In this article, the author advocates co-educational residence halls for college/university campuses. He argues that this living arrangement is more natural and promotes the fullest possible development of the individual through meaningful relationships with the same and opposite sex; it helps to teach the residents personal and social integration and to solidify sexual identity. The author discusses the meaning of co-ed arrangements, how single sex buildings can be adapted and to whom (and why) co-ed living should be offered. The multiple advantages for student and housing administrators of co-ed living are listed. It is mentioned that the issue posed in pursuing the subject of co-ed housing is related to the extent to which colleges can come to grips explicitly with sexual behavior as it relates to "residential education." In summary, the author states that he is advocating, based on student developmental needs, co-educational living as a vital component of residential education. (Author)
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THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE TRIED TO RESEARCH THE TOPIC
OF CO-EDUCATIONAL LIVING KNOW FROM SEARCHING THE LITERATURE
THAT THERE IS A SHORTAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE MATERIAL. THE FEW
ARTICLES THAT HAVE APPEARED IN PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS DON'T
DEAL WITH THE REAL ISSUES OF CO-ED HOUSING NEARLY AS WELL AS
DO THE POPULARIZED MAGAZINE ARTICLES. IN FACT, ONE OF THE
FIRST REFERENCES I RAN ACROSS WAS THE HARRAD EXPERIMENT--
A NOVEL WRITTEN BY ROBERT RIMMER ABOUT AN EXPERIMENT IN
COHABITATION.

ALTHOUGH THE BOOK GOES WELL BEYOND WHAT MANY ARE
WILLING TO ACCEPT TODAY IN LIVING ARRANGEMENTS WITHIN OUR
COLLEGES, RIMMER DOES BRING INTO FOCUS THE DANGERS ASSOCIATED
WITH OUR PRESENT SYSTEM OF "SEGREGATING BOYS AND GIRLS OF
SEVENTEEN OR EIGHTEEN, WHEN THEY ARE AT THE FIRST PEAK OF THEIR
EMOTIONAL INTEREST IN EACH OTHER, AND FORCING THEM INTO ABNORMAL
LIVING PATTERNS DURING THEIR COLLEGE LIFE." RIMMER CONTINUES
BY SAYING THAT "SOCIAL PRESSURE FOR PROLONGED CONTINENCE OFTEN
CREATES FEAR, ANXIETY, AND ACTUAL REPULSION BETWEEN THE SEXES.
THE RESULTS OFTEN ARE TOO EARLY MARRIAGE ENDING IN DIVORCE,
UNWANTED CHILDREN BORN OUT OF WEDLOCK, AND A SEX-OBSESSED
SOCIETY WITH LITTLE OR NO KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT DYNAMIC LOVE IS."15

YOU MAY FIND RIMMER'S ADVOCATION OF COHABITATION AN
EXTREMELY DISTASTEFUL MORSEL TO DIGEST. NEVERTHELESS, IT MUST
BE ACCEPTED THAT HE OFFERS A PRETTY STRONG INDICTMENT OF HIGHER
EDUCATION THAT DESERVES ANALYSIS. HE IS TELLING US THAT WE HAVE
OVERLOOKED THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEXUAL AND INTELLECTUAL
DEVELOPMENT. AS EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS WE, BY SEPARATION
OF THE SEXES THROUGH THEIR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, HAVE SUPPORTED
THE TRADITIONAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN MAN'S PHYSICAL AND MENTAL
FUNCTIONS--BETWEEN THE INTELLECTUAL AND SEXUAL DRIVES, IF YOU WILL.

THE DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH

I SHALL ASSUME AT THE OUTSET THAT WE CAN ALL ACCEPT THAT
THE FULLEST POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL PERSON IS
THE BASIC AIM OF AN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION. IN STUDENT PERSONNEL,
WE CONSIDER THIS NOTION GENERIC TO OUR VERY EXISTENCE, FOR THE
STUDENT PERSONNEL WORKER HAS A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO HELP PREPARE
INDIVIDUALS FOR "FUTURE SHOCK," FOR LIFE IN A FAST CHANGING WORLD
THAT WILL CONTINUE TO CHANGE IN STRANGE AND UNFORESEEABLE WAYS.18

Thus, this focus on developing the "whole man" and preparing
for the continuing development and changing of ourselves as persons
must receive more than secondary emphasis in the educational process.
This basic aim of education carries with it the concept of a person,
highly complex and composed of various intellectual, emotional and
spiritual qualities. These components are striving to function
together; thus, intellectual development occurs with development
of the rest of the person and not in isolation.4

Nevitt Sanford describes adolescence as a time when great
changes can be effected. College youth, he indicates, "is given
a chance to repair [the] ravages, ... childhood [has] visited upon
Him. He can escape the image of himself that he formed when a child, he can find a new way of relating to authority figures, or he can establish new competence in his work. These changes are not discontinuous with his past. But, the point to be emphasized is that adolescence is a time particularly rich in possibilities for change. Our personalities are not determined absolutely and forever from a very early age, as popularized Freudian theory has led many people to believe. Many students come to college already 'knowing' Freud and never realizing how much they can change. They are very happy to discover that a wide variety of choices lies before them and this discovery serves as an impetus to serious consideration of the best directions for change.¹

This description of the late adolescent emphasizes more than ever the importance of educating "the whole man." This developmental model also requires more than insight and good intentions on the part of colleges and universities. If the institution "assumes the task of helping its students to develop their personalities, then all its resources and practices, including its actions and policies with respect to sex, should be directed to this end."¹⁷ Thus, what more logical place to turn our attention than to the residence halls—for it is here that the student spends at least 65% of his time when on campus; for it is here that most of our institutions have spent millions of badly needed dollars; for it is here that the student can be given the chance to identify with a community and to participate fully in the activity of living and, therefore, of learning.
Most of us have long accepted the idea that residential arrangements do have an influence on the learning process, and we have tried various formulas in order to come up with the best facilitative arrangement. We have constructed small, low-rise buildings and high-rise monsters. We have provided corridors and houses; single rooms, double rooms, triple rooms, and suites; private baths and gang showers; freshman halls, upperclass halls, graduate halls, and mixed-class halls.

In our residence arrangements we have long said, "Yes, learning is a total process influenced by a variety of factors." Thus, we have accepted the necessity to provide a physical environment to facilitate growth and development for the student. However, it is uncanny in how few cases decisions about the physical arrangements and supportive programs have been made in the light of a clear conception of how the "whole person" the totality of student development is really influenced by housing arrangements. The traditional and continued separation of the sexes in our campus housing probably represents the most glaring case of our failure to apply what we know about the psycho-social developmental needs of college youth.

Sexuality in Development

To talk of co-educational housing within the context of personality development at this particular phase of the life cycle necessitates consideration of the broader concept of sexuality as it relates to late adolescent development.
"Young people today face an extremely difficult task in trying to find a defensible position on the matter of sexual behavior. Adults are saying little to help them. If we, as educators, hope to offer any kind of meaningful guidance, we had better have an understanding of the place of sex in personality functioning."17

I have already suggested that integration of the biological drive of sexuality as a force within the person contributes to maturation and freedom for learning. Yet, we don't have to look too far to discover the difficulty today's college youth has integrating these instinctual drives into an adequate personality pattern.

The wide gap between rules and regulations apparently designed to inhibit sex on the campus and the reality of student behavior poses no small problem for our students. The current difference between stated rules and practice in implementation of visitation hours provides a most noteworthy example of this problem.

Frederick Hess states the problem pointedly in the following quote: "The worst aspect of sex on the campus--the enforced hypocrisy with which it has been treated at all but the more enlightened colleges."14

Additionally, there is evidence that sexual conduct and sexual morality are changing. One might say that the shift in sexual morality means not so much a decline of moral codes as a change in their contents.8 While the phenomenon sometimes described as a "sexual revolution" is not adequately documented,
IT IS CLEAR THAT COLLEGE STUDENTS ARE ASSERTING THEIR RIGHT TO PRIVACY AND SELF-DETERMINATION IN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THEIR OWN SEXUAL ACTIVITY.

THERE IS SOME CONSENSUS THAT THE DOUBLE SEX STANDARD IS BEING DISCARDED AND THAT WOMEN SEEK SEXUAL EXPERIENCE DURING COLLEGE YEARS MORE OFTEN THAN DID THEIR MOTHERS. THERE IS ALSO EVIDENCE OF EARLIER BIOLOGICAL MATURATION IN ADOLESCENCE, AND OF MORE OPEN AND VOCAL DISCUSSION OF SEXUAL MATTERS. IN FACT TODAY'S COLLEGE STUDENTS ARE PROBABLY BETTER INFORMED ABOUT ALL MATTERS RELATED TO SEX (ALTHOUGH LACK OF INFORMATION IS STILL PREVALENT) THAN WERE THEIR PARENTS.

MEVITT SANFORD POINTS OUT THAT "PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE ARE EASILY LED TO OVERESTIMATE THE AMOUNT OF UNINHIBITED SEXUALITY THAT EXISTS ON OUR CAMPUSES."

IN FACT, "MOST COLLEGE STUDENTS ARE RATHER CONVENTIONAL IN SEXUAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR."

"PHYSICAL CONTACT SEEMS TO BE BUT ONE COMPONENT OF INTEREST IN THE OPPOSITE SEX. ESTABLISHING MORE COMMUNICATIVE RELATIONS OFTEN IS UPPERMOST ON THE STUDENTS' CONSCIOUS AGENDA. WE HAVE FOUND THAT ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY ADVISORS OFTEN DO NOT SEE THE STUDENTS' SEARCH FOR GREATER PSYCHOLOGICAL INTIMACY IN THE PROPER PERSPECTIVE WHEN THEY VIEW STUDENT DEMANDS AS PRIMARILY 'SEXUAL' IN NATURE."

THE ISSUE POSED IN PURSUING THE SUBJECT OF CO-ED HOUSING IS, THEN, RELATED TO THE EXTENT TO WHICH COLLEGES CAN COME TO GRIPS EXPLICITLY WITH SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AS IT RELATES TO "RESIDENTIAL EDUCATION." AND, IF HOUSING ADMINISTRATORS ARE TRULY CONCERNED
WITH INDIVIDUAL GROWTH, THEN ADOLESCENT SEXUALITY MUST BE GIVEN
EXPLICIT CONSIDERATION IN ESTABLISHING RESIDENTIAL LIVING PATTERNS.
LET US NOT FOOL OURSELVES; STUDENTS ARE AWARE OF THE INTENT OF
RULES ABOUT CLOSED DOORS AND ARE UNINHIBITED IN ANNOUNCING THEIR
CONCERNS ABOUT THESE RULES. CANDOR ASSUMES SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE
UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, AND ADOLESCENTS CAN BE COUNTED UPON
TO TEST AUTHORITY UNTIL CHANGE IS FORTHCOMING.

COUPLED WITH THIS PRESSURE FOR CLARITY BETWEEN STATED
RULES AND IMPLICIT EXPECTATIONS OF SEXUAL CONDUCT IS THE CRUCIAL
NEED FOR YOUTH AT THIS POINT IN THEIR MATURING PROCESS TO DEVELOP
THE CAPACITY FOR ESTABLISHING MEANINGFUL RELATIONSHIPS WITH
MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX. THIS ASPECT OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT,
AS WE KNOW, LEADS TO PRESSURE FOR PARIELAL RULES THAT ALLOW FOR
INCREASED PRIVACY. WHILE THIS CONCERN WILL AT TIMES BE SEXUALLY
ORIENTED, THE REAL CRY IS FOR A NATURAL AND RELAXED ATMOSPHERE
THAT ALLOWS FOR INTIMATE COMMUNICATION AND THAT MAY, BUT DOES
NOT NECESSARILY, BRING PHYSICAL INTIMACY.

THE CO-ED LIVING ARRANGEMENT, BY PROVIDING A NATURAL
SITUATION THAT IS LOW IN ANXIETY, MAY BE THE BEST WAY TO HELP
TODAY’S STUDENT DEVELOP A CAPACITY FOR TRUE INTIMACY AS WELL AS
TO HELP HIM SOLIDIFY HIS SEXUAL IDENTITY.

ALL WE NEED TO DO IS ACCEPT THAT SEXUALITY IS AN EVOLVING,
DYNAMIC FORCE THAT CAN BE UNDERSTOOD ONLY IN RELATION TO THE REST
OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT. THEN WE CAN SEIZE THE UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY
THAT IS OURS IN RESIDENCE HALLS TO CREATE AN ENVIRONMENT ENABLING
DEVELOPMENT OF "THE WHOLE MAN." OUR TENDENCY IN THE PAST HAS
BEEN TO REDUCE SEXUALITY IN OUR VOCABULARY TO GIGGLING COMMENTS. TO SUGGEST THAT WE UNDERSTAND COLLEGE YOUTH AND SIMULTANEOUSLY TO IGNORE HIS SEXUALITY IS AS HOPELESSLY NAIVE AS TO SUGGEST THAT OUR COLLEGE RESIDENCE HALLS ARE CONTRIBUTING SIGNIFICANTLY TO THE STUDENT'S GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT OFFERING THE OPPORTUNITY FOR CO-ED LIVING.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY CO-EDUCATIONAL HOUSING?

FOR PURPOSES OF OUR DISCUSSION, I WILL DEFINE CO-ED HOUSING AS THAT ARRANGEMENT IN WHICH MEN AND WOMEN LIVE TOGETHER IN A COMMON OR SINGLE PHYSICAL FACILITY THAT STILL PROVIDES AMPLE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PERSONAL PRIVACY NEEDED AND CONSIDERED IMPORTANT BY MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX. AS SUCH, CO-ED HOUSING CAN TAKE THE FORM OF (1) SEPARATE WINGS ON THE SAME FLOOR LEVEL, (2) ALTERNATING FLOORS, (3) ALTERNATING SECTIONS, (4) ALTERNATING SUITES, (5) ALTERNATING ROOMS, OR (6) ALTERNATING BEDROOMS WITH A COMMON-CORE LIVING-STUDY AREA. I AM, ON THE OTHER HAND, EXCLUDING FROM CONSIDERATION SEPARATE BUILDINGS OR PARTS OF BUILDINGS SHARING ONLY COMMON DINING AND SOME COMMON LOUNGE SPACE. THESE EARLY CO-ED CENTERS PAVED THE WAY FOR THE KINDS OF CO-EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS WE NEED TO PROVIDE FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW. ADDITIONALLY, MANY OF THESE PHYSICAL FACILITIES WILL CERTAINLY BE LESS EXPENSIVE TO CONVERT THAN WILL BE MANY OF OUR OTHER ANTIQUATED, BUT STILL HEAVILY MORTGAGED, "MONASTERIES TO THE PAST."

IMMEDIATELY SOME OF YOU WILL SUSPECT THAT THE KINDS OF CO-ED ARRANGEMENTS I SUGGEST WILL LEAD TO INCREASED SEXUAL PROMISCUITY OR ORGIES AND MOST CERTAINLY COHABITATION. I SUGGEST, ON
THE OTHER HAND, BASED BOTH ON ACTUAL EXPERIENCE AND STUDIES ON
CO-ED LIVING, THAT A SIBLING-TYPE RELATIONSHIP IS MORE LIKELY
TO DEVELOP, LEADING TO LESS PROMISCUITY.

JOSEPH KATZ CALLS THIS PHENOMENON THE INCEST TABOO,
"QUITE SIMPLY, THESE STUDENTS TEND TO FORM DEEP, INTIMATE AND
RATHER BROTHERLY-SISTERLY-TYPE ATTACHMENTS. THEIR ROMANTIC
RELATIONSHIPS ARE MORE OFTEN WITH PEOPLE LIVING OUTSIDE THEIR
OWN HOUSE. YOU SEE, THEY FIND THAT YOU CANNOT TREAT THE PEOPLE
YOU LIVE WITH MERELY AS SEX OBJECTS. IT IS NOT LIKE HAVING A
CASUAL AFFAIR WITH SOMEONE IN ANOTHER DORM AND THEN, WHEN IT'S
OVER YOU SIMPLY DON'T SEE EACH OTHER AGAIN."

BUILDING FOR CO-ED LIVING

AN IMMEDIATE QUESTION THAT COMES TO MIND IS HOW DO WE
TAKE THE TYPICAL DORMITORY OF AN EARLIER DAY, "WITH ITS RANK OF
IDENTICAL CELLS MARCHING IN DOUBLE FILE DOWN A LONG CORRIDOR,"
AND MAKE IT JOINTLY HABITABLE FOR MEN AND WOMEN STUDENTS? CERTAINLY WE CANNOT WISH AWAY 15-YEAR-OLD BUILDINGS WITH 40-YEAR MORTGAGES.

ALTHOUGH LESS THAN THE IDEAL ARRANGEMENT, SIMPLY ALLOWING
MEN AND WOMEN TO LIVE ON OPPOSITE FLOORS CAN BE AN INITIAL STEP. THIS AFFORDS AMPLE OPPORTUNITY FOR PRIVACY OF EACH SEX; BUT, WITH 24 HOUR USE OF COMMON AREAS SUCH AS LOUNGES, RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, STUDY AREAS, VENDING AND LAUNDRY FACILITIES, THE REAL FLAVOR OF THE GIVE AND TAKE REQUIRED FOR THE SEXES TO LIVE TOGETHER WILL DEVELOP. IN THIS FASHION, TOO, THE MOVE TO CO-ED
LIVING CAN BE MADE QUICKLY WITHOUT WAITING UNTIL LARGE CAPITAL OUTLAYS CAN BE MADE. PHYSICAL CHANGES IN BUILDING DESIGN AND FURNISHINGS CAN THUS BE MADE ON A GRADUAL BASIS, WITH THE ADDED ADVANTAGE THAT CO-ED RESIDENTIAL EXPERIENCE WILL LEND TO ADEQUATE DECISIONS ABOUT NEEDED CHANGES.

SOME OF YOU WILL EVEN BE ABLE TO HOUSE MEN AND WOMEN ON THE SAME FLOOR WITHOUT MAJOR REDESIGN OF FACILITIES, AND IN SPITE OF COMMUNITY BATHS, WHERE NATURAL DIVISIONS OF THE LIVING GROUP EXIST BY VIRTUE OF LOCATION OF THE FLOOR LOUNGE OR OTHER BUILDING CHARACTERISTICS.

THE RECENT PRACTICE OF BUILDING COMMON BATHS BETWEEN STUDENT ROOMS WILL HELP FACILITATE THE TRANSITION. THIS ELIMINATES THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNITY BATHS AS A PHYSICAL BARRIER TO DEVELOPING GOOD MIXES OF MEN AND WOMEN IN EACH LIVING GROUP WHILE STILL PROVIDING ADEQUATE SINGLE-SEX PRIVACY.

ANOTHER BUT MORE EXPENSIVE CONVERSION APPROACH, DUE BOTH TO OCCUPANCY REDUCTION AND COST OF THE PHYSICAL CHANGES, INVOLVES CONVERTING ONE BEDROOM TO A LIVING ROOM COMMUNAL FOR THREE OR FOUR BEDROOMS.

THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE BEEN FORTUNATE ENOUGH TO BUILD THE TRUE SUITE OR MODIFIED APARTMENT ARRANGEMENTS ARE IN THE BEST POSITION OF ALL FOR IMMEDIATE CONVERSION WITH A MINIMUM OF PHYSICAL CHANGE AND EXPENSE. IT IS AMAZING, HOWEVER, AS I LOOK AT HOUSING BUILT ON THE SUITE OR APARTMENT PLAN, HOW FEW OF US ARE WILLING TO PERMIT THESE TO BE OCCUPIED ON A CO-EDUCATIONAL BASIS. THIS MAY BE DELIBERATE. ON THE OTHER HAND, SOME PROGRESSIVE HOUSING
Administrators may have been looking ahead all the time but are caught in the bind of having to wait for the public’s repressive suspicions to disappear.

No college administrator today needs to be reminded that incidents involving student sexual behavior, or suspected sexual behavior, often receive sensational publicity unrelated to the gravity of the situation. This publicity inevitably complicates administrative processes, particularly with current financial overtones. Nevertheless, we must be prepared, if necessary, to stand as a buffer between the student and outside (or internal) pressures of opinion, including unfavorable publicity, in order to explore what is psychologically and educationally sound.

"Educators must bear in mind that the students are there to be educated and that the actions affecting them should have this aim, rather than that of pleasing the alumni or protecting the image of the college. Deans simply can no longer be satisfied with roles as disciplinarians or with images of themselves as stern but fair fathers or mothers. They are going to have to learn to take some positive actions that are designed to teach personal and social integration."17

The kinds of physical arrangements best suited for co-educational living are no doubt fairly obvious and, at once, obviously more expensive to build. However, any residential building now on the drawing boards or in the planning stage for the immediate or distant future should be built to accommodate co-educational living.
Future Directions

Besides the general rationale developed earlier in defense of co-educational living as an important adjunct to the learning process, other factors will influence developments in this direction for the future. These include the following:

(1) The average age of college students will increase and more male students will be entering college at a different point developmentally than has previously been the case because of the draft emphasis on age 19.

(2) More people will be in and out of college at different times for other reasons as well. The community college pattern has helped bring on this phenomenon as has the increased emphasis on education as a continual process and the resultant post degree and continuing education programs.

(3) A greater age range among the student population will exist because of the same reasons mentioned above.

(4) A greater diversity among students and student values follows because of the conditions mentioned previously.

(5) Marriage will tend to be postponed because of more participation in voluntary service programs such as the Peace Corps and attendance in graduate
SCHOOL. MARRIAGE IS CURRENTLY LESS PERMANENT AND WILL REMAIN THUSLY UNLESS OTHER FACTORS INCLUDING MARRIAGE POSTPONEMENT BRING ABOUT A CHANGE IN THE STABILITY OF MARRIAGES.

EXPERIENCE WITH CO-EDUCATIONAL LIVING, SOME WILL ARGUE, WILL BECOME AN AGENT OF CHANGE IN THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE. THIS IS CERTAINLY A POINT I WILL NOT ATTEMPT TO DISPUTE. HOWEVER, IT COULD SERVE TO STRENGTHEN MARRIAGE BY BRINGING ABOUT MORE MARRIAGES ESTABLISHED AFTER ADEQUATE PERSONAL SEXUAL IDENTITY HAS DEVELOPED AND THE MEANING OF A VARIETY OF RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX HAS BEEN EXPLORED. STUDENTS WITH CO-ED LIVING EXPERIENCE ARE LESS LIKELY TO HAVE THE "OLD ROMANTIC EXPECTATION OF MARRIAGE AS A SOLUTION TO THEIR IDENTITY PROBLEMS." ON THE OTHER HAND, IT COULD LESSEN THE EMPHASIS ON THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE AND BRING ABOUT A RESTRUCTURING OF MALE-FEMALE RELATIONSHIPS IN OUR SOCIETY. REGARDLESS OF THE IMPACT ON MARRIAGE ITSELF, MANY POSITIVE CHANGES IN THE UNDERSTANDING OF LOVE, HETEROSEXUAL ADJUSTMENT AND OTHER CONSTRUCTIVE VALUE CHANGES ARE LIKELY TO RESULT.

WHILE WE ARE ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT CO-ED LIVING, THE QUESTION OF "IS IT FOR EVERYONE?" IS AN APPROPRIATE ONE TO CONSIDER. ALTHOUGH SOME WILL DISAGREE, I WOULD INDICATE THAT, INASMUCH AS ANY LIVING PATTERN IS APPROPRIATE FOR EVERYONE, CO-EDUCATIONAL LIVING SHOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR TODAY'S COLLEGE YOUTH. THIS IS SUPPORTED BY THE DEVELOPMENTAL NEEDS OF COLLEGE YOUTH AND QUALIFIED, OF COURSE, BY THE IMPORTANCE OF ADEQUATE
Provision for individual sex privacy. However, colleges should not quest after one ideal housing system which is always just around the corner. Rather, they should seek to develop a balanced mix of housing types, providing students maximum variety and freedom of choice in where and how to live. Co-educational housing should be an option from which to choose.

The trend at many institutions has been to consider co-educational living for upperclass and/or graduate students only. I would argue that the entering student has perhaps the greatest need for this kind of living pattern. The psycho-sexual reasons for this have already been explored. Beyond these, however, the entering student has just left a home atmosphere more akin to the brother-sister relations that tend to develop in the co-ed hall. This is a more natural, "at home" situation for him that is likely to be less stress-producing as he attempts to explore his doubts about relations both with the same and the opposite sex. Actually, an insecure entering student may be more easily led into homosexual relationships in a one-sex hall than a co-ed one.

In addition, putting the entering student in a segregated-sex housing at a point when developmentally he needs the opposite, allowing some unhealthy or tenuous adjustments to be made, and then asking the student to move into a co-educational living situation is potentially more confusing than spending the entire four years in a one-sex situation. If I were beginning even the most modest co-ed living program, I would opt for a cross-class
MIX AND BE CONFIDENT THAT I'D HAVE FEWER PROBLEMS MAKING PROGRESS WITH THE FRESHMEN THAN WITH UPPERCLASSMEN WHO HAD HAD A CHANCE TO BE BIASED BY A PRIOR CAMPUS LIVING EXPERIENCE.

Some Additional Comments on Co-Ed Living

WORTHY OF MENTION, TOO, ARE RELATED PROS OF CO-ED LIVING SUCH AS THE BOOST IT GIVES TO THE (1) ESTABLISHMENT OF PRODUCTIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX IN THE WORK WORLD--A POINT ALL THE MORE IMPORTANT IN THE LIGHT OF THE CHANGES THAT THE CURRENT WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT IS LIKELY TO HOLD FOR THE FUTURE, AND (2) ESTABLISHMENT OF HEALTHY ADULT FRIENDSHIPS WITH MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE SEX OUTSIDE THE MARRIAGE AND FAMILY STRUCTURE. TO UNDERSCORE THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS CONTRIBUTION OF CO-ED LIVING, CONSIDER THE NUMBER OF MARRIAGES "LOST" WHERE A MAN OR WOMAN DISCOVERS FOR THE FIRST TIME, AFTER MARRIAGE, THAT IT IS POSSIBLE TO HAVE "FEELINGS" FOR A MEMBER OF THE OPPOSITE SEX OTHER THAN THE MARRIAGE PARTNER.

OVERLAPPING SOMewhat WITH THE PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED BENEFITS OF CO-ED LIVING, BUT MORE SPECIFIC AND SITUATIONAL, ADVANTAGES INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

(1) THE LIVING SITUATION IS MORE NATURAL AND CLOSER TO "REAL LIFE" SEX MIXES.

(2) STUDENTS TEND TO EXHIBIT MORE MATURE BEHAVIOR IN A VARIETY OF SITUATIONS, HAVE BETTER MANNERS, AND EXHIBIT LESS TENSION.

(3) EDUCATIONAL AND RECREATIONAL PROGRAMMING IS MORE EASILY ACCOMPLISHED.
(4) Student decorum is better and damages to the building are typically decreased.

(5) Students plan and participate more in cultural and community activities.

(6) Female students express feelings of greater security and the presence of males does tend to act as a deterrent to intruders.

(7) Sex for sex’s sake is de-emphasized, and this healthier attitude toward sex helps administrators become more willing to let go of restrictive rules and regulations and accept changes in youth’s values.

(8) Students participate less in structured, one-to-one dating, and more in informal group activity.

In summary, let me state that I am advocating, based on student developmental needs, co-educational living as a vital component of residential education. As such, co-education does not become an end unto itself with the overemphasis on sex that is characteristic of residential programs such as co-educational visitation rights. I am realist enough to know that such an innovation is not without its hurdles—most notably that of sexually repressive public opinion. As responsible administrators, however, we must stand ready to “weather the storm” in order to provide for our students what we know to be psychologically and educationally sound.
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