University, Stephens College, Indiana University, Hampshire
College, Duke University, UCLA, University of Denver, Cornell University,
University of Michigan, and the University of Nebraska. These programs
generally entailed the establishment of a student group devoted to serving
particular interests or academic purposes in a residence hall. This
space was provided with the relevant facilities, and co-curricular
(and sometimes regular curricular) activities were developed. These
attempts at unifying the college experiences of students by either
centering them in the residence or by having residence hall life
closely complement the curricular life have met with mixed results.

It could not be said from the evidence so far that a living-learning
residence hall environment will, of itself, guarantee an improvement in

the academic achievement of students. In each case, however, students
were reported to have been more "stable" and satisfied with their college
experiences when compared to students in different programs or in no
program at all.

Discussion

On the whole, information drawn fro literature and research concerning
the manipulation or direction of student life in residence halls has
some relevance to the concerns of NTID. The information gathered from
reviewing the experiences of administrators, researchers, and residence
hall staff at NTID tends to compliment several of the possibilities raised
in the review of research. Some administrators and researchers and most
staff agreed that freshman housing for at least the first quarter would
be the only viable kind of "assigned" housing. Nearly all researchers,
administrators, and staff agree that some form of co-educational housing
would be desirable. Many of those interviewed suspected that similar
major groups would also be a desirable residential arrangement. All
persons interviewed agreed that forced associations would be detrimental,
and that choice of housing assignment would facilitate the quality
of residence hall life and contribute to the self reliance of students.

One of the principle limitations of the literature surveyed is the
generally untested relevance to the deaf of theories about the socio-
metric patterns of hearing persons. The only available information about
deaf residential sociometric patterns is the research conducted by
Riffer at NTID during 1970 and 1971. A number of his conclusions

indicate that sociometric patterns of deaf residents are different
from those of hearing residents. Riffer affirmed that propinquity
was not a significant determinant of friendship patterns among the
students he tested. This conclusion has been affirmed by most of the
staff interviewed. Furthermore, it seems apparent that the criteria
which determine the self selection of deaf peer groups differ from those
of hearing peer groups. The most obvious distinctions among various
students were their communication skills and perceived degree of deaf-
ness. Some deaf students who label themselves "hard-of-hearing" do not
wish to be associated with other deaf students; and more frequently,
there are differences among the more oral and the more manual students.
These two distinctions are not necessarily coterminous. This information
was also affirmed by most of the staff interviewed. Another chief
determinant of deaf friendship patterns indicated by Riffer is the
school background of the students: residential or day school, and
hearing or deaf school background. Most of the persons interviewed were
uncertain of this finding, although a few of the staff tentatively
affirmed it.

The one point upon which most persons interviewed agreed, and which
Riffer affirmed, was that the deaf student is extensively isolated from
the world around him -- to a much greater extent than is the alienated
college student described in much of the literature concerning student
development (Korn, 1969). This condition of isolation seems to underlie
many of the issues of student vocational-academic, personal, and social
development upon which a residence hall should impact in a remedial
and developmental fashion.

DEAF-HEARING INTERACTION

The isolation of the deaf may be conceived as a matrix of many of the difficulties they experience in adjusting their lives to the hearing world. This issue is often couched in the language of segregation-integration, and although these terms may in fact describe an aspect of deaf isolation, the language and topical implications of such an approach are fraught with several dangerous misconceptions. Therefore, in order to clearly present the issues involved, the terms in which this report describes deaf-hearing interactions have been carefully delineated. The information reviewed in this report suggests that there are three distinct yet related aspects of deaf-hearing inter-action: 1) discrimination among deaf students and within deaf-hearing student groups; 2) confrontation among deaf students and within deaf-hearing student groups; and 3) assimilation of deaf students, of hearing students, and of deaf-hearing student groups into an appropriate context.

Discrimination

Riffer (1970a) found that discrimination between types of deaf students was as significant as the discrimination among deaf and hearing students. Initially, it would appear that the basis for such discrimination is lack of communication: except for an "oral" deaf and hearing exchange, the deaf and the hearing students often tend to remain segregated from one another; except for those deaf who practice both oral and manual com-munication, the oral and the more manual deaf remain somewhat socially distinct from one another. In studying deaf friendship patterns (1970b),

Riffer found that good oral speech increased the likelihood of hearing
friendships among the deaf students.

Discrimination among the deaf-hearing student body according to com-
munication skills or types may be the symptomatic indication of a more
basic discriminatory activity. Nearly all persons interviewed, par-
ticularly those with more extensive contact with the NTID students, in-
dicated that there are other variables which often serve as equally
important discriminating criteria among student groups. Among these
were type of family and school background, sex, race, degree of hearing
loss (where this varies from communication skills type), and personality.
These other criteria were also mentioned by Riffer (1970a). A
closer examination of the available information indicated that attitudes
(particularly the student's outlook as it relates to his personal and
social development) were the basis for deaf-hearing student discrimination,
and not simply communication type.

Walter (1969) indicated that "attitudes are the result of a kind of
cultural fixedness toward handicapped people, and not based on direct
experience with deaf individuals." A study by Rusalem (1956) indicated
that "there is much misunderstanding about the deaf and blind and...
only through structured interaction can attitudes be changed" (7). In
a more recent study, Isaacs (1972) determined by means of five question-
naires that certain stereotypes exist among kinds of deaf students in
NTID, and also between the deaf and hearing populous of RIT.

The influence of a student's school background on his friendship patterns (Riffer, 1970b, 1973) indicates the extent to which deaf-hearing interaction is initially determined by the attitudes and experiences the students bring with them. Administrators interviewed as well some research reviewed (Walter and Berdy, 1971) indicated that well over half of the students entering NTID had previous exposure to a deaf-hearing environment. Most of the staff and some of the administrators who had more extensive contact with the NTID students, indicated that there was a quite general and prevailing desire among the deaf students to "integrate" with the hearing student body. Likewise, many of the NTID students who had not identified with their handicap appear to be doing so through association with such a concentrated and large number of deaf students. This contrasts interestingly with the "cultural fixedness toward handicapped people" which presumably characterized a majority of the entering RIT hearing students. Riffer (see Appendix C) described an undercurrent of resentment among some hearing students and faculty toward NTID students.

It is important to recognize that there is both a positive and a negative aspect to the discriminating process underlying student group segregation. When students segregate themselves from the larger student body into interest or peer groups, this is a more natural and positive phenomenon than the isolation of students according to stereotype or through lack of understanding.

Zirkel (1971) has indicated with respect to ethnic group membership that, "...it may either enhance or depress the self-concept of a child" (p. 220) and he suggests that the "disadvantage" of belonging to a minority group can become a positive reinforcement of self-concept and be used as a means to enhance the "scholastic self-realization" of the individual. There appears to be a growing interest among students and staff particularly in encouraging the growth of "deaf pride."

In a more particular sense, it is probably important to the personal development of the indiviual student to maintain certain kinds of exclusive relationships. Kennedy (1972) in a study of the effects of deafness on personality, states that the "choice of a mate is the most significant occurrence at this (19 to 24 year stage", and suggests that it is common and probably desirable for the deaf to intermarry (p. 30).

Administrators, researchers, and staff all generally agree that students should be encouraged to develop their own friendships, and further suggested that initial segregation of deaf and hearing students might, in some cases, be beneficial. Riffer (1971c) suggested that, initially, "putting deaf students among hearing students may result in greater social isolation from other deaf students with no compensating increment in contact with hearing peers."

A student is probably motivated to move beyond the parameters of self-supporting groups and expands the range of his interaction to include persons less like himself through a change or development of attitude.

Many of the persons interviewed felt that an effective way to diminish
the negative discrimination among students is to provide orientation and
educative activities in the formal context of the residence hall,
particularly for the benefit of the hearing students. There is reason
to believe that by encouraging the process of self-selective peer group
formation in an appropriately structured residential environment the
positive aspect of interpersonal discrimination can be enhanced.

Confrontation

NTID is a physically integral part of the RIT campus and there is thus
a certain "mixing" of the deaf-hearing student body which is a given
condition of the academic, social, and personal life of each student.
It is this informal "mixing", as well as the more intensive interaction
possible in a structured environment such as the residence hall, which
gives rise to the intergroup and interpersonal confrontation most
characteristic of deaf-hearing interaction. It is generally true that
as the numbers of a minority group increase, the elements of difference
between them and the majority group will become more visible and
tangible. This is basically a neutral though volatile situation, and
the outcome hinges largely on the context (Katz, 1964, 1968). In the
context of deaf-hearing student confrontation, attitudes are affected
in such a way as to generate either a conflict or an articulate
confrontation among students.

The literature dealing with integration or desegregation of minority
groups offers little more of relevance than a vague promise concerning

the virtue of integration. St. John (1970) in a survey study of the
effects of desegregation on the academic achievement of school children
stated that the available information "suggests that in cases of de-
segregation of school systems or of individuals, of whatever type at
whatever academic level, subjects generally perform no worse, and in
most cases better" (128). Crain, (1970), in concluding a comparative
evaluation of Black post-educational job histories, stated that those
Blacks who attended integrated public schools, when compared to those
who did not, had better jobs and a higher inc· e during the succeeding
two decades of their lives. He suggested that their advantage derived
less from a superior education than it did from a significant differ-
ence in attitudes consequent upon attendance at an integrated school.
Whether these attitudes contributed to their initial attendance at the
integrated school is not made clear.

In contrast to the pro-integration bias which pervades much of the liter-
ature, a more qualified view of the effects of minority group educational
opportunities has recently emerged in some of the more considered
research efforts. Coleman (1966) amassed descriptive data from a sample
of 600,000 children and 60,000 teachers in about 4000 schools concerning
equality of educational opportunity. His data suggested that, given an
equal educational opportunity, the educational disadvantage which
minority children will experience derives from their "family background."
Much of the controversy which has ensued has tended to overlook the
fruitful implications of the significance of "background" or environment,
and has often failed to consider the possibility that equal opportunity

may not adequately meet dissimilar needs or may simply be equally inap-
propriate. Katz (1967), and Stein and Zusser (1970), have variously
suggested that the IQ level of the majority limits the extent of IQ
gains of minority groups sharing in the educational and social experiences
of the majority. Of greater significance here is the conclusion of
Stein and Zusser who stated that, "Both the depressing effects of a poor
social environment and a stimulating effect of a good social environment
are most evident in groups at the greatest social disadvantage. The
greatest deterioriation and the greatest and most substained improve-
ments have been produced by total exposure to a new residential environ-
ment." (p. 67)

Riffer (1970b) found that over a period of time simple exposure to
persons of unlike groups in the college and particularly in the resi-
dential environment tended to break down stereotypes. He found that the
deaf students tended to approximate the attitudes of hearing students over
a six month period. "For better or for worse ... NTID students tend to
become less distinguisable from their hearing contemporaries in their
attitudes about themselves and others." (Stuckless, 1971). The implic-
ation of this attitudinal change, if students do tend to like those most
similar to themselves, is that an increasing similarity of attitudes among
deaf and hearing students might lead to better interaction. Of equal im-
portance, as the subgroups of deaf students tend more toward a "hearing
norm", they might be less likely to discriminate among themselves.

The importance of a change or development of attitude in furthering
deaf-hearing socialization is indicated in some of the literature con-
cerning deaf psychology. Coleman (1964) stated that "...in general per-
sonality maladjustment is more common among physically disabled persons
than among physically normal persons (but) there is no causal connection
between the handicap and the maladjustment. It is the individual's
attitudes, not the disability itself, that are the primary determinants
of his mode and level of adjustment." DiFrancesca and Hurwirtz (1969),
in discussing the problems of deaf employability indicated that "...it is
not lack of innate functional abilities that limit our clients. They do
have sufficient intelligence, motor and coordination skill and moti-
vation to work at a competitive level. It is their deficient social
and emotional functioning that stultifies achievement and precludes
employment."

Craig, Newman, and Burrows, (1972) in a descriptive study of three post-
secondary programs for deaf students concluded in a similar vein that
school drop-outs were not due to deficient academic abilities, but rather
that, "adjustment difficulties, poorly defined career goals, personal
considerations, and financial difficulties are major correctable reasons
for students failing to graduate." (p. 611)

Several studies conducted at NTID in recent years (Walter, 1969;
Stuckless, 1972) further confirmed the fact that contact among unlike
groups in a structured interaction can markedly affect the attitudes of

the individuals involved. Walter, using a pre-posttest format, at-
tempted to measure the change over a period of seven months attitudes of
new staff who participated in the summer faculty training program and of
those who had not. These groups were further divided into subgroups of
faculty who had deaf students in their classes compared with those who
did not. When first tested in September, the faculty who had been in the
Summer Program showed a much higher level of positive affect than did those
who had not participated in the program. But when the tests were admin-
istered again in April, there was no significant carry-over of the effect
of summer program involvement. The difference in levels of faculty
affective response corresponded instead to degree of classroom contact.
This change in faculty attitude seemed to focus particularly on the
variables that related to assimilation of deaf students into hearing society
and to their achievement in classes. This was regarded as a shift toward
a more realistic attitude concerning the handicapping effects of deafness.

Stuckless' survey of faculty and student attitudes towards serving
"special students" at RIT seemed to indicate a generally positive but
realistically qualified attitude. Since this study was conducted at
a time (1970-1971) several years after the first NTID students came to
campus, its seems reasonable to assume that a significant part of the
attitudes surveyed derive from a direct exposure to deaf students. Both
faculty and student attitudes seemed to reflect a distant but positive
regard for serving special students; that is, they attached greatest
"value" to serving special students at RIT and expressed least "ease"
about it. Both students and faculty registered their highest valence

with regard to the concept of offering special technical educational
classes to disadvantaged students; although the faculty were least in-
clined to have special students in their regular classes, and were sim-
ilarly less favorable toward having educationally disadvantaged stu-
dents on campus at all. Both groups did register a positive attitude
toward the general concept of special students on campus, but the strong-
est response was from those students who did not themselves live on
campus.

These studies seem to indicate that RIT has had a generally posi-
tive attitude toward the deaf students, but that any extended contact
with those students results in a marked shift downward in attitude a
more realistic comprehension of the implied limitations of the students'
handicap. This possibility was further noted by Riffer (1970) in his
comparative study of a group of resident advisors and a group of stu-
dent interpreters. Riffer found that the student interpreters, who had
received a more extensive training in the problems of deafness and had
a greater contact with the students, registered a more realistic at-
titude toward the NTID students.

The kind of context which would encourage positive attitudinal develop-
ment in deaf-hearing confrontations is hinted at in some of Riffer's
research. In a study of deaf friendship patterns (1970) Riffer in-
dicated some of the particular circumstances in which friendships seemed
likely to develop between deaf types and between deaf and hearing
students.

The contextual structure of deaf-hearing confrontations seems to have some bearing on the outcome of the interaction. Within the time-span studied, the mere percentage of deaf students in a dorm area did not seem to influence the likelihood of deaf-hearing friendships. Likewise, attendance in class was not conducive to deaf-hearing friendships, although it seemed to promote friendships among some deaf types. Perhaps this was because the classroom support services and particularly the presence of the interpreter single the deaf students out as separate or different.

While the general structure of the residence hall context will probably influence the development of deaf-hearing confrontations, the most important single aspect of that structure is the staff who will implement or direct student activities. The influence of these staff members derives not only from their guidance and information-giving activities, but also from their position as "role models". After the first Summer Program concluded, Riffer (1971c) found that deaf students reported hearing students among their friends with 72% greater frequency than they did when living in distributed housing the previous year. The hearing students named by Summer Program students were almost exclusively resident advisors and interpreters.

The joint importance of having competent staff and appropriate structure was indicated by Riffer when he concluded that, "Apparently, the Summer Program enabled deaf students to become comfortable with hearing

students and thus prepared them for making new friendships when they were put into integrated housing." (Stuckless, 1971, p. 8)

Assimilation

Assimilation is that aspect of deaf-hearing social interaction in which persons of one type can mix more or less indistinguishably with persons of another type. The greatest extent to which this is likely to occur on a broad scale in between deaf types. At the conclusion of the first academic quarter of his study, Riffer (1971a) indicated that the only real extent to which this had occurred between deaf and hearing was in the case of those hearing persons skilled in manual communication and actively involved in working with NTID students (such as interpreters, some residence advisors, etc.) who had moved essentially into the deaf culture. Both Riffer and a number of the persons interviewed further indicated that there are a number of deaf students (usually those who label themselves "har-of-hearing") who prefer not to be identified as deaf and who choose the company of hearing students.

The importance of those individuals capable of assimilation is not that they represent any possible large-scale trend, but that they can serve as a positive influence on both the segregated deaf types and the segregated deaf and hearing students. It is through employing the talents and interests of such persons that NTID can help to assure the provision of an appropriate residential environment for the development of deaf-hearing social interactions.

Discussion

Insofar as this report is intended to inform policy or planning de-
cisions, most of the literature initially reviewed concerning the
integration of minority groups (mostly racial minorities) has not been
included here. The equation of deaf isolation to the much discussed
but little understood ethnic or racial problem, although often cited
for descriptive reasons, has very little prescriptive merit. Most of
the more considered reviews of the literature confess the inadequate
and frequently contradictory nature of the information presently
available in this area (St. John, 1970, 1970; Stein and Zasser, 1970;
Zirkel, 1972).

The very word "integration" is misleading in that it neither prescribes
nor describes in an appropriate way the deaf-hearing social interaction.
There is no place in the public law or subsequent agreements establish-
ing NTID wherein integration is mentioned. It is simply indicated that
NTID shall serve as an integral part of RIT. For a majority of students
entering NTID, integration in a hearing context is not an unprecedented
experience, although for some an exposure to different deaf types may
be a novel encounter.

As an integral part of RIT's institutional life, then, NTID should be
concerned with maximizing the given potential of this institutional
setting by inspiring the development of productive experiences and at-
titudes among the deaf-hearing student body. "The Institute should
provide an environment in which students can achieve maturity, a sense

of social responsibility and a high degree of personal development by supplementing the educational program..." (NTID Policies, Guidelines and Application Procedures, 1966).

Properly speaking, integration means a merging of several parts such that the parts become indistinguishable from one another. Occasionally, the members of one student group may be largely assimilated into the culture of another group; this condition was indicated by the term "assimilation". Riffer (1973) suggested that assimilation could be a positive or a negative occurrence; it may derive from a genuine identification with the needs or attitudes of others, or it may be the product of identity confusion or unrealistic idealism.

The most widespread and prevailing deaf-hearing interaction was described as "confrontation." A deaf-hearing confrontation may develop into a genuine conflict, or it may result in an articulate accommodation between students. (The term "articulate" was used because "it implies as its result a perfect whole, but it differs from integrate in implying no loss of identity or distinctness of the things combined...." Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms). As an articulate interrelation, confrontation between student groups is probably the most common development; and as such it could be described as the mode of "desirable integration".

If student personal and social development were neglected or misdirected, the result would be the isolation of many students in the

deaf-hearing student body. The "discrimination" which underlies this
isolation is, however, different from the discriminating affinities
which generate peer group formation.

These various aspects of deaf-hearing social interrelations exist in a
number of different dimensions. Any given student will have interpersonal
associations among roommates, suitemates, housemates, floormates, and in
the residence hall at large. It seems reasonable to expect that these
different dimensions of his life will reflect various aspects of deaf-
hearing social interaction. It would be a monumental and possibly
fruitless task to attempt extensively to precondition or control the
infinitely complex set of variables which would exist at these various
levels of social activity. In order to eliminate the alienation of
residents from one another and facilitate their adjustment to personal,
social, and academic-vocational needs, the residence halls should be
concerned with providing an environment which positively affects the
basic attitudes of the residents. Many of the persons interviewed, and
particularly those administrators and staff members who have worked directly
with NTID students, agreed emphatically that dealing exclusively with the
social segregation of students would overlook the need for prior attitu-
dinal and personal development.

Information reviewed concerning deaf-hearing social interactions suggests
that the best way to develop productive interrelations between students
in the residential environment is through encouraging the maturation of
personal, social and academic-vocational needs and interests. In so doing,

the NTID residence hall may hope to inspire among all students the
felt need to communicate with and understand one another. Such needs
will be generated within the residence hall peer process, and the
institution may best expect to gain informative access to this area
of student development through the use of responsive, trained staff
in the residence halls.

RESIDENCE HALL STAFF

The Changing Role of the Staff

The evolution of the role of residence hall staff is a symptom of the
changing way in which institutions of higher learning have viewed their
responsibilities and intentions toward students. One consequence of
earlier educational practices which viewed formal education as a discreet
learning process was the separation of student living and learning
experiences. As such, universities and residence halls in particular
have often stood in loco parentis to their students. Housing served as
a purely residual function in the educational system, its purpose being
solely to contain the behavior of the students out-of-class and to
provide shelter and food. The residence hall and residence staff acted
as surrogate parents by controlling, directing, and punishing student
behavior in whatever way was deemed necessary.

The sometimes arbitrary character of the in loco parentis role has been
modified in recent years by the introduction of "due process" into
student affairs. The resultant concept which increasingly has come
to govern residence hall life is one which suggests "the implied
power to enforce reasonable regulations" (Harms, 1970, p.1). This change
in the formal conception of residence hall functions has accompanied
significant restatements of the purpose and importance of student residen-
tial life.

Academic life and the formal learning process, once regarded by educators
as being a discreet event in student life, are now seen to be an

integral part of student social and psychological development. Each area of student activity, whether formal or informal, is related to the over-all learning process. In this light, Riker (1965) and others refer to the residence hall as a living-learning center. Of equal significance is the realization that the influence of student peer groups "has been found to have as much, if not more, impact on student attitudes than does the faculty or curriculum," (Brown, 1972, p. 197). The upshot of these realizations, in light of the fact that the larger portion of a student's time is spent out-of-class and often in the dormitory, is that the residence hall has come to be viewed as a very important part of the educational environment.

Student Personnel

As the perceived purpose of student residential life has changed, so has the function of residence hall staff. Generally one of the first changes in staff duties is the de-emphasis of their police function, as pre-scribed by the in loco parentis concept, in an effort to free them for involvement in more developmental tasks. One such effort at Alfred University delegated police and judicial functions to the students as part of their self-governance, thus allowing the resident advisor to act as an arbitrator or mediator and so involve himself more informally and with greater trust in resident life (Brown, 1969). This kind of effort can further serve to encourage the development of responsibility and self-determination among students (Greenleaf, 1966; Beder and Rickart, 1971).

Increasing awareness of the pervasive importance of peer processes in student life has encouraged the greater use of student personnel as residence hall staff.

> Actually the only real way for top administrators,
> faculty advisors and other college personnel to
> really get a feel for their particular campus and
> students is through the kind of grassroots contact...
> that is available to residence hall staffs, especi-
> ally student assistants. Student assistants know
> more about how other students perceive the campus,
> education and society than any other professional
> on the campus. The awareness of and understanding
> of various students groups, as well as individual
> students, can be facilitated with the linkage fur-
> nished by well-trained student assistants. (Plough,
> 1972, p.9).

The principal role for which student assistants or resident advisors

have been trained in recent years is that of peer counseling (Murry, 1972).

A thirty hour training schedule was established by one college to train

peer counselors, and the reported success of this program (Pyle and Snyder,

1971) was taken as an indication that trained lay students could serve

effectively as peer counselors. A similar and more adequately evaluated

effort was the six-week training course in "accurate empathy" described

by Mitchell, Rubin, Bozard and Wyrick (1971). Tested on a nine point

"Accurate Empathy Scale," the trained resident advisors appeared more

effective as counselors than a similar untrained group. In addition to

initial training, some effort has been given to establishing ongoing

training programs. Meyer (1969) described a program of 1 to 1-1/2 hour

weekly developmental group sessions for resident counselors which were

co-directed by male and female professional counselors.

One function for which residence hall staff could be beneficially trained

is that of programming or coordinating student activities (Riker, 1965;

Powell, Pyler, Dickson, and McClellan, 1969). This function has been

largely neglected in the literature to date, and one of the few visible

efforts in this direction has been the Programmed Housing offered to NTID

students. A principal difficulty encountered in the programmed houses has

been the generalization of resident interests beyond the limits of house

friendships and activities.

> ...some of the frustrations which residence hall
> staff members encounter stem from unsuccessful
> attempts to organize social programs on the basis
> of one hall....Usually subcultures tend to cut
> across residence hall and corridor populations for
> their membership. (Plough, 1971, p.8).

Another function which residence hall staff may serve is that of role

models. Research at NTID has indicated that this may be of particular

relevance among a deaf student populous. Riffer (1971b) found that the

attitudes of incoming NTID students tended to become more like the

attitudes of their resident advisors over a six-month period.

One issue implicit in the variety of resident advisor training programs is

the question of how much training is necessary to equip student personnel

for their appropriate residence hall functions. Programs vary from

several semesters of exposure to behavioral science theories and tech-

niques - (Jackson, 1966) to programs lasting several weeks. It seems

reasonable to suggest that the efficacy of training will relate to the

accuracy with which residence staff are selected. Some programs have

entailed a pre-selection training during which students either opt out

or are selected out before the regular training begins (Carrenti and

Tuttle, 1972).

On the whole, there have been very few viable and scientific evaluations
of the effectiveness of residence staff and their training; the few
efforts available in the literature have have reported exclusively in
psychological journals (Berenson, Carkhuff and Myrus, 1966; Carkhuff,
1968, 1969; Martin and Carkhuff, 1968). Some recent articles have recom-
mended that evaluation would be facilitated by designing resident ad-
visor programs according to organizational theory (McDaniel, 1972) or
"management by objectives" theory (Fischer and Howell, 1971; Hart, 1973).
Such definition of objectives does seem to conduce to clarity of pur-
pose and some greater ease of self-evaluation, but to date it has pro-
duced few hard-fact evaluations.

Residence hall staffing is a relatively new and often minor considera-
tion in the field of educational theory and practice. With few excep-
tions (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969, Chickering, 1969), a comprehensive
and interdisciplinary approach to defining, evaluating and implementing
residence hall staff purposes and functions has not been apparent in the
literature. As such, most of the information dealing with residence
hall staffing is suggestive but not clearly prescriptive. What is
suggested is that if the residence hall is to serve as a living-learning
center, it can best do so through the efforts of student personnel
adequately prepared to capitalize on the peer process through meeting
student needs as they are felt and expressed.

Meeting Student Needs

The extent to which student needs are being adequately expressed and
met at NTID has recently been indicated by research sampling student

opinions about residence hall life and staffing (Weegar, 1973). Using samples of student evaluations of resident advisors, a survey questionnaire of student opinion, and interviews, Weegar has suggested that eagerness on the part of NTID students to be involved in a more stimulating environment is not presently being purposefully and objectively utilized.

The resident advisor was perceived by NTID students as being mainly responsible for administrative, enforcement, and maintenance functions, with a corollary responsibility to provide some counseling. Other non-residents (faculty-staff members), were perceived as having a minimal supportive role in student dorm life, namely provision of some tutoring and counseling services. Although students indicated a general level of satisfaction with the role of the resident advisor, their perception of his role suggests that the place of the R.A. in residence hall life is more insignificant than satisfactory. Students did indicate a desire for resident advisors with greater training in communication and problems of deafness, and likewise for greater faculty-student contact in dormitory activities.

Student self-perceptions indicated a strong sense of self-determination insofar as they expressed the desire to be largely responsible for programming functions and tutoring, and a willingness to share equally in the maintenance function of the resident advisor. "Every study of student opinion in recent years points to the fact that students want to play a larger role in shaping and managing their college lives." (Student Housing, 1972, p. 13).

Although they had indicated a desire for increased student-faculty contact
in the dorms, students further indicated that they did not want any
adults living in the dorms. Furthermore, students preferred mixed, open
housing arrangements (deaf-hearing houses, coeducational houses, club
houses) to the more controlled housing arrangements (honors house,
programmed house, freshmen house, homogeneous major house, all deaf house).

These perceptions contrast strikingly with some of the opinions expressed
by administrators, researchers and staff members interviewed. The per-
sons interviewed generally agreed on the desirability of having adults
living in the dorms, on having some homogeneous or controlled housing
arrangements, and on the role of the resident advisor as counselor,
advisor, and programmer. Opinions expressed in the interviews did agree
with student desires to have greater faculty-student contact, increased
student responsibility and self-determination, and more training for
dormitory staff in communication and problems of deafness.

These findings serve to suggest that residents and university person-
nel have a similar desire to move toward a more responsible living-
learning residence hall environment. They disagree on the respective
roles of students and personnel in determining or directing student
life toward that end.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

In keeping with the extensive re-orientation of college life and
education during recent years, college facilities have tended to express
a broader range of needs and ideals. The NTID residence hall facilities
are, perhaps, more unique than most because they are being designed
to accommodate a deaf-hearing, living-learning environment.

A review of the literature concerning the impact of the physical
environment on dormitory residents would seem to suggest that the general
design of the NTID residence hall facilities conforms in many respects
to the general outlines of a living-learning environment as described
by Riker (1965) and Clarcq (1967, 1971).

Much of the information describing other attempts at various colleges
and universities to design an appropriate living-learning residential
environment has been only slightly informative. The numerous descriptive
or prescriptive statements (Riker, 1965; Alfert, 1968; Rohringer, 1970;
Brown, 1972; College Housing, 1972), generally aim at suggesting, a) that
choice in expressing life style is as important as the structure of the
residence hall in predicting student satisfaction, and b) a living-learning
program will probably require particular facilities to accommodate its
purpose. Studies which attempted to test or predict the effect of the
physical environment on residents were generally inconclusive (Titus, 1972;
Avery, 1971) or dealt with questionable criteria (Sinnette and Sachson, 1973).

The basis for a lack of clarity in this literature is a comparatively primitive state of knowledge concerning the psychological-behavioral effects of a physical environment on people. Most of the studies in this area fail to take into consideration a number of important qualifications: 1) unmeasured personal characteristics, 2)·the extent to which personality influences the use of space as well as how space influences personality, 3) the extent to which reactions to a physical environment may be learned.

In an intelligent and comprehensive review of the literature, Drew (1971) summarized the research into two general areas of effect: color and space. It is interesting to note that even the more general and acceptable conclusions in this field of knowledge can contradict the specific needs of the NTID dormitory.

Color influences movement and mode (activity, relaxation). The effect of light is to excite, the effect of dark is to subdue. Several studies suggested that visual contact with the outside world (i.e. windows in a classroom) is very important to effective homeostasis, and in turn, mental productivity. Yet it is interesting to note that windows are not present in the NTID dormitory classrooms in order to facilitate the visibility of manual communication. Spacial arrangements are thought to have an effect on the kind and quality of interaction that takes place in an area, and such arrangements have been used to manipulate group composition and stability (small spaces conduce to static group composition, while larger, more active, public spaces conduce to more mobile group behaviors or make-up). Several studies suggested that a

circular or semi-circular arrangement was not particularly conducive
to group discussion, yet it is this arrangement which is most necessary
to facilitate manual communication.

Drew suggests that the inconclusiveness of studies concerning the
psychological-behavioral effects of physical environment might imply
that the influences under consideration were so fragile as to be
inconsequential in the real world. However, since the principle mode
of communication among deaf students is the visual mode, it seems likely
that the qualities of physical environment may be more effectively
communicated to the deaf student than they would be to the hearing student.

If there is any concensus of opinion to be found in the literature treating
residential physical facilities, it may be summarized in three points:
1) spacial and color arrangements can create or compliment certain
environmental settings; 2) freedom of expression or choice in life
style is as important to the guarantee of student satisfaction as the
actual character or type of facility; and 3) a living-learning residential
program will probably need particular facilities to accommodate its
purposes.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION

"We don't grow apples; they grow by themselves, and
perhaps we can help."
--Anonymous

Student Life in a Residence Hall

There has been a growing interest among educators about how the con-
ditions of residence hall life may be capitalized upon to enhance stu-
dents' college experiences. Until quite recently, the majority of re-
search in this field involved the manipulation or preconditioning of peer
group formation. Such research has confirmed the existence of some of
the functions of the peer process in student life, but there has been
no conclusive evidence that consistently positive results may be obtained
by interfering with the conditions or elements of student interaction.

The modest success attained by manipulating student peer groups can be
partly attributed to unsophisticated testing procedures and a dearth of
experimental work. It seems just as likely, however, that the very nature
of these efforts is somewhat self-defeating, for by interfering with the
self-selection of peers into their perceived appropriate groups, the re-
searcher is subjecting himself to a high probability of error. Self-
selection appears to be a most significant variable in peer group for-
mation. Just as choice through self-selection plays a key role in the
socialization of students, so it is choice again which underlies the
self-determining process of "identity" development which psychology de-
scribes as a critical milestone in students' passage through adolescence.

In the course of shifting through different and often divergent self-per-
ceptions, students will exhibit regular and seemingly inappropriate
changes in their life style. The notion of a residence hall serving _in
loco parentis_ was a traditional misconception of how to cope with the
improprieties of student life.

Manipulation can inhibit the self-selective aspect of the peer process,
and excessive regulation can inhibit the development of identity among
students. It seems quite probable that arbitrary control of student life,
whether in the name of propriety or of developmental theory, can effec-
tively obstruct the experimentation in interpersonal relationships and
style of living which is necessary to a student's movement away from
parental (and institutional) dependence toward a responsible definition
of his personal goals and his relation to others around him.

The need for support rather than constraint of self-determination is
particularly evident among students at NTID. Many students need to
identify themselves and their place among others due to a sense of isolation
or personal confusion. The uncertain place of the NTID student in the
hearing world as well as the probable discontinuity between his personal
background and his college life may further isolate him from his peers and
confuse his attempt to identify with his handicap. The development of a
positive deaf-hearing interaction is one of the more significant and most
visible issues at stake in the successful student life of NTID.

The potential of the residence hall for mitigating the isolation of stu-
dents from one another derives from its capacity to contribute to and
to encompass most of the formal and informal extracurricular activities
of students. Since student residence life is largely a self-deterministic
peer process, the contribution of the dorm to student life will vary with
the extent to which residential programs and staff functions are either
integrated into or imposed upon the peer process. In many ways the
residence hall staff provide a common ground between the needs of the
institution and the needs of students.

The Residence Hall in Student Life

To a certain extent a residence hall environment implies an institu-
tionalization of the peer process: relationships are structured through
room arrangements, house governance and activities, student roles and
responsibilities. This general framework can play a directive and con-
troling role in student life or it can serve as a contributing and in-
fluential part of the peer process. Recent educational practices have
tended to emphasize the latter possibility.

Educators' appreciation of student life as an integral peer culture has
been matched by a growing awareness that learning is more than a formal
process; that social, psychological and educational activities form a
single experiential mode of student development. The use of student
personnel in residence halls is intended to relate institutional functions
to the peer process in a more responsive way; likewise, the development
of residence halls as "living-learning centers" is intended to relate
educational goals to student life in a more realistic way.

A principal emphasis of the living-learning environment is the integration
of curricular and extracurricular activities. Although this has not
proven to have a notable effect on students' academic achievement, it
does appear to have contributed to the stability and perceived satis-
faction of their college experiences. Lofland (1969) stated that the
continuity of a student's "place round" (i.e. his surroundings, his
various spheres of activity) may determine the stability of his lifestyle;
and Feldman (1972) explicitly proposed that such continuity accounts
for the success of cluster colleges.

The concept of a living-learning environment suggests some interesting
possibilities for the development of a favorable deaf-hearing milieu
in residence halls. A living-learning situation implies a more inte-
grated life-style, and hence, the development of a more integral peer
process with an emphasis on common attitudes. Insofar as the foun-
dation of a positive deaf-hearing interaction is a set of common at-
titudes arising from the peer culture, a living-learning environment
would probably serve to enhance the assimilation of deaf and hearing
students into a common peer culture.

The attitudes which can bring deaf and hearing students into a more
positive relationship are those which arise from the students' need to
better communicate to one another their shared experience of changing
ideals and perceptions. Trained student personnel, by relating the
resources of the institution to these student needs can help to realize
the potential of the residence hall for encouraging and contributing to
the college experience of students.

Developing Student Residence Hall Life

The institution which chooses to move toward developing a living-learning
environment in the residence hall will necessarily reflect and impact upon
the total educational process of the institution itself. This is one of
the most significant and fruitful implications of the living-learning
concept.

In many ways a living-learning residence hall is a kind of educational
clearing house. In such an environment, the creation of a balance
between various alternatives in residential life might raise some
interesting questions.

1) What is the extent of academic input into residence hall
   life? Perhaps some curricular restructuring would be
   necessary in order to better integrate the formal and
   informal learning needs of students. Perhaps facilities
   could be provided in which student interest groups might
   live and work together; and possibly the activities of
   a Free University could be more closely incorporated
   into the residence hall. The academic interests of
   students should be properly equated with their personal
   and recreational interests; and the desirability of
   adult role models and faculty resources in the dorms
   should be weighed against the growing privatistic
   inclinations of students.

2) If physical education is to be a part of students' educational experiences, does this imply a de-emphasis of the traditional and more exclusive team sports? Perhaps a closer and more instructive relationship between the residence hall and the physical education department would make it possible for students to share more generally in the poise and self-confidence which group recreational and competitive activities can provide.

3) Does an increase in student responsibility toward the institution and themselves call for a reallocation of professional and administrative responsibilities? If the residence hall is to serve as a transition from dependent to independent life, it may come to serve less as a room-and-board facility as students provide more of these needs for themselves. Perhaps a greater clarification of the contribution which professionals can make to student development would relieve the institution of certain administrative and custodial responsibilities.

The development of a living-learning residential environment clearly not an overnight or single-decision task. The institution as well as the student would require a long-term process of adaptation and reorganization, and this probably calls for a phased or progressive planning effort. Certain educational, administrative, and financial commitments accrued through past policies would require attention, and student and institutional life must be reasonably directed toward new commitments. In short a living-learning environment is not an established condition but a

balanced process which must be realized over time. Within this process

the residence hall can come to serve as an artifice in which student

life and choice is tempered by a balanced measure of freedom and

responsibility.

REFERENCES

Alberti, A.E. Influence of the Faculty on College Student Development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 1, 18-23.

Alfert, E. Developmental Stage and Choice of Residence in College. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 3, 90-93.

Altschuler, K.Z. (Ed.) Mental Health and the Deaf: Approaches and Prospects. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969.

Astin, A.W. Differential College Effects on the Motivation of Talented Students to Obtain the Ph.D. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 63-71.

Astin, H.S. Educational Progress of Disadvantaged Students. Paper presented to the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington: Human Service Press, 1970.

Austin, C.G. (EB) The Conference on the Cluster College Concept. Journal of Higher Education, 1967, 38, 357-397.

Avery, M.C., Davis, G., and Rozien, R. Architectural Determinants of Student Satisfaction in College Residence Halls. Washington, D.C.: HEW, 1971.

Beal, P.E. and Williams, B.A. An Experiment With Mixed-Class Housing Assignments at the University of Oregon. Student Housing Research, ACUHO Research and Information Committee, February, 1968.

Beder, H.W. and Rickart, S.T. Residence Hall Regulations and Staff Roles: A Substitute Model for in loco parentis. NASPA Journal, 1971, 9(1), 57-61.

Berensen, B.G., Carkhuff, R.R. and Myrus, P. The Interpersonal Functioning and Training of College Students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 441-446.

Brown, R.B. Manipulation of the Environmental Press in a College Residence Hall. Personnel and Guidance Journal, February, 1968, 555-560.

Brown, R.B. Resident Adviser Programming. NASPA Journal, 1969, 7 (2), 86-90.

Brown, R.B. Student Development in an Experimental College or I May Have Seen a Unicorn. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13 (3) 196-201.

Brown, R.D., Winkworth, J. and Baskamp, L. Student Development in a Co-ed Residence Hall: Promiscuity, Prophylactic, or Panacea? Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14(2), 98-104.

Carkhuff, R.R. Differential Functioning of Lay and Professional Helpers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 117-126.

Carkhuff, R.R. Critical Variables in Effective Counselor Training. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1969, 16, 238-245.

Centra, J.A. Student Perceptions of Residence Hall Environments: Living-Learning vs. Conventional Units. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 4, 266-272.

Centra, J.A. Black Students at Predominately White Colleges: A Research Description. College Entrance Examination Board, Research Bulletin No. RB-70-19, March, 1970.

Chickering, A.W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Chickering, A.W. Cultural Sophistication and the College Experience. Project on Student Development in Small Colleges, Research Report, 1970.

Chickering, A.W. To Them That Had, Was Given, From Them That Had Not, Was Taken Away. Project on Student Development in Small Colleges, Interim Report, February 11, 1971.

Chickering, A.W. and McCormick, J. Personality Development and the College Experience. Project on Student Development in Small Colleges, Research Report, 1970.

Clarcq, J.R. Perceptions of Students and Staff Relating to the Purposes of Undergraduate Residence Halls on Selected Public College Campuses on New York State. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1967.

Clarcq, J.R. The Educational Impact of Residence Halls. Improving College and University Teaching, 18(1), 1970, 44-45.

Coleman, J.C. Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Forestman and Company, 1964.

Coleman, J.C. Et. Al. The Quality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Corbett, J. and Sommer, R. Anatomy of a Co-ed Residence Hall. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 215-217.

Craig, W.N., Newman, J.N., and Burrows, N.L. An Experiment in Post-Secondary Education for Deaf People, American Annals of the Deaf, Dec., 1972, 606-611.

Crain, R.L. School Integration and Occupational Achievement of Negros. American Journal of Sociology, 1970, 75, 593-606.

Crew, J.L. and Giblette, J.F. Academic Performance of Freshman as a Function of Residence Hall Housing. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1965, 6, 167-170.

Davison, M.B. Educational Outcomes and Implications of Academically and Vocationally Focused Small Groups of Undergraduate Students in a Women's Residence Hall. Paper read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Minneapolis, April, 1965.

DeCoster, V.A. Housing Assignments for High Ability Students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 19-22.

DeCoster, V.A. Effects of Homogeneous Housing Assignments for High Ability Students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9, 75-78.

DiFrancesa, S.J. and Hurwitz, S.N. Rehabilitation of Hard-Core Deaf: Identification of an Affective Style. Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf, 1969, 3(2).

Dressel, P.L. (ED) The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal, ACT Monograph No. 7, Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1971.

Drew, C.J. Research on the Psychological-Behavioral Effects of the Physical Environment. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41(5), 447-465.

Elton, C.F. and Bate, W.S. The Effect of Housing Policy on Grade Point Average. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 73-77.

Feinberg, L. Faculty-Student Interaction: How Students Differ. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 1, 24-27.

Feldman, K.A. Some Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Change and Stability of College Students. Review of Educational Research, 1972. A, 42, 1-26.

Feldman, K.A. Some Common and Not So Common Approaches to the Study of College Environments and Their Effects. Paper read at annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, 1972 B.

Fisher, M.B. and Howell, J.A. Evaluation and Accountability. NCPA, 10(2), 118-123.

Gehring, D.D. Prediction of Roommate Compatibility. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 58-61.

Gerst, M.S. and Moos, R.H. The Social Ecology of University Student Residences. Paper presented to the National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland, 1971.

Gordon, J.H. Value Differences Between Freshman and Seniors at a State
    University. College Student Survey, 1967, 92(1).

Greenleaf, E.A. Residence Halls, 1970's. NASPA Journal 1960, 7 (2),
    65-71.

Greenleaf, E.A. Co-educational Residence Halls: An Evaluation.
    Journal of the National Association of Women's Deans and
    Counselors, 1962, 25, 106-111.

Hall, R.L. and Willerman, B. The Educational Influence of Dormitory
    Roommates. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 294-318.

Harms, H.E. The Concept of in loco parentis in Higher Education.
    Unpublished manuscript, Florida University Institute of Higher
    Education, Gainesville, Fla., 1970.

Hart, D. Applying Management by Objectives to a Residence Hall Program.
    Paper submitted to ACPA Annual Convention, April, 1973, Cleveland,
    Ohio.

Hartshorne, E.Y. Undergraduate Society and the College Culture.
    American Sociological Review, 1963, 8.

Holland, J.A. and Richards, J.N. Academic and Non-Academic Accomplish-
    ment: Correlated or Uncorrelated? Journal of Educational Psy-
    chology, 1965, 56, 165-174.

Homans, G.C. The Human Group. New York: Hartcort, Brace, 1950.

Huntley, C.W. Changes in Study of Value Scores During the 4 Years of
    College. Genetic Psychology Monograph, 1965, 71, 349-383.

Isaacs, M. Attitudes Towards the College Deaf Student: Stereotype
    or "Kernel of Truth"? Unpublished Research Manuscript,
    Rochester Institute of Technology, 1972.

Jackson, R.E.A. Development of Dormitory Staff as Sub-Professional
    Counselors, research report, North Dakota University, Grand
    Forks, N.D., 1966.

Johnston, S. A Comparison of Environmental Perceptions of Student
    Sub-groups in Residence Halls. Unpublished Research Report,
    Missouri University, 1971.

Katz, E. Review of Evidence Relating to the Effects of Desegration
    on the Intellectual Performance of Negros. American Psychologist,
    1964, 19, 381-399.

Katz, E. Academic Motivation and Educational Opportunity. Harvard
    Educational Review, 1968, 38, 57-65.

Korn, H.A. Higher Education Programs and Student Development. Review
    of Educational Research, 1969, 30, 155-172.

Ladd, D.R. Change in Educational Policy: Self-Studies in Selected
    Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Lehman, I.L. and Dressel, P.L. Critical Thinking, Attitudes, and
    Values in Higher Education. Cooperative Research Project No.
    590 (HEW), 1962.

Lofland, J. Deviance and Identity, Englewood Clifts, New Jersey:
    Prentice Hall, 1969.

Maissonneuve, J.A., Palmade, G. and Fourment, C. Selective Choices
    and Propinquity. Sociometry, 1952, 15, 135-140.

Martin, J.C. and Carkhuff, R.R. The effects of Training upon Trainee
    Personality and Behavior, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968,
    24, 109-110.

McConnell, T.R. and Heist, P. The Diverse College Student Population.
    In Sanford, H. (Ed.) The American College, New York: Reiley &
    Sons, 1967.

McDaniel, R.R. Organization Theory and Preparation of Student Per-
    sonnel Workers. NASPA Journal, 1972, 10(2), 101-105.

Meyer, D.E. A Study of Student-Faculty Relationships at the College
    Level. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wis-
    consin, 1965.

Meyer, M. Technique and Facilititation of Developmental Groups,
    paper presented to ACPA Convention, 1969.

Mitchell, K.M., Rubin S.E., Bozard, J.P. and Wyrick, T.J. Effects
    of Short term Training on Residence Hall Assistants. Counselor
    Education and Supervision, 1971, 10(4), 310-318.

Morishima, J.K. Effects on Student Achievement on Residence Hall
    Groupings Based on Academic Majors. In Bagley, C.H. (Ed.)
    Research on Academic Input: Proceedings of the 6th Annual
    Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Cortland,
    New York: Office of Institutional Planning, State University
    of New York and Cortland, 1966.

Murphy, R. and Ortenzi, A. Use of Standardized Measurements in the
    Selection of Residence Hall Staff. _Journal of College Student_
    Personnel, 1966, 8(6), 360-363.

Newcomb, P.H. Student Peer Group Influence. In Sanford, N. (Ed.)
    The American College: Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Newcomb, T.M. and Feldman, K.A. _The Impact of College Students_,
    Vol. 1, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Ogden, G.B. Some Consequences of an Innovative Living-Learning Program.
    Paper presented to Annual Meeting of New England Educational
    Research Organization, Boston College, 1971.

Pace, L.T. Roommate Dissatisfaction in Residence Halls. _Journal of_
    College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 144-147.

Pemberton, C.S. An Evaluation of the 1967-1968 Living-Learning Ex-
    periment at the University of Delaware. _University Impact_
    Study, Delaware: University of Delaware, 1968.

Plough, T. Understanding Student Subcultures, paper presented at
    CMU workshop, August 19, 1969.

Powell, J.R., Plyler, S.A., Dickson, B.A. and McLellan, S.D.,
    The Personnel Assistant in College Residence Halls. Boston:
    Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Pyle, R.R. and Snyder, F.A. Students as Paraprofessional Counselors
    at Community Colleges. _Journal of College Student Personnel_,
    1971, 12(4), 259-262.

Riffer, R.L. Feedback About the Summer Interpreter Training Program
    paper submitted to the NTID Division of Research, Sept. 1970a.

Riffer, R.L. Abstract of speech at A.G. Bell Conference. Philadelphia,
    June 26, 1970b.

Riffer, R.L. Social Patterns of Deaf People in Integrated Programs.
    Report of the Proceedings of the 45th Meeting of the Convention
    of American Instructors of the Deaf, Little Rock, Arkansas,
    1971a, 330-333.

Riffer, R.L. Student Social Development at NTID. Paper presented to
    NTID Division of Research and Training, 1971b.

Riffer, R.L. Determinants of the Sociometric Patterns Among Deaf
    and Hearing Students at NTID. Paper presented to NTID Division
    of Research and Development, 1971c.

Riker, H.C. Planning Functional College Housing. New York: Bureau
of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Riker, H.C. College Housing as Learning Centers. ACPA Report,
Washington, D.C., 1969.

Rockey, N.C. Living and Learning at Central Washington State College.
Paper presented at NDEA Institute for College Student Personnel
Workers, Michigan State University, 1969.

Rohringer, L. Style of living means more than style of building.
College and University Business, 1970, 50 (4), 50-52.

Rusalem, H. A Study of College Students Attitudes about
Deafness and Blindness. New Outlook for the Blind, 1956,
59, 90-91.

St. John, M.H. Desegration and Minority Group Performance. Review
of Educational Research, 1970, 1, 111-133.

Schoemer, J.R. and McConnell, W.A. Is There a Case for the Freshman
Women's Residence Hall? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1970,
49, 35-40.

Schroeder, C.C., and Lemay, M.L. The Impact of Co-ed Residence Halls
on Self-Actualization. Journal of College Student Personnel,
1973, 14, 105-110.

Severinsen, K.N., Viviano, A., and Hopkins, G., Effect of Over As-
signment to Residence Hall Rooms. Journal of College Student
Personnel, 1970, 11, 141-143.

Shaw, W.B. Communitizing a Residence Hall: One Strategy. Unpublished
address, University of Denver, 1972.

Siegel, A.E. and Siegel, S. Reference Groups, Membership Groups, and
Attitude Change. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957,
55, 35-40.

Sinnette E. R., Sachson, A.D. and Eddy, G. The Influence of Living
Units on the Behavior of College Students. Journal of College
Student Personnel, 1973, 3, 209-214.

Stein, Z. and Zusser, M. Mutibility of Intelligence and Epidemeology
of Mild Mental Retardation. Review of Educational Research,
1970, 40, 59-67.

Stern, G. Of Bardot and the State of our Colleges. Current Issues
in Higher Education: 1966, Washington, D.C.: National Education
Association, 1966.

Sternberg, C. Personality Trait Patterns of College Students Majoring in Different Fields. Psychological Monographs, 1955, 69, 18-26.

Stuckless, E.R. Research on the Social Adjustment of NTID Students. Paper prepared for NTID Focus, 1971.

Stuckless, E.R. A Study of Faculty and Student Perceptions Towards Serving Special Students at RIT. Unpublished Research Report, NTID, 1972.

Student Housing, A Report from Educational Facilities Laboratory, Library of Congress, Catalog No. 72-87894, 1972.

Student Housing: A Report to the Statutory Commission, Madison, Wisconsin, April, 1971.

Taylor, R.G. Effects of Living Environment on Achievement and Study Habits. Paper presented to ACPA Convention, St. Louis, March, 1970.

Teevan, F.C. Personality Correlates of Undergraduate Field of Specialization. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 212-214.

Titus, C.R. Student Express Their Housing Needs and Preferences. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 3, 202-204.

Vreeland, R. The Effect of Houses on Students Attitudes and Values. In Whiteley, J.M. and Sprandel, H.Z. (EDS) The Growth and Development of College Students, American College Student Personnel Association, Student Personnel Series No. 12, 1970.

Wallace, W.L. Student Culture. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Walter, G.G. A Study of Faculty Attitudes Toward NTID and Related Concepts. Unpublished research report, NTID, 1969.

Walter, G.G. and Berdy, S.M. Profile of Students Entering NTID in 1970. NTID Research Report (HEW), 1971.

Warr, P.V. Attitudes and Behavior in a Hall Residence. University Quarterly, 1964, 19, 56-68.

Webster, H. Changes in Attitudes in College. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 109-117.

Whittaker, B. Student Sub-cultures Reviewed and Revisited. Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1969, 1, 23-24.

Zirkel, P.A. Self-Concept and the Disadvantage of Ethnic Group Membership and Mixture. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 211-226.