

Satisfaction Among College Students Living in Traditionally Staffed and Alternatively Staffed Residence Centers

Carolyn Jones, Minda Heyman, Valerie Sarma, Kimberly Sluis, and Michele Starzyk

This study compares satisfaction among students living in a residence center with a traditional staffing structure and students living in a residence center with an alternative staffing pattern. The satisfaction of students is assessed in relationship to community, independence and accountability, policy enforcement, and safety. The researchers also assess the level of importance students place on different aspects of their living environment in an effort to determine how different hall environments meet student needs.

Institutions of higher education have long been involved in the process of creating environments that foster student satisfaction.

Given the considerable investment of time and energy that most students make in attending college, the student's perception of value should be given substantial weight. Indeed, it is difficult to argue that student satisfaction can be legitimately subordinated to any other educational outcome. (Astin, 1977, p.164)

Generating environments that satisfy a diverse population of students has become especially important with regard to student housing. "Students increasingly are bringing to higher education exactly the same consumer expectations they have for every other commercial establishments with which they deal" (Levine & Cureton, 1997, p. 14). In an increasingly consumer-based system with growing competition from private housing developers, colleges and universities must address issues of student satisfaction with regard to the housing environments offered on their respective campuses.

In examining student satisfaction with residence hall environments, researchers have discovered that "variety in styles and types of accommodations increases the appeal of residence hall living to a

greater number of students" (Grimm, 1993, p.249). Responding to the changing needs of students, such as privacy, is necessary for the success of residence life programs on university campuses (Grimm, 1993).

It is clear that in an effort to increase student satisfaction, and thus increase student housing retention rates, residence life programs must make adjustments in both the type of services they provide and the ways in which they provide these services. This study compares satisfaction among students living in a residence center with a traditional staffing structure and students living in a residence center with an alternative staffing pattern. For the purpose of this research traditional staffing is defined as a building in which Resident Assistants supervised by graduate and professional staff live on individual floors. Understanding how these environments are related to student satisfaction will assist residence life professionals as they look to generate living environments that will best meet the needs and demands of a changing student population.

Literature Review

Facility and Staff Structure Components

Literature focusing on the staffing structure in residence halls is limited. The emphasis of prior research is on programming design (Schroeder and Freesh, 1977), academic performance within unique program designs (Delucchi, 1993) and student satisfaction with differing programs (Floyd, 1987). It is therefore necessary to utilize a historical approach to analyze the trends in residential facility design and staffing structure.

Greenleaf (1969) outlines predictions for residence halls in the following areas: construction, programs, regulations and staffing. Structurally, the trend was to modify halls from long corridors to a grouping of rooms that allows for privacy (Greenleaf, 1969). Greenleaf points to the growing desire of students, particularly upperclassmen, to have "the privacy of a single room" (Greenleaf, 1969, p. 67).

Rules and regulations were also prevalent issues in the 1970s. Greenleaf's 1969 writings suggest, "Administrators must take the lead in involving students in a thorough and objective reexamination of current rules and regulations....As young adults, students are gaining support

for greater freedom, self-responsibility and individual determination of behavior" (p. 69). It was thought that if student input was not considered when drafting rules and regulations then campuses would have difficulty in retaining students (Greenleaf, 1969).

Literature on staffing structure has focused on how departments of residence life have emphasized the importance for staff "to place emphasis upon student self-discipline, self-responsibility and educational interaction" (Greenleaf, 1969, p. 69). Greenleaf's (1969) belief is that staff size will decrease while training and preparation of staff will increase. Greenleaf (1969) further posits, residence halls need to change to fit the students' needs of the future.

Interestingly, while the nature of students' needs have changed, the trends that Greenleaf postulates for the 1970s are still relevant today. Blimling (1993) submits that it is expected that more students will want private rooms and will seek to live in residence halls that have more services. In order to meet the changing needs, student housing facilities at many universities will require renovation (Blimling, 1993). Moving towards more privacy-based facilities has "the potential to fundamentally change the way residence life staff interact with students and the magnitude of the influence that residence halls can have on students" (Blimling, 1993, p. 12).

Finally, Grimm (1993) discusses the multitude of on-campus living arrangements. While providing several options from apartment-style with minimal supervision to traditional high-rise corridor housing, each have been found to provide both benefits and challenges for students; there is no agreement as to a single design or combination of concepts for creating a residential hall hybrid (Grimm, 1993).

Satisfaction with Residence Center Environment

Research focusing on satisfaction with residence environments is not widely available, therefore the research presented in this portion of the literature review focuses on general research relating to the following areas: community, independence, accountability, policy enforcement, and personal safety. Astin (1985) asserts that student satisfaction with campus services is a measure of institutional effectiveness. In response to this finding, institutions should seek student input in order to increase effectiveness of services. However Boyer's (1987) research has found

that "almost without exception, the role of students in campus decision-making is not taken seriously in higher education" (p.235).

Residence hall environments have the ability to enhance students' personal and educational experiences (Anchors, Douglas & Kasper, 1993). According to Anchors, et al. (1993) a residential community "aims at promoting the common good, imparts a sense of belonging, and supports the ultimate goals of encouraging students' personal development" (p.461). A sense of caring, trust, teamwork, involvement, and shared leadership by students can be used as criteria to determine the health of the community (Anchors et al., 1993).

Supportive communities have the ability to provide students with opportunities to explore their personal identity and interdependence with others (Anchors et al., 1993). Residence life programs, which value student development, should promote responsibility and positive contributions to communities among students (Winston & Anchors, 1993). According to Magolda (1993), residence halls are environments in which students have the opportunity to evaluate their morals. Resident Assistants play an integral role in this process as they educate residents about the center policies and help residents to understand why the policies exist and why enforcement of policies is necessary (Winston & Fitch, 1993).

Winston and Anchors (1993) advocate that residence halls should be "endorsing the cultivation of a healthy lifestyle, both physically and psychologically" (p.41). Students are seeking more independence in their residence communities and expect to be safe and secure in the residence halls (Schuh, 1996). Schuh (1996) suggests that there is a relationship between lack of supervision and presence of safety in residence halls.

Methods

Participants

The study was conducted at a large, public, Research I institution in the Midwest during the fall semester of 2000. First-year students are not required to live on the campus. Students who are interested in living in a residence hall must apply through the residence life office to live in one of the 11 residence halls or campus apartments.

The staffing structure of Smith Hall consists of undergraduate

Residence Assistants who are supervised by three Graduate Supervisors. Resident Assistants live on each floor where they supervise thirty-five to seventy-five students. They are responsible for community building, extensive programming, and providing on-call duty coverage for weeknights and weekends. During on-call duty, Resident Assistants are responsible for hall safety by locking center doors and enforcing policy.

In contrast, the residents of each floor in Brown Hall elect their own Floor President who serves as a student government representative and also implements programs for approximately thirty-three floor residents. Three graduate students in Brown Hall serve as Resident Leadership Specialists who supervise the Floor Presidents. On-call weeknight and weekend duty is rotated between the Resident Leadership Specialists and two uniformed and armed staff police officers that live and work in the center.

The researchers limited the participant pool to sophomores, juniors and seniors for two reasons. First, researchers wanted to focus specifically on the undergraduate experience. While there is a small population of graduate students who reside in Brown Hall, the vast majority of students living in Smith Hall are undergraduates. Second, first-year student residents were excluded from the sample. The researchers felt this exclusion was necessary because the university does not allow first-year students to select a residence hall, and first-year students would therefore be unable to complete the section of the instrument that asks the participant to disclose the reasons for choosing to live in your residence hall. In addition, the study examined students' experiences in the residence halls. First-year students did not have as much experience living in the residence halls, because they are newcomers to their living environments. The researchers gathered 60 surveys from Brown Hall and 42 from Smith Hall to make the total sample 102 participants.

Instrumentation

Based on the literature reviewed, the survey was constructed to measure the students' feelings of importance, comfort and satisfaction with various aspects of their campus residential living environment. The main difference between the halls, staffing structure, was a focus when

constructing questions for the survey. The survey consists of five sections: 1) demographic information, 2) importance of hall characteristics in selection of residence, 3) comfort level with personal safety, 4) satisfaction with community, independence/accountability, policy enforcement and physical safety, and 5) open ended response questions. The demographic information section solicited information through multiple choice and fill in the blank questions. The next four sections utilized a five point Likert scale to measure the importance, comfort, and satisfaction that students have with various aspects of residential living. A "no basis for judgment" option was also included in both the comfort and satisfaction sections. The final section consisted of two open-ended response questions regarding overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Surveys were color-coded to distinguish between each residence hall. The two survey instruments contained identical questions, except for questions pertaining to police staffing. The Smith Hall survey contained questions regarding the "idea" of police officers in the building. The Brown Hall survey contained questions regarding the "presence" of police officers in the building. This difference was necessary due to the fact that Smith Hall does not currently have police officers on staff, while Brown Hall does.

Prior to its actual distribution, the survey was given to a group of undergraduate men and women as a pretest. Once an application was approved by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, researchers set up tables to distribute surveys in the first floor lobby of both Smith and Brown residence halls.

Analysis

After 102 usable surveys were collected, the data were analyzed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Means were calculated for each variable. T-tests were then utilized to determine the difference between means for Smith and Brown respondents. In addition, open-ended responses for questions were hand coded by four researchers. Two questions asked participants for self-reported responses of the best aspect of their residence hall and what they were most dissatisfied with in their residence hall. For the best aspect, the

responses are divided into the following categories: privacy/independence, facilities, location, RA/residents, cost and other. Dissatisfaction responses are separated into the following categories: facilities, parking, food, RA/staff, noise, social interaction, policies, cost, none, and other. For both open ended questions, responses that were only given once were placed in the "other" category.

Limitations

Due to the nature of our study, several limitations need to be noted. One limitation is that the sample size is relatively small. Sample size was limited due to time and the number of available participants. A second limitation resulted from the uneven breakdown of gender in each residence hall tower. In addition, the large number of first-year students living in Smith Hall resulted in a restricted number of eligible participants from that residence hall. Since the majority of Smith's residents are first-year students and graduate students reside in Brown Hall, this may also impact the environments in each residence hall. Finally, the sample is not representative of the population because residents self-selected to participate in the study.

Results

Demographics

Demographic information for participants is located in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Frequencies for Brown and Smith

Variable	Brown Frequency (%)	n	Smith Frequency (%)	n
Gender				
Female	55	33	38.1	16
Male	45	27	61.9	26
Academic Class				
Sophomore	46.7	28	61.9	26
Junior	43.3	26	23.8	10
Senior	10.0	6	14.3	6
Race/Ethnicity				
African American/Black	13.3	8	23.8	10
Hispanic/Latino	1.7	1	0.0	0
American Indian	0.0	0	2.4	1
White/Non-Hispanic	80.0	48	71.4	30
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.0	3	2.4	1
GPA				
3.5-4.0	16.7	10	31.0	13
3.0-3.4	38.3	23	35.7	15
2.5-2.9	35.0	21	19.0	8
2.0-2.4	5.0	3	9.5	4
1.5-1.9	3.3	2	0.0	0

Level of Importance

Table 2 contains significant findings regarding level of importance, comfort, and satisfaction as reported by participants. The residents of the two centers differ on a number of variables related to the level of importance they place on certain aspects of their living environment. At the $p < .001$ significance level, cost is more important to residents living in Smith ($M=3.68$) than it is to residents living in Brown ($M=2.58$). There is a significant difference ($p < .001$) between the importance of the residence hall proximity to other services used by participants in Brown ($M=3.52$) and Smith ($M=4.36$). Another significant difference within the importance category is indicated between the means of Brown ($M=3.88$) and Smith ($M=2.86$) with regard to the attractiveness of the residence facility. There is a significant difference ($p < .01$) between the importance of the hall being recommended by friends for Brown ($M=3.02$) and Smith ($M=2.29$) participants. At the $p < .05$ significance level, limited staff supervision is more important to participants in Brown ($M= 3.35$) than to participants in Smith ($M=2.69$).

Level of Comfort

There are differences in the mean comfort levels of Brown and Smith participants. Respondents in Smith ($M=3.79$) report a greater degree of comfort with their knowledge of what to do if a tornado siren sounds in their residence hall than do their counterparts in Brown ($M=2.95$). This finding is significant at the $p < .01$ level. At the $p < .05$ level, there is a significant difference between the comfort respondents of Brown ($M=4.23$) and Smith ($M= 4.69$) report having with their knowledge of what to do if a fire alarm sounds in their building. When asked about their level of comfort with the "presence" of armed police officers living in their building, Brown respondents report a mean of 3.80. When asked about their level of comfort with the "idea" of armed police officers living in their building Smith respondents report a mean of 3.26. When compared, the difference between these two means is found to be significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Level of Satisfaction

Community. The only significant finding within the satisfaction with community variables is the satisfaction participants report regarding the

level of trust they have for other residents living in their community. Brown (M=3.83) respondents report a higher level of trust for community members than do their counterparts in Smith (M=3.20). This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Independence and Accountability. Brown participants are more satisfied with the degree of independence and accountability provided in their current residence hall. The differences between participant satisfaction with the level of privacy and with the building alcohol policy are significant at the $p < .001$ level. For the variable of privacy, participants from Brown (M=4.63) are more satisfied than are participants from Smith (M=3.88). The alcohol policy measure yields a mean of 4.25 for Brown and a mean of 3.18 for Smith. Brown (M=4.63) participants have a higher level of satisfaction with the feelings of independence they have in their residence hall than do participants from Smith (M=4.05). This difference is significant at the $p < .01$ level. Brown (M=4.32) participants also report a higher level of satisfaction than do their counterparts in Smith (M=3.77) with regard to the level of respect that the Residence Life staff in their building have for resident privacy. This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Policy enforcement. Brown residents report higher levels of satisfaction with policy enforcement in their residence hall. At the significance level of $p < .01$, Brown (M=3.92) participants are more satisfied with the enforcement of quiet hours than are Smith (M=3.00) participants. Brown (M=3.60) participants also report a higher level of satisfaction with the consistency with which residence life staff members confront policy violations than their counterparts in Smith (M=2.89). This difference is significant at the $p < .05$ level. Brown (M=3.92) participants are more satisfied with the consideration of their opinion in the creation of residence hall policies and procedures than are Smith (M=3.00) participants. This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Safety. The most significant finding within the safety variables is the ability of security staff to create an environment where the participant feels safe. This finding is significant at the $p < .001$ level with a mean of 4.42 for Brown and a mean of 3.71 for Smith. At the $p < .01$ level, participant satisfaction with building locking procedures and the safety that the residence hall provides in comparison to off-campus housing

are significant. Brown (M=4.19) participants are more satisfied with building locking procedures than are Smith (M=3.43) participants. Brown (M=4.40) participants also report a higher level of satisfaction with the safety that their hall provides in comparison to off-campus housing than do Smith participants (M=3.68). Smith (M=4.05) participants report a higher level of satisfaction with their knowledge of what to do in an emergency situation than do Brown (M=3.47) participants. This is significant at the $p < .05$ level. Participants in Brown (M=4.50) have a greater level of satisfaction with the degree of physical safety they feel their residence hall provides than do participants from Smith (M=4.05). This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 2. Significant Differences in Importance and Satisfaction Variables Between Brown and Smith

Variable	Brown Mean	Brown SD	Smith Mean	Smith SD	Significance
Importance Variables					
Cost of Hall is Lower	2.58	1.21	3.68	1.42	***
Staff Supervision is Limited	3.35	1.33	2.69	1.24	*
Hall Recommended	3.02	1.32	2.29	1.15	**
Location on Campus	3.52	1.30	4.36	.98	***
Building is Attractive	3.88	1.09	2.86	1.51	***
Comfort Variables					
Fire Protocol	4.23	1.11	4.69	.90	*
Tornado Protocol	2.95	1.36	3.79	1.46	**
Armed Live-in Police	3.80	1.12	3.26	1.45	*
Satisfaction Variables: Community					
Trust for Other Residents	3.83	1.13	3.20	1.32	*
Satisfaction Variables: Independence and Accountability					
Privacy	4.63	.80	3.88	1.25	***
Independence	4.63	.74	4.05	.99	**
Staff Respect for Privacy	4.32	.98	3.77	1.42	*
Alcohol Policy	4.25	1.18	3.18	1.64	***
Satisfaction Variables: Policy Enforcement					
Opinion Considered	3.44	1.20	2.81	1.17	*
Quiet Hours	3.92	1.28	3.00	1.60	**
Staff Consistency	3.60	1.07	2.89	1.37	*
Satisfaction Variables: Safety					
Emergency Knowledge	3.47	1.24	4.05	1.03	*
Building Locking Procedures	4.19	1.10	3.43	1.50	**
Safety Provided by Security Staff	4.42	.81	3.71	1.07	***
Physical Safety	4.50	.71	4.05	1.08	*
Safety vs. Off-campus	4.40	.77	3.68	1.19	**

* $p = .05$; ** $p = .01$; *** $p = .001$ for t test analyses

Self-Reported Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction. When asked open-ended questions about the features in their current residence hall that are

most satisfying and dissatisfying, respondents indicated responses that were coded into general categories. Forty-three percent of the participants from Brown indicated that privacy is the best feature of their current residence hall. Another 32% of Brown respondents rated facilities as the best component of their residence hall. Location was the best feature for 15% of the Brown participants. Ten percent of Brown participants contributed answers that were coded as "other."

When responding to the same question, 41% of Smith respondents rated location as the best feature of their current residence hall. Twenty-seven percent of Smith respondents indicated that the building staff and residents of their building are the most positive aspect of living in Smith hall. Another 20% of participants felt that cost is the best feature of their current residence hall. Twelve percent of the Smith respondents contributed answers that were coded as "other." Brown participants were most dissatisfied with: the social interaction provided by their community (37%), facilities in their residence hall (14%), food available in their residence hall (12%), building policies (7%), cost (5%) and parking (4%). Nine percent of participants from Brown felt that nothing was most dissatisfying about their current living environment. Thirty-five percent of the Brown responses were coded as "other."

Smith respondents felt most dissatisfied with the food (58%) available in their residence center. Another 15% rated the building staff as the most dissatisfying aspect of Smith. Noise (12%) was also an area of dissatisfaction for Smith participants. Ten percent of Smith respondents indicated that they were most dissatisfied with the building policies. Five percent of the responses given by Smith participants were coded as "other."

Discussion

The findings related to importance, comfort, and satisfaction provide insight into the impact of residential environments on campus. This raises practical and theoretical implications divided into three subcategories: level of importance, comfort and satisfaction.

Level of Importance

Several variables show significant differences between Brown and Smith. Smith participants reported the cost of the residence hall and

the location of the hall to be more important than Brown participants. Brown participants reported limited supervision, recommendation of the hall by friends, and attractiveness of the appearance to be more important than Smith participants.

Several reasons may have caused residents of Smith to report a mean that was almost one point higher than the mean of Brown participants for cost. The Smith mean response is described in between important and very important and the Brown mean can be characterized as in between unimportant and neutral. Obtained through a Residence Life publication, the cost for a double room at Brown is \$3,276 while Smith residents pay \$2,641, a difference of \$635 for the academic year. There are also several living options available at Brown that are considerably more expensive, that are not available at Smith. These options include suites and apartments that range in price from \$4,306 - \$4,399. Additionally, 24% of students surveyed at Smith participant in a Cooperative Community. The Smith Cooperative Community allow residents to reduce their annual room rates by \$878 - \$1,301 in exchange for the responsibility of sharing floor cleaning. This finding suggests that the option of differing levels of cost, as well as programs to subsidize cost, enable some students to afford to live on campus. An additional implication may be that providing new options on campus might not truly be options for all students, but rather options for students who can afford to pay higher housing fees. Additional research may examine how students are paying for college and how the method of payment affects their housing selection.

When examining responses to location, responses from participants living in Brown can be described as between neutral and important and responses from participants in Smith can be characterized as between important and very important. This finding suggests benefits of on-campus versus off-campus housing may be related to location of the residence hall. As the Residence Life department builds and renovates new campus housing, it may be useful for them to consider the ways in which new housing can be designed to provide the benefits of off-campus living and while maintaining the proximity of the residence hall to campus.

A significant difference exists between the importance respon-

dents of Smith and Brown place on limited supervision from staff. For Brown participants, this variable is more important than it is for Smith participants. This finding is particularly insightful considering that the difference in staffing structure in Brown varies from the traditional staffing structure model. Brown utilizes elected floor presidents who serve as student government representatives and perform limited staff functions. This suggests that students who rate this variable as important are more likely to live in an alternatively staffed structure with less supervision.

The variable that addresses the issue of hall recommendation indicates that students surveyed at Brown consider peer influence when selecting their residence. It is possible that because Brown Hall is a newly renovated residence center, participants may be more apt to recommend the facility to their friends. It would be interesting to examine why friends recommended the hall. Additionally, the findings imply that Smith participants' response can be described as unimportant ($M=2.29$).

Finally, the importance of appearance of the facility is significant between Brown and Smith respondents. The Brown mean suggests that attractiveness of the residence hall appearance is of importance to Brown participants, while the Smith mean suggests indifference with response to the importance of attractiveness of the residence hall appearance. This suggests that students considered Brown's newly renovated structure when deciding to live in this facility. Self-reported data from the open-ended survey questions of Brown participants emphasizes the importance residents place on living in a new facility.

Level of Comfort

Only three variables show significance related to level of comfort reported by participants. Comfort with participants' knowledge of what to do when a fire alarm sounds, knowledge of what to do when a tornado alarm sounds, and the presence or idea of armed police living in the building yielded significant differences between Brown and Smith respondents. Because of their nature, the questions related to knowledge of emergency procedures are discussed together. Based on mean scores, Smith respondents are very comfortable with their

knowledge of fire procedures and comfortable with knowledge of tornado procedures. In comparison, Brown respondents are comfortable with knowledge of fire procedures and neutral in regard to their comfort with tornado procedures.

These findings may have several implications. First, participants from both halls are more comfortable with the fire procedures than the tornado procedures for their buildings. Fire drills are conducted each semester in both Brown and Smith halls. This may result in higher levels of comfort with fire procedures for participants. It may be useful for the staff of each building to consider conducting tornado drills in an effort to better educate all residents about the tornado procedures. Residents in Smith express an overall comfort while residents in Brown express neutrality about their knowledge of tornado procedures in their hall. It is important to consider whether the staff structure at Brown, which allows for limited supervision, impedes the process of preparing students for emergency situations. Residence Life staff should consider how emergency information is disseminated to students. If Resident Assistants are used to distribute this information, then adjustments must be made to ensure the residents in non-traditionally staffed residence centers are made familiar with emergency procedures in their hall. The lower levels of comfort with emergency procedures among Brown participants when compared to Smith participants may create a liability for Residence Life staff at this institution.

The third variable that shows significance pertains to the issue of live-in police officers. Because Brown actually has live-in armed police and Smith does not, this question differed on the surveys for each hall. The Brown survey asked about the "presence" of armed police while the Smith survey asked about the "idea" of armed police living in the hall. The difference in response could imply that a comfort level is gained through personal contact and interaction with police officers. The police officers living and working in Brown are residents who are introduced to their peers at hall meetings. It is interesting to note that while this variable is significant, there is no significant difference in the means with regard to armed police walking the halls at night. The use of armed police is a relatively new phenomenon and it may be instructive to further examine student response to this staffing approach.

Level of Satisfaction

The satisfaction level that participants report having with the trust for other students in their residence hall is significant between Brown and Smith. The mean response from students in Brown Hall is higher than the mean response in Smith Hall. This could be in part due to the difference in populations in each of the halls. Brown Hall does not house first-year students, while a large percentage of residents in Smith Hall are first-year students. The majority of residents in Brown are returning students, who may be more likely to know and trust their neighbors and roommates than Smith residents whose neighbors and roommates are composed of a majority of first-year students.

Additionally, this higher level of satisfaction reported from students in Brown Hall may also suggest that residents of Brown perceive their fellow residents to have a higher level of maturity. These findings have interesting implications for residence hall professionals who are trying to build and promote a sense of community and trust in an environment that is primarily first-year students.

Respondents from Brown Hall are significantly more satisfied than respondents from Smith Hall with the variables of privacy, independence, staff respect for privacy, and the alcohol policy. These findings are congruent with Greenleaf (1969) and Blimling (1993), whose research stated that students are satisfied with the privacy single rooms offer and the opportunities for freedom and independence. In this section, the two questions that yielded the most significant results were "the level of privacy I have in my residence hall" and "the alcohol policy in my hall." These results are not surprising given the fact that the majority of rooms in Brown Hall are single-occupancy rooms and the alcohol policy in Brown Hall is more liberal than the policy in Smith Hall. No alcohol is allowed in Smith, whereas residents who are twenty-one in Brown Hall may have alcohol in their residence.

Satisfaction varies between Brown and Smith participants regarding issues of policy enforcement. Brown participants believe that their opinions are taken into consideration when policies and procedures are created for their residence hall. In addition, Brown participants are more satisfied than Smith participants with the enforcement of

quiet hours in their building. Lastly, residents in Brown Hall are more satisfied with their residence hall staff's consistency with confronting policy infractions. Winston & Fitch (1993) believe that staff play a vital role in educating residents regarding the need for policies in the residence hall. These findings provide a practical starting point from which residence hall staff may make improvements in their efforts to educate students about building policies. Staff may also review their procedures regarding policy enforcement to ensure a greater deal of consistency in the future. Specific attention should be paid to the enforcement of quiet hours. The difference in satisfaction of the consideration of opinions of Brown and Smith residents may be due to the differences between the staffing structures in the two buildings. In addition, Brown's renovations included marketing research conducted by an outside agency, which used student focus groups. Students were asked for their opinions about facilities and staffing. The fact that the building renovations, policies, and staffing structures reflect the earlier input of students may impact the level of satisfaction reported by Brown participants. As Greenleaf (1969) asserted, administrators need to take the opinions of students into account when establishing policies in an effort to ensure student satisfaction.

Schuh (1996) suggests that students desire a feeling of safety in their residence hall. Brown Hall respondents report that they are more satisfied in the areas of procedures for locking their building, the ability of security staff to provide a safe environment, the degree to which residents feel physically safe, and the degree of safety living in the hall provides as opposed to off-campus living. Smith Hall respondents are only more satisfied with their knowledge of what to do in an emergency. In order to increase the level of safety for residents, staff may need to look to other residence halls for differences in safety protocol. For example, the rooms in Brown Hall require a card key swipe to gain entrance, as opposed to Smith's traditional key system. Residence hall staff may look into the benefits and costs associated with a different room locking method. In addition, staff may need additional programming efforts to ensure that their residents are knowledgeable on what to do in emergency situations.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to compare levels of importance, comfort, and satisfaction between residents living in traditionally and non-traditionally staffed residence halls. When participants in these two different types of halls were compared, significant findings occurred within the category of satisfaction with safety. The importance variables of cost, limited supervision, hall recommendation, location, and appearance were found to be significant between halls. Lastly, significant differences in satisfaction were determined in regard to independence and accountability.

As cited in the literature review, prior research has indicated that student needs and demands are changing. Students are entering institutions of higher education with consumer-based expectations (Levine & Cureton, 1997). The responsibility of meeting these demands with regard to living environments is now in the hands of residence life professionals. As student affairs professionals seek to understand the impact of different living environments, this research provides a basis for future inquiry regarding staffing structure in residence halls.

References

- Anchors, S., Douglas, K. B., and Kasper, M. K. (1993). Developing and enhancing communities. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 461-480) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Astin, A. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Blimling, G. S. (1993). New challenges and goals for residential life programs. In R. B. Winston, Jr., S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America* (pp. 177). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Delucchi, M. (1993). Academic performance in college town. *Education*, 114, 96-100.

Floyd, N. E. (1987). College student living group satisfaction in an innovative residential community. *College Student Journal*, 21, 241-248.

Greenleaf, E. A. (1969). Residential Halls 1970's. *National Association of Student Personnel Administration*, 7(2), 65-71.

Grimm, J. C. (1993). Residential alternatives. In R. B. Winston, Jr., S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 248-268). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. & Cureton, J. S. (1998). Collegiate life: An obituary. *Change*, 30, (3), 12-17, 51.

Magolda, M. B. (1993). Intellectual, ethical, and moral development. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 95-133). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Schroeder, C. C. and Freesh, N. (1977). Applying environmental management strategies in residential halls. *National Association of Student Personnel Administration*, 15(1), 51-56.

Schuh, J. H. (1996). Residence halls. In A. L. Rentz & Associates (Eds.), *Student affairs practice in higher education* (pp. 269-279). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Grimm, J. C. (1993). Residential alternatives. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 248-268) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, R. B. & Anchors, S. (1993). Student development in the residential environment. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 25-64) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Winston, R. B. & Fitch, T. R. (1993). Paraprofessional staffing. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 269-291). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Minda Heyman graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in May 2001 with a M.S. in Student Affairs Administration. She received her undergraduate degree in Journalism from the University of Maryland. During her time at IU, Minda worked with the Internship Opportunities Program at the Career Development Center.

Carolyn Jones graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University with a M.S. in 2001. She received a B.A. in Journalism from Iowa State University in 1999. While at IU, Carolyn served as a member of the Greek Advising Team in the Office of Student Activities.

Valerie Sarma is 2001 graduate of the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University Bloomington. She received a B.S. in Psychology from Loyola University Chicago in 1999. At IU, Valerie served as a Graduate Supervisor in Read Residence Center.

Kimberly Sluis graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in May 2001 with a M.S. in Student Affairs Administration. She received her undergraduate degree in Sociology from North Central College. During her time at IU, she served as a Graduate Supervisor in Read Residence Center.

Michele Starzyk graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University Bloomington in May 2001. She received a B.A. in International Relations from Drake University in 1999. Michele worked with Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority at DePauw University and as a Resident Leadership Specialist in Willkie Residence Center at Indiana University.

Campus Alcohol and Drug Abuse and the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 By: Kimberly A. Sluis

Alcohol abuse among college students poses a major challenge for university administrators across the country. Many studies have documented the high levels of alcohol abuse and the severity of problems associated with college drinking. More than 85% of students surveyed by the Core Institute in 1999 reported having consumed alcohol in the year prior to participating in the research (Core Institute, 2000). The Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study found that "nationally one in five college students is a frequent drinker" (Wechsler, Molnar, Davenport, & Baer, 1999, p. 247). Often times college student alcohol consumption is not only frequent but also heavy. Binge drinking is a common activity for a significant percentage of college students. For the purposes of the Harvard Study, binge drinking was defined as the consumption of five or more drinks in a row for men and four or more consecutive drinks for women (Wechsler, et al., 1999). Wechsler, et al. (1999) reported a 42.7% binge-drinking rate among college students. In addition, the Core Institute (2000) reported that 46.9% of students surveyed had consumed five or more drinks in one sitting at least once during the two weeks prior to completing the 1999 Core alcohol and drug survey.

Many student problems have been linked to excessive alcohol consumption. According to data from the 1999 Core Survey, 62.8% of students had experienced a hangover in the year prior to their participation in the survey. The Harvard study found that a large percentage of students who identified as frequent binge drinkers also reported having experienced various problems related to their drinking (Wechsler, et al, 1999). Many of these students missed class, fell behind with studies, did something they later regretted, experienced blackouts, argued with friends, engaged in unplanned or unprotected sex, damaged property, had trouble with the police, were injured, overdosed on alcohol, and drove after drinking or bingeing (Wechsler, et al., 1999). Fifty-four percent of the frequent binge drinkers reported having experienced five or more of the above mentioned problems related to