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ABSTRACT

Classroom Instruction Within a Residence Hall: A Comparative Study at Eastern Illinois University

by

Janet K. Zielke
M.A. Candidate
Eastern Illinois University, 1988

Major Professor: Dr. Douglas G. Bock
Department: Speech Communication

This study examined the attitudes, attendance habits, and overall grades of students in an experimental section of Speech Communication taught within a residence hall. The results of this study were found to be significant by comparing them to three sections of the same Speech Communication course taught in "standard" classrooms. This study provides support for the continuation of the experimental program in the fall of 1988. Implications in terms of revision and expansion are discussed.

(51 pages)
Introduction

The integration of academic and nonacademic life on college campuses, long a topic of concern in higher education, has powerful educational advantages. The dichotomy of classroom and residential life is both common and unfortunate. Opportunities for student growth in each domain are frequently lost, particularly when the knowledge presented in the academic setting appears unrelated to problems students experience in the residence hall. Similarly, newly discovered interests and insights achieved in the residences often remain undeveloped because there is little opportunity for them to be pursued through the academic processes.

With the recent rapid growth in higher education (Bess, 1973) huge complexes of residence halls have been built with little thought to the ways in which residence life might be integrated into academic life. Often beset by unwieldy state and federal restrictions on costs per square foot, institutions have cut financial corners by using space-saving devices without thinking about the educational life of students, let alone their personal living space. The typical long corridors, bolted-down furniture, monolithic exteriors, and cramped lounge spaces are case in point. Jencks and Riesman (1962) suggest that the typical residence which "joins two students, two beds, two bureaus, two desks, two straight chairs, and two hundred square feet of floor" is hardly sufficient to produce "enlightenment."
Classroom Climate

Student affairs professionals have long been concerned about the development of college students and providing an environment in which students can develop to their fullest (Hadley, 1987). Several theories have been advanced to explain the post-adolescent years (Chickering, 1969; Heath, 1977; Kohlberg, 1976; Loevinger, 1976; Perry, 1970; Sanford, 1966). Efforts have been made to validate these constructs and to develop assessment tools that measure the significant psychosocial or intellectual dimensions of a person's development during this important part of the life cycle (Knefelkamp, 1974; Prince, Miller, & Winston, 1974; Rest, 1979).

Other researchers have investigated how different environments relate to the development of students during the college years (Astin, 1967; Holland, 1965; Pervin, 1967; Stern, 1970). Some students prosper in one environmental setting and others do not, even though they are operating in essentially the same milieu. Differing external forces have varying effects on the individual according to the individual's internal developmental drives and needs (Hadley, 1987).

As far as many educators are concerned, the ideal classroom or school environment is that which is conducive to maximum learning and achievement. The majority of classroom environment research, therefore, has examined the effect of actual environment on achievement (Fraser, 1986a). This extensive research suggests that well developed personal relationships among students are very important. Haertel, Walberg, and Haertel (1981) labeled this condition "cohesiveness." Similarly, the meta-analysis of Johnson,
Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, and Skon (1981) led to the conclusion that cooperation within the class promotes higher achievement than competition, and that this is the case across all subject areas, for all age groups, and for a wide variety of tasks.

Nevertheless, the meta-analysis of Johnson and colleagues has been criticized by Cotton (1982) and Cook (1982) and McGlynn (1982), who emphasized the importance of interactions between achievement outcomes and situational moderators. In a rejoinder, Johnson, Maruyama, and Johnson (1982) reviewed research on many possible moderators but could find little support for their existence. Johnson and colleagues reiterated that the advantages of cooperation for increased achievement prevailed across a wide variety of tasks, even when the tasks were selected to demonstrate the superiority of competition.

Unfortunately, there have been too few studies to permit a meta-analysis of research on students, preferred environment and their achievement outcomes. It is not generally known how preferred environments relate to achievement or whether the type of learning environment that is ideal for academic achievement corresponds to the students' ideal. Parent, Forward, Canter, and Mohling (1975) found that, where university students' individual preferences were met as far as the amount of external control was concerned, they did attain higher achievement levels. Moreover, in person-environment fit studies, it was found that the relationship between achievement and actual classroom individualization were positive for students higher in preferred individualization but negative for students lower in preferred individualization (Fraser & Fisher, 1983a; Fraser & Rentoul,
1980). But whether the preferred environment is beneficial or not can depend on the goals of educators (Moos, 1979).

Presented here are suggestions followed by many instructors when creating a positive learning climate, regardless of the teaching facility (Sullivan & Wircenski, 1986).

1. Know your students.
2. Plan for instruction.
3. Prepare an information board.
4. Prepare the physical environment.
5. Plan for the social environment.
6. Project enthusiasm.
7. Maintain eye contact.
8. Move about the room.
9. Provide praise and reinforcement.
10. Vary your instructional strategies.
11. Use humor in teaching.
13. Be available to students.

According to this information, one should consider the potential for expanding residence halls to include more of the curriculum.

Residential Colleges

Programs combining living and learning are not new to American higher education. At minimum, some residence halls occasionally invite a faculty member to the residence hall to give a lecture or to join students for an afternoon "meet-the-faculty" coffee hour. In
more elaborate forms, faculty live and teach in the residence hall, and the curriculum is developed at least in part by the students and faculty in the residential college (Riker, 1965).

Those colleges and universities which recognize that curriculum and extracurriculum are necessarily linked usually make some effort to merge the two. Among the earliest institutions to move in this direction were Harvard and Yale, which modeled their house plans after the Oxford/Cambridge example (Vaill, 1967). Many other institutions have followed their lead with programs in which approximately 250 to 400 undergraduates (sometimes excluding freshmen) can develop some sense of identity within a unit smaller than the institution as a whole (Newcomb, 1971). Typically, classes are held in the residential facility itself. Libraries and study rooms are provided, and in some new experiments remote computer consoles are added.

The faculty in residential colleges may be permanently attached to the college, but more frequently they hold joint appointments in the traditional academic departments and in the residential colleges. Faculty are encouraged to take at least some of their meals in the college dining hall. Sometimes their offices are situated in the residences. Other academic personnel, such as graduate students, may be assigned either as tutors or as academic/personal counselors and asked or offered the opportunity to live in. Where courses are not formally offered by the residential college, faculty associates recruited by students may be informally attached to the residential unit. Though they may occasionally be compensated by the institution, their rewards come more commonly from the contracts they have with students (Olson, 1968).
With notable exceptions, most residential college programs have not been successful (Shaffer & Ferber, 1965). One explanation for the failure is that students are most often assigned to residence halls randomly: The combination in each residence of students with varying interests and at different stages of development is likely to approximate the distribution in the campus at large. Therefore, residential programs offered periodically in each residence hall may appeal to only a small minority of students in the hall. Their counterparts with similar interests are living elsewhere.

When residences have special characteristics (music, athletics, politics), like-minded new students gravitate to them, perpetuating their images. Congregations such as these, when not overly homogeneous (and hence lacking in stimulating diversity), can have a salutary effect on student life. In terms of the students' needs for security, for example, the sharing of concerns about the difficulties of course work (they tend to take similar courses) tends to lessen the strain. Not only are the students faced with the same problems, but in working toward solutions, they learn the values of collaboration and the rewards of helping and when students with like interests share a residence, extracurricular programs usually bring good turnouts (Newcomb, 1966).

It is possible in new institutions to hasten history by helping students develop residences with unique attributes, rather than allowing them to develop by chance over long years. Careful publicizing can result in attracting students with similar interests, thus fulfilling the prophecy.

The success of the residential setup at a particular college
depends on the nature of the curriculum and other qualitative aspects of the institution (Riker, 1965). At a large, traditional university in which most courses are intended to be pre-professional and where faculty tend to be cosmopolitan and knowledge-centered (rather than student-oriented), the links between classroom and residence are usually weak.

Planning for the integration of the two must take into account possible faculty reluctance to becoming involved with students outside the traditional classroom setting. Other staff professionals must be recruited in this case, and both staff and willing faculty can cooperatively engage students in residential learning experiences. At small and perhaps experimental institutions, faculty may have been recruited with a view toward their willingness to take an active role with students. Here, the merging of residential and classroom life can take quite a different form, perhaps even doing away with the dichotomy.

Based upon this review of literature, this study attempts to identify if Eastern Illinois University is just such an institution. Would classroom instruction within the residence hall be a beneficial program at Eastern Illinois University?

Based on this review of literature, it is the belief of this researcher that if certain courses were offered within a residence hall:

1. Class attendance would be better than it is in a standard classroom since the students would only have to go downstairs instead of across campus.

2. The overall final grade of each student will be higher in a
class within a residence hall since the attendance would be better.

3. Less housing contracts would be broken for a hall which offered classes in the basement due to the convenience of this option.

4. Student attitudes would be more positive to a hall which offered the most in the way of curricular and extra-curricular activities.

**Hypotheses**

For the purpose of this study, the following four hypotheses have been generated.

H1. Classroom instruction within the residence hall will result in higher final overall grades.

H2. Classroom instruction within the residence hall will result in better class attendance.

H3. Classroom instruction within the residence hall will enhance attitudes toward the residence hall system.

H4. Classroom instruction within the residence hall will enhance student satisfaction.
During the spring semester of 1988, Carman Hall hosted three freshman-level courses; introduction to speech communication (SPC 1310), introduction to math (MAT 1150), and personal health (HST 1200). However, for the purpose of this thesis, the scope of the research was narrowed to look only at SPC 1310.

The purpose of the magnification of this particular course in the experimental program was to provide concrete data comparing the section of SPC 1310 taught in the Carman Hall basement to similar sections taught in standard classrooms in Coleman Hall.

Carman Hall

In a continuing effort to improve their facilities, Carman Hall opened a new entertainment room named the Copa Cabana Room on October 15, 1977. The room, located in the basement of Carman, was walled off by the builders, who were the hall residents themselves. Original plans for the room included a portable bar, color TV, and other entertainment equipment. It was designed to be flexible in that many things could take place in the room like floor meetings and floor parties.

Partial cost of the construction and equipment was paid for by the Resident Housing Authority. The rest was funded by a coordinating
fund, which was money collected by machines in the hall and from activity fees. Events that took place in the Copa Cabana Room included talent shows and coffee houses with the residents of the hall providing the entertainment, and special activities such as casino night and disco dancing lessons (Cook, 1977).

Today, Eastern Illinois University Housing has one main goal and that is to make Carman as liveable as possible. They try to make people want to live there. For over ten years they have tried to integrate upper-classmen into Carman while trying to get the freshmen to want to stay as upper-classmen.

However, the reality of the situation was that if students did not get their first, second or third choice in residence halls and ended up in Carman, they would cancel their housing contracts. There has always been a waiting list for housing at Eastern so Carman was always filled to capacity, but it was rarely by choice.

It seemed that the only way Carman could possibly become an upper-classmen residence hall would be by building up the surroundings with class buildings or recreational centers. Since these plans never left the drawing board, Housing had to settle for making Carman a good "Freshmen" hall.

A tutoring program was initiated a few years ago with the idea that 17 and 18 year old freshmen would be more likely to walk downstairs for help in a subject than to walk across campus. Housing felt they were making real progress in their mission of helping with the educational process. The program was very successful.

It was this same line of thinking which was followed in initiating the classroom instruction program in the basement of Carman
Hall. "If the mountain won't come to Mohomet, bring Mohomet to the mountain" (L. Hencken, personal communication, June 28, 1988). The idea was to make the classes more convenient. The major complaint of Carman residents was that the walk to classes was too far. Other than that, the hall was friendly, fun, and very active.

Therefore, it made sense to adapt the previously mentioned Copa Cabana room for classroom instruction. The Copa Cabana room was adapted for classroom instruction by installing two blackboards and a movie screen, and by providing 40 chairs with attached desk tops, a teacher's desk, a podium, chalk, erasers, and an overhead projector. Lou Hencken, Director of Housing, said, "The room was made, basically, ready to go" (Britt, 1987). The chairs were bought and left behind by the St. Louis Cardinals football team when they came to Eastern for camp during the summer of 1987. The blackboard, chalk and erasers were only $200.00 total and, with the Housing Department's $14 million budget, this was very affordable. The classes taught were chosen based on physical classroom conditions. Obviously, there could be no labs, typing or computer courses. But, the room was suitable for required lecture courses such as English, health, math, sociology or speech. According to the building service workers, the room was the same temperature as the rest of the hall so no extra heating was required.

**Expectations**

The experimental program was designed as another way to enhance the residence hall system at Eastern Illinois University. Of course, Eastern was not a pioneer in this field. They got most of their
background information from Michigan State University which has the world's largest residence hall system (L. Hencken, personal communication, June 28, 1988).

According to initiators of the experimental program at Eastern Illinois University, the purpose of the program was simple. Only freshman courses were offered and there were freshman living in Carman Hall. In the spring, when it gets cold outside, the students can go right to the basement (Britt, 1987).

Speech Communications Chair, Dr. Douglas Bock, said, "Classes in Carman is a good idea. I think we need to find innovative ways to deliver education to our students. I don't see that this will hurt the quality of education. I think it's a good idea to teach in a non-traditional way because it shows that Eastern has commitment to its students. This is just the beginning. If it works, hopefully we will have more out there (at Carman Hall) in the fall (1988) (Britt, 1987).

"We'll see how it works," said Math Chair, John LeDuc. "There are other institutions across the country that conduct a large number of their classes in the residence halls. This is not a new idea by any means." LeDuc said he doesn't see a specific need for it at Eastern Illinois University. However, he admits that "It would be more convenient for one faculty member to go there (Carman Hall) than for 35 students to go across campus to Old Main" (Britt, 1987).

The classes were meant for Carman Hall residents, but it was possible for other students, such as off-campus residents living near Carman Hall, to get in. The registration office even had the course registration number specially coded to take only Carman residents. On the spring schedule, Carman Hall was listed in some of the spaces
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where the standard classrooms were listed.

Housing hoped this would be one more thing to enhance living in Carman. The parents, students, instructors and departments involved were very enthusiastic about the program (Lou Hencken, personal communication, June 28, 1988).

Course Requirements

In order for the reader to better understand the intent of the course selected for this study, the course requirements will be explained in detail (Department of Speech Communication, 1987).

It is the aim of SPC 1310 to help students become more effective communicators and more critical listeners. This is also assumed to be the goal of the student. The function of the course is to diagnose the individual needs of the student and guide him through a series of readings, exercises, and projects designed to achieve the maximum improvement in the time available. The greatest good for each and all can be accomplished if the individual student understands and observes the following guidelines.

Objectives of the Course

1. To prepare the student to be a more effective oral communicator in and after college.

2. To increase the student's understanding of speech communication as a means of influencing human behavior.

3. To aid the student in adjusting to many types of speech-communication situations.

4. To help the student understand the theory and put into
practice selecting, analyzing, evaluating, organizing, developing, and communicating information, evidence, and points of view.

5. To prepare the student to be an ethical communicator.

**Minimum Course Requirements**

These are the course requirements that each and every student must do in all of the SPC 1310 courses taught in the department. However, each instructor may add exercises and assignments, both graded and ungraded, for the benefit of an individual class as time permits.

1. Five graded oral communication experiences; (a) one problem-solving interacting group experience, (b) one informative extemporaneous speaking experience, (c) one persuasive (persuade, convince, actuate or stimulate) extemporaneous speaking experience, (d) two other oral communication experiences chosen from the following list: debate, entertaining speech, group discussion, informative speech, interview, persuasive speech, and special occasion speech. The assignments chosen to fulfill these two experiences will be designated by the instructor as extemporaneous, manuscript, memorized or impromptu as the instructor deems advisable.

2. One graded hourly written exam and one graded final written exam.

3. One graded listening experience.

**Basis for Grading**

1. Performance (the application of the principles of effective communication) will be weighted more heavily than the written papers
and the examinations in determining the students final grade. Therefore, 70% of the final grade will be based on instructor evaluation of oral communication experiences, and 30% of the final grade will be based on instructor evaluation of written exams and exercises.

2. The instructor will use a point system (the more difficult and lengthy projects and exams being worth the higher points) that can be evaluated at any time during the semester in this manner:

- 90 to 100% of the total points to that date = A
- 80 to 89% of the total points to that date = B
- 70 to 79% of the total points to that date = C
- 60 to 69% of the total points to that date = D

Any percentage total below 60% will mean you are failing the course.

3. To be eligible for a passing grade, each student must complete each of the minimum course requirements.

Assignments

1. All assignments are due when scheduled.

2. All late or missed assignments are given zero points until made up.

3. All assignments should be done in the order in which they are given because improvement of communication is based upon each and every assignment that goes before.

Attendance

1. Regular attendance at all classes is expected of all students. Academic instruction at the University operates under the
principle that class attendance is necessary to the complete learning process. The inherent nature of a communication class requires that attendance be the rule—absence be the exception.

2. If a student is absent from class for a legitimate reason which is established through the University health service or office of student personnel services and has the instructor's approval, the student will be given a reasonable opportunity to make up the work missed if at all possible. When the absence is not explained, no such opportunity need be afforded the student.

3. A student who is absent from class, for whatever reason, is held responsible for the class material covered during his absence and is expected to turn in all the exercises, papers, etc., assigned for submission during the course.

4. The student should notify the instructor well in advance of a legitimate absence whenever possible.

Make-up.

1. It is the responsibility of the student to make arrangements before or on the day the student returns for any make-up appointment.

2. Work missed for a legitimate reason must be made-up at the convenience of the instructor, and within a reasonable amount of time. no penalty.

3. Minimum course requirements missed because of an unexpected absence must be completed at the convenience of the instructor. The penalty on this make-up work will be having the grade for the assignment lowered two letter grades 20% of the total value for the assignment.
Critical Listening

One can often learn as much from observing the work of others as from his/her own speaking experience. Critical listening is an important part of our training. One may be called upon frequently for reactions to the communication techniques of ones classmates.

Ethical Behavior

University regulations are followed regarding plagiarism and cheating. One should not receive or give excessive help in completing an assignment. Communication is difficult. Please observe the following for the benefit of ones classmates and the instructor.

1. Arrive on or before the class begins.

2. Arrange the room before the class begins if a special arrangement is needed. Put the room in its original order at the end of the period.

3. Erase the board and take down any materials used in ones exercises.

4. Please pay attention to the main person or persons who are communicating. Do not talk or read the newspaper, books, etc. or do assignments for your other classes.

5. If a student must be late or out of the room, please do not enter when another student is giving a speech. When the speech is over, then come in.

6. Entry into the room when any communication is going on should be as unobtrusive as possible. Do not disrupt the class.

7. Do not eat or drink in the classroom.
Appointments

Your instructor maintains regular office hours. Students are welcome to make appointments and to consult with the instructor about any difficulties he may encounter in the course. When an appointment is made, the student will be expected to arrive at the time of the appointment. Any questions about the class that the instructor cannot answer, or any complaints should be taken to R. Glen Wiley, Director of SPC 1310 Teaching Assistants, 199C, Coleman Hall.

Criteria Used For Evaluating Speeches

The Average Speech

The average speech (grade C) should meet the following criteria:

1. Conform to the kind of speech assigned (informative, persuasive, etc.).

2. Be ready for presentation on the assigned date.

3. Conform to the time limit.

4. Fulfill any special requirements of the assignment - such as preparing an outline, using visual aids, conducting an interview, etc.

5. Have a clear specific purpose and central idea.

6. Have an identifiable introduction, body, and conclusion.

7. Show reasonable directness and competence in delivery.

8. Be free of serious errors in grammar, pronunciation, and word usage.
The Above Average Speech

The above average speech (grade B) should meet the preceding criteria and also:

1. Deal with a challenging topic.
2. Fulfill all major functions of a speech introduction and conclusion.
3. Display clear organization of main points and supporting details.
4. Support main points with evidence that meets the test of accuracy, relevance, objectivity, and sufficiency.
5. Exhibit proficient use of connectives - transition, internal previews, internal summaries, and signposts.
6. Be delivered skillfully enough so as not to distract attention from the speaker's message.

The Superior Speech

The superior speech (grade A) should meet all the preceding criteria and also:

1. Constitute a genuine contribution by the speaker to the knowledge or beliefs of the audience.
2. Sustain positive interest, feeling, and/or commitment among the audience.
3. Contain elements of vividness and special interest in the use of language.
4. Be delivered in a fluent, polished manner that strengthens the impact of the speaker's message.
The Below Average Speech

The below average speech (grade D or F) is deficient in the criteria required for the C speech.

Oral Assignments

Impromptu Speech

A 2 to 3 minute speech to be delivered impromptu. The focus of the speech may be informational, persuasive, or entertaining.

The speaker will draw three topics and choose one to speak about. The speaker will then be given two minutes to collect his/her thoughts before beginning to speak.

Informative Speech

A speech of 3 to 6 minutes informing the audience about some object, process, concept, or event. Use of a visual aid is required. The speaker should turn in a complete sentence outline, but the speech itself should be delivered extemporaneously from a brief speaking outline which will be turned in upon completion of the speech.

Evaluation will focus on basic matters such as establishing eye contact, avoiding distracting mannerisms, formulating a sharp specific purpose statement, fulfilling the functions of an introduction and conclusion, limiting main points and arranging them properly, and employing connectives effectively.

Be creative in selecting a visual aid and be conscientious in following the guidelines discussed for using them.

As in all speeches, the time limit should be strictly followed.
**Persuasive Speech**

A speech of 4 to 8 minutes designed to persuade the audience for or against a question of policy. The speaker may seek either passive agreement or immediate action from the audience, though the student is encouraged to seek the latter if there is appropriate action for the audience to take. In either case, the student should be sure to deal with all three basic issues of policy speeches – need, plan, and practicality. A complete sentence outline should be submitted. Delivery of the speech is to be extemporaneous with the speaking notes turned in at the end of the speech.

This speech will require considerable research and skillful use of the methods of persuasion. Special emphasis should be given to evidence and reasoning, plus audience analysis and adaptation.

**Commemorative Speech**

A speech of 3 to 5 minutes paying tribute to a person, a group of people, an institution, or an idea. The subject may be historical, contemporary, famous or obscure. A preparation outline is not required. This speech should be written out and delivered from manuscript. The speakers will hand in their manuscripts after their speech.

This assignment calls for a less didactic speech than the informative and persuasive speeches. It focuses particularly on the use of language. Use language imaginatively and experiment with the devices for enhancing clarity and vividness. The student should rehearse this speech thoroughly so as to present it with strong eye
contact and dynamic vocal variety.

**Group Presentation**

A problem solving discussion that will be a panel-forum taking one class period. A discussion outline is required to be turned in.

**Course Syllabus**

The original SPC 1310 course syllabus was provided by the Department of Speech Communications (1987) and was adapted to the academic calendar each semester. There was little, if any, variation from this syllabus. The book used in combination with this syllabus was entitled, "Principles and Types of Speech Communication (10th ed.)" by Ehninger, et al. (1986).

**Textbook Reading Assignments**

Please note the dates that you are expected to have read or comprehended the assigned materials in the textbook. They are to have been completed by class time on the day they are assigned. Quizzes, both announced and unannounced, may be given over the material on that day or any day after the completion date (Department of Speech Communication, 1987).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. August 26 (W)</td>
<td>Course Overview/Get Acquainted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. August 28 (F)</td>
<td>Chapter 1 - &quot;The Public Person and the Speech Making Process&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. August 31 (M)</td>
<td>Chapter 2 - &quot;Listening: Speaker Audience Interaction&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. September 2 (W)</td>
<td>Impromptu Speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. September 4 (F)</td>
<td>Impromptu Speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. September 11 (F)</td>
<td>Planning and preparing speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. September 14 (M)</td>
<td>Chapter 7 - &quot;Developing Your Ideas: Finding and Using Supporting Materials&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. September 16 (W)</td>
<td>Supporting materials and library research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. September 18 (F)</td>
<td>TEST #1 - Chapter 1-5 and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. September 21 (M)</td>
<td>Chapters 10 and 11 - &quot;Beginning and Finding the Speech&quot; and &quot;Outlining the Speech&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. September 23 (W)</td>
<td>Pages 401-411 and 426-429 - Speaking in Small Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. September 25 (F)</td>
<td>Group project work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. September 28 (M)</td>
<td>Group project work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. September 30 (W)</td>
<td>GROUP A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. October 2 (F)</td>
<td>GROUP B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. October 5 (M)</td>
<td>GROUP C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. October 7 (W)</td>
<td>GROUP D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. October 9 (F)</td>
<td>MIDTERM EXAM - Chapters 1-5,7,10 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. October 12 (M)</td>
<td>Chapter 9 - &quot;Adapting the Speech Language to Communicate&quot;, &quot;Using Your Voice and Body to Communicate&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. October 16 (F) | Chapter 15 - "Speeches to Inform"
23. October 19 (M) | Speeches to Inform
24. October 21 (W) | Pages 378-387 - "Analyzing Speakers"
25. October 23 (F) | GROUP B
26. October 26 (M) | GROUP C
27. October 28 (W) | GROUP D
28. November 2 (M) | GROUP A
29. November 4 (W) | Chapters 6 and 8 - "Determining the Basic Appeals" and "Adapting the Speech Structure to Audiences: The Motivated Sequence"
30. November 6 (F) | Chapter 17 - "Speeches to Persuade and Activate"
31. November 9 (M) | Speeches to Persuade
32. November 11 (W) | TEST #2 - Chapters 9, 12-14, 15, and Pages 378-387
33. November 13 (F) | GROUP C
34. November 16 (M) | GROUP D
35. November 18 (W) | GROUP A
36. November 20 (F) | GROUP B
37. November 23 (M) | Chapter 18 and Pages 411-413 - "Speeches on Special Occasions" and "Humor in Public Speaking" Outside Listening Assignments Due
38. November 30 (M) | Special Occasion Speeches
39. December 2 (W) | GROUP D
40. December 4 (F)  GROUP A
41. December 7 (M)  GROUP B
42. December 9 (W)  GROUP C
43. December 11 (F)  Review Day
44. December 15-19  FINAL EXAM WEEK
CHAPTER III

Methodology

Demographics

Four sections of SPC 1310 were used for this study. Each section was taught by the same instructor, a female Graduate Assistant in the Department of Speech Communication at Eastern Illinois University. The demographics of the sections breakdown as follows.

Section 1

semester: fall 1987

time: 8:00 - 8:50 AM MWF

place: Coleman Hall

# of students: 23

M/F ratio: 10 male, 13 female

year in school: 21 Fresh., 2 Soph., 0 Jr., 0 Sr.

(after drops and withdrawals)

Section 2

semester: fall 1987

time: 8:00 - 9:15 AM TR

place: Coleman Hall

# of students: 25

M/F ratio: 11 male, 14 female

year in school: 14 Fresh., 8 Soph., 1 Jr., 2 Sr.)
Section 3

semester: spring 1988

time: 8:00 - 8:50 AM MWF

place: Coleman Hall

# of students: 23

M/F ratio: 5 male, 18 female

year in school: 14 Fresh., 4 Soph., 3 Jr., 1 Sr.

(after drops or withdrawals)

Section 4

semester: spring 1988

time: 8:00 - 9:15 AM TR

place: Carman Hall

# of students: 24

M/F ratio: 5 male, 19 female

year in school: 23 Fresh., 0 Soph., 0 Jr., 1 Sr.

(after drops or withdrawals)

The sections will be referred to as sections 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, throughout the remainder of this paper.

Measuring Instruments

The only measuring instruments needed for this study were three surveys which were specifically designed to be periodically
administered to the students. Survey 1 (see Appendix A) was designed to determine student expectations of the experimental program. Survey 2 (see Appendix B) was designed to discover the reasoning behind student opinion of the experimental program. Survey 3 (see Appendix C) was designed for each student to give a summary of the experimental program. Due to the nature of the surveys, reliability and validity were assumed.

**Design**

To test H1, the number of unexcused absences for each student in sections 1-4 was recorded. This data was then averaged by section and compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

To test H2, the overall final grades for each student in sections 1-4 was calculated and recorded. This data was then averaged by section and compared. The level of significance was set at .05.

To test H3, a personal interview was conducted with Lou Hencken, Director of Housing, to reveal the number of contracts broken by students assigned to Carman Hall in the Fall of 1987 and the Fall of 1988. He also provided qualitative feedback on the attitudes of parents and students toward the residence hall system.

To test H4, three surveys were designed and administered by the author to determine student satisfaction with the experimental program.

**Procedure**
During the fall 1987 semester, data was collected only for sections 1 and 2. Attendance was taken daily (see Table 1) and grades were recorded when appropriate according to the course syllabus (see Table 2).

The course requirements and course syllabus remained the same for the spring 1988 semester. Therefore, for sections 3 and 4, daily attendance was also taken (see Table 1) and grades were recorded when appropriate (see Table 2).

However, three surveys were also given to only sections 3 and 4. One survey was given during the first week of class (see Appendix A), the second survey was given at mid-term (see Appendix B), and the third survey was given during finals week (see Appendix C). These surveys were designed to help determine the participants' attitudes towards the program as it was in progress.

Data was collected, tabulated, and compared to form the conclusions of this study.
Table 1

Number of Absences by Each Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Final Grade (%) for Each Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

Results

Table 3 presents a descriptive summary of statistics for sections 1-4 in order to compare the final grade of each student.

Table 4 presents a descriptive summary of statistics for sections 1-4 in order to compare the number of absences of each student.

Table 5 presents the results of Survey 1 by categorizing the similar answers given by both sections 3 and 4.

Table 6 presents the results of Survey 2 by categorizing student evaluation of the experimental section at mid-term by only section 4.

Table 7 presents the results of Survey 3 by categorizing the pros and cons of both sections 3 and 4.
Table 3

Summary of Final Grades for Sections 1-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEC 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84.478</td>
<td>19.099</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86.760</td>
<td>13.929</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90.590</td>
<td>15.342</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC 4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.708</td>
<td>6.524</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Summary of Number of Absences for Sections 1-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ABS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ABS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ABS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ABS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Results of Initial Survey (see Appendix A)

date: January 25, 1988  
section: 3 (MWF)  
total surveys returned: 22

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. good idea</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bad idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unaware of situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. do not live in Carman</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coleman is closer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not like Carman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only section available at 8:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meet people outside Carman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all sections were full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

date: January 26, 1988  
section: 4 (TR)  
total surveys returned: 21

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. great</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weather is no object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. convenient</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only section available at 8:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meet others from Carman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can sleep in later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relaxed atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weather is no object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Results of Mid-term Survey (see Appendix B)

date: March 10, 1988
section: 4 (TR)
total surveys returned: 20

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- change to a later time 1
- larger variety of classes 1
- continue the program 7
Table 7

Results of Final Survey (see Appendix C)

date: May 4, 1988
section: 3 (MWF)
total surveys returned: 15

1. less absences
   weather is no excuse 3
   better grades 1
   no parking problems 1
   standard classroom 6
   close (central campus) 10
   meet new people 2
   near the instructors office 1
   meeting time 1

2. too far away
   distractions (noise, tar, road, hot) 4
   walk in bad weather 2
   where will it end? 2
   none 6

3. yes 12
   no 3

4. yes 9
   no 5
   maybe 1
Table 7 (continued)

Results of Final Survey

date: May 5, 1988  
section: 4 (TR)  
total surveys returned: 22

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. meet people in the hall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>better attendance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>weather is no object</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>convenient</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>extra sleep</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>course work easier (know everyone better so speeches are easier to give)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>relaxing atmosphere</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. too cold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>too early</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>not enough class members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hard to read the black board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no clock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>do not get to meet people other than Carman residents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>people dress sloppily</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>easier to skip</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Discussion

The first hypothesis stated that classroom instruction within the residence hall will result in higher overall final grades. Table 3 revealed that the average final grade for students in the "standard" classroom (section 1-3) was 87% (87.27). The average grade for the section taught within the residence hall (section 4) was 93% (92.70). A t-test showed these results to be statistically significant at .05. Thus, hypothesis one was supported.

The second hypothesis stated that classroom instruction within the residence hall will result in better class attendance. Table 4 revealed that the average number of absences per student in the standard classroom (sections 1-3) was 3.21. The average number of absences per student in the section taught within the residence hall (section 4) was 1.23. A t-test showed these results to be statistically significant at .05. Thus, hypothesis two was supported.

The third hypothesis stated that classroom instruction within the residence hall will enhance attitudes toward the residence hall system. The results of the three surveys given to sections 3 and 4 (Tables 5,6,& 7) indicated that the student attitudes toward the hall have changed. Table 5 indicated that students did not particularly care for the hall. However, by the last survey (Table 7), students indicated that they enjoyed living in the hall, meeting more people in
the hall, going to class in the hall, and hoped the program would be continued. The students not involved in the experimental section also indicated they would like to enroll in such a course if offered in their hall.

It is also important to include here that a personal interview, conducted with Mr Lou Hencken, Director of Housing (June 28, 1988), showed that the number of housing contracts being broken by students assigned to live in Carman Hall had dropped from 118 to less than 30 this past year which he attributes to the in hall class instruction available. Thus, hypothesis three was supported.

The fourth hypothesis stated that classroom instruction within the residence hall will enhance student satisfaction. Again, the results of the three surveys given to sections 3 and 4 (Tables 5, 6, & 7) indicate that the student's satisfaction was enhanced. According to Table 5, students started out enthusiastic about the program. Table 6 shows the students own assessments of why they are enjoying the program. Table 7 concludes with student recommendations that the program should be continued and expanded. Thus, hypothesis four was supported.

The overall results of this study indicate that a program such as was tested here has numerous benefits on a campus such as Eastern Illinois University. Attendance increases, grades increase, and attitudes become more positive which results in higher levels of student satisfaction.

At this point, it is also important to list the negative aspects of the program. According to the students and instructor of this experimental section, the only negative aspects that arose all focused
on the physical conditions of the program.

Due to the fact that the classroom was in the basement and at 8:00 am, the room was often cold which was a major distraction to the learning process. Also, due to the size of the room, the blackboards provided by housing were not big enough to be read from the back row. The chalk and erasers also provided by housing were stolen the first week of class, so the instructor had to provide her own for the remainder of the semester. A clock would have been beneficial for starting and ending class on time, as well as, for timing speeches and other activities. The noise from the blowers located just outside the classroom made it difficult at times for the students in the back of the room to hear the instructor. Lastly, due to the location and time of the class, students came downstairs right out of bed and so their appearance was often rather sloppy. Suggestions should be considered to revise these problem areas if the program is to be continued.

**Implications**

Based upon the positive significant results of this study, the Housing Department at Eastern Illinois University has decided to expand the program beginning in August of 1988.

The same courses (SPC 1310, HST 1200, MAT 1150) will be offered again, along with a new section of history (HIS 2010). The time slots offered will be expanded to include 8:00am, 3:00pm, 4:00pm and 5:00pm sections with the continued notion that day classes would only defeat the program. If students had to walk back to Carman for class when they are already on the main part of campus, the program would not be as beneficial.

Ideas are also being considered for using 1/3 of the food service
facilities for classes. Once again, all of the courses offered will have to be of the lecture variety.

The Housing Department is making continued progress in their efforts to integrate academic and non-academic life at Eastern Illinois University.
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APPENDIXES
Appendix A

Survey 1 - Initial Survey

1. What are your reactions to the experimental program of having classes in Carman Hall (general)?

2. Why did you choose or not choose to be in the section of SPC 1310 that meets in Carman Hall (specific)?

3. Based on your own knowledge, is the experimental section meeting up to your individual expectations?
Appendix B

Survey 2 - Mid-term Survey

These questions are to be answered by comparing the class(es) you have in Carman to the class(es) you have elsewhere on campus.

1. Does the location of the class(es) have anything to do with your attitude toward the class(es)? (why or why not)

2. Does the location of the class(es) have anything to do with your relationships with the other students in your class(es)? (why or why not)

3. Does the location of the class(es) make a difference in your attendance habits? (why or why not)

4. Do you feel the location of the class(es) has an impact on the grade(s) you are maintaining in the class(es)? (why or why not)

5. Have you recommended the courses offered in Carman to your peers? (why or why not)

Do you have any additional comments that would aid in the evaluation of the classes meeting in Carman?
Appendix C

Survey 3 - Final Survey

1. Write a brief paragraph describing the positive aspects of having class in Carman (Coleman) Hall.

2. Write a brief paragraph describing the negative aspects of having class in Carman (Coleman) Hall.

3. Should the Carman Hall Program be continued?

4. Should the Program be expanded to other halls?
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