

Chapter 1 Statement of Problem

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the values/concerns of today's college students as expressed through desktop graffiti. First, the nature and extent to which college students at a major land grant university engage in desktop graffiti is assessed. This study then examines the degree to which the type and extent of desktop graffiti varies by the gender, major, and course composition in the classrooms studied. In essence, it is argued that the graffiti found on student desktops is an excellent unobtrusive (Webb 2000) or indirect measure of student values, attitudes, fantasies and/or behavioral dispositions. As Abel and Buckley (1977) assert in their book, *The Handwriting on the Wall*,

Graffiti is a form of communication that is both personal and free of the everyday social restraints that normally prevent people from giving uninhibited reign to their thoughts. As such, these sometimes crude inscriptions offer some intriguing insights into the people who author them and into the society in which these people belong (Abel and Buckley 1977:3)¹.

Overview of Study

Not only is this study and its analysis of basic sociological interest, it may also be very informative to a much wider audience of educators, administrators, and parents. It may be useful to examine the trends found regarding both the quantity and

¹According to the American Heritage Dictionary "The word *graffiti* is a plural noun in Italian. In English, *graffiti* is far more common than the singular form *graffito* and is mainly used as a singular noun in much the same way data is" (American Heritage Dictionary 2000). Thus, throughout this paper, I will use the term graffiti.

content/quality of graffiti by student major, class standing, and gender; and it is hoped that such information will better inform the public as to what is really on some college students' minds.

Following a review of pertinent literature concerning graffiti (Chapter 2), and a description of the research design of the study (Chapter 3), results of the analyses of the classroom graffiti found on desktops are presented in two separate chapters.

Chapter 4 presents a description of the nature of various themes and subjects found through a content analysis of the desktop graffiti present in various college classrooms. Chapter 5 is more inferential in nature, and examines the degree to which the amount and content of desktop graffiti is correlated with aggregate measures of the majors, genders, and class standings of those students who populate the classrooms examined.

Chapter 2 Survey of the Literature

History of the Study of Graffiti

The study of graffiti is decades old. For example, books such as *The Writing on the Wall: An Account of Pompeii in Its Last Days*, by J. Lindsay (1966) use the graffiti on the walls of buildings in Pompeii to understand this ancient culture better (Abel & Buckley 1977:4). The year 1935 marked the publication of the first scholarly study of graffiti. Allen Walker Read (1935) was first inspired to study graffiti after a trip out West in which he observed a great deal of graffiti on the stalls of many a public restroom. As Read puts it, “It was borne upon me that these inscriptions are a form of folk-lore that should be made the subject of a scholarly study” (Read 1935:17). Based upon these observations, he wrote *Lexical Evidence from Folk Epigraphy in Western North America: A Glossarial Study of the Low Element in the English Vocabulary* (Abel & Buckley 1977).

Since this pioneer study, many similar analyses have been made of public restroom graffiti. Additionally, as Robert Reisner (1971) points out in his well known work *Graffiti: Two Thousand Years of Wall Writing*:

As the graffiti writer gets more and more into these open areas where his chances of being seen are greater, there is a tendency for his message to be of a generalized nature without too much pornographic emphasis...in lavatories, or in any place where there is complete privacy, however, the messages although still often banal, are much more visceral (Reisner 1971:4).

One of the most valuable aspects of graffiti is that it is, as Reisner (1974) puts it in the introduction of his *Encyclopedia of Graffiti*, “the voice of the common man...topics

too sensitive, too bigoted, too outrageous for the official version are the natural province” (Reisner 1974:6). Graffiti allows one who may fear an open expression of his opinion to express himself. Additionally, Reisner (1974) suggests that, “the analysis of graffiti could provide vital information for investigations of the breakdown of discipline and order, or into the workings of the moronic or ego-starved or bored mind” (Reisner 1974:8).

There is substantial support for the study of graffiti. It seems to be the consensus that the analysis of graffiti has and will continue to reveal things about the cultures in which we live that: 1) we may not be aware of; and, 2) could aid in the reworking/formulation of certain action plans, such as those against racism.

An extensive amount of contemporary research has been done on graffiti. Predominantly, this has consisted of the study of two types of graffiti—street graffiti, and graffiti found on the walls of lavatories. A variety of components must be looked at when studying graffiti—most importantly is the way it physically exists. Is it spray paint on a subway train? A carving on a school desk? Ink on the stall of a bathroom door? The physicality of the graffiti brings with it certain implications.

Components of Street Graffiti

Street (also known as subway) graffiti tends to be the product of a process of mentoring and brings with it an unofficial status system. Richard Lachmann (1988) studied the world of street graffiti in New York City in the early 1980s. He combined interviews and participant observation with 25 well-known graffiti artists to gain a better understanding of the world of street graffiti. He found that the making of street graffiti is a fairly dangerous process. One is often at risk of being injured by oncoming subway trains, or being arrested (potentially violently) by city police. Due to its danger, novices

must be mentored by an already established graffitist which in turn makes such novices aware of the social nature of graffiti—that is, its audience (Lachmann 1988). “By accompanying a mentor, the novice learns that there is an audience for graffiti...this belief is a precondition for engaging in graffiti writing and militates against the likelihood that individuals who lack personal acquaintance with graffiti writers will become writers themselves” (Lachmann 1988: 234).

An interesting result of such a mentoring system is that it produces social and geographic concentrations of graffitists overtime (Lachmann 1988). Howard Becker (1963; 1982) found in his work with marijuana users that the user must adopt the proper smoking technique in order to reach the desired end. It is important to note that these marijuana users learn to get high in this deviant subculture which teaches the techniques and norms of the deviant behavior. Lachmann, drawing from Becker, suggests that novice graffitists would have to learn techniques as well as a sense of desirability from a mentor, which would produce certain concentrations of this type of artist both socially and geographically (Lachmann 1988).

The graffiti artists in Lachmann’s study tended to configure a fairly homogenous group—they were predominantly male (all but one, who was a girlfriend of one of the male artists); they were for the most part Hispanic or black; they tended to be in their teens, and their careers tended to be short lived. As Lachmann explains, the goal for many of these writers is to establish their “tag”, which is a distinct identity for them. They go through a period of intense “tagging” until they are able to claim the title of “king of the line” (Lachmann 1988). Once this has happened, however, such artists tend to stop doing graffiti and return to their “normal” lives.

Identity

One of the main functions of street graffiti is to form an identity for oneself, and establish oneself within a status system. There has yet to be one single, agreed-upon definition of identity within social psychology, but the following from McCall and Simmons (1966) is one that has been widely accepted and is viewed as a sort of standard within the discipline.

Personal identities serve as the pegs upon which social identities and personal biographies can be hung. If an individual could not be recognized from one occasion to another as the same person, no stable social relationships could be constructed, and therefore there would be no social identities at all. Both types of identification are vitally important in the process of human interaction (p.65; in Owens 2003:215).

While this definition provides us with the personal side of identity, it can be strengthened by adding a structural component from Stryker (1980): “Identities are ‘parts’ of self [constituting] internalized positional designations...that exist insofar as the person is a participant in structured role relations” (Stryker 1980: 60; in Owens 2003: 215). When analyzing the uses of graffiti, it is necessary to take into account structural factors as well as those at the more micro level to understand the ways in which the phenomenon fits into society.

Street Graffiti as a Tool for Building Masculinity

Gender is undoubtedly one of the most salient and important identities a person possesses. In Western society today, a great importance is placed on men to express and even “prove” their masculinity. In fact, an unequal amount of stress is put on men to uphold the ideal of masculinity, which includes such things as being strong, tough, a

leader, successful, competitive, as well as separating oneself from that which is feminine (Howard & Hollander 1997).

Several studies have looked at street graffiti as a tool for building one's masculinity. Previous work has focused on the use of graffiti as a response to class-related problems, but one may also look at it from the standpoint of gender. Nancy Macdonald (2001), in her book *The Graffiti Subculture: Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York*, explores the lives of male street graffiti writers in two major urban areas. Both Macdonald (2001) and Lachmann (1988) find that writers use graffiti to prove and strengthen their masculinities. Lachmann reports that male graffitiists' sexism "is an integral part of their bravura conception of the act of doing graffiti—they often define the dangerousness of writing on the subways in terms of women's inability to participate" (Lachmann 1988: 235). Similarly, Macdonald found that the writers in her sample tend to define the masculinity of the activity in two main ways: 1) by asserting that girls lack the actual skill and ability to do graffiti, or 2) by stressing that while girls may be *physically* able to do graffiti, they lack the motivation (Macdonald 2001). The graffitiists in her sample clearly emphasized the masculine nature of the activity of doing graffiti, and contended that graffiti brings with it a great deal of risk and danger, therefore making it "men's work." Writers in her study also cited repeatedly that girls are lacking in such things as strength, stamina and judgment (Macdonald 2001).

One can look at the use of graffiti as a tool for building one's masculinity in an even more practical light. For example, Lachmann (1988) reports that many of the writers he interviewed (most of which were still teens) used the leverage tagging brought them to essentially make it through high school. While he found they commonly missed

two or three months of school to take part in intense tagging to become “king of the line,” these writers were then able to return to school and actually *focus*, for they had established themselves as “tough guys” and did not have to deal with the distractions that come with *not* having done this. In fact, such writers often graduated earlier than classmates who had not made a name for themselves via graffiti. (Lachmann 1988).

Art Worlds and Street Graffiti

Howard Becker (1963; 1982) defines an art world as “the network of people whose cooperative activity, organized via their joint knowledge of conventional means of doing things, produces the kind of art works that the art world is noted for” (Becker 1982: X). Becker stresses that one should look at art as a collective activity—pieces of art are products of numerous processes and the system as a whole that produces them. Becker does not look at art as merely a final product, but instead proposes viewing art as an ongoing process. Not only must art be made (by a team of people, not just the “artist” whose signature appears on the canvas), but it must also be appreciated—that is, it must have an audience in order to be considered art (Becker 1982).

Thus, one might pose the question: is graffiti art? If so, what is its art world? If not, why not? Lachmann suggests that subway graffiti artists are at the same time involved in an art world and a deviant subculture (Lachmann 1988).

Becker has taught us that we can understand both deviance and artistic creation as the results of two sorts of social interactions. First, novices must learn the motivations and conventions for engaging in these activities. Second, deviants’ and artists’ careers are furthered or thwarted by the ways in which audiences label and react to them and their endeavors (Lachmann 1988: 230).

The issue becomes even more complex when one takes into account the notion of commodification—some of the writers Lachmann spoke to went on to create graffiti-style art for galleries, participate in shows, and sell their pieces for thousands of dollars. This has been one of the reactions to graffiti by the general public—it is either looked at as a criminal act (typically the original reaction), or it may be moved (as a subcultural artifact) from its community of origin and onto the market, thus making it available to all (Lachmann 1988).

An aspect of art worlds that should be noted is that “Art worlds frequently incorporate at a later date works they originally rejected—thus the distinction lies not in the work but in the ability of an art world to accept it and its maker” (Becker 1982: 227). Can one then think of street graffiti in these terms? Or has its “acceptance” as art really just taken the form of a commodity to fuel the capitalist system while at the same time shattering its folkloric nature?

Deviance and Street Graffiti

Another question that must be addressed is that of graffiti as deviance. Becker defines deviance as follows: “Deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an ‘offender.’ The deviant is one to whom that label has been successfully applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label” (Becker 1963: 9). Hence, that which is deviant is a fluid notion. Therefore, it is safe to assume the deviant status of graffiti may be something that is in a constant state of fluctuation.

Components of “Indoor” Graffiti

While a comprehensive study of graffiti requires analyzing both indoor and outdoor graffiti, the remainder of this paper will focus on that graffiti which is done inside, for this more closely relates to desktop graffiti than does street graffiti. Numerous studies have been done of indoor graffiti, and have predominantly looked at graffiti found in bathroom stalls. The content of such graffiti has tended to be of a sexual (and predominantly anti-homosexual) nature. While the present study analyzes desktop graffiti, the two are similar enough to draw some comparisons.

There are two main theories in the study of indoor graffiti. The first views graffiti as an accurate reflection of the attitudes of a given community. Stocker et al. (1972) argue three main points:

- 1) Graffiti are an accurate indicator of the social attitudes of a community
- 2) Most homosexual graffiti are a result of societal condemnation of homosexual behavior, which permits this behavior to be used as an insulting device; and with gay liberation, such graffiti will decrease
- 3) The difference between men’s and women’s graffiti is due to childhood socialization, and if there is a change in amount and type of men’s and women’s graffiti, then there has been a change in some aspect of women’s socialization patterns (Stocker et al. 1972: 358).

While this has been a widely accepted view of graffiti in the past, several theorists have called it too simplistic, and even accuse Stocker et al. (1972) of missing the overall point. Gonos et al. (1976), after extensive contact with folklorists and field experience, suggest an alternative explanation of graffiti:

We postulate that the relative frequencies of different thematic contents of graffiti will vary inversely with relevant dominant values of the social milieu in which the graffiti are found. Our reasoning is that when values are in the process of change and proscriptions against the public utterance of particular sentiments are becoming stronger, there will

be a tendency for some individuals to express these sentiments covertly (Gonos 1976: 41).

Thus, when a certain view is no longer acceptable in the public sphere, Gonos suggests this view may be *more* frequently found in graffiti.

To study this alternative explanation, Gonos conducted a study consisting of extensive fieldwork of indoor graffiti in NY and NJ in several settings, namely university lavatories and bar lavatories. His hypothesis was as follows: “The relative frequency of graffiti giving expression to a particular value will be greater in social milieus where the suppression of remarks carrying this value is greater” (Gonos 1976: 42). According to Gonos, the idea of suppression carries with it two conditions: 1) the pressure to be expressive on a certain topic in a certain vein 2) the operation of normative constraints against public utterance of particular positions on the topic (Gonos 1976). Based on these conditions, Gonos predicts that graffiti on topics of interest will be present in settings where it is no longer acceptable to express such views.

Gonos’ findings support his hypothesis. Specifically, he finds that in settings where there is 1) a liberal, outspoken attitude toward homosexuality, 2) homosexuality is an “issue”, and 3) consequently there is suppression of anti-homosexual rhetoric, one finds a high frequency of anti-homosexual graffiti.

Gonos makes a very important point concerning two exceptions to his explanation: 1) the value expressed in graffiti may be the remains of a traditional value now smothered under a newly accepted dominant one; and 2) the value may represent an extreme alternative still unacceptable of expression in the social circles of which the graffitist is a member.

One of the key characteristics of indoor graffiti is its anonymous nature. “The anonymity of the public bathroom allows the graffitist the opportunity to discuss an issue which is proscribed, restricted, or taboo in the graffitist’s ordinary circle of social being” (Gonos 1976: 41).

Students as Graffitists

Those groups which lack the opportunity to have their opinions heard may sometimes express themselves via graffiti. Onuigbo G. Nwoye (1993) conducted a study of graffiti on the walls of a college campus in Nigeria (bathroom and stairwell graffiti). He found that graffiti is in fact a way for the minority group to express itself. While a fairly large amount of research has been done which focuses on women as the minority in terms of self-expression, students are also a group that can be seen as a minority in need of a venue for their opinions. In fact, one may even go so far as to view students as a *powerless* group within the classroom setting. “Women as a subgroup denied access to public speech and writing have begun to receive some attention, but a similar minority group, students, numerically and organizationally weaker, have not received adequate attention in their attempts to articulate their views when mainstream society has denied them the means of doing so through established media” (Nwoye 1993: 440). Nwoye notes that graffiti on college campuses is a similar phenomenon across the globe, which may be proof that the student population is a minority in terms of self-expression (Nwoye 1993).

“Demographics” of the Graffitist

The findings from numerous studies of indoor graffiti have allowed us to compile a sort of “demographic” of the graffiti artist. Green (2003) provides a helpful compilation

of trends in indoor graffiti writing. Interestingly, some of these findings are somewhat contradictory. However, some important trends materialize, and tend to follow the lines of gender.

First, one can look at *amount* of graffiti each sex tends to produce as evidenced in numerous studies. Males have been found to write many more inscriptions in a number of studies (e.g., Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin & Gebhard, 1953; Otta, 1993; Schreer & Strichartz, 1997; Sechrest & Flores, 1969). Interestingly, Stocker, Dutcher, Hargrove and Cook (1972) found more graffiti done by females than males in more liberal universities, whereas more graffiti was done by males at more conservative universities. At the high school level, studies have found up to 80 percent of graffiti is done by females (Ahmed, 1981; Wales & Brewer, 1976; as cited in Green 2003).

As far as *content* of graffiti goes, politics and sex seem to be the most popular topics (Green 2003: 284). Males tend to write more graffiti on political topics (e.g., Lowenstine, Ponticos, & Paludi, 1982; Otta et al., 1996). Some studies have found more sexual graffiti written by females (Bates & Martin, 1980), more by males (Schreer & Strichartz, 1997), or no difference (Otta et al. 1996). Males have been found to write more “erotic” sexual graffiti, whereas females write graffiti that is of a more romantic nature (Ahmed 1981; Wales & Brewer, 1976). Interestingly, Wales and Brewer (1976) found that the amount of erotic graffiti written by females increased with socioeconomic status (Green 2003).

The positive or negative nature of graffiti found tends to differ based on gender as well. Female graffiti tends to be more positive, containing “advice to the love-forlorn and on existential issue about life, marriage, and happiness” (Lowenstine et al., 1982: 308).

Male graffiti tends to be more negative, including racially prejudiced graffiti (e.g., Bruner & Kelso, 1981; Otta, 1993; Schreer & Strichartz, 1997; Stocker et al., 1972), more homophobic graffiti (e.g., Schreer & Strichartz, 1997; Stocker et al., 1972), and more insults (e.g., Bruner & Kelso, 1981; Otta, 1993). Females are more likely to ask questions (Fitzpatrick, Mulac, & Dindia, 1995; Tannen, 1994), disclose personal information (Dindia & Allen, 1992), and refer to emotion (Fitzpatrick et al., 1995; Goldsmith & Dun, 1997; Mulac, Studley, & Blau, 1990). Males are more likely to give opinions (Mulac & Lundell, 1986; Mulac et al., 1990), use expletives (Bayard & Krishnappa, 2001; Limbrick, 1991), and use longer sentences (Mulac, 1989; Mulac et al., 1990; as cited in Green 2003). Green (2003: 290) found there was a high incidence of drug and drinking related graffiti in the female toilets, and also reports women and men being equally likely to discuss and ridicule classes and talk about exams, studying, sports and music.

Anti-homosexual Graffiti

As previously noted, graffiti of a sexual nature is one of the most common types found indoors. Much of this graffiti contains anti-homosexual slurs. Homosexuality is a marginalized status in the United States. George W. Smith and Dorothy E. Smith (1998) conducted a study of male homosexual high school students in order to gauge the climate of high schools for such students. They employed the research approach of Institutional Ethnography, which is based on “the ontological presupposition that an actual world exists that people actively bring into being and that can be studied and observed” (Smith 1998). The authors are specifically interested in the current educational sphere—what norms the current educational system is based on.

In their research, Smith & Smith (1988) find that the topic of homosexuality is a problem in their sample. The “ideology of the fag” was the dominant one within the schools they surveyed. This ideology was expressed both verbally and physically—the term fag was routinely used, as was negative body language. Anti-homosexual graffiti was also prevalent. The teachers at the school only helped to fuel the problem—Smith reports that teachers either openly participated in the ideology, or at least went along with it rather than objecting to it. Courses were lacking in education about homosexuality, and school counselors were not adequately trained to counsel gay students. This resulted in turning the homosexual students’ “problems” into individual inadequacies, rather than seeing these students’ problems as part of a larger problem stemming from the prevalent negative ideology present in the school. This prevalent ideology resulted in the homosexual students being either ostracized or having to go along with the social norms and “pass” as a straight student. Additionally, the homosexual students were surrounded by reminders of their unpopular status as evidenced in the graffiti found in the school (Smith 1998).

Summary

Graffiti is a phenomenon that has received a great deal of attention, and understandably so. We have seen that graffiti serves a variety of purposes in a variety of social situations. Whether one is doing graffiti to secure a place in a status system, to prove one’s masculinity, or to express an unpopular attitude, graffiti is much more complex than a bunch of scribbles.

The Present Study

The climate on college campuses is of much interest today to a variety of groups, including parents, school administrators, faculty, students, and members of the surrounding community. The present study seeks to gauge what some of the pressing issues are for college students at a major land grant university in the US. Graffiti is collected from a random sample of nine classrooms in two buildings on campus, one which typically houses liberal arts classes, and one which tends to house engineering courses. The graffiti from each room is analyzed according to amount and content. Data from the Registrar pertaining to these specific classrooms is then looked at, and includes the major and gender of the students who attended class in these rooms, as well as the classes that were taught during the Fall semester of 2003. Associations between the amount and content of graffiti and the classroom characteristics are then analyzed.

Expectations

The review of the literature suggests that a significant amount of graffiti of a racist nature will be present. In addition, sex is expected to be a popular topic. Support of the university, and in particular its sports program, is expected. The literature also suggests that evidence might be found of cheating, such as answers to questions being “stored” on the desktops. Based upon the literature on graffiti, specifically on the work of Gonos (1976), it is hypothesized that graffiti of a sexual nature might tend to focus on homosexual topics and, more specifically, express a negative attitude toward homosexuals.

Chapter 3 Research Design

Ecological Fallacy

It must first be noted that this study encounters a basic Ecological Fallacy—one does not know who is truly responsible for the graffiti being analyzed—is every student participating, or merely a handful? Such fallacies as the Ecological Fallacy stem from the incorrect pairing of theory and methods. Figure 1 depicts the various fallacies possible when conclusions are incorrectly drawn in this manner.

Figure 1.

POTENTIAL FALLACIES AND PITFALLS STEMMING FROM THE ERRANT FIT BETWEEN THEORY AND METHODS

<i>Theoretical Orientation</i>	<i>Methodological Approach</i>		
	<i>Low Empirical</i>	<i>Moderately Empirical</i>	<i>Highly Empirical</i>
Realist	Consistent	Nosnibor Fallacy	Nosnibor Fallacy
Quasi realist Quasi nominalist	Errors of dummy-variable Analysis	Consistent	Errors of collapsing data
Nominalist	Ecological Fallacy	Ecological Fallacy	Consistent

Source: Snizek (1979: 206)

W.S. Robinson (1950) defines an Ecological fallacy as “Simply drawing inferences about an individual’s behavior on the bases of coincidence of two grouped properties”

(Robinson 1950: 351). Another common fallacy is known as the Nosnibor fallacy

(Robinson spelled backward), and is simply the reverse of the Ecological Fallacy—the researcher tries to draw group-level inferences based on individual-level data (Snizek

1979). Thus, keeping both of these common mistakes in mind, it would be misleading to claim that any results found in this study represented the student body as a whole. The

information analyzed is simply suggestive of aggregate trends and cannot be specifically identified with any student or group of students. However, the data do stand to serve as an *indicator* of the concerns of today's college student. While as sociologists, we have the option to choose from a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches, we must remain aware of the possibility of misleading conclusions stemming from incorrect joining of such approaches (Snizek 1979).

Sampling Design

This study is of a qualitative, interpretive nature. The graffiti on desks at a major land grant university were analyzed using a content analysis approach. As Neuman (2003) points out, "Content analysis involves random sampling, precise measurement, and operational definitions for abstract constructs. Coding turns aspects of content that represent variables into numbers" (Neuman 2003: 311). In this study, nine classrooms were randomly selected in two buildings of interest on campus—one which typically holds liberal arts classes, and the other which tends to hold engineering classes. From these classrooms (six in the liberal arts building, and three in the engineering), every desk was analyzed for the presence of graffiti.

Classes Held

In all but one classroom, approximately 12 classes per semester were held. Typically, between 200 and 300 students attended class in these rooms. Three of the rooms hosted classes predominantly in engineering, three in math, one in English, one in history, and one in art. The latter two rooms, however, held a variety of courses in the humanities—the main course held made up for less than 30% of the classes held.

Student Major

The most popular student major was engineering, for it was the most common major of students in eight of the nine classrooms. Other popular majors included University Studies, Math/Statistics, Business/Economics, and Interdisciplinary Studies.

Gender of Students

Fewer females attended class in these rooms than did males. Fewer professors who taught in these rooms were female than were male.

Description of Data Collection

Data were collected during the winter break of 2003. According to the head of the buildings and grounds department, desks are cleaned right before the beginning of each semester. Thus, desks were analyzed before much of their content had been erased. Because of this cleaning schedule, one can be fairly certain that the majority of the graffiti found had been done in the previous semester.

The number of desks in each room was recorded. The average number of desks per room was 42, with a total of 419 desks comprising the sample. Each desk was placed into a category based on the amount of graffiti it contained—low, moderate or high. The content of every instance of graffiti found on each desk was recorded. In total, 5,285 individual pieces of graffiti were recorded. After discarding 3,527 examples of graffiti that were unintelligible, the remaining 1,758 specimens of graffiti were categorized in order to reveal the most common themes/trends. It must be noted that many of the pieces of graffiti were nothing more than unclear scribbles—please refer to Appendix E to see

photographs of the graffiti. These photos illustrate the indiscernible nature of much of what was found on the desktops.

In the spring of 2004, information was obtained from the University Registrar concerning how many students attended class in the rooms studied, what classes were held in these rooms, the gender and major of the students, and the gender of the professors teaching in the rooms during the fall of 2003. This information was later correlated with the nature and amount of desktop graffiti found in the classrooms studied. These statistics were compiled and trends noted. The complete list of information obtained from the University Registrar can be found in Appendix B.

Chapter 4 Analysis

Descriptive Data Analysis

The data collected from the desks was tabulated, and then categorized. Two hundred and fifty-seven desks in the liberal arts building (Classics Hall) and 162 in the engineering building (Mechanical Hall) were studied, resulting in a total 5,285 individual instances of graffiti. However, many of these were indiscernible, and have thus been dropped from further analysis. After an exhaustive examination of the remaining 1,758 pieces of graffiti, the following categories were decided upon based upon the graffiti found, and used to classify these graffiti: Alcohol, Cars, Curse Words, Depression, Drugs, Greek Life, Love Messages, Math Equations, References to Mothers, Music, Poetry, Politics, Religion, School, Sex, Sports, Violence, and the University. A test of interjudgemental reliability was performed with a fellow graduate student in order to ascertain the decisions made in classifying the graffiti into the categories formulated. The test consisted of independently placing 100 randomly selected pieces of graffiti from the sample into the available categories; of these, the placement of 97 pieces of graffiti was independently agreed upon. This then yielded an interjudgemental reliability coefficient of .97.

Categories of Graffiti

The following is a description of instances of graffiti falling into each category. The examples given are actual pieces of graffiti analyzed in this study.

Alcohol: drawing of a beer bottle; “I’m Drunk”; drawing of a keg

Cars: drawing of a car; “BMW”; “My Mazda ...”

Curse Words: “Fuck”; “Damn”

Depression: “Help Me!”; “I can’t go on living”

Drugs: drawing of a marijuana leaf; “Smoke the Reefer”; “Tripping on Shrooms”

Greek Life: “Pi Delta Delta”; “PDD Sucks”

Love Messages: “I Love Bill”; “Sally (drawing of a heart) Timmy”

Math Equations: “ $2x+3ab=35$ ”; “ $24/4=6$ ”

References to Mother: “Your mom’s donkey balls”; “I was with your mom last night”

Music: “G-unit”; “Pink Floyd”; song lyrics; drawing of grateful dead bears

Poetry: lines of poetry

Politics: “Bush Sucks”; “Anarchy Rules”

Religion: Drawings of the cross; “Jesus died for you”

School: “I love school”; “School Sux”

Sex: drawings of a sexual nature; “I slept with ...”; “Brad likes big cock”

Sports: “Go Jets”; “Yankees Suck”

Violence: “I want to kill you”; drawings of weapons

University: “Go University!”; “University Rules!”; drawings of the school mascot

For some of the graffiti found, it was necessary to enlist the help of several undergraduate students in order to understand what the graffitist was referring to. There were numerous items that recurred of which I was unsure; thus, I compiled a list of these recurring findings, passed it out to five students, and asked them to explain the meaning of each piece of graffiti. This allowed me to better understand the graffiti from the standpoint of those who are likely authoring it.

Analysis by Room

Figure 2 presents the relationships between the variables being analyzed: content of graffiti, class being taught, student enrollment, major of student, gender of student, and gender of professor. An in-depth analysis of Figure 2 follows. Trends among rooms/across buildings are noted, and final analyses made of the results overall.

Figure 2.

ROOM	# OF CLASSES	SUBJECT OF CLASSES	# OF STUDENTS	STUDENT MAJOR*	STUDENT GENDER	PROF GENDER	GRAFFITI CONTENT*	AMOUNT
CLA* 328	11	English (63%)	256	University Studies (14%) Bus/Econ (13%) Engineering (12%)	43% Female 57% Male	27% Female 73% Male	Sex (23%) Univ** (19%) Drugs(17%) Greek(14%)	.438 per student
CLA 318	12	Math (66%)	297	Engineering (43%) Math/Stat (12%) Accounting/Econ (8%)	27% Female 73% Male	16% Female 84% Male	Univ (28%) Sex (17%) Drugs (10%) Greek (10%)	.805 per student
CLA 304	10	Math (50%)	257	Engineering (28%) Math/Stat (17%) Natural Science (14%) University Studies (10%)	35% Female 65% Male	20% Female 80% Male	Univ (24%) Sex (15%) Greek (14%) Drugs (8%) Religion (8%)	1.06 per student
CLA 233	11	Art (27%)	307	Engineering (20%) Interdis. Studies (13%) University Studies (12%) Art (10%)	44% Female 56% Male	56% Female 44% Male	Univ (37%) Greek (17%) Sex (13%)	.514 per student
CLA 212	13	Math (61%)	397	Engineering (50%) Education (13%) Computer Science (13%)	30% Female 70% Male	23% Female 77% Male	Univ (27%) Greek (17%) Sex (16%) Curse Words (13%)	.665 per student
CLA 210	15	History (26%)	314	Engineering (14%) History (26%) Interdis. Studies (10%)	36% Female 64% Male	53% Female 47% Male	Univ (26%) Greek (22%) Sex (19%)	1.13 per student
MEC 221	18	Enginer. (27%)	891	Engineering (55%) Natural Science (13%)	31% Female 69% Male	17% Female 83% Male	Univ (25%) Sex (20%) Music (9%) Greek (9%)	.137 per student
MEC 222	10	Enginer. (70%)	233	Engineering (70%)	20% Female 80% Male	10% Female 90% Male	Univ (25%) Greek (12%) Sex (10%)	.690 per student
MEC 207	10	Enginer. (40%)	189	Engineering (83%)	21% Female 79% Male	20% Female 80% Male	Univ (26%) Curse Words (12%) Sex (10%)	.386 per student

* Only the three or four most popular categories are presented; thus, percentages do not equal 100.

*CLA: Classics Hall; MEC: Mechanical Hall; **Univ: University

Six classrooms were studied in the liberal arts building. **Classics Hall 328** held 11 classes during the fall 2003 semester. Of these, 63% were English classes. A total of 256 students attended class in this room during the semester. Of these students, 14% were majoring in university studies, 13% in business/economics, and 12% in engineering. 43% of the students were female, and 57% were male. Twenty-seven percent of the professors who taught in this room were female, and 73% were male.

The content of the graffiti found in this room had to do primarily with sex (23%), University (19%), drugs (17%) and Greek life (14%).

Classics Hall 318 held 12 classes during the fall of 2003. An overwhelming percent of these classes were in the subject of math (66%). A total of 297 students attended class in this room during this semester. The student majors that stand out are as follows: engineering (43%), math/statistics (12%), accounting/economics (8%), computer science (7%), and natural science (7%). Of these students, 27% were female, and 73% were male. Sixteen percent of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 84% male.

The content of the graffiti found in Classics Hall 318 was primarily about the University (28%). Other popular themes include sex (17%), Greek life (10%), and drugs (10%).

Classics Hall 304 hosted 10 classes during the fall of 2003. Fifty percent of these courses were in math. 257 students attended class in this room during this semester. Of these students, 28% were majoring in engineering, 17% in math/statistics, 14% in natural science, and 10% in university studies. Of these students, 35% were female, and 65%

were male. Twenty percent of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 80% male.

The content of the graffiti found in Classics Hall 304 dealt primarily with the University (24%). Other popular subjects include sex (15%), Greek life (14%), religion (8%) and drugs (8%).

Classics Hall 233 held 11 classes in Fall 2003. Of these courses, 27% were art classes. A total of 307 students attended class in this room during the semester. Of these students, 20% were engineering majors, 13% interdisciplinary studies, 12% university studies, and 10% were art majors. Forty-four percent of these students were female, and 56% were male. Fifty-six percent of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 44% male.

The content of graffiti found in Classics Hall 233 was largely about the University (37%). Other popular topics include Greek life (17%) and sex (13%).

Classics Hall 212 hosted 13 courses during the fall semester of 2003. Sixty-two percent of these courses were math. A total of 397 students attended class in this room. 50% of these students were majoring in engineering, 13% in education and 13% in computer science. Thirty percent of these students were female, and 70% were male. Twenty-three percent of those professors who taught in this room during the semester were female, and 77% were male.

The University was the most prevalent theme found (27.5%) in the graffiti on desks in Classics Hall 212. Greek life (17%), sex (16%) and curse words (13%) were also popular.

Classics Hall 210 held a total of 15 classes during the fall of 2003. Four of these classes were in history, two were in math, and two were in philosophy. A total of 314 students attended class in this room during the semester. Twenty-six percent of these students were majoring in history, 14% engineering and 10% interdisciplinary studies. Of these students, 36% were female, and 64% were male. Fifty-three percent of the professors who held class in this room were female, and 47% were male.

The content of the graffiti in Classics Hall 210 was largely about the University (26%), Greek life (22%) and sex (19%). Drugs accounted for 7.5% of the graffiti found, and music was the theme of 7% of the graffiti. A mere .8% of the graffiti found was of a racist nature.

Three classrooms were analyzed in the engineering building. In **Mechanical Hall 221**, a total of 18 classes were held during the fall of 2003. Of these classes, 22% were in MS, 16% were in aerospace and ocean engineering, 11% were in chemistry, and 11% were in civil engineering. A total of 891 students attended class in this room during the fall semester. Of these students, 55% were majoring in engineering, 13% were studying natural science, and 8% were in business. Thirty-one percent of these students were female, and 69% were male. Seventeen percent of the professors who taught in this room were female, whereas 83% were male.

The content of the graffiti found in Mechanical Hall 221 had to do primarily with the University (25%) and sex (20%). Other popular subjects were Greek life and music, both of which accounted for 9% of the graffiti found.

Mechanical Hall 222 hosted 10 classes during the fall semester of 2003. The majority of these classes were in engineering (70%). Two hundred and thirty-three

students in all attended class in this room during the semester. Seventy percent of these students were majoring in engineering. Twenty percent of these students were female, and 80% were male. Ten percent of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 90% male.

The content of the graffiti found in Mechanical Hall 222 was largely about the University (25%), Greek life (12%) and sex (10%).

During the fall of 2003, 10 classes were held in **Mechanical Hall 207**. Of these, 40% were engineering, and 20% were math. 189 students had class in this room during the semester. Of these students, 83% were majoring in engineering. Twenty-one percent of these students were female, and 79% were male. Twenty percent of the professors who held class in Mechanical Hall 207 were female, and 80% were male. The content of graffiti in Mechanical Hall 207 was mainly about the University (26%), curse words (12%) and sex (10%).

Summary of Analysis

The name and logo of the land grant university in which this study was conducted is found to be the most popular subject of desktop graffiti. Curse words, Greek life, sex, and drugs are also very popular topics. Based on these results, one can see some interesting trends. These are now presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5 Summary and Conclusions

Overall Trends

Graffiti According to Course

Interestingly, the major of the students does not appear to affect the quantity or quality of the graffiti—instead, it appears as though the course being taught and the room in which it was held a more important influence on the graffiti found. In the one room in which English was the predominating course taught, sex is the most popular graffiti topic. This is the only time the University is not the most prevalent theme.

Content of Graffiti

The University is by far the most popular theme of the graffiti found on the desktops. It is the most prevalent in 8 out of the 9 rooms. Such graffiti includes things such as “Go Mascot,” “I Love University” and drawings of the University symbol and the school mascot. Graffiti of a sexual nature is the second most popular topic of graffiti. Such graffiti included the following: “I want the pussy,” and “I screwed her.” Graffiti referring to Greek organizations and graffiti pertaining to drugs is found to be the third most popular topic. Greek graffiti tends to be the representative letters of the organization. Drugs are dealt with in the following ways: “Smoke weed today please,” “I want the blunt,” and numerous drawings of joints, marijuana leaves, and water bongs.

Hence, while one might expect that graffiti differs according to variables such as major and gender of student, this does not appear to be the case. Rather, the content of graffiti tends to be fairly homogenous. Some differences do stand out, however.

Quantity of Graffiti

The first has to do with the quantity of the graffiti. While there is a good deal of graffiti in classrooms in both Classics Hall and Mechanical Hall, there is much less graffiti in Mechanical Hall. There is an average of 118.6 pieces of discernable graffiti per room in Mechanical Hall, compared to an average of 229.3 per room in Classics Hall, despite the fact that each classroom contains approximately the same number of desks (42 on average). Thus, one is able to compare across rooms. The one room that houses a larger number of desks is Mechanical Hall 221—there are approximately 200 desks in this room. In this case, every fifth desk was analyzed, and this fact was taken into account when determining the approximate amount of graffiti per student.

Focus of Sexual Graffiti

Another trend that surfaced has to do with graffiti of a sexual nature. Not only is sex the second most popular topic of graffiti in all of the classrooms, but upon closer examination, an even more telling trend is evident. Much of this graffiti concerns two specific sexual topics: there is an excessive amount of reference to oral sex, as well as a high level of anti-homosexual graffiti. Of the 287 pieces of graffiti of a sexual nature analyzed, 71 (24.7%) are of an anti-homosexual nature and 109 (37.9%) refer to oral sex. Examples of anti-homosexual graffiti include such slurs as the following: “you gay fuck” and “----is a fucking faggot.” These findings support the expectations noted earlier—this may be seen to reveal a tolerance of homophobic attitudes similar to the findings of Smith (1998) in his study of “the ideology of the fag” and supporting the aforementioned hypothesis of Stocker et al. (1972). Conversely, this finding may be seen to support Gonos’ (1976) hypothesis if one thinks of the University as a place where homosexuality

is a topic of interest, and that there may be a fairly accepting view of it—making anti-homosexual attitudes not acceptable (thus, they show up in graffiti). Noteworthy is the fact that not one piece of graffiti in *support* of homosexuality was found.

Racist Graffiti

Another expectation was that a significant amount of graffiti of a racist nature might be found due to recent racial tension on campus. However, very few pieces of racist graffiti are in our sample; in fact, only *seven pieces* of the 1,758 pieces of categorized graffiti are of a racist nature. Of these, all target one of two Asian groups, Vietnamese and Korean. Such pieces of graffiti include the following: “Koreans eat dog,” “Go home and fuck yourself, Vietnamese.” This is interesting when one takes into account the racial makeup of students on campus (that Asian constitute a larger minority than do other racial minorities, such as African Americans). This finding might suggest that racism toward the largest minority group on campus is the trend, rather than a typical black-white animosity.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we see that students who are writing and drawing on classroom desktops at the university studied tend to write about one of the following topics: the University, sex, drugs, and Greek organizations. Much of this sexual graffiti is of an anti-homosexual nature. Very little racist graffiti is found. There do not appear to be differences between those classes taught by female vs. male instructors, nor classes attended by more female than male students. However, the building the class is held in affects the quantity of graffiti found, with Mechanical Hall having much less graffiti than

Classics Hall. Student major seems to be more important than course composition in deciding the quality of the graffiti found.

Comparing these results to some of the findings of other studies, we find that, in support of Gonos' (1976) hypothesis, a large amount of the sexual graffiti is anti-homosexual in nature. This suggests that homosexuality is an issue on campus. This may also suggest that expressions of an anti-homosexual nature are not accepted, and thus the desktop becomes the venue for such expressions. One then questions why racist graffiti is not found to a larger degree—is it still acceptable to express attitudes of a racist nature? Or is race no longer even an issue on campus. It is interesting to note that of the few pieces of racist graffiti found, all are directed against Asian groups. This may be reflective of the racial makeup of the campus, since Asian groups are the dominant student minority.

Another point to make is that while Gonos' (1976) hypothesis may be accurate in terms of graffiti referring to certain topics, it may not hold across the board. While anti-homosexual attitudes may be unpopular at the university, and consequently found in desktop graffiti, the same cannot be said about support of the university and Greek organizations. Both of these topics are expressed both covertly, via graffiti, and overtly, via T-shirts, bumper stickers, etc. Thus, one must take into consideration the *subject* of graffiti being analyzed when applying Gonos' (1976) hypothesis.

The large amount of graffiti found in support of the university and in support of Greek organizations is suggestive of the type of student who is producing the graffiti—presumably, a student who is in support of the school and its programs as a whole. Ironically, however, in expressing their support, they are defacing school property. This

brings us to another issue—the “accepted” nature of this type of graffiti on campus. One can view in terms as a form of “permitted deviance.” Nothing has been done to curb this activity, and thus it may be seen as something that is allowed. One could even look at desktop graffiti as part of the college experience, not unlike taking 1000 level classes with 600 other students, living in a dorm, etc. Interestingly, I spoke with one undergraduate who noted that s/he used to write on desktops because of the novelty of the activity, but now that s/he is a junior, it is no longer as appealing.

Future Research

There are several possibilities for further research. It might be valuable to replicate this study at a small, liberal arts college, and compare the findings to those found at the university studied here. One could also compare the graffiti on desks at an all male compared to an all female college. Additionally, one could look at graffiti produced by students of differing grade levels, from elementary on up. Another aspect of desktop graffiti that deserves study is the societal reaction to classroom graffiti by the campus community. Specifically, that such graffiti is common and even expected, and not punished. One could compare this fact to the reaction by the university to other types of graffiti on campus, such as spray paint on buildings. One could compare the messages being expressed in each form of graffiti, and the subsequent university reaction.

This study has produced some very strong patterns that may be an indication of what some students at the university candidly are thinking and feeling. While one may not generalize these findings to the student body as a whole, one may now feel more confident that he has a better grasp of the campus climate at this university. The results of this study concerning both the amount and content of classroom desktop graffiti offer a

unique and insightful look into campus culture and climate, that has hitherto remained untapped. Hopefully, other researchers will examine this unobtrusive measure of student culture in greater detail in future studies.

References

- American Heritage Dictionary*. 2000. London: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Abel, Ernest L. and Barbara E. Buckley. 1977. *The Handwriting on the Wall: Toward a Sociology and Psychology of Graffiti*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Ahmed, S. M. S. 1981. "Graffiti of Canadian High School Students." *Psychological Reports* 49: 559-562.
- Bartholome, Lynn and Philip Snyder. 2004. "Is it Philosophy or Pornography? Graffiti at the Dinosaur Bar-B-Que." *Journal of American Culture* 27: 86-99.
- Bates, J.A. and M. Martin. 1980. "The Thematic Content of Graffiti as a Non-reactive Indicator of Male and Female Attitudes." *The Journal of Sex Research* 16: 300-315.
- Bayard, D. and S. Krishnayya. 2001. "Gender, Expletive Use, and Context: Male and Female Expletive Use in Structured and Unstructured Conversation Among New Zealand University Students." *Women and Language* 24: 1-15.
- Becker, Howard. 1963. *Outsiders*. New York: Free Press.
----- . 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bruner, E.M. and J. Kelso. 1981. "Gender Differences in Graffiti: A Semiotic Perspective." In S. Montague and W. Arens (eds.), *The American Dimension*. Sherman Oaks: Alfred.
- Delamater, John, ed. 2003. *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Fitzpatrick, M.A.; A. Mulac, and K. Dindia. 1995. "Gender Professional Language Use in Spouse and Stranger Interaction." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 14:18-39.
- Gadsby, Jane. 1996. "Secrets of the Women's and Men's Rooms." *Macleans* 109: 113-114.
- Goldsmith, D. J. and S. A. Dun. 1997. "Sex Differences and Similarities in the Communication of Social Support." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 14:317-337.
- Gonos, George; Virginia Mulkren; Nicholas Poushinsky. 1976. "Anonymous Expression: A Structural View of Graffiti." *The Journal of American Folklore* 89: 40-48.
- Green, James. 2003. "The Writing on the Stall: Gender and Graffiti." *Journal of*

- Language and Social Psychology* 22: 282-296.
- Howard, Judith A. and Jocelyn Hollander. 1997. *Gendered Situations, Gendered Selves*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Kinsey, A.C.; W. B. Pomeroy; and P.H. Gebhard. 1953. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.
- Lachmann, Richard. 1988. "Graffiti as Career and Ideology." *The American Journal of Sociology* 94: 229-250.
- Limbrick, P. 1991. "A Study of Male and Female Expletive Use in Single and Mixed-Sex Settings." *Te Reo* 34: 71-89.
- Lindsay, Jack. 1966. *The Writing on the Wall: An Account of Pompeii in its Last Days*. London: Frederick Muller Limited.
- Lowenstine, H. and M. A. Paludi. 1982. "Sex Differences in Graffiti as a Communication Style." *Journal of Social Psychology* 117:307-308.
- Macdonald, Nancy. 2001. *The Graffiti Subculture: Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York*. New York: Palgrave.
- McCall, G.J. and J. L. Simmons. 1966. *Identities and Interaction*. New York: Free Press.
- Mulac, A. and T. Lundell. 1986. "Linguistic Contributors to the Gender-linked Language Effect." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 5:81-101.
- Neuman, W. Lawrence. 2003. *Social Research Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nwoye, Onuigbo G. 1993. "Social Issues on Walls: Graffiti in University Lavatories." *Discourse & Society* 4: 419-442.
- Otta, E. 1993. "Graffiti in the 1990s: A Study of Inscriptions on Restroom Walls." *Journal of Social Psychology* 133:589-590.
- Owens, Timothy. 2003. "Self and Identity." Pp. 205-232 in *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by John Delamater. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Read, Allen Walker. 1935. *Lexical Evidence from Folk Epigraphy in Western North America: A Glossarial Study of the Low Element in the English Vocabulary*. Paris: Privately published.
- Reich, Wendy; Rosalie Buss; Ellen Fein & Terry Kurtz. 1977. "Notes on Women's

- Graffiti." *The Journal of American Folklore* 90: 188-191.
- Reisner, Robert. 1974. *Encyclopedia of Graffiti*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Reisner, Robert. 1971. *Graffiti: Two Thousand Years of Wall Writing*. New York:
- Robinson, W. S. 1950. "Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals." *American Sociological Review* 15: 341-357.
- Schreer, G. E. and J. M. Strichatz. 1997. "Private Restroom Graffiti: An Analysis of Controversial Social Issues on Two College Campuses." *Psychological Reports* 81:1067-1074.
- Sechrest, L. and L. Flores. 1969. "Homosexuality in the Philippines and in the US." *Journal of Social Psychology* 79:3-12.
- Smith, George W. and Dorothy E. Smith. 1998. "The Ideology of 'Fag': The School Experience of Gay Students." *The Sociological Quarterly* 39: 309-327.
- Snizek, William E.; Ellsworth Fuhrman & Michael K. Miller, eds. 1979. *Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Metasociological Perspective*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Stocker, Terrance L.; Linda W. Dutcher; Stephen M. Hargrove and Edwin A. Cook. 1972. "Social Analysis of Graffiti." *Journal of American Folklore* 85: 356-366.
- Stryker, S. 1980. *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Menlo Park: Benjamin Cummings.
- Tannen, D. 1994. *Talking From 9-5*. London: Virago.
- Wales, E. and B. Brewer. 1976. "Graffiti in the 1970s." *Journal of Social Psychology* 99: 115-123.
- Webb, Eugene; Donald T. Campbell; Richard D. Schwartz; and Lee Sechrest. 2000. *Unobtrusive Measures*. London: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX A

This appendix consists of a key of the abbreviations used in the data that was analyzed. Student majors were referred to as ME or SOC, for example, in the list provided by the Registrar. Thus, the following shows that ME stands for mechanical engineering, and that SOC stands for sociology.

Course Key

ACIS—Accounting and Information Systems

AE—Aerospace Engineering

AAEC—Agriculture and Applied Economics

ALS—Agriculture and Life Science

AGED—Agricultural Education

ANSC—Animal Science

APSC—Animal and Poultry Science

AOE—Aerospace and Ocean Engineering

ARCH—Architecture

ART—Art and Art History

AS—Aerospace Studies

BC—Building Construction

BCHM/BIOC—Biochemistry

BIOL—Biology

BIT—Business Information Technology

BLST—Black Studies

BOT—Botany

BUS—Business

BSE—Biological Systems Engineering

CE—Civil Engineering

CEE—Civil and Environmental Engineering

CHE—Chemical Engineering

CHEM—Chemistry

CHN—Chinese

CLA—Classics

CPE—Computer Engineering

COMM—Communication Studies

CS—Computer Science

CSES—Crop and Soil Environmental Science

CT—Clothing and Textiles

DASC—Dairy Science

EAD—Engineering Administration

ECON—Economics (Business)

EDCI—Education, Curriculum and Instruction

EDP—Environmental Design and Planning

EDRE—Education, Research and Evaluation

EE—Electrical Engineering

ELPS—Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

ENGL—English

ENSC—Environmental Science

ENT-Entomology

ESM—Engineering Science and Mechanics

FCD—Family and Child Development

FIN—Finance, Insurance, Business Law

FOR—Forestry

FR—French

FST—Food Science and Technology

GE—General Engineering

GEOG—Geography

GEOL—Geology

GER—German

GR—Greek

HD—Human Development

HIDM—Housing, Interior Design, and Residential Management

HIST—History

HNFE—Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise

HORT—Horticulture

HTM—Hospitality and Tourism Management

HUM—Humanities

IDS—Industrial Design

IDST—Interdisciplinary Studies

ISE—Industrial and Systems Engineering

IS—International Studies

ITDS—Interior Design

LAR—Landscape Architecture

MATH—Mathematics

ME—Mechanical Engineering

MGT—Management

MINE—Mining Engineering

MKTG—Marketing

MSE—Materials Science and Engineering

MUS—Music

OE/OCE—Ocean Engineering

PAPA—Public Administration/Public Affairs

PHIL—Philosophy

PHYS—Physics

PSCI—Political Science

PSYC—Psychology

SOC—Sociology

SPAN—Spanish

STAT—Statistics

TA—Theatre Arts

UA—Urban Affairs

UAP—Urban Affairs and Planning

US/UST—University Studies

WOOD—Woods Science and Forest Products

WS—Women's Studies

WSCI—Wood Science

APPENDIX B

This appendix includes tables that shows the classes taught in each room studied, the enrollment, the gender of students and professors, the majors of the students, and the content of the graffiti by room. Each room has its own table, each of which ends with “final counts” of each room. Thus, for the first room in the table, Classics 233, one can see that the most common major of students who attended class in this room in Fall 2003 was interdisciplinary studies, with 45 students listing IDST as their major.

CLASSROOM DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Classics 233

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
ART	3	51	3FEMALE	ACIS 1 ART 30 ARTF 7 FIN 1 IDST 2 ITDS 3 MKTG 2 SOC 1 US 4	34 FEMALE 16 MALE
COMM	1	20	1MALE	COMM 20	19 FEMALE 20 MALE
EDCI	1	32	1MALE	AGED 4 BED 2 CHEM 1 EDCI 4 FR 2 HD 6 HNFE 1 ISE 1 MATH 4 PHED 1 TA 1 TED 4 US 1	18 FEMALE 13 MALE
ENGL	1	94		ACIS 1 BC 1 BIOC 1 BIOL 5 BIT 1 BUS 3 CE 4 CHE 1 CPE 6 CS 7 DASC 1 ECON 1 EE 3 ENGL 3 ENSC 1	34 FEMALE 61 MALE

				FIN 3 GE 17 HD 1 HIDM 1 HIST 2 HORT 1 IDS 1 IS 1 ITDS 1 MGT 1 MKTG 2 MUS 1 OE 1 PSCI 3 PSYC 1 PUA 1 SOC 1 STAT 1 US 14 UST 1	
HST	1	29	1FEMALE	BIOC 1 BIOL 2 CHE 3 COMM1 GE 1 IDST 18 MKED 1 MKTG 1 UST 1	10 FEMALE 19 MALE
ME	1	32		ME 32	3 FEMALE 29 MALE
PHIL	1	24	1MALE	AAEC 1 APSC 1 BCHM 1 BIOL 3 ESM 1 HNFE 3 MATH 1 MKTG 2 PSCI 1 PSYC 4 SOC 2 US 4	13 FEMALE 11 MALE
PSYC	1	1	1MALE	FCSE 1	1 FEMALE
WS	1	6	1FEMALE	CHEM 1 IDST 4	4 FEMALE 2 MALE

				SOC 1	
FINAL COUNTS		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS=289/301	PROFS: 5 FEMALE 4 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: AAEC 1 ACIS 2 AGED 4 APSC 1 ART 30 ARTF 7 BC 1 BCHM 1 BED 2 BIOC 2 BIOL 10 BIT 1 BUS 3 CE 4 CHE 4 CHEM 3 COMM 22 CPE 6 CS 7 DASC 1 ECON 1 EDCI 4 EE 3 ENGL 3 ENSC 1 ESM 1 FIN 4 GE 18 FIN 7 FR 2 FSCE 1 HD 8 HIDM 1 HIST 2 HNFE 7 HORT 1 IDS 1 IDST 45 IS 1 ITDS 5 ISE 1 MATH 6 ME 32	136 FEMALE 171 MALE

				MGT 1 MKED 1 MKTG 12 MUS 1 OE 1 PHED 1 PSCI 4 PSYC 5 PUA 1 SOC 9 STAT 1 TA 1 TED 4 US 41 UST 2	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Classics 210

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
BLST	1	28	1MALE	AE 1 COMM 1 EPP 1 ESM 1 FIN 1 GE 2 HD 1 IDST 9 MATH 1 ME 1 MGT 1 MINE 1 MKTG 3 PSYC 4	10 FEMALE 18 MALE
ELPS	1	6	1MALE	ELPS 6	6 FEMALE
HIST	4	169		ACIS 1 ARCH 2 ART 1 BIOC 1 BIOL 1 BIT 2 CHEM 1 COMM 2 CS 2 EE 1	21 FEMALE 64 MALE

				ENGL 4 FIN 1 HD 1 HIDM 1 HIST 45 HNFE 1 HTM 2 IDST 2 IS 1 PSCI 5 PSYC 2 TA 1 US 2 UST 1 WOOD 1 WSC1 1	
HST	1	36	1FEMALE	AE 1 APSC 1 BIOL 1 BIT 1 CS 1 ECAS 1 EE 1 ESM 1 GE 11 IDST 14 MATH 1 ME 2	3 FEMALE 33 MALE
IDST	1	3	1MALE	HNFE 1 IDST 2	1 FEMALE 2 MALE
IS	1	34	1MALE	ART 1 BIOL 2 COMM 5 ENGL 1 GEOG 2 HD 1 HIST 1 HNFE 1 IS 12 MKTG 1 PSCI 5 PSYC 1 PUA 1	24 FEMALE 10 MALE
ITAL	1	44	1FEMALE	AE 1 ARCH 1 ART 3	26 FEMALE 18 MALE

				BIT 2 BUS 3 CLA 1 COMM 4 CS 1 FIN 2 FR 1 GEOL 1 HD 1 HIST 2 HNFE 1 IDS 1 IDST 1 IS 6 ITDS 1 MKTG 5 PSCI 2 PSYC 1 PUA 1 TA 1 US 1	
MATH	2	76	1FEMALE, 1MALE	CHEM 1 CS 4 GE 27 US 6	6 FEMALE 32 MALE
PHIL	2	52	1FEMALE, 1MALE	ART 1 BIOC 1 COMM 1 CPE 1 CS 1 ECAS 1 ENGL 2 HIST 1 IDST 2 ISE 1 MGT 1 MSE 1 PHIL 8 PSCI 3 PSYC 4	8 FEMALE 21 MALE
WS	1	11	1FEMALE	BIOL 1 CHE 1 HIST 1 IDST 4 IS 1 PSYC 1	11 FEMALE

				SOC 2	
FINAL COUNTS		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS=459/391/314	PROFS: 6 MALE, 5 FEMALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: ACIS 1 AE 3 APSC 1 ARCH 3 ART 6 BCHM 1 BIOC 2 BIOL 5 BIT 5 BUS 3 CHE 1 CHEM 2 CLA 1 CPE 1 COMM 15 CS 9 ECAS 2 EDP 1 EE 3 ELPS 6 ENGL 7 ESM 2 FIN 4 FR 1 GE 42 GEOG 2 GEOL 1 HD 4 HIDM 1 HIST 100 HNFE 4 HTM 2 IDS 1 IDST 40 IS 24 ITDS 1 MATH 2 ME 3 MGT 2 MINE 1 MKTG 9 MSE 1 PHIL 8	

				PSCI 23 PSYC 15 PUA 2 SOC 2 TA 2 UST 1 US 11 WOOD 1 WSCI 1	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Classics 318

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
AS	2	57	2MALE	ACIS 1 AE 9 ARCH 1 BIOL 2 BIT 2 CHEM 1 COMM 1 CS 1 ECON 3 EE 6 FIN 1 GEOG 1 GEOL 1 HIDM 1 HIST 3 HTM 1 IDST 3 IS 2 ME 4 MGT 1 PSCI 7 PSYC 1 SOC 1 SPAN 1 UST 1	16 FEMALE 41 MALE
COMM	1	24	1MALE	ACIS 1 BIT 2 BUS 8 COMM 10 MGT 1	14 FEMALE 10 MALE

				MKGT 2	
MATH	8	196	1FEMALE, 7MALE	AE 2 BC 5 CE 5 CHEM 1 CPE 3 CS 19 ECAS 2 EE 16 EM 1 GE 52 GEOL 2 HIST 1 HNFE 2 ISE 5 MATH 34 ME 15 MINE 4 MSE 1 PHYS 8 STAT 2 US 15 UST 1	38 FEMALE 153 MALE
SPAN	1	25	1FEMALE	AGED 1 BC 1 BIOL 2 CEEN 1 COMM 3 CSES 1 ECAS 1 EE 1 EM 1 FIN 1 GE 1 HIDM 1 HORT 1 IDST 2 MINE 1 PHYS 1 PSCI 2 PSYC 2 US 1	13 FEMALE 12 MALE
FINAL COUNTS		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS: 302/297/300	2 FEMALE, 10 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: ACIS 2 AE 11	81 FEMALE, 216 MALE

				AGED 1 ARCH 1 BC 6 BIOL 4 BIT 4 BUS 8 CE 5 CEEN 1 CHEM 2 CPE 3 COMM 14 CS 20 CSES 1 ECAS 3 ECON 3 EE 23 EM 2 FIN 2 GE 53 GEOG 1 GEOL 3 HIDM 2 HIST 4 HNFE 2 HORT 1 HTM 1 ISE 5 IDST 5 IS 2 MATH 34 ME 19 MGT 2 MINE 5 MKTG 2 MSE 1 PHYS 9 PSCI 9 SPAN 1 STAT 2 US 16 UST 2	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Classics 304

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
BIOL	1	8	1MALE	BIOL 6 FST 1 PHYS 1	6 FEMALE 2 MALE
ENGL	1	24	1MALE	ACIS 1 BIOL 13 CS 1 ENGL 2 HD 1 MGT 1 MKTG 2 PSYC 1 WSC1 2	14 FEMALE 10 MALE
HUM	1	41	1MALE	ACIS 3 BIOC 2 BIOL 1 BIT 1 BUS 1 CHE 1 COMM 1 CS 3 EE 1 ENGL 1 FIN 3 GE 2 HIST 1 HTM 1 ITDS 1 MATH 1 MKTG 2 MSE 1 PSCI 2 PSYC 4 US 7 WSC1 1	18 FEMALE 23 MALE
MATH	5	130		AE 2 ARCH 1 CE 1 CHE 3 CPE 4 CS 8 ECAS 2 EE 9	35 FEMALE 95 MALE

				ESM 2 FR 1 GE 23 HIST 1 IDST 1 MATH 39 ME 8 PHYS 10 PSYC 1 PUA 1 SOC 1 STAT 1 US 11	
PHIL	1	32	1MALE	AE 1 BIOL 2 BIT 1 BUS 1 CS 2 ECAS 1 ECON 1 FIN 1 FSCI 1 GE 3 IDST 1 IS 1 ISE 1 MATH 1 ME 2 MKTG 1 PSYC 6 US 5	4 FEMALE 28 MALE
SPAN	1	22	1MALE	AE 3 ART 1 BIOL 2 CHE 1 COMM 2 CS 1 ECAS 1 HIST 1 IS 3 MUS 1 PGE 1 PSYC 1 SOC 1 TA 1 US 2	11 FEMALE 11 MALE

FINAL COUNT		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS: 257/257/250	5 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: ACIS 4 AE 6 ARCH 1 ART 1 BIOC 2 BIOL 18 BIT 2 BUS 2 CE 1 CHE 5 CPE 4 COMM 3 CS 15 ECAS 4 EE 10 ENGL 3 ESM 2 FIN 4 FR 1 FST 1 FSCI 1 GE 28 HD 1 HIST 3 HTM 1 ISE 1 IDST 2 ITDS 1 IS 4 MATH 41 ME 10 MGT 1 MKTG 5 MSE 1 MUS 1 PGE 1 PHYS 11 PSCI 2 PSYC 13 PUA 1 SOC 2 STAT 1 TA 1 US 25	88 FEMALE, 169 MALE
----------------	--	--	--------	--	---------------------------

				WSCI 3	
--	--	--	--	--------	--

Classics 328

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
COMM	1	24	1MALE	ACIS 2 BIT 2 BUS 8 COMM 4 FIN 2 IDST 1 MGT 4 MKGT 1	8 FEMALE 16 MALE
CS	1	11	1MALE	CS 2 CSA 9	2 FEMALE 9 MALE
ENGL	7	164	3FEMALE, 4MALE	APSC 1 ARCH 4 ART 2 BC 2 BCHM 1 BIOC 2 BIOL 9 BIT 1 BUS 3 CE 3 CHE 2 COMM 5 CPE 2 CS 4 CT 3 ECON 1 EE 4 ENGL 9 GE 20 HD 12 HIST 1 IDST 2 IS 1 MATH 4 MUS 1 PHIL 1 PSCI 5 PSYC 6 SOC 6	80 FEMALE 84 MALE

				SPAN 1 STAT 1 TA 1 US 36 WOOD 1 WSCU 4	
HUM	1	33	1 MALE	ACIS 1 BUS 1 COMM 1 CPE 1 CS 5 GE 2 GER 1 HD 1 HIDM 1 IDS 1 IDST 8 IS 4 MGT 1 MKTG 1 PSCI 1 PSYC 3	10 FEMALE 23 MALE
PHIL	1	24	1 MALE	ACIS 2 APSC 1 ARCH 2 BIOL 1 BUS 1 COMM 5 CS 5 FIN 1 IDST 1 MGT 1 PSCI 1 PSYC 2 US 1	12 FEMALE 12 MALE
FINAL COUNT		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS: 256/249/256	3 FEMALE, 8 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: ACIS 5 APSC 2 ARCH 6 ART 2 BC 2 BCHM 1 BIOC 2 BIOL 10 BIT 3	112 FEMALE, 144 MALE

				BUS 13 CHE 2 CPE 3 COMM 15 CS 16 CSA 9 CT 3 ECON 1 EE 4 ENGL 9 FIN 3 GE 22 GER 1 HD 13 HIST 1 IDS 1 IDST 12 IS 5 MATH 4 MGT 6 MKTG 2 MUS 1 PHIL 1 PSCI 7 PSYC 11 SOC 6 SPAN 1 STAT 1 TA 1 US 37 WOOD 1 WSCI 4	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Classics 212

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
ELPS	4	59	3MALE	EDCI 1 EDRE 1 ELPS 56 PAPA 1	44 FEMALE 15 MALE
HUM	1	37	1MALE	AE 1 BCHM 1 BIOC 1	14 FEMALE 23 MALE

				BIOL 3 BIT 1 BUS 1 CLA 1 COMM 2 CS 1 ENGL 1 GE 3 IS 1 ISE 1 MATH 1 ME 2 PHED 1 PSYC 3 SOC 1 TA 1 US 9 WSCI 1	
MATH	8	300	3FEMALE, 5MALE	AE 13 ARCH 1 BAD 1 BC 4 BIOC 1 BIOL 3 BIT 2 BSE 3 CE 11 CHE 3 CHEM 4 CPE 15 CS 55 EE 9 ENSC 1 ESEN 1 ESM 2 FIN 1 GE 99 GEOL 2 IDST 2 ISE 13 MATH 17 ME 31 MINE 5 MSE 4 OE 1 PGE 1	60 FEMALE 242 MALE

				PHYS 10 STAT 3 US 21	
FINAL COUNTS		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS 396/434/398	3 FEMALE, 10 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: AE 14 ARCH 1 BAD 1 BC 4 BCHM 1 BIOC 2 BIOL 6 BIT 3 BSE 3 BUS 1 CE 11 CHE 3 CHEM 4 CLA 1 CPE 15 COMM 2 CS 56 EDCI 1 EDRE 1 EE 9 ELPS 56 ENGL 1 ENSC 1 ESEN 1 ESM 2 FIN 1 GE 102 GEOL 2 ISE 14 IDST 2 IS 1 MATH 18 ME 33 MINE 5 MSE 4 PAPA 1 OE 1 PGE 1 PHED 1 PHYS 10 PSYC 3	118 FEMALE, 280 MALE

				SOC 1 STAT 3 TA 1 WSCI 1 US 30	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Mechanical 207

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
AOE	1	13	1MALE	AE 9 ME 3 OCE 1	2 FEMALE 11 MALE
ECE	4	94	4MALE	CPE 23 EE 70 MINE 2	12 FEMALE 68 MALE
ESM	1	1	1MALE	EM 1	1 FEMALE
MATH	2	75	2FEMALE	CHEM 2 CS 3 ECON 1 GE 60 GEOL 1 PGE 1 PHYS 1 SOC 1 US 1	7 FEMALE 43 MALE
ME	1	17	1MALE	AE 6 ME 11	17 MALE
SPAN	1	28	1MALE	ACIS 1 ARCH 1 BIT 1 COMM 1 CS 1 FIN 1 GE 1 HD 1 HNFE 2 IS 5 MATH 2 MKTG 2 PSCI 2 PSYC 2 SPAN 3 US 1	18 FEMALE 10 MALE

				WSCI 1	
FINAL COUNT		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS: 228/224/189	2 FEMALE, 8 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: ACIS 1 AE 15 ARCH 1 BIT 1 CHEM 2 CPE 23 COMM 1 CS 4 ECON 1 EE 70 EM 1 FIN 1 GE 61 GEOL 1 HD 1 HNFE 1 IS 5 MATH 2 ME 14 MINE 2 MKTG 2 OCE 1 PGE 1 PHYS 1 PSCI 2 PSYC 2 SOC 1 SPAN 3 US 2 WSCI 1	40 FEMALE, 149 MALE

Mechanical 221

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
ACIS	1	57	1 FEMALE	ACIS 9 APSC 1 BC 1 BIT 8 BUS 3 CS 1 CT 1	19 FEMALE 38 MALE

				ECON 1 FIN 2 GE 2 HIST 1 HTM 1 IDST 2 ISE 2 MATH 2 ME 1 MGT 2 MKTG 9 MUS 1 US 3 UST 2 WSCI 1	
AOE	3	222	3MALE	AE 191 DAE 4 DOE 10 GE 1 OCE 3 OE 13	FEMALE 29 MALE 182
BIOL	1	76		APSC 1 BCHM 3 BIOC 1 BIOL 58 CSES 1 ECAS 1 ENGL 1 EPP 1 HNFE 1 HORT 3 ME 1 MKTG 1 PSYC 2 UST 1	FEMALE 53 MALE 23
CEE	2	134	2MALE	BC 11 BSE 1 CE 94 CEEN 1 CPE 1 GE 1 ISE 21 ME 2 OE 2	33 FEMALE 100 MALE
CHEM	2	69	2MALE	BCHM 9 BIOC 16	38 FEMALE 31 MALE

				BIOL 3 BSE 1 CHEM 29 CSES 1 EE 1 ENSC 1 FIN 1 GE 1 HIST 1 HNFE 1 MSE 1 US 2	
ESM	1	58	1MALE	AE 8 BC 3 CE 5 EM 1 GE 7 ISE 5 MATH 1 ME 26 MSE 1 OE 1	7 FEMALE 51 MALE
FIN	1	58	1MALE	ACIS 4 BIT 2 CHE 1 FIN 49 MGT 1 MKTG 1	18 FEMALE 40 MALE
MATH	1	85	1FEMALE	ARCH 1 BC 2 CS 7 GE 60 MATH 7 PSCI 1 US 8	17 FEMALE 68 MALE
ME	1	7	1MALE	ME 7	7 MALE
MS	4	69	4MALE	ACIS 1 BCHM 1 BIOC 2 BIOL 5 BIT 1 COMM 1 CS 3 ECON 1 GE 14 HIST 4	12 FEMALE 57 MALE

				IS 3 MGT 2 PHYS 2 PSCI 10 PSYC 1 US 16 UST 1 WSCI 1	
SOC	1	68	1 FEMALE	BIOL 4 COMM 9 ECAS 1 ELPS 1 FR 2 HD 10 IDS 1 IDST 6 IS 1 MKTG 1 PSCI 4 PSYC 7 SOC 20 WSCI 1	52 FEMALE 16 MALE
FINAL COUNT		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS: 903/891/891	3 FEMALE, 14 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: ACIS 6 AE 199 APSC 2 ARCH 1 BC 17 BCHM 13 BIOL 66 BIT 11 BUS 3 BSE 2 CE 99 CEEN 1 CHE 1 CHEM 29 CPE 1 COMM 10 CS 11 CSES 2 CT 1 DAE 4 DOE 10 ECAS 2	278 FEMALE, 613 MALE

				ECON 2 ELPS 1 EE 1 EM 1 ENGL 1 ENSC 1 EPP 1 FIN 52 FR 1 GE 86 HD 10 HIST 6 HNFE 2 HORT 3 HTM 1 IDS 1 ISE 28 IDST 8 IS 4 MATH 10 ME 37 MGT 5 MKTG 12 MSE 2 MUS 1 OCE 1 OE 16 PHYS 2 PSCI 15 PSYC 10 SOC 20 US 29 UST 4 WSCI 3	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Mechanical 222

COURSE	SECTIONS TAUGHT	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	GENDER OF PROFESSOR/S	STUDENTS' MAJOR	STUDENTS' GENDER
AOE	3	79	3MALE	AE 62 DAE 1 DOE 5 OCE 2 OE 9	FEMALE 9 MALE 70
ECE	2	65	2MALE	CPE 28	FEMALE 5

				EE 37	MALE 60
GER	1	24	1MALE	AE 1 ARCH 1 CPE 1 ECON 1 EE 1 GE 1 GER 2 HIST 1 IDST 1 IS 6 ME2 MGT 1 PHYS 1 PSCI 2 US 2	6 FEMALE 18 MALE
GR	1	24	1MALE	APSC 1 ARTF 1 BIOL 2 CLA 3 COMM 2 EE 1 ESM 1 GE 2 HD 1 HIST 1 PHIL 1 PHYS 1 PSCI 1 PSYC 2 PUA 1 US 3	10 FEMALE 14 MALE
ME	2	11	1FEMALE, 1MALE	ME 11	4 FEMALE 7 MALE
PHIL	1	30	1MALE	ACIS 1 BUS 1 CHEM 1 COMM 1 CS 2 EE 1 FIN 2 GE 4 HIDM 1 HNFE 2 ISE 1 MATH 1	14 FEMALE 16 MALE

				PSCI 6 PSYC 3 US 2 UST 1	
FINAL COUNT		TOTAL # OF STUDENTS: 233/233/233	1 FEMALE, 9 MALE	TOTAL OF MAJORS: ACIS 1 AE 63 APSC 1 ARCH 1 ARTF 1 BIOL 2 BUS 1 CHEM 1 CLA 3 CPE 29 COMM 3 CS 2 DAE 1 DOE 5 ECON 1 EE 40 ESM 1 FIN 2 GE 7 GER 2 HD 1 HIDM 1 HIST 2 HNFE 2 ISE 1 IDST 1 IS 6 MATH 1 ME 13 MGT 1 OCE 2 OE 9 PHIL 1 PHYS 2 PSCI 9 PSYC 5 PUA 1 US 7 UST 1	48 FEMALE, 185 MALE

APENDIX C

This appendix consists of profiles of each room. It provides a concise rundown of the number of classes taught in each room, the subject of those classes, the number of students who took class in the room, the majors of the students, the gender of the students, the gender of the professors who taught in the room, and the content (including quantity and quality) of the graffiti found in the room.

Profile of Classics 210

Total # of Classes Taught: 15

Subject of Classes Taught: 1 BLST (6%), 1 ELPS(6%), 4 HIST(26%), 1 HST(6%), 1 IDST(6%), 1 IS(6%), 1 ITAL(6%), 2 MATH (13%), 2 PHIL(13%), 1 WS(6%)

Total # of Students: 314

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 26 (6%)
- Architecture/Design: 7 (2%)
- Art: 6 (1.5%)
- Classics: 1 (.2%)
- Communications:15 (4%)
- Computer Science: 9 (2.5%)
- ECAS: 2 (.5%)
- Education: 6 (1.5%)
- English: 7 (2%)
- Engineering: 56 (14%)
- Foreign Language: 1 (.2%)
- Geography: 2 (.5%)
- Human Development: 4 (1%)
- Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise: 4 (1%)
- History: 100 (26%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 40 (10%)
- International Studies: 24 (6%)
- Math/Statistics: 2 (.5%)
- Natural Science: 14 (3.5%)
- Philosophy: 8 (2%)
- Political Science: 23 (6%)
- Psychology: 15 (3%)
- PUA: 2 (.5%)
- Sociology: 2 (.5%)
- Theatre Arts: 2 (.5%)
- University Studies: 12 (3%)

Students' Gender: 116 female (36%), 198 male (63%)

Professors' Gender: 8 female (53%), 7 male (46%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Alcohol: 6 (1.5%)
- Cars: 6 (1.5%)
- Curse Words: 11 (3%)
- Drugs: 27 (7.5%)
- Greek Life: 79 (22%)
- Love Message: 3 (1%)
- Music: 26 (7%)
- Political: 13 (3%)
- Racism: 2 (.8%)
- Religion: 8 (2%)
- Sex: 66 (19%)
- Sports: 13 (3.5%)
- University: 92 (26%)
- Violence: 2 (.8%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 15 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. Four of them were history, two were math, and two were philosophy.
- 314 students attended class in this room.
- The student majors that stand out are:
 - Engineering: 14%
 - History: 26%
 - Interdisciplinary Studies: 10%
- 36% of these students were female, and 63% were male
- 53% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 47% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Greek Life (22%)
 - Sex (19%)
 - University (26%)
 - Drugs (7.5%)
 - Music (7%)
 - Racism (.8%)

Profile of Classics 212

Total # of Classes Taught: 13

Subject of Classes Taught: 4 ELPS (30%), 1 HUM(7%), 8 MATH (62%)

Total # of Students: 398

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 6 (1%)
- Architecture/Design: 1 (.2%)
- Classics: 1 (.2%)
- Communications:2 (.4%)
- Computer Science: 56 (13%)
- Education: 58 (13.3%)
- English: 1 (.2%)
- Engineering: 218 (50%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 2 (.4%)
- International Studies: 1 (.2%)
- Math/Statistics: 21 (5%)
- Natural Science: 31 (7%)
- PAPA: 1 (.2%)
- Psychology: 3 (.6%)
- Sociology: 1 (.2%)
- Theatre Arts: 1 (.2%)
- University Studies: 30 (6.5%)

Students' Gender: 118 female (30%), 280 male (70%)

Professors' Gender: 3 female (23%), 10 male (76%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Alcohol: 2 (.7%)
- Cars: 10 (3%)
- Curse Words: 35 (13%)
- Drugs: 12 (4.5%)
- Greek Life: 46 (17%)

- Love Message: 3 (1%)
- Music: 16 (6%)
- Sex: 44 (16%)
- Sports: 24 (9%)
- University: 73 (27.5%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 13 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. Four of them were ELPS and four were math.
- 397 students attended class in this room.
- The student majors that stand out are:
 - Engineering: 50%
 - Education: 13%
 - Computer Science: 13%
- 30% of these students were female, and 70% were male
- 23% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 76% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Greek Life (17%)
 - Sex (16%)
 - University (27.5%)
 - Curse words (13%)

Profile of Classics 233

Total # of Classes Taught: 11

Subject of Classes Taught: 3 ART (27%), 1 COMM (9%), 1 EDCI (9%), 1 ENGL(9%), 1 HIST(9%), 1 ME(9%), 1 PHIL(9%), 1 PSYC(9%), 1 WS(9%)

Total # of Students: 307

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 31 (9%)
- Architecture/Design: 7 (2%)
- Art: 37 (10%)
- Building Construction: 1 (.2%)
- Communications: 22 (6%)
- Computer Science: 7 (2%)
- Education: 8 (2.5%)
- Engineering: 69 (20%)
- English: 3 (.8%)
- Foreign Language: 2 (.5%)
- FSCE: 1 (.1%)
- Human Development: 8 (2.5%)
- Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise: 7 (2%)
- History: 2 (.5%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 45 (13%)
- International Studies: 1 (.2%)
- Math/Statistics: 7 (2%)
- Music: 1 (.2%)
- Natural Science: 20 (6%)
- Political Science: 4 (1%)
- Psychology: 5 (1.5%)
- PUA: 1 (.2%)
- Sociology: 9 (2.5%)
- TED: 4 (1%)
- Theatre Arts: 1 (.2%)
- University Studies: 41 (12%)
- UST: 2 (.5%)

Students' Gender: 136 female (44%), 171 male (55%)

Professors' Gender: 5 female (55%), 4 male (45%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Alcohol: 1 (.6%)
- Curse Words: 5 (3%)
- Drugs: 9 (5%)
- Greek Life: 28 (17%)
- Math Equations : 8 (5%)
- Music: 8 (5%)
- Political: 5 (3%)
- Sex: 20 (13%)
- Sports: 15 (9%)
- University: 59 (37%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 11 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. An overwhelming percent of these were Art (27%).
- 307 students attended class in this room.
- The student majors that stand out are:
 - Engineering: 20%
 - Art: 10%
 - Interdisciplinary Studies: 13%
 - University Studies: 12%
- 44% of these students were female, and 55% were male
- 55% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 44% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Greek Life (17%)
 - Sex (13%)
 - University (37%)

Profile of Classics 304

Total # of Classes Taught: 10

Subject of Classes Taught: 1 BIOL (10%), 1 ENGL (10%), 1 HUM (10%), 5 MATH (50%), 1 PHIL (10%), 1 SPAN (10%)

Total # of Students: 257

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 18 (7%)
- Architecture/Design: 2 (.8%)
- Art: 1 (.4%)
- Communications: 3 (1%)
- Computer Science: 15 (6%)
- ECAS: 4 (1.5%)
- Engineering: 69 (28%)
- English: 3 (1%)
- Foreign Language: 1 (.4%)
- Human Development: 1 (.4%)
- History: 3 (1%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 2 (.8%)
- International Studies: 4 (1.5%)
- Math/Statistics: 42 (17%)
- Music: 1 (.4%)
- Natural Science: 36 (14%)
- Political Science: 2 (.8%)
- Psychology: 13 (5%)
- PUA: 1 (.4%)
- Sociology: 2 (.8%)
- Theatre Arts: 1 (.4%)
- University Studies: 25 (10%)

Students' Gender: 88 female (35%), 169 male (66%)

Professors' Gender: 2 female (20%), 8 male (80%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Alcohol: 9 (3%)
- Anti-School: 15 (5%)
- Curse Words: 7 (2.5%)
- Drugs: 22 (8%)
- Greek Life: 38 (14%)
- Love Message: 6 (2%)
- Math Equation: 8 (3%)
- Mother: 4 (1.5%)
- Music: 6 (2%)
- Poetry: 2 (.7%)
- Political: 3 (1%)
- Pop culture: 7 (2.5%)
- Racism: 4 (1.5%)
- Religion: 23 (8%)
- Sex: 41 (15%)
- Sports: 13 (4.5%)
- University: 66 (24%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 10 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. An overwhelming percent of these were Math (50%).
- 257 students attended class in this room.
- The student majors that stand out are:
 - Engineering: 28%
 - Math/Statistics: 17%
 - Natural Science: 14%
 - University Studies: 10%
- 35% of these students were female, and 66% were male
- 20% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 80% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Drugs (8%)
 - Greek Life (14%)
 - Religion (8%)
 - Sex (15%)
 - University (24%)

Profile of Classics 318

Total # of Classes Taught: 12

Subject of Classes Taught: 2 AS (16%), 1 COMM (8%), 8 MATH(66%), 1 SPAN (8%)

Total # of Students: 297

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 24 (8%)
- Architecture/Design: 1 (.3%)
- Building Construction: 6 (3%)
- Communications: 14 (5%)
- Computer Science: 20 (7%)
- ECAS: 3 (1%)
- Education: 1 (.3%)
- EM: 2 (.6%)
- Engineering: 126 (43%)
- Foreign Language: 1 (.3%)
- Geography: 1 (.3%)
- Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise: 2 (.6%)
- History: 4 (1%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 5 (1.3%)
- International Studies: 2 (.6%)
- Math/Statistics: 36 (12%)
- Natural Science: 20 (7%)
- Political Science: 9 (3%)
- University Studies: 18 (6%)

Students' Gender: 81 female (27%), 216 male (73%)

Professors' Gender: 2 female (16%), 10 male (83%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Cars 1 (.4%)
- Curse Words: 17 (7%)

- Depression: 3 (1%)
- Drugs: 25 (10%)
- Greek Life: 25 (10%)
- Love Message: 4 (1.5%)
- Mother: 3 (1%)
- Music: 26 (11%)
- Political: 6 (2.5%)
- Racism: 1 (.4%)
- Religion: 14 (6%)
- Sex: 40 (17%)
- Sports: 5 (2%)
- Violence: 1 (.4%)
- University: 68 (28%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 12 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. An overwhelming percent of these were Math (66%).
- 297 students attended class in this room.
- The student majors that stand out are:
 - Engineering: 43%
 - Accounting/Economics: 8%
 - Computer Science: 7%
 - Math/Statistics: 12%
 - Natural Science: 7%
- 27% of these students were female, and 73% were male
- 16% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 83% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Drugs (10%)
 - Greek Life (10%)
 - Sex (17%)
 - University (28%)

Profile of Classics 328

Total # of Classes Taught: 11

Subject of Classes Taught: 1 COMM (9%), 1 CS (9%), 7 ENGL (63%), 1HUM (9%), 1 PHIL (9%)

Total # of Students: 256

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 33 (13%)
- Architecture/Design: 7 (2.5%)
- Art: 2 (.07%)
- Building Construction: 2 (.07%)
- Communications: 15 (5%)
- Computer Science: 16 (6%)
- CSA: 9 (3%)
- Clothing and Textiles: 3 (1%)
- Engineering: 31 (12%)
- English: 9 (3%)
- Foreign Language: 2 (.07%)
- Human Development: 13 (5%)
- History: 1 (.03%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 12 (4%)
- International Studies: 5 (2%)
- Math/Statistics: 5 (2%)
- Music: 1 (.03%)
- Natural Science: 20 (8%)
- Philosophy: 1 (.03%)
- Political Science: 7 (2.5%)
- Psychology: 11 (4%)
- Soc: 6 (2%)
- Theatre Arts: 1 (.03%)
- University Studies: 37 (14%)

Students' Gender: 112 female (43 %), 144 male (56%)

Professors' Gender: 3 female (27%), 8 male (72%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Alcohol: 1 (.08%)
- Curse Words: 5 (4%)
- Depression: 6 (5%)
- Drugs: 20 (17%)
- Greek Life: 16 (14%)
- Love Message: 2 (2%)
- Math Equations : 4 (3%)
- Music: 4 (3%)
- Religion: 3 (2.5%)
- Sex: 26 (23%)
- Sports: 3 (2.5%)
- University: 22 (19%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 11 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. An overwhelming percent of these were English classes (63%)
- 256 students attended class in this room.
- Student majors that stand out include:
 - Bus/Econ: 13%
 - Engineering: 12%
 - University Studies: 14%
- 43% of these students were female, and 57% were male
- 27% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 72% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Drugs (17%)
 - Greek Life (14%)
 - Sex (23%)
 - University (19%)

Profile of Mechanical 207

Total # of Classes Taught: 10

Subject of Classes Taught: 1 AOE (10%) , 4 ECE (40%), 1 ESM(10%) , 2 MATH (20%), 1 ME (10%), 1 SPAN (10%)

Total # of Students: 189

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 6 (2%)
- Architecture/Design: 1 (.4%)
- Communications: 1 (.4%)
- Computer Science: 4 (1%)
- Engineering: 187 (83%)
- Foreign Language: 3 (1.3%)
- Human Development: 1 (.4%)
- International Studies: 5 (2%)
- Math/Statistics: 2 (.8%)
- Natural Science: 6 (2%)
- Political Science: 2 (.8%)
- Psychology: 2 (.8%)
- Soc: 1 (.4%)
- University Studies: 2 (.8%)

Students' Gender: 40 female (21%), 149 male (78%)

Professors' Gender: 2 female (20%), 8 male (80%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Curse Words: 9 (12%)
- Depression: 1 (1%)
- Drugs: 4 (5%)
- Greek Life: 1 (1%)
- Love Message: 3 (4%)
- Math Equations : 4 (5%)
- Mother: 1 (1%)

- Music: 6 (8%)
- Poetry: 2 (2%)
- Politics: 1 (1%)
- Pop Culture: 2 (2%)
- School: 2 (2%)
- Sex: 8 (10%)
- Sports: 7 (9%)
- Religion 1 (1%)
- University: 19 (26%)
- Violence: 2 (2%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 10 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. A large amount of these were ECE (40%) and Math (20%).
- 189 students attended class in this room.
- The student major that stands out is:
 - Engineering: 83%
- 21% of these students were female, and 78% were male
- 20% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 80% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Curse words (12%)
 - Sex (10%)
 - University (26%)

Profile of Mechanical 221

Total # of Classes Taught: 18

Subject of Classes Taught: 1 ACIS (5%), 3 AOE (16%) , 1 BIOL (5%), 2 CEE (11%), 2 CHEM (11%), 1 ESM(5%), 1 FIN (5%), 1 MATH (5%), 1 ME (5%), 4 MS (22%), 1 SOC (5%)

Total # of Students: 891

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 74 (8%)
- Architecture/Design: 2 (.2%)
- Building Construction: 17 (2%)
- Communications: 10 (1%)
- Computer Science: 11 (1%)
- Clothing and Textiles: 1 (.1%)
- ECAS: 2 (.2%)
- Education: 1 (.1%)
- Engineering: 486 (55%)
- English: 1 (.1%)
- Foreign Language: 1 (.1%)
- Hospitality: 1 (.1%)
- Human Development: 10 (1%)
- History: 6 (.6%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 8 (.8%)
- International Studies: 4 (.4%)
- Math/Statistics: 10 (.1%)
- Music: 1 (.1%)
- Natural Science: 123 (13%)
- Political Science: 15 (2%)
- Psychology: 10 (1%)
- Soc: 20 (2.2%)
- University Studies: 33 (3%)

Students' Gender: 278 female (31%), 613 male (68%)

Professors' Gender: 3 female (17%), 14 male (82%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Curse Words: 9 (7%)
- Depression: 2 (1%)
- Drugs: 3 (2%)
- Greek Life: 11 (9%)
- Love Message: 1 (.8%)
- Math Equations : 3 (2%)
- Mother: 1 (.8%)
- Music: 12 (9%)
- Poetry: 6 (4%)
- Politics: 2 (1%)
- Religion: 8 (6%)
- School: 1 (.8%)
- Sex: 25 (20%)
- Sports: 7 (5%)
- University: 31 (25%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 18 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. A large amount of these were MS (22%), AOE (16%), and CHEM (11%) and CE (11%).
- 891 students attended class in this room.
- Student majors that stand out include:
 - Bus/Econ: 8%
 - Engineering: 55%
 - Natural Science: 13%
- 31% of these students were female, and 68% were male
- 17% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 82% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Greek Life (9%)
 - Music (9%)
 - Sex (20%)
 - University (25%)

Profile of Mechanical 222

Total # of Classes Taught: 10

Subject of Classes Taught: 3 AOE (350%), 2 ECE (20%), 1 GER (10%), 1 GR (10%), 2 ME (20%), 1 PHIL (10%)

Total # of Students: 233

Students' Major:

- Accounting/Business/Economics/Management/Marketing: 7 (3 %)
- Architecture/Design: 1 (.04 %)
- Art: 1 (.04%)
- Classics: 3 (1%)
- Communications:3 (1%)
- Computer Science: 2 (.08%)
- DAE: 1 (.04%)
- DOE: 5 (2%)
- Engineering: 165 (70%)
- Foreign Language: 2 (.08%)
- Human Development: 1 (.04%)
- Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise: 2 (.08%)
- History: 2 (.08%)
- Interdisciplinary Studies: 1 (.04%)
- International Studies: 6 (2%)
- Math/Statistics: 1 (.04%)
- Natural Science: 6 (2%)
- Philosophy: 1 (.04%)
- Political Science: 9 (3%)
- Psychology: 5 (2%)
- PUA: 1 (.04%)
- University Studies: 7 (3%)
- UST: 1 (.04%)

Students' Gender: 48 female (20%), 185 male (80%)

Professors' Gender: 1 female (10%), 9 male (90%)

Content of Graffiti:

- Alcohol: 2 (1%)
- Anti-school: 2 (1%)
- Cars: 1 (.06%)
- Curse Words: 11 (6%)
- Depression: 7 (4%)
- Drugs: 9 (5%)
- Greek Life: 20 (12%)
- Love Message: 1 (.06%)
- Math Equations : 9 (5%)
- Music: 13 (8%)
- Poetry: 5 (3%)
- Political: 3 (1.8%)
- Religion: 11 (6%)
- Sex: 17 (10%)
- Sports: 7 (4%)
- University: 41 (25%)
- Violence: 2 (1%)

Room Profile in General:

- A total of 10 classes were taught in this room during the fall of '03. An overwhelming percent of these were AOE (30%), ECE (20%) and ME (20%).
- 233 students attended class in this room.
- The student major that stands out is:
 - Engineering: 70%
- 20% of these students were female, and 80% were male
- 10% of the professors who taught in this room were female, compared to 90% male
- Graffiti content that stands out includes:
 - Greek Life (12%)
 - Sex (10%)
 - University (25%)

APPENDIX D

This appendix contains the data collected from the content analysis of each room. Displayed are the pieces of graffiti found by category. Not all pieces found are reported in this appendix—this is to merely serve as an example of the types of graffiti found.

Classics Hall 328

ALCOHOL 1

CURSE WORDS 5

Fuck 1
Fucker 1
Fucked up 1
Kickass 2

DPRESSION 6

I'm bored 4
Help Me! 1
U beyond help 1

DRUGS 20

Marijuana 10
Mushrooms 9
Overdose 1

GREEK LIFE 16

LOVE MESSAGES 2

MATH EQUATIONS 4

MUSIC 4

Ba Ha Boys 1
Wu Tang 3

RELIGION 3

Crosses 2
God 1

SEX 26

Body parts (female) 3
Body parts (male) 2
Anti-homosexual 5
Oral 5
Phone number 1
Slut 11

SPORTS 3

UNIVERSITY 22

Classics Hall 318

CARS 1

CURSE 17

Fuck 11

Shit 2

DEPRESSION 3

Kill me 1

DRUGS 25

Cocaine 1

Marijuana 17

Anti-Marijuana 1

Mushrooms 6

GREEK LIFE 45

LOVE MESSAGES 4

MOTHER 3

MUSIC 26

311 6

ACDC 1

John Denver 1

Hansen 1

Metallica 1

Oasis 1

Phish 1

Tool 2

Sublime 1

Wu Tang 11

POLITICAL 6

Anti-army 1

Pro-army 2

Anti-police 3

Peace 2

RACISM 1

RELIGION 14

Cross 7

Jesus 2

Star of David 1

SEX 40

Body parts (female) 6

Body parts (male) 6

Anti-homosexual 13

Oral 13

Slut 1

SPORTS 5

Maryland 1

UVA 3

Wisconsin 1

VIOLENCE 1

UNIVERSITY 68

Classics Hall 304

ALCOHOL 9

ANTI-SCHOOL 15

CURSE 7

Asshole 2

Bitch 1

Bullshit 2

Fuck that 1

DRUGS 22

Crack 2

Crank 1

Marijuana 16

Morphine 1

Mushrooms 2

GREEK LIFE 38

LOVE MESSAGES 6

MATH EQUATIONS 8

MOTHER 4

Mom between my legs 1

Your momma 2

MUSIC 6

Carbon Leaf 2

Frank Zappa 1

Led Zeppelin

NIN 1

Wu Tang 1

POETRY 2

POLITICS 3

POP CULTURE 7

Dilbert 2

Ernie 1

Simpsons 2

Superman 2

RACISM 4

Anti-Korean 2

I hate everyone 1

RELIGION 23

Anti-God 1

Cross 14

Christian fish 3

God 5

SEX 41

Body parts (female) 1

Body parts (male) 11

Anti-homosexual 3

Oral 14

Slut 4

SPORTS 13

Miami 2

Cubs 1

Tennessee 1

UNIVERSITY 66

Classics Hall 233

ALCOHOL 1

CURSE 1

DRUGS 9

Marijuana 7

Mushrooms 2

GREEK LIFE 28

MUSIC 8

Damn Yankees 1

Fleetwood Mac 1

The Doors 1

Pink Floyd 1

Nappy Roots 1

NIN 1

Sublime 1

Wu Tang 1

POLITICS 5

Anarchy 2

Army 3

SEX 20

Body parts (male) 4

Anti-homosexual 3

Oral 14

SPORTS 15

Miami 1

Pittsburgh 1

UVA 1

WVU 1

Cubs 7

Tennessee 4

UNIVERSITY 59

Classics Hall 212

ALCOHOL 2

CARS 10

CURSE WORDS 35

Bitch 1

Fuck 27

DRUGS 12

Marijuana 11

Nitrous Oxide 1

GREEK LIFE 46

LOVE MESSAGES 3

MUSIC 16

Bon Jovi 1

G-Unit 4

NAS 4

Oasis 1

Tupac 1

Weezer 1

Wu Tang 3

50 Cent 1

SEX 44

Body parts (female) 5

Body parts (male) 4

Anti-homosexual 18

Oral 14

SPORTS 24

Celtics 1

Miami 7

Pittsburgh 1

UVA 3

WVU 1

UNIVERSITY 73

Classics Hall 210

ALCOHOL 6

CARS 6

CURSE WORDS 11

Bitch 3

Fuck 6

Hell 1

DRUGS 27

Marijuana 22

LSD 3

Mushrooms 1

GREEK LIFE 79

LOVE MESSAGES 3

MUSIC 26

Hatebreed 2

Jay Z 1

Ja Rule 1

Bob Marley 1

Phish 2

Pink Floyd 1

NAS 2

Outkast 2

String Cheese 1

Sublime 2

Wiggins 3

Wu Tang 7

50 Cent 1

POLITICS 13

Anti-Bush 3

Pro-Bush 2

Anarchy 2

Peace 1

US flag 1

RACISM 2

Anti-Korean 2

RELIGION 8

Cross 3

Christian fish 2

Jesus 1

SEX 66

Body parts (female) 10

Body parts (male) 10

Anti-homosexual 16

Oral 27

SPORTS 13

Miami 1

Pittsburgh 1

UVA 2

Duke 1

WVU 1

UNIVERSITY 92

VIOLENCE 2

Mechanical Hall 207

CURSE WORDS 9

Bastard 1

Damn 2

Fuck 4

Mother Fucker 1

DEPRESSION 1

Help! 1

DRUGS 4

Marijuana 2

Mushrooms 2

GREEK LIFE 1

LOVE MESSAGES 3

MATH EQUATIONS 4

MOTHER

Your mom 1

MUSIC 6

Grateful Dead 1

Jimi Hendrix 1

Led Zeppelin 1

Pink Floyd 1

Wu-Tang 2

POETRY 2

POLITICS 1

SCHOOL 2

SEX 8

Body Parts 3

Oral 5

SPORTS 7

RELIGION 1

Christian fish 1

UNIVERSITY 19

VIOLENCE 2

Injury 1

Killed 1

Mechanical Hall 221

CARS 1

CURSE 9

Asshole 1

Crap 1

Damn 1

Fuck 2

Hell yeah 1

Pain in the ass 1

What the hell? 1

DEPRESSION 2

Kill me 2

DRUGS 3

Ecstasy 1

Marijuana 2

GREEK LIFE 11

LOVE MESSAGES 1

MATH EQUATIONS 3

MOTHER 1

Mom's donkey balls 1

MUSIC 12

Ataris 1

Atmosphere 1

Black Sabbath 1

Counting Crows 1

Incubus 3

Martika 1

NIN 1

Poison the Well 1

Wu Tang 2

POETRY 6

POLITICS 2

Go Army 1

War 1

RELIGION 8

Amen 1

Devil 1

Crosses 5

Christianity 1

SCHOOL 1

SEX 25

Body parts (female) 1

Body parts (male) 4
Anti-homosexual 11
Oral 6
Phone number 1

SPORTS 7
Oakland A's 2
Cubs 1
NY 2

UNIVERSITY 31

Mechanical Hall 222

ALCOHOL 2

CARS 1

CURSE 11

Damn 1

Extreme loser 2

Fuck 3

Go to hell 1

Hell yeah 1

Holy shit 1

Kicks ass 1

Shut up 1

DEPRESSION 7

Camp kill yourself 1

Help me 4

Save me 1

Someone shoot me 1

DRUGS 9

Anti-drugs 2

Drugs 1

Marijuana 5

Mushrooms 1

GREEK LIFE 20

LOVE MESSAGES 1

MATH EQUATIONS 9

MUSIC 13

311 2

Biggie Smalls 1

DMX 2

Grateful Dead 1

NIN 1

No Doubt 2

Phish 1

Tim McGraw 1

Wu Tang 2

POETRY 5

POLITICAL 3

Anarchy 1

Anti-war 1

Go USA 1

RELIGION 11

Cross 5

Christian Fish 1

Jesus 5

SEX 17

Body parts (female) 1

Body parts (male) 2

Anti-homosexual 2

Oral 11

SPORTS 7

Miami 1

WVU 1

UNIVERSITY 41

VIOLENCE 2

Anti-violence 1

Die 1

APPENDIX E

The following appendix consists of photos taken of desktop graffiti at the end of the fall of 2003.







