Contents

ARTICLES

MULTIMEDIA

Acknowledgments

SENIOR EDITOR'S NOTE

Thank you for reading the third annual issue of *Peer Review: The Undergraduate Research Journal of the Ethnography of the University Initiative at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*. This journal's mission is to demystify the publication process for undergraduates at the University of Illinois while providing a platform to disseminate their valuable scholarship to a broad audience. As the official journal of the Ethnography of the University Initiative (EUI), *Peer Review* publishes undergraduate research that focuses on the university, its communities, and its members. Through course-based research opportunities, EUI encourages students to critically analyze their own institution of higher education. *Peer Review* accepts diverse types of projects and in addition to the five articles in this volume, you will find a video documentary and a podcast.

Over the academic year, I have worked closely with our authors throughout the submission and revision stages. I remain impressed by their desire to make their research publically accessible and their courage to share their findings outside of the classroom. Too much of undergraduate intellectual labor is confined to coursework alone. The scholarly community owes undergraduates a great deal of credit when it comes to students producing theoretically sound, insightful, provocative, and useful research. My hope is for this journal to continue to poke and prod at institutional inertia and inform/remind the reader that undergraduates can and do contribute to the academy – beyond their increasingly expensive tuition.

This volume comprises scholarship that addresses queer spaces, the history of dorm coedification, administrative discourse and resulting student protest, student housing selection, basketball culture, and the use of emotional support animals on campus. Each piece expands the reader's knowledge of the University of Illinois while also urging the reader to reexamine core components of the institution and its mechanisms. These authors have important points to make, and I am happy *Peer Review* has provided them the place to do it.

The journal is made possible by a team of talented and hard-working individuals. I must thank the undergraduate editors (Katrina Halfaker, Aishwarya Raj, Jennifer Reardon, and Katherine Williams) for their sustained commitment to perfecting this issue and also their dedication to restructuring the editing process for future volumes. I have witnessed their editing prowess grow exponentially over the course of two semesters and look forward to seeing their future projects. Jennifer Reardon created the wonderful cover art for this issue. Many thanks also to Karen Rodriguez'G (EUI Director) and Merinda Hensley (EUI Executive Committee) for their generous support throughout the journal's many iterations this academic year. And, finally, I must thank you, the reader, for taking the time to learn about the University of Illinois through undergraduate research.

Noelle Easterday
Senior Editor

UNDERGRADUATE EDITOR'S NOTE

It has been an interesting year for the journal as we introduced new editors, including myself, to the publication staff. Some challenges we faced included deciding on editing formats and structuring the journal for years to come. Throughout the entire process, my colleagues as well as this issue's authors made all the effort worth it. As I write this note, I can begin to imagine what our authors must have felt when they each decided to disseminate their pieces for the public to read and enjoy.

As an editor, there is nothing more gratifying than seeing a publication come to fruition. Throughout the editing process, I never once questioned this project's value because the submitted papers were not only theoretically substantive but also taught me about my own institution, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The people I worked with filled every meeting with learning and humor. I would like to thank my fellow undergraduate editors, the authors, and especially the senior editor, Noelle, for allowing me to be an integral part of the publication of Peer Review's third issue.

Aishwarya Raj, freshman
Undergraduate Editor

A *Queer Compass* of Champaign-Urbana

MARISSA HALTERMAN

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
halterm2@illinois.edu

Abstract

This research looks at the creation and navigation of queer spaces in Champaign-Urbana, and more specifically at the University of Illinois. By using newspapers, photos, maps, and other archival documents, the paper narrates how a queer compass of the University has changed, specifically comparing Champaign and Urbana. Another tool used in this paper are the voices of current (2015) queer students at the University, voicing their concerns, experiences, and opinions about campus spaces created by the University and their friends, and how some of them have reacted to these spaces by creating their own. The goal of this paper is to expose the ways in which the University creates space for queer students, how they have created their own space, and the differences between Champaign and Urbana as sites of queer experience.

I. INTRODUCTION

It was spring of 2013, and I had just begun school at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. I tried to attend every event I was invited to due to the stifling fact that I was a transfer student and had no friends. So, I started to attend social gatherings in Champaign where my dorm was. They were just how I imagined college, heavy on drinking culture, socialization, and shared interests. A few weeks after my initial encounter in Champaign, I went to Urbana for a party for the first time. What I saw was incredible. Students in Urbana seemed to live on a different planet than the students I had previously interacted with. They dressed differently, spoke about different topics, listened to alternative music, and from what I observed, had much different kinship ties, romantic relationships, and community. From this point on, I noticed that this binary was inherent in discourse around each space and constantly being reproduced by the student population. These differences were seemingly assumed by most students I talked to, causing me to wonder more about the history and production of these differences, as well as what they meant to queer students navigating the University.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Living, studying, and experiencing the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) campus for almost four years has highlighted one major partition within the campus: the two towns of Champaign and Urbana. The official title of the University groups these two towns together, creating one shared space. Consequently, students constantly refer to the different towns as hubs of certain types of cultures, and go so far as to understand each as a possible identity category, determining characteristics and lifestyle choices of those that choose to live there. Some would disagree, and say that the two are relatively the same and that those ideas are based on stereotypes and gossip. I wanted to explore this difference through a queer lens, and a critical institutional lens identifying the LGBTQ students that live, work, and study in these places and learn from their experiences in them.

In this research "queer" is an important critical term used to question normative and nonnormative identity categories and formations (Somerville 2007) as well as directly describing the LGBTQ community and LGBTQ identifying individuals. Interest in this research stems from a personal intrigue of the passion, negative and positive, that some students portray for different areas of campus, whether that

may be Urbana, Champaign, or certain buildings or spaces at the University.

III. METHODOLOGY

My use of the term "*queer compass*" is used to provide a new logic of interaction with campus space based on the experience of queer students. This *queer compass* privileges safety, liberal or 'progressive' spaces, and other queer students as directors. It is necessary to queer the notion of a directive compass for students, as queer students experience spaces differently due to different orientations, sexual and otherwise. These 'directives' represent places that students' minds and bodies are bringing them to, sometimes without explanation or reason. *Queer compass* works as not only a navigation tool but as a way to find meaning in these spaces based on collective ideologies and preferences. It is a way of knowing where to go to be fulfilled socially, academically, mentally, and sexually. *Queer compass* is a locator of different organizations of life, activities, kinships ties, and romantic relationships. These spaces may be different for each queer student, and are constantly in tension with normative ideals about student activities, extracurriculars, and taste. It is important to differentiate these ways of navigating space and time, as these distinctions may appear 'natural' to those within and outside. The ideology defining these locators is constantly being reproduced by those within them, and those who are queered as they too become part of these spaces and queer networks. Although this *queer compass* is inspired by those that I interviewed, this sample was entirely made up of white students, and further research and time are necessary to expand this optic to all important identities. This does affect the ways in which these cultures and communities are represented, as well as the results of the research.

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The UIUC campus works to portray itself as diversified and accepting, recently creating 'diversity courses' and promoting discussions on social oppression through emails and forums. I wanted to specifically hear queer voices talk about their feelings about the narrative their University presents. Going into this research, I needed to investigate what these differences in spaces were and how they were manifested in experiences, lifestyle choices, and kinship ties. More specifically, I asked: how did local cultures become queer? Where do local queers feel most welcome and why? What experiences do queer students share in these spaces, and how do these experiences differ? How does the use of a 'queer compass' challenge the assumption that Champaign-Urbana is a shared space? How do students use queer compasses to navigate campus spaces? Focusing on the creation of these spaces was an important place to start, whether students or the University inspired and established them and how this affected how welcome queer students felt and the ways they went about navigating these spaces.

The first step involved consulting archival materials at the Student Life and Cultural Archives to study the ways in which queer students and Registered Student Organizations (RSOs) were represented in campus local media, and what message and purpose these groups had in creating and spreading queer culture. Another important part of looking at the difference between Champaign and Urbana and the cultures in each was getting a sense of where events were held historically, and the location of buildings that were important to queer movements and meetings. The maps and information about the buildings on campus were all found in the archives in the Main Library on campus. The most important part of this research lies in the words of the queer students that were interviewed and learning from their personal experiences with their identities on the UIUC campus. This project aims to uncover some of the ways queer students navigate Urbana and Champaign, and how they navigate the quotidian on campus with or without these perceived differences. Although the number of students interviewed was limited because of time, this research attempts to present an honest narrative about life at the University of Illinois for queer students.

V. ARCHIVAL EXPLORATIONS

The Student Life and Culture Archives is a great resource to the UIUC campus historically and culturally; it is where most of the background research for this project was done. The archival research that was most beneficial was the amount of

information that the Student Life and Culture Archives had about queer RSOs as well as news clippings describing queer life and events. These pieces of queer life from year ago, identified how *queer compasses* have changed based on the political and social moment on campus. Many specified locations of queer events on/off campus; some of these places still exist such as the Student Union, yet others do not, such as the Balloon Saloon, a gay bar that was once located on 317 N. Freemont Street, Champaign (Flowers 1975). Seemingly few places were welcoming to these kinds of events, and they were mostly broadcasted and marketed through personal pamphlets made by the groups hosting them. It was evident that some of these places tried to disassociate themselves from their connection to gay culture. In an article titled "Where gays can feel unfettered" (Hanson 1975) from the Daily Illini (newspaper) from July 8th, 1975 the manager of the Balloon Saloon asked the DI, "don't name us" and "Champaign is still too small a town to be totally open about it", referring to 'gay' as an association with this location.

A photo from The Daily Illini from March 27th, 1976 titled "Grinning with glitter" features photos of the annual Spring Glitter Ball that the Gay Illini, a queer RSO, hosted every year. The caption of the photo informs the reader that the event was at the Illini Union, and that "most dancers preferred to be photographed from behind, if at all…" (Daily Illini 1976). Both articles from the main campus newspaper show how taboo being gay or even being associated with this group was at the time, and the ways in which gay people had to protect themselves from public scrutiny because of media attention. Historically, local media has produced many articles on queer culture and the gay community, yet the representation of these queer bodies has always been distinctly separated from other news stories through the discourses of titles and content. Some titles include: "Lesbians strive to end bias: gay women face harassment; some distrust counseling serve" (Cohen 1974) and "Gay Women: A Different World". These distinctions cause cultural dissonance, and the separation of queer news from 'normative' news stories. 'Queer issues' on campus and in local news have been framed as issues that are only applicable to the queer community. The pieces have all focused on the ways that queers live, or how they feel about being queer, but never how they fit into 'general' routines as people with jobs, families, and their own struggles outside of their queerness.

The maps and information found in my search through the archives garnered some interesting results. When campus was first built, the women and men's dorms were on opposite sides of campus. It was evident that the University was attempting to split up the two entirely, with other gendered buildings dictating the space that students inhabited such as gymnasiums, cultural centers, and sports areas (University of Illinois 1949). Over time, campus has shifted to be more gender heterogeneous and there are currently dorms where men and women live on different floors of the same building. Although still not trans friendly, the move for multiple genders to exist within the same spaces has improved. This is another way in which genders outside of the binary have been able to exist on campus as not all spaces are gendered explicitly. In a pamphlet distributed by the University from 1949, it is stated, "the individual is not forgotten nor lost at Illinois. Because of its size – not in spite of it – the University is able to offer unusual opportunities and the student to find associates to fit any interest…it has long recognized its responsibility in all phases of student life, outside as well as in the classroom" (University of Illinois 1949). This quote specifically fascinated me because of the University's explicit statement of responsibility in "all phases of student life". This pamphlet also locates the different Dean of Students offices as places of support if students felt as if their individual needs were not being met. This has also changed over time as we now have places such as the LGBTRC (Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Resource Center) and the WRC (Women's Resources Center) for concerns about sexuality, gender, and mistreatment on campus, information, and support.

VI.   QUEER VOICES

The interview part of this research was the most important in creating a place where queer voices could be heard so that our University and larger community could look critically at the spaces we may or not be creating for queer students. Interview participants were found through queer friends of friends and peers. Considering a vast

majority of my friends are some 'flavor' of queer, this was a great resource. We met in coffee shops and had very personal, story based conversations that helped me to understand the daily thought processes of different queer students on campus, the ways they navigate campus, and why. My subject pool included 3 white students who live in Urbana; one genderqueer person, and two female identifying women, one who identified as bi and one who identified as pan. I also interviewed two white gay men that lived in Champaign.

Some restrictions of my subject pool were the difficulty of finding 'out' queer students of color, and the fact that most of my interviewees were from the same area, middle-upper class Chicago suburbs. Another important point is that all of my participants were able-bodied, limiting my research on the ways that all queers navigate the spaces at UIUC. Although I do think this represents a large amount of students on campus, these experiences are not shared throughout queer communities of color, queers from different class statuses, international students who identify as queer, queer students with disabilities, and other genders/sexualities that I was unable to explore. Other future possibilities include interviewing Alumni of the University to understand historical perspectives on queerness and the locations that were habitable and welcoming. In addition to alumni, current professors and workers on campus, queer RSO presidents, and a larger diversity of students would also be important prospects for more interviews and observations.

A lot of the questions that I asked participants had to do with where the main spaces that they occupied were located, who they were affiliated with or created by, if they were queer friendly, and what types of experiences they've had in them. Four out of the five people interviewed had been to campus-affiliated groups such as: Q at Allen Hall, Pride, Building Bridges, Women of Pride, and Infusions. The second person interviewed, Chris, is a sophomore, gay, white, male from Roselle, Illinois who had never reached out to any University LGBT groups because

> I feel like if I had like a bad experience coming out or something like that then I would probably reach out to those groups, just so I could find an environment where I

could feel like, included in, but since all my friends are supportive and stuff I feel comfortable (Reynolds 2015).

This student equated going to LGBT clubs on campus to lacking sufficient support in other spaces. Each student's experience with LGBT RSOs and groups obviously differed, although most of my participants stopped attending them shortly after going for the first time. My first participant, Jack, a gay, white male senior from Des Plaines, Illinois, claimed that Infusions was

> … kind of cliquey. And me not coming from that place where they were coming from, being still unsure of myself, I think it kind of made a disconnect where I couldn't really vibe with them on certain levels…I honestly didn't feel very welcomed by this group, which was a shock to me because arguably the club was made for people like me who were unsure, and were looking for a place to talk about their lifestyles with (Carrera 2015).

The fourth person interviewed, Kailey, a sophomore pansexual female from Bloomington-Normal, Illinois remembered going to her first Women of Pride meeting, and felt

> …like when I'm in an established group where people are already friends and I'm like here, I feel like a little uncomfortable sometimes, but they tried their best to like get me to feel included… so it was good (Blake 2015).

A consensus of most of my interviewees was feeling left out at queer meetings, that the space was already established and it was hard to find a place for themselves. Most of the interviewees also established their own queer or queer friendly kinship ties, surrounding themselves with people who understand their needs and experiences. They also mostly expressed that their favorite place to discuss their identities was in an intimate setting with their friends.

The genderqueer lesbian senior that was interviewed created her own spaces on campus, and is in leadership positions in two different RSOs, as

well as being active in forming coalitions between activist groups on campus. She states that

> the community that trans people find is either real life people, or online in places like Tumblr…then there are the stealth people, who are trans men who had overwhelmingly supportive families, transitioned in like junior high or high school, and can walk through the world just being a really short dude. And that's fine, like that's awesome for them, we've had people who were at CUTES (Campus Union for Trans Equality and Support) for like a year, and got on T, fully transitioned, got top surgery, and stopped coming because they felt that they weren't Trans enough to go anymore (Skora 2015).

Most of the places that these students occupied were located in Urbana, and it was an overwhelmingly shared opinion between most people interviewed that Urbana was a more 'open' place to be. The third person interviewed, Rhea, a pansexual sophomore from Naperville, Illinois talked about her experience.

> Getting cat called and shit, it's not a great time. That's like one of the reasons I don't spend a lot of time in Champaign, because like Champaign is one of the only places I've been cat called (Smith 2015).

Rhea went on to tell me how one of her friends was called a 'fag' in Champaign, and beat up by guys who came out of their car. Later the cops found a gun in the car and a crime alert was sent out to the entire campus community. When asking her about the ways she viewed each town, she said,

> I've just had very different experiences like Urbana versus Champaign. Like Urbana, me and [my friend] got really drunk last year and we were just walking around Urbana holding hands, you know, kinda like skipping, it's cool, it was nothing sexual and like people were okay with it. No one said anything. But then I'll walk out with a friend in Champaign and this was last year, and we were both getting cat called and it's just like an 'okay, enough enough' so, I don't know. I'm

guessing I was just really unlucky, and I'm guessing my friends were too because I guess a lot of other people have good experiences it's just I haven't (Smith 2015).

Kailey felt similarly, and talked a lot about the ways that Urbana and Champaign were different.

> I just feel like in Urbana there seems to be more like minded people, for whatever reason I don't know why…of course there are totally like queer people living in Champaign that are like, around, but I just feel like, yeah, I don't know, maybe like, the gatherings in Champaign are more like almost like the mainstream college culture. I guess if that makes sense like 'oh yeah college, jello shots, we have a keg….it's fun…' um and then like Urbana is more like I guess the people who are sub culture type, like counter culture type people. You know because like when was the last time you went to a house show in Champaign? Like I've never been to a house show in Champaign, I've never even heard of a house show being in Champaign and so it's just like I don't know, your research is so interesting, because like why does this divide, like real or imaginary exist? Like what's happening here like why are all like the 'sensitive artsy kids who paint their nails black', why do they all live in Urbana? Like I don't' know, frat douches live in Champaign. Oh! You know what I think? It could be like a class thing too, or even like a perceived like you know, a want to be perceived class thing, because I found that like the people that live in Urbana like um, tend to be people that have jobs, or are paying their own rent, or like they're at least something (Blake 2015).

Kailey talked about the ways that Champaign and Urbana differed in class status, it costs more to live in Champaign, so the kids with jobs paying their own bills live in Urbana. This was a remarkable point, looking at the ways that Champaign is growing as a city through the construction of new and more expensive high-rise apartment buildings, while Urbana lacks the same amount of Urban growth. She also mentioned the connection between the location

of 'counter culture' and queerness, which was an important point about queerness as not only an identity category, but as a challenge to existing norms. Jack found that there was a correlation between creative performance spaces and the welcoming of queer people in Urbana.

> I think it has to do with the fact that all the frats and sororities are kind of located on the Champaign side, and it's pretty widespread, and then you have on the other side, you have the more artistic, you have Krannert right next to Urbana, you have the dance studio right next to Krannert, so you have a lot of these more artistic things, and I'm not trying to say that there's an exact correlation with artsy stuff and queerness, but I feel like there does tend to be more queer vibes with those more artsy, ya know, artsy ways of life (Carrera 2015).

The Greek life on campus was another important topic of conversation in each interview. All of the people interviewed felt as if the Greek community promoted heteronormative ideals and some queer students felt threatened and unsafe because of their identities in the area of Champaign where most fraternities and sororities are located. The trans student that was interviewed felt that if they went to this side of town their life was at risk. Queer students felt as if the language and shared views of Greek students were either against them, or not concerned with their community or lifestyle choices. All of the interviewees were asked how they felt on campus being queer, and most talked about their experiences in the dorms. Although historically the dorms were completely separated by gender, there are now mixed gender dorms, although they have a long ways to go before they are trans/all gender friendly. Most queer students found their 'queer' community specifically in Allen Hall, and felt that this was a very welcoming place for students to talk about queerness due to the group Q, and the amount of information and events held here. The queer students interviewed were either not into 'mainstream' bar nightlife, or would engage with it only when it was with friends or specifically at gay events such as Murphy's Thursday night 'Thursgays' event or the openly gay bar C-Street, both in

Champaign. When asked about where he mostly hangs out, Jack responded,

> I don't go out nearly as much as my other collegiate friends, but, I've gone to Murphy's quite a few times this past year, Firehaus…and yeah, also more of apartment house parties, more low-key settings, I generally prefer these if at all possible. Bars can sometimes be hectic environments that aren't always enjoyable (Carrera 2015).

Students also talked about the ways that some places may market themselves as queer but do not actually live up to this culturally. C-Street was talked about with both gay men interviewed, but other queer students did not see this as a 'queer' space.

VII. CONCLUSION

Each student's queer directives are created and navigated in different ways depending on where the student started out living, what their experiences were prior to coming to college, if they were less accepted at home they were more likely to reach out to support groups here, and the memories and feelings that are associated with each town. Although each student is affected differently by each experience, there were definitive ways that queer white students navigated Champaign and Urbana. The ways that students talk separately about Urbana and Champaign was always incredibly thought provoking, prompting research about what this meant for queer experience, and how it may have differed in the past. This topic was so important because of the implications that spaces have for queer students, for their safety, wellbeing, and overall happiness. The University of Illinois brands itself as an inclusive and diverse space that is constantly re-evaluating and improving approaches to diversity, and queer perspective is and continues to be necessary to determine what this really means to students. It was also crucial to look at the two towns separately as places outside of the campus community, as autonomous areas that host and encourage differing cultures and experiences due to the people and places within them. Obviously there are many more factors to explore around this topic, and future research is necessary to fully understand all student's

perspectives and variety of experiences as living queer in Urbana Champaign.

After looking at students' responses coupled with historical and archival research, Champaign and Urbana each had important distinctions in the context of queer space and directives, leading to the notion of a *queer compass*, or a certain way of finding meaning in and navigating spaces. When thinking of queer spatiality, it is imperative to think about safety (physically and mentally) and the threat of possible conflict. Champaign was framed as the less 'safe space', due to multiple incidents that happened to students there, including violence, verbally and physically. Students felt safer in Urbana residential areas, due to the perceived and experienced "accepting" nature of the area and people within it. Views of Champaign were also affected by the ways that Greek communities were perceived as sometimes intolerant of different identities, and more prone to act on this intolerance. My sample included only white students, which limits the range of possible and important knowledge about queer spaces. Another important aspect of queer spaces is the way that each space promotes possibilities for open discussion about multiple identities. Students felt that the University did not meet these needs, causing them to create their own groups, RSO's, or kinship circles of other queer friends. Comparing history to now, UIUC has become a seemingly more integrated and tolerant place for the discussion and performance of queer identities. Although this may be true, institutionalizing queer spaces has created divisions in how students are able to experience their identities. This research has helped to uncover some of the reasons students inhabit and create the spaces that they do, and shown that it is imperative to start more conversations around queer spaces on campus to meet the needs of the queer community. Queer students have and always will exist at the University of Illinois, our history is important to learn from, and our future is critical to imagine.

REFERENCES

Cohen, Sharon. "Lesbians strive for end to bias". *The Daily* Illini (Champaign, Illinois), 1974. Record Series 41/2/46, Box 1, University of Illinois Archives.

Flowers, Norman. "Urbana Social Events". *The Sixty-Niner* (Rantoul, Illinois), 1975. Record Series 41/2/46, Box 1, University of Illinois Archives.

"Grinning with glitter." *The Daily Illini* (Champaign, Illinois)*,* 1976. Record Series 41/2/46, Box 1, University of Illinois Archives.

Hanson, Erica. "Where gays can feel unfettered". *The Daily Illini* (Champaign, Illinois). 1975. Record Series 41/2/46, Box 1, University of Illinois Archives.

Somerville, Siobhan. *Keywords for American Cultural Studies*. New York: New York University Press, 2007.

The University of Illinois. *Welcome to Illinois*. Champaign, 1949. Pamphlet. University Archives Reference File, 1963-, Record Series 36/3/65, [Folder 42: Campus Maps, 1940-49], University of Illinois Archives. Pamphlet.

An Intimate Revolution in Campus Life? Gender Roles and their Impact on Dorm Coedification: A University of Illinois Perspective

JOSEPH PORTO

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
jjporto2@illinois.edu

Abstract

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, ground-up change helped achieve the coedification of the residence halls. Students themselves lobbied for new residential policies and crafted the "Proposed Undergraduate Residence Hall Flexible Living - Master Plan" (referred to as "the Master Plan" for convenience) in the summer of 1970, which, after careful revisions from university administration, set the guidelines for the university's first genuinely coed dorms. The "Flexible" aspect of the program represented the dorm-by-dorm process by which it operated. Because each dorm created its own unique coedification plan, some interesting patterns arose between the male and female houses. These patterns serve to highlight larger gender stereotypes and differences typically perceived by early-year undergraduate students in the late sixties and early seventies.

I. INTRODUCTION

Before Coedification: 1930-1968

Before male and female students began to live together in the dorms at U of I, most students lived in sororities or fraternities and in off-campus certified housing. According to a housing report from 1930, 50% of female students lived in sororities, 26% lived in "twin city homes for student roomers" (these were local families who hosted students in their homes), 16% lived in one of the three women's residence halls, and 8% lived in co-ops or houses managed by church boards (Housing Reports, 1929-30). According to another report from 1940, most female students still lived in "student roomer" homes, with their parents, or in sororities (Housing Reports, 1939-40). This meant that female students at U of I in the 1930s resided in a completely sex-segregated living arrangement. Female students only saw males in class, at parties, or in the library. Males and females never interacted with each other on a consistent day-to-day basis (unless they were dating, married, etc.) until the implementation of coed dorms.

For the few female students who did live in the sex-segregated residence halls during this time, harsh rules governed their private lives. Dorm officials locked the doors at 10:30pm every weeknight and at 1am on Fridays and Saturdays. Quiet hours began at 7:30pm every night except on Fridays and Saturdays.

Men weren't allowed inside the women's halls and vice-versa, and even phone calls from men were restricted to the hours after 4pm on all days except Saturday and Sunday (Housing Reports, 1939-40). If male and female students wanted to meet each other at all, they had to plan it ahead of time and do so at a coffee shop or in the library; male and female students never got a chance to interact with each other without being able to prepare themselves first. "Self-regulated women's hours" helped to gradually lift these restrictive rules in the women's halls between 1940 and 1960. Female students were given keys to access the dorms after they were locked, and phone call bans were eventually lifted (Background for Proposed Recommendations 1969). University policy still prohibited unmarried men and women from living together or even visiting each other's university-approved residences until the late sixties. However, the Pennsylvania Avenue Residence Hall (PAR) acted as the sole exception to this rule.

The university constructed PAR in 1962 with the goal to create an ideal coed dorm. The Daily Illini called the new dorm "An Experiment in Co-ed Living" (Watson 1963). This experiment was conducted relatively early compared to the rest of the nation—mass coedification nationwide (and at UIUC) didn't occur until the late sixties and early seventies, however, PAR wasn't exactly revolutionary. In designing the building, the university completely segregated the building's four

halls, with women living in the two halls in the northern half and men living in the two halls in the southern half. The two groups interacted explicitly in common lounge areas and the cafeteria, where hall authorities could keep a close eye on them. For the students living in PAR and their parents back at home, there wasn't much to complain about with the new arrangement because not much had changed. As a result, males and females still only interacted in public spaces. The establishment of PAR didn't symbolize anything special for the student body; it didn't mark the beginning of the end of sex segregation on campus. Thus, the dorm operated without protest until pressure for further integration shook things up later in the sixties.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Student Groups and Ground-Up Change

A student-powered rhetoric began to develop on campus in the mid-sixties – in fashion with the revolutionary youth culture of the time – that challenged the university's restrictive policies. Students formed new coalitions and criticized the administration's practices of in loco parentis, or policy acting in place of students' parents (Hackmann 1965). In regards to the residence halls, students wanted desperately to implement optional coed living and visitation, and they took action to accomplish this. Higher-ranking members from sex-segregated student groups like the Men's Residence Hall Association (MRHA) and the Women's Independent Student Association (WISA) began to join together and form new coed groups, like the Inter-Dormitory Communication Council (IDCC) and the South West Campus Federation (SWCF)—the latter of the last two producing the Master Plan that eventually enabled coedification on campus (Vaughan 1969).

University administration also played a hand in motivating the formation of coeducational student groups, mostly as a result of a policy proposed in the summer of 1969 by Arnold Strohkorb, then director of housing. The policy, if passed, would have raised rent for all students living in the residence halls by $100. During this summer, the SWCF and the IDCC formed to combat the rent increase and also hash out the logistics of a coedification plan with a combined effort from the male and female halls. However, the male members of these groups still held most of the power and controlled most of the group's decisions. For example, members of the MRHA also participated within the SWCF and thus gained double representation at meetings between students and the university housing association (Vaughan 1969). Female student leaders from the halls on Fourth Street and at Allen and Lincoln Avenue (LAR), as well as members of WISA, were selected to represent female student interests in the SWCF because a female version of a residence group like the MRHA didn't exist. Despite this coed cooperation, the student groups lost the battle against the rent increase in the negotiations that followed. The MRHA (the SWCF and IDCC had just been formed and couldn't participate) did succeed in another one of their goals, though — getting Strohkorb to establish the Student Housing Advisory Committee (SHAC) (Vaughan 1970). SHAC was created as a subsidiary of the office of housing. Male and female student dorm leaders – resident advisors, hall presidents, members of hall student governments, etc. – comprised the members of SHAC. The office of housing created the group as a response to pressure from students for the ability to lobby for student interests from within the administration's infrastructure.

Students' increased representation within the housing office, coupled with Strohkorb's implementation of militaristic procedures, led to the further criticism and eventual resignation of the director of housing. The most militaristic and widely criticized policy Strohkorb enacted during his short tenure happened during the 1969-70 school year. Strohkorb began to seek out students who had left the dorms before completing the 75-hour (5 semester) in-residence requirement, forcing students to break or pay their way out of apartment contracts. This ramping up of the persecution of students who left the halls early drew heavy condemnation even from administrators under his employ. Housing administrator Robert Gruelle, for example, called the persecution of students living in illegal housing a "crack down," and labelled the University's housing regulations as "the most archaic in the nation," (Schwartz 1970). Later that year, on Friday March 20th 1970, Strohkorb resigned from his position as director of housing after a tenure of only 2 years. His replacement, Sammy Rebecca, would prove to be much better at communicating with students and working with them to implement the policies they desired.

Coeducational Visitation: 1968 - Visitation Test Run

Before the university put full coedification into effect, they first wanted to test a coeducational visitation policy. Beginning in February of the spring semester of 1968, the university implemented an experimental coeducational visitation plan that would allow men and women to visit each other's residences from noon to one a.m. on Friday and Saturday and noon to midnight on all other days of the week. The plan also laid out rules for guests

within the dorms, for instance: "Rooms shall be unlocked and available to access at all times when a guest is present in a host's room," and "A procedure [must exist] for escorting guests to and from private areas of the living unit," (Peltason to President Henry 1969). The administration left these rules intentionally vague because the specifics were to be voted upon by the residents of each dorm, with a two-thirds majority required for approval. The university's administration considered the experimental semester of the plan a success, and it they permanently implemented it at the start of the 1969-70 school year.

1969 - Full Implementation

This implementation did not come without controversy, however, as conservative members of the Board of Trustees forced a split decision on the vote for whether or not to continue the experiment after its trial year. The board president, Earl M. Hughes, was concerned for freshman women's safety and wanted a stipulation in the plan that limited their visitation hours. This limitation was impossible, though, because dorm rooms were not assigned by class. Other board members, like trustee Ralph Hahn, were concerned that if visitation did not pass that it would deteriorate student-staff relations and "put the chancellor in an almost intolerable situation come September," (Daily Illini 1969). The board ultimately remained divided on the issue and decided not to vote, and a no-vote meant that the plan would move forward through the 1969-70 school year (Daily Illini 1969).

The rules laid out for the visitation program took a fairly standard approach when compared with other colleges' policies from around the same time. Some had more relaxed rules, (Oberlin had unlimited visitation hours) and some were more restrictive (some schools still required that doors remain open if a guest of the opposite sex was present); still, universities had been rapidly becoming more coedified across the nation as a result of the social revolutions of the late sixties, which pressured them to establish coed dorms and more liberal visitation hours (Ray and Thorsen 1970). This change from the segregation of sexes across the board to relatively sudden coedification shocked members of the generation who had gone to college prior to the sixties.

Concerns for Female Students' Security

Changes in visitation policy and increased coedification occurring at universities across the country especially irritated parents and alumni, and

this was no different at UIUC. The previous generation attended a school where the sexes lived on opposite ends of campus and weren't allowed to visit each other's residences at all, and they felt that the separation was beneficial to their academic studies. Parents feared that if their children lived in close proximity to, or were allowed to visit members of the opposite sex freely, that they would undoubtedly lose focus on their school work. Furthermore, parents viewed their daughters as being particularly vulnerable in coed living situations because men were viewed as a constant threat to their belongings and personal well-being.

Robert G. Brown, Associate Dean of Student Programs and Services, expressed a fear for female students' safety in one of his memos on the new visitation system. He argued that a centralized registration system was essential for male visitors in the female halls. He justified this by stating: "I felt that we would have great difficulty in rationalizing central registration for the men's halls as the male students and staff did not view women visiting men's residence halls as a big threat to security," (Brown 1969). In another instance of concern for female students' safety, a U of I alum voiced his concern about coeducational visitation and residence in a letter to university president David D. Henry. He stated that the university wasn't being fair to its female students by forcing them to live in coed dorms, and that because of this, "Our daughters themselves are complaining that their privacy is denied them," (Sacadat to President Henry 1969). This statement is in line with female students' opinions of coedification: according to a survey conducted by the Housing Division on Coedification and Visitation (they established a special division just to gauge student's perceptions of the new policies), 70% of female students responded yes to the question, "Would you prefer to live in a hall segregated by sex?" compared to 29% of men. Furthermore, 61% of women and only 18% of men responded yes to the question, "Do you think, in principle, the University should provide a residential area (House/Floor) in which NO visitation would be permitted?" (Satterlee to Strohkorb).

National Attitudes toward Gender

As stated earlier, visitation policies were voted on by each individual residence, and as a result many dorms decided not to make use of the full range of hours offered to them. The dorms that limited their visitation hours the most were the all-female ones. Of the fifty-one female units who reported, four chose not to have any coeducational visitation program, forty-four established visitation hours only during

allotted times on the weekends, and only three allowed weekday visitation. Of the residences that chose to allow visitation, none of them were for more than four hours a day, and they always ended at 5p.m., although there was one uniquely lenient hall that allowed visitation from nine to twelve forty-five a.m. on Saturdays (Peltason to Levy and Millet 1969). The men's halls, on the other hand, unanimously voted in favor for the full range of visitation hours, from noon to two a.m. on Friday and Saturday, and noon to midnight on all other days.

This raises the obvious question: why did the female students vote for restricted visitation hours? First, they were very clearly concerned about their safety, and legitimately so. Men had never been allowed to enter the women's halls before without special permissions, and the students living there were understandably concerned with the threat to personal security and privacy that male visitors posed. Second, the nature of sexuality and gender roles in the sixties, despite its apparent advancements, also motivated this fear. By 1968, the National Women's Organization (NWO) had been founded, the Civil Rights Act had been put into effect (which banned discrimination against women in employment), and pro-abortion sentiment had been growing preceding the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision in 1973. By all historical accounts, gender roles were being radically redefined in the public sphere. The fight for equal civil rights for all races, ethnicities, and genders carried out by the "baby boomer" generation had been active for at least a decade, which would lead one to think that women entering a public university in 1968 would be sensitive to these issues and desire greater freedoms for themselves as they became adults. What actually transpired, though, was that daughters internalized and retained the conservative definitions of gender roles instilled in them by their parents, friends, and peers upon entering college.

A survey conducted in 1976 by the University of Michigan asked its participants to rate themselves on a scale of one to seven, with a one indicating they completely agreed with the statement "men and women should have equal roles," and a seven indicating a complete agreement with the statement "women's place is in the home." The responses were then collected and used to rank white and black males and females as either "liberal," "neutral," or "conservative" depending on what numbers they chose. The results showed that white females were 26.3% conservative and 51.5% liberal on this issue, the most conservative and least liberal out of all of the groups surveyed. White males were the second least liberal group at 58.7%, and black males and females were the most liberal, holding identical

percentages at 63.4% (Mason, Oppenheim, and Czajka 1976). There are a few different factors that played a part in why white females clung to values of traditional gender roles more than their male counterparts, even after the height of the sexual revolution. According to French and Nock, these views depended on three different factors: whether or not the female was a housewife or a working woman (working women were more liberal), educated or uneducated (educated women were more liberal), and a blue-collar or a white-collar worker (white-collar female workers were more liberal) (French and Nock 1951). Before the revolutions of the sixties, one could imagine, the general population held on to traditional gender role beliefs more strongly, and consequently among working, educated, and white-collar women who sent their children to college.

Thus, it can safely be assumed that white women entering UIUC in 1968 (the vast majority of students were white at this time, although "Project 500" had tripled the amount of African American students that very year), whose parents were trained in more traditional beliefs when it came to gender roles, were inclined to side with their parent's views rather than the radical ideas that were vying to change the definitions of these roles. The parents of young adults of the late sixties were raised to believe in prevailing gender stereotypes, like the idea that women were more influenced by their emotions than logic, or that they were more interested in the frivolous and aesthetic aspects of life. As a result of their perceived emotional and materialistic nature, members of the generation preceding the baby boomers – the silent generation – largely believed that women were inherently intellectually inferior to men. What is most important in helping us understand the motives of our female UIUC students in the late sixties, however, is the fact that these ideas were endorsed by both men and women of the previous generation (Kitay 1940). These negative stereotypes of women were so prevalent, and so well-advocated by men, that many women had adopted and acted in accordance with them, or were at least discouraged from defying them for fear of being ostracized by society at-large.

Now, with the perspective of these new students' parents in mind (as well as the administration and alumni, who were also a part of the previous generation), we can more fully understand why these female students unanimously voted for strict visitation policies: they were just as concerned about their safety from male students as their college administrators, parents, and alumni were. Who could blame them? They were understandably afraid that the male students would take advantage of them if they were given such

unrestricted access to their residences. This is why the administration deliberated most about the central registration policy for the female dorms. One letter stated, "In addition, women's residence halls are encouraged [it was later clarified that this was not optional] to develop a central hall registration system to provide better security for residents and their possessions and to make it possible to close the hall at an earlier time during the evening hours," (The Office of Student Programs and Services to All Head Residents and Advisors 1969). These restrictive policies, influenced by traditional gender roles and voted into practice by the residents themselves, would not last forever.

The Master Plan

The influence of the sexual revolution that swept the country didn't take exception to the campus in Champaign-Urbana, and its effects were felt directly through changes to university policy regarding gender. The SWCF, in association with multiple other student groups (MRHA, WISA, IDCC, and SHAC), crafted the Master Plan during the first semester of the 1969 school year. The plan was comprehensive: it laid out the details of flexible coedification for each hall on campus, described orientation and social programs to help students adjust to the new living arrangements, estimated the costs of necessary renovations, established added security measures, examined the plan in relation to others in the Midwest, and defined new coed hall student government structures. The Master Plan was submitted to then Director of Housing Arnold Strohkorb on February 23rd, 1970 (Satterlee to Rebecca 1970). Strohkorb had little influence on the plan, however, as he resigned only a month after its submission. His successor, Sammy Rebecca, handled the evaluation and revision of the plan in cooperation with the SWCF and SHAC.

After minor revisions – the Office of Student Housing's main concern was producing an accurate cost analysis – Rebecca sent the plan to Dean of Students Hugh Satterlee on July 20th, who approved it and subsequently sent it to Chancellor Jack Peltason and President David Henry. After discussion, the Chancellor and the President agreed not to inform the Board of Trustees of the full cost and necessary tuition raises required to implement the plan: "In view of the Board's interest in all matters touching upon student affairs, however, you may wish to consider the extent of the detail regarding physical modification the Board wish to be concerned with in considering this plan," (Peltason to President Henry 1970). The plan was then sent to the Board of Trustees who formally accepted it at their meeting in January 1971, allowing it to be implemented in the fall of the 1971 school year. The approval of the Master Plan even garnered coverage from the local Channel 3 News team; anchor Don Wilcox reported in a two-part piece about the creation of the plan, the struggle to get it past the Board, and the students' refusal of in loco parentis policies (Wilcox to Rebecca 1971). The promise of increased competition with the apartment and off-campus housing markets and the belief that students would stay in the dorms longer ultimately convinced the Board to approve the plan. The Board's only stipulation was that the plan establish more stringent security measures that were not specified in the original draft, such as locked doors between male and female sections of the dorms and locked stairwells to prevent non-students from entering buildings.

According to the Master Plan, each dorm chose if and in what way they would be coedified. All of the previously female dorms' votes resulted in a decision to either go coed by wing (PAR-style) or to remain all female (most common). The male dorms' votes resulted in a decision to either have a split-floor living plan (most common), a floor-by-floor living plan, or to remain all male (least common). A split floor plan meant that men and women lived on the same floor separated by a lounge area and locked doors, and a floor by floor plan meant alternating floors of male and female rooms. The female students voted for more strict gender segregation mainly due to privacy concerns. Sammy Rebecca was quoted in 1975 saying, "The students resisted going coed. It got a lot of negative reaction from the women. They were afraid that if guys moved in they would lose their privacy. The girls who live there [ISR] are happy with it [the split-wing coedification layout]," (Colander 1975). The trend of female halls remaining more segregated than the male halls would not last, however, as over time a majority of the all-female halls petitioned to coedify, some by wing and some by floor (Gehring 1972).

III. METHODOLOGY

I conducted the research for this paper mainly at the University of Illinois Student Life and Culture Archives. My main sources for information about coedification and coeducational visitation on campus came from the archives' collections about these processes. These collections consisted mostly of correspondence between a variety of administrators, student groups, and alumni, but there were also documents like the Housing Reports from 1929-40 and the Coedification Master Plan. I also used the University of Illinois Library's digital newspaper collection to locate Daily Illini articles related to

coedification. For a wider perspective and information about other campuses, I studied Chicago Tribune and national newspaper/magazine articles (like the Life article referenced in the title).

In terms of structure, I tried to strictly organize my paper by date for maximum readability, but I had to keep some themes together that overlapped with other themes' dates. For example, the "Student Groups and Ground-Up Change" section of this paper includes Housing Director Arnold Strohkorb's resignation even though it happened in 1970, and the next section, "Coeducational Visitation," begins in 1968. Some dates will overlap like this in the paper, but I felt that keeping themes together and breaking the consistency in date order improved readability in these instances.

IV. CONCLUSION

The coedification process at U of I and across the nation may not have been the "Intimate Revolution in Campus Life" claimed by the 1970 LIFE article that covered the process at Oberlin, but rather a more nuanced and gradual progression of gender integration. Differences perceived by the female and male students enforced a situation in which the men's dorms took no issue with integrating women, and the women's dorms most certainly did take issue with integrating men. Male students saw no reason to oppose coedification because female students weren't perceived as a threat. The female students, on the other hand, carried legitimate concerns about privacy and safety, as well as more complicated anxieties about the disruption of the types of traditional male-female interaction that their parents and society expected of them. However, fully coeducational dorms did not result in breaches of security or personal privacy, but rather a relaxed and diverse environment for students to live in. Pat Colander states, "Clark hall is one, big, happy family and—like most coed dorms—largely devoid of 'incest'," [emphasis added] (Colander 1975).

Looking at where we are today, the dorms at UIUC are just as diverse as they were in the sixties. Incoming freshmen can choose whether to live in single-sex or coed living arrangements, and the dorms are still widely varied in their forms of coed living. Students can live in coed-by-wing dorms in Barton and Lundgren, split-floor halls in LAR, PAR and many others (this is now the most common method of organization), or numerous all-female or all-male halls across campus. Looking ahead to the future, the new Wassaja hall will allow mixed-sex apartment-style suites at UIUC in fall 2016. Whether coedification takes the form of men and women living together in the same room, on the same floor, or even just in the same building, it is important to understand how the students at U of I and at campuses across the nation in the late sixties and early seventies broke down barriers and fought for the students' right to choose whether or not they want to live coeducationally on campus.

REFERENCES

All archival research conducted at the University of Illinois Student Life and Culture Archives

1969. "Trustees take no stand on room visitation," Daily Illini, September 13: 11 & 13.

"Background for Proposed Recommendations". 1969. "Coeducational Visitation, 1969" folder, "Background" subsection. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Brown, R.G. Personal memo. September 9 1969, "Coeducational Visitation, 1969" folder, "Memos For Record" subsection. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Colander, Pat. 1975. "The coed dorm: It's 'no big deal'." Chicago Tribune, April 14: 11 & 13.

French, Sandra S., and Nock, Steven L. 1951. "Social Advantage and Attitudes toward Women's Roles." Sociological Inquiry 51, no. 1: 55-60.

Gehring, Jim. 1972. "Increased coedification asked." Daily Illini, March 14: 1 & 4.

Hackmann, Frank. 1965. "Student Senate Passes 3 Bills Chipping at 'In Loco Parentis'," Daily Illini, November 18: 3.

"Housing Reports, 1929-30". Box 3, record series 41/3/1.

"Housing Reports, 1939-40". Box 3, record series 41/3/1.

Kitay, Philip M. 1940. "A Comparison of the Sexes in their Attitudes and Beliefs about Women: A Study of Prestige Groups." Sociometry 3, no. 4: 399-407.

Mason, Karen Oppennheim, and Czajka, John L. 1976. "Change in U.S. Women's Sex-Role Attitudes, 1964-1974." American Sociological Review 41, no. 4: 573-596.

"The Office of Student Programs and Services to All Head Residents and Advisors". Letter. "Coeducational Visitation, 1969" folder, "Approval"

subsection. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Peltason to Levy and Millet. Letter. Spring 1969. "Coeducational Visitation, 1969" folder, "Peltason - Levy, Peltason - Millet" subsection. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Peltason to President Henry. Letter. July 1 1969. "Letter to D.D.H." folder. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Peltason to President Henry. Letter. October 23 1970.

"Coedification, 1967-1974 #4" folder. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Ray, Bill and Karen Thorsen. 1970. "Co-ed Dorms: An Intimate Revolution in Campus Life." LIFE, November 20: 32-41.

Sacadat to President Henry. Letter. October 24 1969. "Coeducational Visitation, 1969" folder, "Sacadat – President Henry" subsection. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Satterlee, Hugh to Rebecca, Sammy. Letter. July 20 1970. "Coedification, 1967-1974 #4" folder. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Satterlee, Hugh to Strohkorb, Arnold W. Letter. "Coedification, 1967-1974 #1" folder, box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Schwartz, Kyle. 1970. "Violations on rise – Strohkorb: Comments on housing crackdown . . ." Daily Illini January 8: 2.

Vaughan, Pat. 1969. "Harms raps new board, charges unequal representation…" Daily Illini, December 6: 13.

Vaughan, Pat. 1970. "MRHA tries to work together – Begin housing reforms," Daily Illini, August 1: 2.

Watson, Arleda. 1963. "PAR — an Experiment in Co-ed Living," Daily Illini, May 2: 9.

Wilcox, Don to Rebecca, Sammy. Letter. October 1971, "Coedification, 1967-1974 #1" folder. Box 1, record series 37/6/5.

Worthington, Rogers. 1996. "Coed Dorms Now The Norm: Parents' Onetime Fear Becomes Par For College Course," Chicago Tribune, March 12: http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1996-03-12/news/9603120186_1_coed-housing-residence-halls-college-housing.

ABBREVIATIONS

Groups

MRHA: Men's Residence Hall Association
WISA: Women's Independent Student Association
SWCF: South West Campus Federation
IDCC: Inter-Dormitory Communication Council
SHAC: Student Housing Advisory Committee

Residences

PAR: Pennsylvania Avenue Residence Hall
LAR: Lincoln Avenue Residence Hall
ISR: Illinois Street Residence Hall

Scandalous!:
An Analysis of Administrative Discourse Around the Student Body, and an Examination of Student Resistance at UIUC, January- August 2014

STEPHANIE SKORA

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
skora2@illinois.edu

Abstract

This paper examines the various discourses surrounding students during scandals on the University of Illinois campus between January and August of 2014, with a focus on the racist Twitter scandal and the Salaita scandal. Drawing on administrative statements, emails to the campus community, and University documents, this project analyzes the administration's rhetorical deployment of the student body. Further, the project examines the modes of resistance utilized by students and their allies to resist efforts by the administration to shape the narrative of student experience. Making use of critical content analysis with a queer theoretical lens, the paper shows how the discourse of "civility" was used as a neoliberal policing tool by University administration to avoid conversations of larger issues such as race and colonialism.

I. INTRODUCTION

My research question began as a much more expansive project. Beginning the semester, my goal was to research the discourse used to depict and construct the UIUC student body during the past decade of administrative scandals and wrongdoings, in an attempt to find a link between the actions of the administration and the rhetoric used by the institution throughout scandal. However, I quickly realized this to be too sizeable a task, given the research and time constraints on my project. The question then shifted towards examining only the most "major" scandals of the past five years at UIUC: the clout/admissions scandal, the scandal that removed University President Michael J. Hogan from office that involved reading the email of faculty (this scandal was, unfortunately, not given a catchy name by which we can briefly refer to it), and the summary unhiring of Steven Salaita. Upon making this research shift, I changed my focus as well, going from simply analyzing the administrative rhetoric during these scandals to examining specifically the way that the administration talked about the student body and used the institution to construct an image of undergraduates and their needs in a particular way. This administrative shaping of the narrative of the student body is significant, because UIUC, an excellent model of the neoliberal, corporatized University, can then take actions claiming for them to be "in the interest of the students" or "what the students want," and self-justify these actions because they are in control of the narrative.

This focus on administrative control of the discourse surrounding the student body remained prominent in my final research, although the focus continued to narrow. Further narrowing of my topic came not because of the size of the question, but rather from an unsuspected obstacle that arose while I was conducting archival research. The University Archives at UIUC collect data and materials when they it receives new items from departments or offices on campus, and I quickly learned that my particular research question was located too near to the present to have substantive materials regarding the way that the University was portraying undergraduates during the years between 2009 and the present. This led to a final shortening of my topic to examining only the administrative rhetoric around the student body during the year of 2014, and a final project emerged with two major instances of examination: the racist tweeting scandal that took place in January of 2014, and the unhiring of Steven Salaita, which occurred during August of 2014. In its

current form, the project consists of four main questions: What is the relationship between the Twitter scandal of January of 2014, and the scandals resulting from the unhiring of Steven Salaita in August of 2014? How has the changing discourse of "civility" impacted speech on campus? How did the administrative deployment of the student body change since the January 2014 scandal? And, finally, what forms of queer student resistance arose in the aftermath of these scandals?

II. CIVIL AND UNCIVIL DISCOURSES

The year of scandal began on January 27th, 2014, a particularly cold and windy day near the beginning of the Spring semester, when then-Chancellor Phyllis Wise declined to grant the student body a snow day, despite temperatures being in the negative-twenties. Students took to the social media site Twitter to express their displeasure at having to go to class, and to attack the Chancellor for her decision. The outbursts quickly turned ugly when many students, including women and students of color, began using racist and misogynist epithets at the Chancellor, aggregating them using the hashtag "#FuckPhyllis." Tweets began to appear using East Asian stereotypes and jokes about the Chancellor, comparing her stance on the snow day to Communist China and likening her to Kim Jong Un (Rega Jha). Subsequently, tweets called the Chancellor a "bitch," "slut," and "whore" and threatened violence against her, all for her decision to not call a snow day (Jha). These actions on social media by students are now referred to as the "Twitter Scandal".

Responses from the University began the following day, beginning with an email entitled "Civility and Respect for an Inclusive Illinois," sent to all University students by then-Student Body President Damani R. Bolden. In his email, Bolden emphasized the "respect we share for each other and our campus leaders," extended an apology to Chancellor Wise for the actions of those undergraduates, and professed that "civility, respect, and tolerance must always be shown through our words and actions toward each other and all members of our community" (Bolden). He concluded the email by encouraging students to commit to the principles of Inclusive Illinois, the campus' diversity and inclusion initiative, including the principle of "challenging my own beliefs, opinions, and viewpoints" (Bolden). On January 29th, two days after the social media attacks on Chancellor Wise, then-Chair of the University of Illinois Board of Trustees, Christopher G. Kennedy, and then-University of Illinois President Robert A. Easter sent out a University MASSMAIL to the entire UIUC campus community, entitled "Civil Discourse 101," by . This email directly admonished the student body for their racist and sexist attacks on the Chancellor, saying that they had nationally shamed the University. The email continued, citing political theorist John Locke's definition of "civil discourse," and highlighting that it is "expected that… we engage in civil discourse in our treatment of others" (Kennedy and Easter, January 2014). Chancellor Wise herself responded to the attacks with an op-ed published through Inside Higher Ed on the 30th, again restating the need for "civil and respectful discourse" and stating that she "shudder(ed) to think what might happen if that type of vitriol were directed at a vulnerable member of our student body or university community" (Wise, January 2014). Although University officials were quick to state that there would be no consequences for the students who attacked the Chancellor in their tweets, the rhetoric of the responses as a whole, particularly their invocation of "civility" is of utmost importance (Culley).

In this context, we see the rhetoric of civility widely deployed as an admonishment to students, reminding them to speak with the proper respect to one another, and to others on campus. Civility is used as a rebuttal to racism, attempting to imply to students that one can eliminate racism from conversation by simply being polite to one another. Further, in a move emblematic of the neoliberal university culture of "diversity," and "inclusion," Inclusive Illinois was invoked multiple times, encouraging students to challenge their own views on race, racism, and hateful speech. Indeed, the Inclusive Illinois Office produced a semester-long series of events, beginning in February of 2014, with the aim of challenging students to confront their views on race (Inclusive Illinois). Simultaneously crucial to recognize is the administrative deployment of the student body in this scenario. Despite several members of the undergraduate population hurling virulent racist and ad feminiam attacks at the campus's highest-ranking administrator, the University depicted these same students as largely innocent, or at worst, ignorant in the attack. No consequences were levied against the students, and formal responses were rife with statements casting the violent tweets as "teachable moments," and shifting blame for the content of the tweets away from those who actually produced them (Kennedy and Easter, January 2014). Regardless of the impact or content of their speech, students could not and would not be blamed for their hateful words, and would instead be educated on how to be more "civil," in order to work towards an inclusive Illinois. However, this softball approach to the discourse of civility would not long retain its gentle touch.

In July of 2014, Steven Salaita, a Palestinian-American scholar who had agreed to take a tenured professorship in the program in American Indian Studies at UIUC began tweeting about the vicious Israeli bombing of Gaza taking place that summer, and the genocidal policies of the Israeli government. His tweets, made throughout the month of July, including critiques on the ubiquitous deployment of charges of anti-Semitism by Zionists, and emphasizing the Israeli bombing campaign's killing of children, were quickly noticed by community members in Champaign-Urbana, and donors to the University (Mackey). Emails from then-UIUC Provost Ilesanmi Adesida to Professors Nicholas Burbules and Joyce Tolliver noted that Chancellor Wise had been "deluged" with protest messages from donors and the community, since news of Salaita's tweets broke in the community newspaper (Scheinman). Chancellor Wise and UIUC Vice President for Academic Affairs Christophe Pierre, facing this mounting pressure, decided to take action. Without consulting with the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, any of the professors who were on the search committee that hired Steven Salaita, or the Chair of the Program in American Indian Studies, Robert Warrior, the Chancellor and Board wrote to Professor Salaita on August 1st, notifying him that he was no longer employed at the University of Illinois, and effectively unhired him from his tenured position (Wise, August 2014). This unfolding of events at the University is now referred to as the "Salaita Scandal" or the "Salaita Case".

When the news of Professor Salaita's unhiring reached students on campus, some twenty days later, the backlash was immediate. The program in American Indian Studies issued a vote of no confidence in Chancellor Wise, and student protests began, including a sit-in outside a Board of Trustees meeting that lasted several hours (Abunimah). The same day, Chancellor Wise sent the students a MASSMAIL communication entitled "The Principles on Which We Stand," in which she outlined the reasoning behind her decision to unhire Steven Salaita. The email contained commitments to academic freedom, repeatedly referred to by Wise as a "bedrock principle" of the academy, and assuring students and faculty that the decision to unhire Professor Salaita was in no way made because of his political speech. Instead, the concerns over Salaita's speech were recast in terms of civility, or, in his case, incivility. Wise went on to write that "we cannot and will not tolerate… personal and disrespectful words or actions that demean and abuse either viewpoints themselves or those who express them," and a belief that her job as Chancellor required her to ensure that debate is possible on all topics, both in and outside of the classroom in a "scholarly, civil, and productive manner." Concluding the email, Wise asserted that UIUC is built upon a tradition of civility, and noted that "most important, every student must know that every instructor recognizes and values that student as a human being" (Wise, August 2014). Within three hours of the Chancellor's MASSMAIL, Christopher Kennedy and Robert Easter sent another statement, which was co-signed by the entirety of the University system's executive governance, echoing Wise's remarks on civility and affirming confidence in her leadership (Kennedy and Easter, 2014).

In the context of the Salaita case, the discourse of civility underwent a significant shift. Civility here was deployed decisively as a weapon against the speech of Steven Salaita, positioned clearly in an attempt to silence his deep critiques of the Israeli state. Wielded as a censoring tool as well, the rhetoric of civility was used to cast into doubt the teaching ability and scholarship of Steven Salaita, despite a lack of evidence implicating an inability to engage civilly with students. Particularly striking, and telling, are the words of the Chancellor, that "every student must know that every instructor recognizes and values that student as a human being," implying heavily that, because of Salaita's perceived incivility, and his political speech against Israel, he was unable to view Jewish students as human beings (Wise, August 2014).

With that line, the administration fully reconstructed the image of the student body, and recast civility as a method of protecting students from allegedly dangerous, anti-Semitic views. The undergraduate population itself was deployed as a mass of homogenous students, headed by the concerns of Jewish students, collectively terrified of the possibility of having a vehement critic of Israel on campus, and indeed feeling unsafe in his presence. On top of that, students were portrayed as wholly unable to have their views challenged substantively, unable to learn from faculty who disagree with them, and were narratively placed as fully in support of the administration, save for a few disgruntled outliers against members of the faculty. This differs wildly from both discourses in January, where the student body and the rhetoric of civility were put forth in entirely different ways, despite a strikingly similar context.

III. COMPARATIVE CIVILITY

In the span of nearly seven months, the rhetoric of civility, and the institutional narrative of the student body at UIUC were turned on their head by the same administrative actors that shaped them in the first place. Of most concern are the changes in the

meaning of "civility," the alteration in the deployment of the student body, the subject position of those students, and the administrative violence of "no consequences," which created hierarchies of acceptable racism on campus. Yet all of these changes hinge on the drastic shift, not solely of the discourse on civility, but the deployment of the student body, as well. Were the narrative of the student body to hold true, the collective population of students had gone in seven months from forgiven, irresponsible aggressors to fragile, unable-to-be-challenged individuals, who cannot withstand an encounter with a professor whose opinion differs from their own. Yet there is a grim irony in the claim that students could not be "safe" or "comfortable" if exposed to Salaita's views, when their own were arguably much worse. It could be argued that one forfeits the right to label the social-media-based political views of a faculty member of color "uncivil" after hurling racist and misogynist slurs over the same social media platform. The shift in discourse was created entirely on an administrative level, creating an act of administrative violence against marginalized students, particularly students of color, and a sense of acceptability around sexism and gender-based attacks.

The administration's deployment of the discourse of civility in conjunction with an insistence that no punishment would be meted out to students who tweeted personal threats at Chancellor Wise created a hierarchy of what kinds of threats and speech would be deemed acceptable by the University. This clear administrative violence is a replica of the institutional violence discussed by Dean Spade in his foundational book *Normal Life*, when biopolitical institutions of the state drive people of color, low income people, and queer people into spaces of oppression by legislating them fewer life chances. To understand the administrative violence of the University's creation of acceptable racism, we must first understand the mechanisms of neoliberal narratives of diversity and inclusion that allow for the burden of administrative violence to be shifted to already oppressed groups of students. The Inclusive Illinois initiative and Chancellor Wise's scheduled "listening and learning tour" of the campus following the unhiring function as the foundation of an institutional bulletproof vest for accusations of racism As Sara Ahmed argues, how can the University be accused of creating a hierarchy of racism or violence when the University is committed to equality and diversity (116)? Yet, these commitments and initiatives, like Inclusive Illinois, are non-performative commitments. In performative commitments, the language of the commitment serves the purpose of taking action, and making an

actual commitment to do something, and then bringing to reality the commitment which they name. However, in a non-performative commitment, such as the diversity and inclusion statements of many universities, including UIUC, the language and repetition of the commitment serve the purpose of making a commitment to diversity and inclusion, without actually bringing into being any sort of action on that commitment. In other words, the repetition of the commitment itself serves as the actual action upon that commitment, freeing the committing body (the University) from having to actually take real steps and take real action beyond token gestures towards furthering diversity, hence "no consequences for students" (117).

The fact that the administration failed, and continues to fail, to take real action in furthering the goal of diversity, or simply takes token actions towards that goal is useful to the critics of the University as well, because, as Ahmed points out, if the administration is saying what it is doing (or what it is supposed to be doing), then we, as critics, can show that they are not actually doing what they are saying (121). The rhetoric of civility took a similar turn as the deployment of the student body, once used as a means of challenging student racism in January, "civility" quickly became a tool of the administration to silence challenges of student views from faculty.

The discourse of civility took a similar turn; once used as a means of challenging student racism in January, "civility" quickly became a tool of the administration to silence challenges of student views from faculty. While this change was much clearer, and easier to identify in the MASSMAILs themselves, the shift in the rhetoric of civility played a major role in facilitating the narrative change in the image of the student body. Civility was the operative force, allowing the administration to cast the formerly aggressive students as a collective body who had "learned their lesson," so to speak, and now conducted themselves civilly and with respect. Therefore, when the label of "uncivil" was applied to Steven Salaita, he was immediately cast in opposition to the students, as not only a personal threat to their comfort, but also a de-civilizing force, threatening to return a lack of civil speech to the student body.

This portrayal has a twofold effect, particularly considering Salaita's hiring in the program in American Indian Studies. First, the casting of Salaita as uncivil reinforces the settler colonial origins and motivations of the University, and positions the administration in direct opposition to the faculty, the mission, and the scholarship of the program in American Indian Studies. By casting Salaita as an uncivil, or savage, influence on the student body, the justification for his unhiring was

made implicitly clear, and the program in American Indian Studies was further damaged—a boon for the administration, as the faculty of this program are a site of continual challenge to the racist and settler colonial policies of the University. This makes the hierarchy of racism created by the narrative manipulation of the student body by the administration strikingly clear: the University tacitly endorses racism against people of color, even if they are administrators, and will go so far as to stealthily endorse and promote racism against indigenous peoples, be they Native American, or Palestinian.

On the opposite end of this hierarchy is perceived racism, particularly that charged as racism to deflect critiques of interests that mirror the University's own, for the University has little reason to invest time, effort, or endorse scholarship that seeks to dismantle settler colonialism, white supremacy, or cisheteropatriarchy. This realization leads into the second purpose of the changing discourse of civility: enacting fear in other faculty, similarly aligned to Professor Salaita. According to Roderick Ferguson, the kinds of power that this rhetorical shift attempted to exert directly over the American Indian Studies Program is evidence of a form of violent institutional coercion, aimed at subduing the activities and the faculty of American Indian Studies so that the administration does not have to do the work of "controlling" them directly (31-35). The work of civility is impactful in that way: it forces the faculty to either shift their efforts to leaving sites of administrative control (and indeed only two faculty who were in the Program in American Indian Studies remain with their lines in that program as of the writing of this paper), and away from the project of creating spaces of resistance within the University without putting themselves at risk. The unhiring of Steven Salaita is positioned as a warning to faculty, while the administration seeks to control their speech with the rhetoric of civility. The main ability for creating sites of resistance then falls to the students.

IV. METHODOLOGY

My research methods consist of conducting a close reading of University statements, and mass communications, and a student statement. Using queer theory as a primary analytic lens, I conducted a critical content analysis on my materials, drawing on the theoretical works of Cathy Cohen, Roderick Ferguson, Sara Ahmed, and Dean Spade to inform my analyses. Given the nature of my research, the subjects of my analysis consisted of documents, rather than individuals or interviews. These documents consist of four University MASSMAILs,

two per scandal, sent during late January and late August of 2014, respectively, one article from Inside Higher Ed by former UIUC Chancellor Phyllis M. Wise, in which she responded to the racist tweets from the January scandal, and student statement made by the student activist coalition #UIStudents4Salaita on the statements made by the administration during meetings with the group. Finally, my documents include several of the tweets that could be said to have caused the scandals themselves. Compiled in two different news articles, these tweets are a vastly important piece of these scandals, as their content informed both the discourse and the response of the administration.

Through a close reading and examination of these documents, I will demonstrate how the University constructed an image of the student body which fit their needs. Further, I will demonstrate how the University politically deployed the discourse of "civility" as a policing tool, and how students utilized queer political resistance in opposition to this administrative deployment of their narrative and imposition of speech codes.

V. CONCLUSION

We must conclude with discussion of the students once more, and how the administrative use of their narrative allows for students to access queer modes of resistance against this narrative, and the discourse of civility. This queer resistance comes in the form of applying queer political resistance to the neoliberal, settler colonial, and racist structures in the intellectual tradition of Cathy Cohen (437-465). In the context of the Salaita case, this queer resistance came in the form of an activist student coalition named #UIStudents4Salaita. Naming themselves in using the tagging style of Twitter, this group, led by a core of seven students (four graduate, and three undergraduate students), released a statement following a meeting with Chancellor Wise on September 1st, and organized multiple protests, events, and rallies until November of 2014. The student statement called out the administration's manipulation of student body narratives, and the violence of the discourse of civility, particularly the unhiring of Steven Salaita. The statement served the purpose of creating a clear counter-discourse to the administrative narrative of the student body, and presenting an open resistance to the regime of fear that civility imposed upon the faculty. Clearly emphasized in the statement were Chancellor Wise's contradictions with her earlier statements, and a clear callout of the manipulation of the rhetoric of civility. #UIStudents4Salaita stated, "we feel that the Chancellor is strategically using the rhetoric of

protection and safety to justify this decision, which in effect makes us more vulnerable to ignorance, racism, and intolerance by not honoring academic freedom or supporting American Indian Studies' (AIS) expertise in the field, their governance, or their hiring decision" (#UIStudents4Salaita). Clearly marking what they saw as sites of administrative violence, the coalition pulled back the metaphorical curtain on the actions of the administration, and exposed the true implications of the administration's speech, actions, and neoliberal practices.

This student group's resistance played a key role in the disruption of the administration's attempt to cleanly sever Steven Salaita from the University, and brought an intense spotlight onto the additional hardships that his firing, and the conduct of the University brought to marginalized students in underappreciated departments and programs, like American Indian Studies. Most importantly, it denied the University a complete hegemonic narrative of the student body as fearful of Salaita's views. The importance of denying this narrative cannot be understated. With a counter-narrative in place, #UIStudents4Salaita was able to cause disruptions to the administrative process, and the formal process of finalizing Salaita's unhiring. Student activism and resistance received major news coverage, and created a platform for dissenting student voices to the administration to be heard (Jodi Cohen). Yet aside from the importance of the disruption, the creation of counter-hegemonic narratives, and the exposure of violences, the queer resistance of #UIStudents4Salaita accomplished one more thing. Their resistance showed that the only individuals truly capable of controlling and creating narratives of the student body are the students themselves.

REFERENCES

Abunimah, Ali. "Students Take Demand to Rehire Salaita Directly to Univ. of Illinois Trustees." The Electronic Intifada. August 23, 2014.

Ahmed, Sara. "Commitment as a Non-performative." On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life. Durham: Duke UP, 2012. 116.

Bolden, Damani. "Civility And Respect For An Inclusive Illinois". Email to the Author. January 28, 2014.

Cohen, C. J. "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?" GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies 3.4 (1997): 437-65.

Cohen, Jodi. "U. of I. Trustees Vote 8-1 to Reject Salaita." Chicagotribune.com. September 11, 2014.

Culley, Vera. "No Disciplinary Action Planned for U of I Students Who Spewed Racist Remarks on Twitter." FOX2nowcom. January 27, 2014.

Ferguson, Roderick A. "The Birth of the Interdisciplines." The Reorder of Things: The University and Its Pedagogies of Minority Difference. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 2012. 31-35.

Inclusive Illinois. "#ONECAMPUS: Moving Beyond Digital Hate Campus Conversation Rescheduled." Email to Author. February 3, 2014.

Jha, Rega. "After Being Denied A Snow Day, University Of Illinois Students Respond With Racism And Sexism." BuzzFeed. January 27, 2014.

Kennedy, Christopher G. and Robert A. Easter. "Civil Discourse 101". Email to the Author. January 29, 2014.

Kennedy, Christopher G. and Robert A. Easter. "An atmosphere for learning". Email to the Author. August 22, 2014.

Mackey, Robert. "Professor's Angry Tweets on Gaza Cost Him a Job." The New York Times. September 12, 2014.

Scheinman, Andrew. "UIUC release of 'supplemental' Salaita emails." Samizdat-startups.org. August, 2015. 8.

Spade, Dean. Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law. Brooklyn, NY: South End Press, 2011.

UIStudents4Salaita. Student Statement in Response to September 1st Meeting with Chancellor Phyllis Wise. 3 Sept. 2014. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL.

Wise, Phyllis. "Moving Past Digital Hate." Inside Higher Ed. January 30, 2014.

Wise, Phyllis. "The Principles on Which We Stand." Email to the Author. August 22, 2014.

How Students Pick Their Housing Situations: Factors and Analysis

KEFEI WU & ANTHONY DEVRIESE

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
kefeiwu2@illinois.edu, amdevri2@illinois.edu

Abstract

To learn about why students choose to move out of university provided housing, Kefei and Anthony conducted a research about five factors that students consider when choosing their living situations. During our research, we interviewed with an expert from the university, reviewed some past research studies, conducted three focus groups to gather qualitative data, and sent out online surveys to collect quantitative data. Our major hypothesis was that students considered rent as the most important factor and safety as the least important factor when they made their housing decisions. However, we found that nearly all participants of our online survey considered safety as the most important factor. At the end of this paper, we offered some explanations and policy implications to the University Housing Department based on what we learned from the research.

I. INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of their sophomore year, a number of students move out of their dorms and live in an apartment or a house. In the Champaign-Urbana area, there are 14 University residence halls, 14 Private Certified houses, and a plenty of apartments available. Why do students move out of their dorms after their freshman year? What factors do students consider when they make their housing choices?

The purpose of this paper is to provide information about how students choose their apartments and housing choice in general, to analyze why students consider certain factors more important than other factors, and to explore some suggestions for University Housing to attract more students. During the research, we reviewed past research studies related to student housing, conducted three focus group interviews, sent out online surveys, and interviewed experts in order to get a better understanding of students' decisions on housing, and to compare different perceptions by students and university officials. Our main hypothesis was that students choose their apartments based on factors such as location, rent, amenities, safety, financial situation, and roommate choice, with rent the most important factor and safety the least important factor. After conducting the research, we drew the conclusion that students do consider the factors that we proposed when they make their housing decisions, but they value safety the most among other factors.

At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, first-year students are required to live in a certified facility (University Housing, Private Certified Housing, or a certified fraternity or sorority) for their first year. The Office of the Dean of Students maintains certified housing standards and grants recertification. Students can freely choose their housing accommodations after their first year.

There are several university policies that might affect students' choice of housing. According to the Smoke-Free Policy, "all campus facilities and grounds are smoke free, meaning a complete prohibition of smoking any materials." Under this policy, students who smoke can choose to quit smoking by participating in quitting programs offered by the university, or move out of university housing to accommodate themselves. Moreover, the Sports in the Hall Policy prohibited the use of any sports equipment due to the risk of personal injury, damage to the residential facilities or individual property, and disruption within the environment. With these restrictions, students who possess these properties may choose to move out of residence halls in order to place these properties inside their rooms.

Other factors can have positive impacts on students' choice to live in university housing. For example, university residence halls and certified houses are typically near the academic buildings, and also near the MTD bus stops. Students would prefer university housing because of the convenient locations, saving time on transportation. Also, student organizations and residence halls usually hold a variety of activities for students to participate in their

spare time. Free recreational facilities are another reason for students to choose university housing. Therefore, although some policies imposed on students restrict students to a certain extent, the university has provided various benefits that attract students to live in campus housing.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

We have read various scholarly articles relevant to our research topic. Many of these articles come from the University of Illinois, but some come from other universities with similar housing situations as the University of Illinois. We believe by referring to these papers, we can comprehend our topic better and have a better direction to conduct our research.

One factor that was analyzed in students' housing choice is risk assessment. According to a study by Sadayuki (2015), students who prefer university housing over private housing do so because of the lack of risk involved with university housing. These risks involve broken amenities, bad customer services, etc. In the apartment market, students sometimes have to balance between a lower priced but risky apartment, or a higher priced safer one. With this consideration, it could be better to stay in university residence halls to avoid those risks.

In another research paper, Seow-Eng, Petrova, and Spieler (2013) pointed to location and safety elements in students' housing choice. They found that although there is growth in the off-campus market, a majority of university students still prefer living on campus because of the convenience it provides. In terms of safety, universities with higher crime rates see a greater number of students living in university housing compared to schools with lower crime rates.

Delgadillo and Erickson (2006) examined student satisfaction with off-campus housing. Findings revealed that apartment manager's responsiveness and fairness can also determine student satisfaction with off-campus housing. All these articles provided us some factors to consider when we examine the important factors that affect students' housing decisions. After full consideration, we decided to include six factors that could be easily assessed in our research analysis, which are rent, safety, location, amenity, financial situation, and roommate choice.

III. HYPOTHESES

We drew our major hypothesis that students valued rent the most and safety the least when making their housing decision. To be more precise,

we split our main hypothesis into five questions based on different student groups. These hypotheses are listed as follows:

1. People who have a part-time job rate rent higher than safety, location, and amenities.
2. People who feel safe around their apartments may not think safety as an important factor, so they may rate it low.
3. People who do not pay their own rent are not as concerned with the cost of their living arrangements as opposed to those who do pay their own rent.
4. International students rate safety as the most important factor.
5. People who live in houses do so because they can live with many of their friends.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Interviews with Experts

Due to a conflict of schedule, we only sent a list of questions and got an email response from an Associate Director. As a result, we found that the university was providing a quality service to students, and the university housing department had a precise perception about students' preferences.

The Associate Director is from the Housing Information Office, which oversees the Office that provided University Owned Residence Hall & Private Certified housing options for students. According the the Associate Director, the university determined the semester rent by calculating a per night cost based on the number of nights in a semester and the cost to provide programs and services, such as rooms, meals, on call staffs, and academic programs. To secure students' safety, the university had security and access committees that continuously evaluate the policies that are related to safety. Some examples are card access, security patrol, and security cameras. To evaluate amenities, the Office took a consideration on student feedback, market trends, and costs to the students. Besides, students were provided with flexible roommate options.

Furthermore, the Office also did surveys to learn about students' opinions. According to the survey, students left the university provided housing mainly because room and board price was too high, quality of life/social/noise/policies/RA, or just time/ready to move on. On the contrary, students chose to stay in the dorms because of location,

community atmosphere, or other cost considerations. In sum, the university has a relatively precise understanding about students' choice, and we will compare it with our survey results in the following paper.

We adopted both focus group interviews and online surveys to get qualitative data and quantitative data in order to test our hypotheses. From the focus group interviews, we could gain more insights about considerations of different individuals, and we were able to ask questions to have them clarify some possible confusions. As for online survey data, we could easily see the whole population's choices and conduct statistical analysis.. Through drawing diagrams and doing regression analysis, we could see the correlations of different factors that affect students' housing choice.

Focus Group

Having read about the previous studies by students who also participated in the Ethnography of the University Initiative, we realized that it is difficult to recruit strangers to participate in focus group interview within the time limit. Hence, we recruited participants by finding our friends to participate in the research, and having our friends recommend their friends to participate. As a result, we conducted three focus groups, with one group including three people, one group including four people, and a control group including five people who lived in fraternity houses. Participants from the other two focus groups all lived in apartments.

We selected the Undergraduate Library and Armory as public places to conduct the focus group interviews. Kefei moderated two groups that lived in apartments, and Anthony moderated the control group that lived in fraternity houses. Our focus group questions were constructed in an order that starts with ice-breaking questions and generally moves to deeper questions. In order to maintain a comfortable interview atmosphere, we asked some follow-up questions when we found the answers needed more explanations, and we allowed participants to discuss with each other as long as the topic was relevant to our research study.

Some of the in-depth focus group questions were as follows:

1. Why did you choose to live in your current accommodation?
2. Who pays the rent?
3. How comfortable do you feel about your living accommodation?
4. How long does it take from your living accommodation to class?

5. Rank the importance of the following factors from a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being least important, and 10 being most important) when you choose your living accommodation, and briefly explain. Location, rent, amenities, safety, your relationship with your roommate.

Online Survey

To answer our research question by using quantitative data, we decided to send out online surveys that complement our focus groups. We were given suggestions from our peers and our instructor on how to adjust the questions to be more easily understandable and answerable for an online survey. Moreover, to find individuals willing to participate in our survey, we designed the survey that took no longer than fifteen minutes to answer. When we had our final set of questions prepared, we created our survey using the website, Qualtrics, as the survey generator. Some sample questions include:

1. Rate the importance of the following factors when you chose your living situation: roommate choice, rent, location, safety, and amenities.
2. How often do you make housing payments?
3. Do you currently have a paid job?
4. Do you have student loans?
5. How safe is the neighborhood around your residence?

We distributed the link to our survey throughout various social media groups and email lists we had compiled in class. After we started receiving feedback, we checked frequently to make sure those data were valid. Having finished the data collection process, we analyzed the data using a statistical software called Stata.

Focus Group Results

All participants in our three focus groups were students from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, ranging from sophomores to juniors, and varying in different majors. The participants all lived in university residence halls or private certified houses during their first year attending the university. After the first year of college, the participants in our control group lived in the same fraternity house, and the participants in the two other focus groups lived in apartments.

When we asked about roommate choice, all

except one participants had at least one roommate. Also, the participants claimed they got along with their roommates. However, their explanations were quite different. While some people gave all the positive evaluations on their roommates, some participants did not talk to their roommates, as long as they did not interfere with each other, because "this type of relationship prevents any disagreements from happening", according to one participant.

In order to learn why they chose their current apartments or fraternity house, we directly asked for the reasons. Participants who lived in apartments mentioned convenient location, complete amenities, relationships with roommates, and fair rent. To be more specific, the participants who were satisfied with the locations of their apartments stated that their apartments were close to the County Market or restaurants, and also close to their academic buildings. Those who mentioned utility were satisfied with the stove in the kitchen, and the internet speed. Furthermore, one participant claimed the rent was fair based on the quality of his apartment. The control group had a distinct perspective compared with the other two focus groups. All of the participants in the control group claimed that they wanted to live with their good friends and get to know others better. Additionally, the location of the fraternity was convenient for them to go to class. Apparently, participants living in the fraternity house put more weight on the roommate factor, or, to be more precise, they gave more weight to the social factor than other participants living in apartments.

As for how comfortable the participants felt about their living accommodations, the participants living in apartments all noticed some problems with the apartments. For example, one participant said the laundry machines were downstairs, which was inconvenient. Two participants complained about the old utilities and the poor maintenance service. Nevertheless, they were satisfied with their apartment overall. Similar things were mentioned in the control group. The participants living in the fraternity house complained about the loudness, the lack of respect, and the taste and cleanliness of food. In terms of positive feedback, they felt it was convenient to eat, sleep, and workout in the same building.

Different from our initial hypothesis, most participants said that their parents paid for their rents, not just international students. Some participants had a part-time job, but according to them, the amount of money they earned could not cover their rent and other expenses.

For the final questions, we asked the participants to rank different factors: location, safety, amenities, and rent. We did not ask about their financial situation because some people could be sensitive about it, and we could actually infer it from their expenditures. As a result, participants from the two focus groups generally put location and safety as the most important factors when considering their apartments. Moreover, they considered safety as an important factor because they were concerned about the safety issues around their apartments, and they paid close attention to campus crime alerts. We also found that international students focused more on safety issues than domestic students did, thus proving our fourth hypothesis. Besides, for the control group, the participants' responses were clear. They put location and rent as the most important factors with amenities and safety the least important factors. They explained that a major reason for them to choose the fraternity house was due to the convenient location to get to classes. Furthermore, they also mentioned that because they had siblings, they did not want to burden their family, so a cheap rent was preferable.

From the focus group interviews, some of our hypotheses got confirmed. As we stated in our hypothesis, people who did not pay their own rent were not as concerned with the cost of their living arrangements as opposed to those who did pay their own rent. Nonetheless, participants who did not pay for their rent still considered rent as an important factor because they did not want to put financial burden on their families. Another hypothesis was confirmed as well. International students did largely consider safety as the most important factor. Finally, from the control group's responses, we could conclude that people who live in houses do so because they could live with many of their friends.

Online Survey Results

As a result of the online survey, we got 165 responses in total. Through analyzing the data, the results confirmed some of our hypotheses but contradicted with our main hypothesis that safety was the least important factor.

Our first hypothesis was that people who have a part-time job on campus may have more financial responsibilities, and therefore rate rent as their most important factor when choosing their living situations. As hypothesized, a major majority of individuals who have a part time job on campus did consider rent a very important factor when deciding where to live, according to the survey data. However, rent was also a very important factor among students who answered that they do not have a part time job on campus. This tells us that rent is crucial to students' housing choice regardless of how financially stable they were. Furthermore, we ran a regression to see if students with a paid job lived in housing accommodations with a cheaper rent. We set

a dummy variable "paid job" and selected the amount of rent as the dependent variable. From the output, we the coefficient of paid job is a negative value. This indicates that students who had a part-time job tend to choose to live in places that had a cheaper rent.

Our second hypothesis was that people who continually feel safe around their apartment do not consider safety as a very important factor. Using the same process to test this hypothesis with Stata, we compiled the results into a diagram. [See Appendix A].

Surprisingly, the opposite was true of our hypothesis. Given the diagram above, a large portion of students living in very safe neighborhood consider safety as very important, while all students who lived in unsafe neighborhood only considered safety as a moderately important. Hence, we initially underestimated how safety impacts on students' housing choices. One possible explanation for the result might be that people chose a safe neighborhood because they value safety a lot, rather than that people do not value safety because they lived in a safe neighborhood.

Our next hypothesis was that people who do not pay their own rent are not as concerned with the cost of their living arrangements as opposed to those who do pay their own rent. Using Stata we were able to examine both the importance of rent, and how involved parents are in a student's financial responsibilities. Of the students surveyed, 92.48% considered rent to be at least somewhat important in their decision making process. To answer our hypothesis, we also examined parent's financial involvement. As a result, it is evident that parents of the participants were very active in helping pay some costs during a student's education. More than 50% of the students answered their parents covered all of their living expenses. In contrast, only less than 5% answered that their parents did not help them pay for any of their expenses. These findings contradict our hypothesis and suggest that even though some individuals do not pay for their housing, they still feel obligated to try and find a place with a reasonable price.

The fourth hypothesis we examined involved international students and safety. Due to the fact that international students are very far away from home, they would be more likely to rate safety as a very important factor when deciding where to live. According to the survey results, we found that of international students, 59% rated safety as a very important factor while only 6% rated safety as an unimportant factor when choosing a housing option. The finding confirmed our hypothesis that international students are very concerned with safety when looking for a place to live.

Our final hypothesis was that individuals who live in a house do so because of the opportunity to live with many of their friends. To test this we examined how individuals living in a house responded to the question of roommate importance. We found that of individuals living in a house on campus, 70.37% rated roommate choice as very important. Interestingly, people who lived in apartments responded very similarly. 78.95% of the students who lived in apartments chose roommate choice as a very important factor. This percentage is even larger than the percentage of students who lived in houses. This shows us that living with your friends is not only an important factor among house dwellers, but remains true for most of the individuals who lived in apartments. However, among individuals who lived in university provided housing, only 65% of them thought roommate choice as very important. The lower percentage is reasonable because some students who choose to live in resident halls are willing to be assigned with random roommates.

V. LIMITATIONS

Although we foresaw some constraints of the research and attempted to solve the potential problems, we still encountered some difficulties during the recruitment process, and when we conducted our focus group interviews. Specifically, through omitting the process of recruiting participants that we were not familiar with, our participants for focus groups and online surveys had some restrictions. For example, the participants had similar backgrounds as ours, and the participants were likely to answer questions in a similar way to how we could answer.

Another restriction was that we only got 12 participants for our focus group in total. Our expectation for focus groups was 5-6 people in each focus group, with 3-4 focus groups in total. Because of the limited size of the focus group, we were not able to analyze more individual's considerations. Hence, other individuals' different decision-making processes were not represented in the research.

Furthermore, despite the fact that we recruited a control group with students living in a fraternity house in the focus groups, we missed a control group of people living in dorms. The consequence was that we were not able to compare students' reasons for staying in dorms with students' reasons for moving out of dorms. Lastly, for each focus group interview, there was only one of us presented and moderated the interview. It would have been better if two of us both presented in the focus group interviews, with one person recording and asking questions, and another

person wrote down some notes and follow-up questions.

Similar constraints existed during our online survey recruitment process. Since we could not have the university send out surveys for us, we only sent the surveys to our friends and tried to let them send the surveys to their friends. Thus, the participants of the online survey might share some similarities with us.

VI. CONCLUSION

There are many important factors to consider when students decide where to live. In our study, we chose six factors: rent, location, amenities, safety, amenities and financial situation to analyze. From the responses from our focus group participants, it was clear that location, safety, and rent were a key factor in deciding where to live. Meanwhile, the online survey data suggested that rent and safety were among the most important factors to consider, because most students do not want to burden their families and regard safety as a necessary element in housing choice. We were surprised to find that safety, which we considered as the least important factor, actually plays an important role in students' housing choice.

To attract students living in residence halls, the university could hold more activities to get students engaged in a social atmosphere, and get to know each other better. Moreover, the university residence halls should provide more flexible choices for students to choose their roommates. Since safety is a significant element in students' decisions, the university could provide more information about security methods (i.e. installation of security camera and the activities of campus police). The university policy makers can also work closely with the private housing providers to ensure that a specific set of standards on amenities are met. Last but not the least, the university needs to consider adjusting room and board price reasonably by controlling spending. We would leave this open-ended question to further research studies.

REFERENCES

Delgadillo, L., and Erickson, L. V., "Off-Campus Student Housing Satisfaction," Journal Of Family & Consumer Sciences, 98(4), 5-9.

Seow-Eng, Ong, Milena Petrova, and Andrew C. Spieler, "Demand For University Student Housing: An Empirical Analysis." Journal Of Housing Research 22.2 (2013): 142-164, Accessed November 18, 2015 DOI: 10.15396/eres2007_226.

Sadayuki, Taisuke, "Uncertainty In A College-Town Housing Market: The Case Of The University Of Illinois At Urbana-Champaign," Journal Of College & University Student Housing 41.2 (Jan 2015): 78-97, Accessed November 18, 2015.

APPENDIX A

Importance of Safety ⟍ Safety of Neighborhood	not important	moderately important	very important
unsafe	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
moderately safe	6.90%	51.72%	41.38%
very safe	6.00%	48.00%	46.00%

Pick Up

STANLEY GODIA & TARREN ADAMS

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
godia2@illinois.edu, tbadams2@illinois.edu

Abstract

The following is a multimedia presentation created by undergraduate students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. This short video examines the different aspects of basketball cultures that exist on campus. Students and basketball enthusiasts shared their experiences and opinions about playing "pick up" games at two athletic facilities at UIUC. First at the Activities and Recreation Center (ARC), and at the Campus Recreational Center East (CRCE). During the research period participants were asked various questions pertaining to the research topic. In the beginning of our presentation we previewed some basketball history focusing on the influences of street basketball, including the famous Rucker Park in Harlem, NY. We focused on examining how that street style of play, also known as "Pick Up" basketball has merged into today's basketball culture. All participants answered questions at the various sporting facilities around campus. General questions included, "What is your favorite place [court] to play basketball on campus?" "Why do you prefer this particular location?" "What are your experiences within all and or one of these locations with the sport of basketball?" "Which groups of people do you play with, and if not with a specific group, how do you decide who you will play with or against," and "What are some trends or ideas that have been influenced by basketball culture, that are present or unique to UIUC?

Concerning the UIUC campus, we found the ARC to be the most popular simply because of its size, and high level of competition. Here we also highlighted the ranking of the courts which was briefly described by one of the participants. CRCE located closer to the Quad, is home to more international students and an overall less competitive style of play. Looking back on basketball history we can see that there were numerous sports figures that shaped today's game; such as Michael Jordan and Allen Iverson. Through our discoveries we found that basketball on the UIUC campus and in a more general scope is influenced a lot by its history and what we witness in today's basketball world. There are no barriers such as race, other than one's ability to participate. The basketball culture that exist on campus is distinguished from facility to facility in the style of play, but all together students and others on campus can find something to relate to through the game of basketball.

The Culture of Emotional Support Animals and Service Animals on the University of Illinois Campus

STEPHANIE DELONG

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
sddelon2@illinois.edu

Abstract

The purpose of this project was to understand the assumptions about emotional support animals (ESA) and service animals at the University of Illinois. I sought to compare opinions and experiences regarding ESA and service animals by interviewing members of the University community. Initially, my hypothesis was that ESA are seen as less legitimate than service animals. The interviewees' responses not only support this assumption, but they also demonstrate some reasons people assign more validity to physical impairments rather than mental illness, which thereby affect people's opinions toward the associated animals. Overall, the project shows that the University successfully accommodates people with physical restrictions, but it is lacking in terms of educating about and accommodating those with mental illness. My hope is that this project will serve as a wakeup-call for the University to address the needs of students, faculty, and employees who suffer from mental illness.