



3 1293 20145 4612



MEANINGFUL INTERACTION:
AN EXPLICATION OF A
SUGGESTED NECESSARY CONDITION
OF SOCIALIZATION IN
A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY SETTING

By
Donald M. Bybee

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1965

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the advice and constructive criticism offered to him by the members of his committee. Without the help of Drs. Wilbur B. Brookover (Chairman), David Gottlieb, and Denton Morrison it would have been impossible to initiate and coordinate the many phases of a project of this sort. The writer also wishes to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance offered to him by the members of the student personnel services staff in East Wilson Hall.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF APPENDICES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORY AND RELATED LITERATURE	7
III. STRATEGY OF RESEARCH	20
IV. FINDINGS	32
V. CONCLUSION	33
FOOTNOTES	44
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47
APPENDIX	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4-1. Relationship between the rating of relationships by Head and Graduate Resident Advisers and the configuration of goal sympathy perceived by students	32
4-2. Relationship between the rating of relationships by Resident Assistants and the configuration of goal sympathy perceived by students	33
B-1. Relationship between ratings of relationships by Head and Graduate Resident Advisers and perceptions of goal sympathy by students	53
B-2. Relationship between ratings of relationships by Resident Assistants and perceptions of goal sympathy by students . . .	54

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
A. INSTRUMENTATION	49
B. ALTERNATIVE BREAKDOWN OF DATA	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Need

Socialization is the general sociological heading under which one would classify a large part of the concern of very nearly all college and university administrative organizations. That is, there are those administrators whose functions may be described as attempts to transmit selected elements of the greater society's social and cultural heritage to the nearly mature coming generation. The name generally given to this area of practice and study within the college or university community is student personnel services. The chief functionary is usually a Vice President for Student Affairs or a Dean of Students.

In contradistinction to the academic faculties, whose functions may be similarly described, the avowed or official ends or goals of these organizations seem to vary more from institution to institution. Also, within and among institutions there seems to be a division of opinion as to whether student personnel services ought to be organized and perceived as supplementary or complimentary to the academic or instructional efforts. There is, however, very little disagreement concerning¹ the desirability of having the functions performed.

A useful way to conceptualize the present state of affairs is to envision a continuum. At one end there are those institutions in which student personnel services have a definitely ancillary status; their existence is justified only in so far as they contribute more or less directly to the classroom instruction. At the other end of the continuum are those institutions in which student personnel services are encouraged to be what may be called student oriented, as opposed to strictly instruction oriented. Their status within the institution is generally a coordinate one, and through a number of more or less specific programs attempts are made to educate the student in ways other than increasing his knowledge and proficiency in a number of selected academic disciplines.

Although one could probably observe attempted socialization in either extreme type of situation, it is in those situations of the second general type that it may be more clearly seen as socialization in the more usual sense of the term, rather than as one or another type of specialized education. (The real or supposed distinction between education and socialization is not crucial for present purposes.) The general focus of this study will be those situations tending toward the second general type. This seems justified in view of the fact that as colleges and universities are growing so is the practice and study of student personnel services.²

One of the most fundamental aspects of the social-

ization process is that historically it has always been differentially successful. Indeed, as Moore notes, the relative efficiency of the socialization process determines to a large degree the extent to which a given social system remains stable or undergoes social change.³ Given the crucial nature of the enterprise, it would seem that on a practical basis alone further study of the socialization process would be useful. However, given the gradual shift in the responsibility for the performance of the socialization process from the family and other such primary groups to increasingly large and often impersonal organizations--perhaps epitomized by the large university--it would seem that efforts to study the phenomenon in its new "location" should be useful in and of themselves. Such is the presumption under which this study was begun.

Purpose

The general purpose of this study, as its title implies, is to explicate a concept which, in turn, is presumed to refer to a necessary condition of socialization in the college or university setting. By explication is meant the process of bridging the gap between the theoretical or conceptual and empirical domains. Thus, although what follows will at least roughly approximate a more or less typical thesis form, the overall net result should be a conceptually and operationally defined concept. The explication will

proceed in such a manner that the task may be at least tentatively considered as accomplished when answers are discovered to a few selected research questions.

Objectives

The starting place of the explication will be a model of adolescent behavior recently suggested as useful by Gottlieb and Guttman. Although originally constructed for use with facet analysis, the model indicates certain independent and dependent variables which, if the explication is accurate, will yield a number of hypotheses which may be verified by observation and measurement.

Gottlieb and Guttman say the following about adolescent behavior:

...that adolescents behave much the same anywhere, in any socio-cultural context, in that they will become oriented to (involved with) referents whom they perceive as having the desire and the ability to help them attain skills, goals, and roles (ends), and that they will not become oriented to referents having neither the desire nor the ability to help them attain these same ends. 4

The model's applicability to present purposes becomes clear when the college or university setting is viewed as the relevant socio-cultural context and when it is realized that the practitioners in the area of student personnel services attempt (or ought to attempt) to control the definitions of their respective situations in such a manner as to be perceived as having the desire and/or ability to help students achieve their ends or goals. This, it is here argued, leads to meeting the

relevant necessary condition of socialization in the college or university setting.

Another (the other) part of meeting this so-called necessary condition of socialization is for the college students to become oriented to or involved with members of the student personnel services staff, thus completing the definition of the situation in which meaningful interaction occurs. The objectives of this study entail identifying and observing the relevant variables in this process in such a manner that a general hypothesis of the following form may be tested: It is hypothesized that in those instances where a student perceives a member of the student personnel services staff, i.e., a referent, as having the desire and/or ability to help the student achieve certain of his goals, meaningful interaction probably will occur. And in those instances where a student does not so perceive a staff member, meaningful interaction probably will not occur. In other words, meaningful interaction probably will not occur unless a student perceives a staff member as having the desire and/or ability to help him achieve certain of his ends or goals.

For purposes of this study, the desire and/or ability to help a student achieve his goals will be conceptualized simply as "goal sympathy," even though it will eventually be shown to have more than a single dimension. Thus the perception of a staff member's

goal sympathy or lack of it will occupy the status of an independent variable, whereas some indication of meaningful interaction itself--or its absence--will occupy the status of a dependent variable.

By means of a thorough, but selective, review of the relevant literature and through utilization of appropriate design and analysis, it is hoped that the above hypothesis will be verified and that the gap between social theory and social "reality" will successfully be bridged.

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND RELATED LITERATURE

Goals or Ends

According to one of its authors, the Gottlieb-Guttman model of behavior is not based on any single theory or school of theory,⁵ but one can easily see that it may be viewed as a particular example of a more general phenomenon variously known as an action schema, a means-end schema, or, perhaps, a crude form of anthropomorphism. This latter designation is Sorokin's reaction to Parsons' general means-end theoretical orientation in 1937⁶ which he (Parsons) has subsequently reaffirmed with "no fundamental changes."⁷

The following will not be an attempt to justify or refute any one or another grand social theory, but, given the status of ends or goals within the context of this study and the general eminence of Sorokin, there would seem to be sufficient reason to devote some discussion to such a means-end schema's usefulness at least for present purposes.

Sorokin's objections to the schema seem mainly to involve the analytical status of ends: If they are mistaken for the products of unconscious motivations, if they are mistaken for simple effects or posterior conditions, or if they are mistaken for behavior

occurring "because of" something instead of "for the sake of" something, they are not truly ends. His principal positive criterion for the establishment of an end or goal is simply--and only--that it be thought of as such.³ And, indeed, this does limit the field, for the existence of goals or ends becomes dependent upon what is here implied is a much too explicit and particular state of mind.

The theoretical bias of this study is a position from which it is not meaningless to regard ends or goals as dependent upon a state of mind, but it is a considerably more general one. For purposes of this study, goals or ends may be thought of as end states--or simply states of affairs--which are anticipated as or expected to be rewarding.

This theoretical orientation represents what is expected to be a useful synthesis of the theoretical works of Parsons, Becker, Newcomb, and Homans. Its touchstone, as it were, derives from Parsons' original statement made in 1937:

The origin of the mode of thinking in terms of the action schema in general is so old and so obscure that it is fruitless to inquire into it here. It is sufficient to point out that, like the schema of the classical physics, it is deeply rooted in the commonsense experience of everyday life, and it is of a range of such experience that it may be regarded as universal to all human beings. Proof of this claim can be found in the fact that the basic elements of the schema are imbedded in the structure of all languages, as in the universal existence of a verb corresponding to the English verb "to do." 9

Within this orientation the restrictions concerning the classification of goals are relatively flexible. Covert and reflexive motivations, although undoubtedly present, are analytically of slight importance. Simply that an individual wants to do something implies a goal orientation.

Thus a given individual is likely to assess a given situation in terms of whatever is rewarding to him, i.e., in terms of whatever will help him do whatever it is that he wants to do, whether it is the seeking of one or another type of gratification or the avoidance of some type of unpleasantness. Both types of behavior may be regarded as potentially rewarding, and either could--but does not have to--be regarded as directed toward the achievement of a goal or end (or an intermediate goal or end) that the individual may have clearly in mind.

It is in this sense, then, that we shall speak of goals and goal-directed behavior. Sorokin's implied objections to such an orientation become largely irrelevant when this position is made explicit and juxtaposed with his own. Whether, as Parsons seems to contend, goal-directed behavior represents a single exhaustive class of human behavior is a question that need not now be pursued. The relevant point here is that in the following this general orientation seems to be more useful than possible alternatives in reflecting--or imposing order on--the empirical reality at the focus of this study.

Ends or Goals and Interaction

That a good deal of behavior can be viewed as goal-directed, at least in the above sense, becomes obvious, however, when one examines Homans' descriptions and explanations of human behavior. Borrowing the points of view of behavioral psychology and elementary economics, Homans writes, for example, that one may "...envision human behavior as a function of its pay-off: in amount and kind it depends on the amount and kind of reward and and punishment it fetches."¹⁰ That this kind of goal-directedness is relevant to the central concern of this study, i.e., the interaction process, is shown by Homans' definition of interaction, per se: "...when an activity (or sentiment) emitted by one man is rewarded (or punished) by an activity emitted by another man, ...we say that the two have interacted."¹¹

That this type of goal-directedness is relevant to the Gottlieb-Guttman model is also shown by Newcomb in a somewhat indirect manner. In an article on interpersonal attraction Newcomb writes that "...the reader of either theoretical or empirical treatises is likely to conclude that, for social-psychological purposes, the phenomena of attraction are undifferentiated (except in degree)."¹² He then proposes to differentiate among types of attraction on the basis of "reward associated" attitudes.¹³ If it can be presumed that attraction normally precedes interaction--at least the kind of interaction under scrutiny

here--Newcomb has added weight to the position here being presented.

Thus it would seem that a means-end schema should be useful for present purposes in that it is relevant to the relationship likely to obtain between an adolescent (a college student) and a referent (a member of the student personnel services staff). Before pursuing this particular topic further, however, let us begin to examine the relationships among socialization, an adolescent's goals (a college student's goals), and referents (members of the student personnel services staff).

Socialization and Referents

With respect to socialization we can begin by repeating that it is a particular type of socialization that is under consideration here. It is what Parsons calls the "third stage" of socialization; it occurs at¹⁴ the college or university level of formal education. Parsons writes that "...the main outline of the structure of the individual personality is derived, through socialization, from the structure of the systems of social objects to which he has been exposed in his life history, including, of course, the cultural values and norms which¹⁵ have been institutionalized in those systems." The college, university, or graduate school is the third such system, preceded by the family and the primary and secondary school systems.

One such "social object" to which the adolescent

is exposed during this third stage of socialization is, in many colleges and universities, the supposed referent in this study. As an agent of socialization his intention with respect to the college students in his charge is to attempt to inculcate the relevant aspects of the cultural values and norms subscribed to by the institution of which he is a part.

Referents and Students' Goals

In his empirical setting, however, the role of this individual (the referent) can and should be at least analytically separated into two interrelated aspects. For this individual on the job is at once an agent of socialization and an agent of social control. This is, of course, true of other presumed agents of socialization and in this context the distinction could be an important one in understanding the behavior of the adolescents involved.
16

That this should be true becomes clearer when we again examine the notion of goals, the goals sought by adolescents. The adolescents in question here are, of course, the American college students about whom a great deal has been recently reported. And a substantial portion of this literature is concerned with assessing the theoretical and practical importance of their goals as they interact with their environments during this third stage of socialization.

In this literature the notions of youth cultures or student cultures seem to be occupying an increasingly prominent place. Coleman, among others, has gone to considerable length to describe and explain the many aspects of these youth cultures as they first emerge in the American high school.¹⁷ Trow, Becker, Newcomb, Pace, and others have devoted considerable attention to these cultures as they flourish on the nation's college and university campuses.¹⁸

Becker, for example, views the student culture as a means toward the achievement of more or less specific intermediate goals which are, in turn, the means toward the attainment of more long-range goals: "...student culture can be viewed as a collective response to chronic and pressing problems, problems which arise when the long-range perspectives of students are confronted by the social environment of the campus."¹⁹ Becker adds that these situational problems must be shared by a minimal number of students who interact, thus encouraging the emergence of a student culture.²⁰

The inference to be drawn here is that in attempting to solve these ubiquitous situational problems confronting them, these college students are engaging in goal-directed behavior. The goals that they are attempting to achieve are the solutions to these situational problems. And, of course, similar goals are likely to be common to groups and/or individuals in similar situations. In

terms of the above definition these students are either seeking some form of gratification or they are attempting to avoid some form of unpleasantness.

Trow, who has done some significant pioneering in this area, writes that with respect to such subcultures "...most colleges are not monolithic and uniform but contain within themselves different subsocieties, whose members share common codes of values, attitudes, and patterns of behavior."²¹ That is, there are likely to be a variety of types of what Becker calls situational problems and thus a variety of types of goals that are apt to be the objects of goal-directed behavior. However many of these subcultures there are in a given institution is an empirical question, but Trow suggests that four general types are usually represented in varying proportions.²²

Pace, among others, has studied the other side of the coin, as it were: the environments within which these student subcultures differentially succeed in meeting and solving their situational problems. That is, he has studied the cultural values and norms of these institutions which comprise the content of the social and cultural heritage which is presumed to be transmitted during the process of socialization--by the presumed agents of socialization, i.e., the referents in this study.

Pace describes several types of subcultures exist-

ing on the college and university campuses; the student subcultures are examples of only one of at least three types. In addition to the student subcultures, Pace²³ describes the faculty and administrative subcultures. Given the social and psychological characteristics of students, as compared with those of a college or university administration, one can easily see that relative to the administrative organ represented by the student personnel services staff, the goals of students are likely to be heterogeneous.

This may have implications for the staff member's role as an agent of social control. Social control, as Parsons writes, has to do with counteracting tendencies toward deviance,²⁴ and if the students' goals were sufficiently heterogeneous they are bound to imply a certain amount of "deviant" behavior. Under such circumstances one can easily imagine a university staff member acting as an agent of social control. Trow, as a matter of fact, labels one of his four typical student subcultures as the "deviant" subculture.²⁵

Thus some proportion of the interaction between the referent and the college student may be viewed as examples of the operation of the mechanism of social control. It is here suggested that this interaction may or may not be what is being called meaningful interaction. That is the process of social control may be a component of or separate from the process of social-

ization depending, it is suggested, on the presence or absence of perceived goal sympathy. This should become clearer as we now turn to a discussion of meaningful interaction and socialization.

Meaningful Interaction and Socialization

The notion that meaningful interaction is a necessary condition of socialization derives in part from the almost universally held proposition that whatever it is that is transmitted during the socialization process is transmitted via the interaction process. Parsons, for example, discusses interaction and socialization as they occur under normal circumstances: "An established state of a social system is a process of complimentary interaction of two or more individual actors in which each conforms with the expectations of the other(s) in such a way that alter's reactions to ego's actions are positive sanctions which serve to reinforce his given need-dispositions and thus to fulfill his given expectations....It is only when this mutuality of interaction has been established that we may speak of socialization."²⁶

This statement, of course, implies that there are types of interaction which would be irrelevant, if not inimical, to the socialization process. For example, Becker suggests a classification of social interaction, or "sociation" in his terms, based on its most fundamental aspects--association and dissociation.²⁷ Becker

lists what he calls the associative and dissociative processes. The associative processes are advance, adjustment, accordance, and amalgamation; whereas the dissociative processes are competition, contravention,²³ and conflict. In the context under consideration here both types of interaction are represented. The latter types, i.e., the dissociative types, it is suggested would be irrelevant, if not inimical, to the socialization process.

Individual relationships are not likely to be pure examples of either type, but they probably tend more toward one type than the other. And if a relationship were predominantly dissociative, it is suggested that it would not contribute to socialization to the extent that it precluded the complimentary relationship described above. A staff member whose function with respect to a given student was primarily that of social control would probably have this sort of relationship; and in such a case, as far as socialization is concerned, an impasse would have been reached.

An associative relationship, on the other hand, would be the sort of relationship implied by Parsons' above statements. But the mere fact that it is associative (or only mildly dissociative as in a case where social control would be a component of socialization) does not in itself insure that it will be meaningful in terms of socialization. For a relationship of this

sort it is hypothesized that the target of socialization, i.e., the student, must perceive the agent of socialization as being sympathetic to his goals--as having goal sympathy.

From Theory to Empirical Reality

The first stage of the explication is now complete. Meaningful interaction may now be conceptually defined as that associative interaction occurring within a socialization context between an agent of socialization and a target of socialization who perceives the agent as sympathetic to his goals--as having the desire and/or ability to help him attain his goals. It is suggested that it is necessary for this type of relationship to exist between a student and a university staff member in order that socialization may occur; and that if it does not, socialization is not likely to occur.

The next stage of the explication should involve obtaining evidence to indicate whether the various concepts and relationships in the conceptual definition have empirical counterparts. More specifically, it would be useful to know whether what is being called perceived goal sympathy is correlated with a particular sort of associative relationship. If the correlation exists, the concept meaningful interaction will have been demonstrated to have an empirical referent, and the concept will have been at least tentatively explicated. To compellingly demonstrate that this sort of relation-

ship is in fact a "necessary condition" of socialization, if possible, would take considerably more time and talent than is presently available. It will, therefore, remain as a suggestion. It is presumed, however, that previous and subsequent remarks will serve to at least strongly suggest the validity of this suggestion.

CHAPTER III

STRATEGY OF RESEARCH

Introduction

This phase of the project was begun and completed subsequent to the previous phase. Therefore, the general grammatical tense of the presentation must change. This chapter and the following one are descriptions of how answers to the questions implied at the end of the preceding chapter were secured.

The Setting

In accordance with the objectives of the study as a whole, the site of the research was a university campus-- a large, state supported university in the Great Lakes region of the United States. The university is one of the many maintaining extensive facilities to enhance the out of class experience of its students. That is, it takes seriously the notion of socialization discussed in the preceding chapters.

Of these many facilities, it is in the university's residence halls that interaction between students and members of the student personnel services staff is qualitatively and quantitatively most intense. It is here that day to day contact, a number of planned programs, and not a few ad hoc decisions are supposed

to accomplish the process of socialization. It was, therefore, from one of these residence halls that a sample of students was selected.

Each residence hall on the campus of this university is staffed by three grades of student personnel workers. The top administrative position in a residence hall is that of Head Resident Adviser. This man is a full time member of the Student Affairs staff in addition to typically being an advanced graduate student in student personnel and administration. He is also usually well trained and experienced. Such was the case in the residence hall chosen for this study.

The Head Resident Adviser is assisted by two Graduate Resident Advisers who are usually graduate students in education or the behavioral sciences. Their appointments with the Student Affairs office are half-time. Their function is to assist the Head Resident Adviser and to oversee a number of specific programs within the residence hall.

Each residence hall on the campus studied is subdivided into a number of smaller units called houses or precincts. A Resident Assistant lives in each of these units which contains from fifty to sixty undergraduate students. The Resident Assistant typically is an upperclassman who has demonstrated superior ability and maturity. Each takes a three credit course of formal training and attends weekly or biweekly training

sessions conducted by the Head Resident Adviser.

Although social control is a concern of all these individuals, the specific function of each staff member is to act as an agent of socialization as it has been discussed. The official by-word is to create and sustain a "living-learning" situation.

Operationalization of Variables

Although the approach here is a correlational one and a definite antecedent-consequent time order is not postulated, it will be convenient to refer to the two principal variables of the study as the independent and dependent variables. Beginning with the independent variable, then, the following means were employed for its operationalization.

Perceived Goal Sympathy:

The task here was to find a set of operations which would indicate whether a student perceived a member of the student personnel services staff as having the desire and/or ability to help him attain one or another of his goals. It would have been simple enough to ask a student this question directly, but a few judicious trials of versions of this procedure led to interminable difficulties concerning the meanings of such terms as goal, ability, or desire. Considerations of this sort are of course relevant and important, but it was decided that they were not sufficiently germane to warrant the

utilization of this type of direct approach.

An agent of socialization in a college or university setting is called upon to work with individual students harboring all sorts of goals and definitions of their respective situations. Whatever they pursue or value, a member of the student personnel services staff may or may not be perceived as instrumental in this quest. With these considerations in mind (and after a few more trials and errors), a questionnaire was prepared which seems to take this aspect of the situation well into account as well as overcoming the difficulties mentioned above.

The questionnaire breaks down into three two-part questions. First of all, the respondents were to be asked: "Under your present circumstances at the university, which one(s) of those listed below do you see as having an interest in you and your future?" Respondents were to place an X on the line preceding applicable responses. They were asked to choose from a presumably exhaustive list of those individuals in their human environment. The list was as follows: an instructor or professor other than your academic adviser; your academic adviser; your R.A. (Resident Assistant); a close friend other than your roommate; your roommate; the head adviser or either graduate adviser in your residence hall; and "someone not listed" whom they were to specify.

If a respondent were to make more than one response

to the question, he was then asked to identify which of those individuals already indicated he saw as having the most interest in him and his future. The purpose of this second question was to make more certain that a respondent knew what kind of information was being sought, i.e., information about whom he perceived as having an interest in him and his future.

The purpose of the entire first two-part question is seen as an attempt to define the research situation to the respondent and to give him practice in working with the questionnaire. This first question was followed by two more two-part questions of a similar form but differing in contents.

With respect to the same presumably exhaustive list of individuals in their human environment, respondents were next to be asked: "Which of those listed below do you see as having a sincere desire or inclination to give you some kind of advice or help?" This was to be followed by asking the respondent to identify which of those indicated by him had the strongest desire or inclination to give him some kind of help or advice.

And, finally, respondents were to be asked: "Which of those listed below do you see as having the ability to give you useful or valuable advice or help?" And this was followed by asking the respondent to identify which of those indicated by him he saw as having the most ability to give him useful or valuable help or advice.

The logic of this procedure is that the notions of help or advice only have meaning with respect to ends or goals--especially as they were defined in the previous chapter. Whatever the student's goals or situational problems, the above questions are relevant to him. His responses should indicate whether he perceives members of the student personnel services staff as instrumental to him. That is, they should indicate the presence or absence of perceived goal sympathy.

The Associative Relationship:

If a respondent did identify a member of the student personnel services staff as being sympathetic to his goals, we would, according to the hypothesis, expect meaningful interaction to occur between that student and that staff member. Under these circumstances, the staff member as an agent of socialization and social control would have an essentially associative relationship with the student in terms of the definition suggested in the previous chapter in that the student would probably relate to him or become oriented to him. In other words, we would expect the dependent variable to be present also.

With these considerations in mind it was decided to interview all the staff members included on the list to which the students were to respond on the questionnaire. After inferring the nature of the relationship between the staff member and the student (from the staff member),

it would be possible to correlate the responses made by the staff members and the responses made by the students.

As agents of socialization and social control members of the student personnel services staff are obliged to maintain a particular definition of the situation existing between them and students. They have certain objectives and goals by virtue of their positions. This limits and conditions the interaction between them and students. In terms of his position and role, only certain kinds of interaction between him and a student would be satisfactory to the staff member. Presuming this to be the case it was decided to have staff members, after a series of preliminary questions, rate the relationship between them as staff members and students on a six point scale ranging from very satisfactory to very unsatisfactory.

The logic here is that if the relationship were sufficiently satisfactory to the agent of socialization it would be evidence to believe that if socialization were not already under way, it had not been blocked by a dissociative or otherwise irrelevant relationship. In short, according to our hypothesis, a sufficiently satisfactory rating should exist with respect to a relationship in which the student perceived the staff member as somehow sympathetic to his goals or ends.

The preliminary questions preceding the final rating question were designed to recall specific relevant

features of the relationship between the staff member and a given student to the staff member's mind. For example, he was to be asked how well he knew the student, how often he interacted with him relative to other students, whether there had been problems with the student, and, if so, what kinds of problems were encountered in the relationship. After these preliminary questions the staff member was to be asked to, in terms of his objectives as a staff member, rate the relationship between him and the specific student, i.e., "How would you as (an R.A., a Head, or Graduate Adviser), and in terms of what you're trying to accomplish, rate the relationship between you and? As very satisfactory, quite satisfactory, just satisfactory, just unsatisfactory, etc."

Each member of the residence hall staff was to be interviewed (privately) to determine the nature of the relationship between him and the students in the sample with whom he interacted. Each Resident Assistant was to be interviewed about those students in the sample who lived in his house, and the Head and both Graduate Resident Advisers were to be interviewed about all those students in the sample whom they knew by name.

In those instances where a student was known by only one staff member, i.e., the Resident Assistant, the Resident Assistant's rating of the relationship was the one to be used in the analysis. If two staff members knew a student and disagreed substantially in their

ratings, the rating of the one professing to know the student better (on a five point scale) would be employed. If three staff members knew a student and there was substantial disagreement, the most divergent rating would be excluded.

Copies of the questionnaire sent to the students and the interview schedule followed with the members of the student personnel services staff are included in the appendix.

The Sample of Students

The questionnaire was to be sent to a twenty percent sample of the six hundred fifty undergraduate males residing in the residence hall chosen for the study. The sample represents what is called a systematic random sample. That is, after a random start from one to K on a complete alphabetical listing of residents, every Kth individual was selected.²⁹ K in this case was set equal to five. Each student thus selected was, a priori, the "responsibility" of at least three staff members: the Head Resident Adviser, both Graduate Resident Advisers, and the Resident Assistant assigned to his house.

Proposed Analysis

The relationship between a student and a staff member was considered to be "sufficiently satisfactory" to meet the definition of meaningful interaction if it was given either of the two top ratings. Since it was

a six point scale, a dichotomy had to be made between satisfactory and unsatisfactory in the mind to the interviewee, and it is believed that the "just satisfactory" category (the third from the top) would give the interviewees an opportunity to avoid what would amount to making an admission of at least partial failure to the interviewer. (The long pauses preceding this particular response during the process of data gathering and the interviewer's familiarity with the interviewees tend to support this decision.)

It can be seen that the process of data gathering should yield two discrete and dichotomous variables. Either a student respondent will perceive a staff member as sympathetic to his goals or he will not so perceive a staff member. And either the relationship will be rated as sufficiently satisfactory or not.

Therefore, the obvious method of cross classification will be employed. That is, the data will be cast in contingency tables from which the Contingency Coefficient and X^2 's may be computed.

Hypotheses

Because there are two separate classes of student personnel workers in the study, and because the dimensions of goal sympathy are distinct phenomena, a number of hypotheses should be tested. The data should be such that analysis will make it possible to note any differ-

entials between the two classes of student personnel workers; and it should be possible to at least make some estimates about the relative importance of the two dimensions of goal sympathy.

Because of the nature of this enterprize, the more or less conventional process of hypothesis testing will not be employed. In the tradition of Lipset, Trow and Coleman it is suggested that factors are present which make tests of significance either too strong or irrelevant.³⁰ The intent here is to attempt to discover indications of the presence or the absence of a number of relationships. No presumptions are made concerning the description or the estimation of parameters. Nor is it presumed that this study is in any way a definitive one. In this sense it may be thought of as an exploratory or a pilot study.

Under these circumstances the decisions whether to accept or reject null hypotheses at a specified level of confidence are not really crucial. Indeed the use of conventional hypothesis testing procedures presupposes the existence of factors which, if present, would be quite incompatible with what is conceived as the purpose of the study.

With these considerations in mind, then, two sets of nearly identical hypotheses will be examined--one set pertaining to the Resident Assistants and one set pertaining to the Head and Graduate Resident Advisers.

They are all variants of the following general form:

That satisfactory relationships will tend to be associated with perceived goal sympathy, and that unsatisfactory relationships will tend to be associated with no perceived goal sympathy.

It can be seen that the Contingency Coefficient and χ^2 are relevant to this formulation.

In all there will be two sets of four hypotheses varying with respect to the rater of the relationship and with respect to the configuration of goal sympathy implied by its two dimensions. These configurations are (in set theory terms): (1) ability and no ability, (2) desire and no desire, (3) desire and ability--the "intersection" of the two sets--and either one or the other of neither of them, and (4) desire and/or ability--the "union" of the two sets--and neither desire nor ability.

Let us now finally proceed to an examination of the data collected.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Summary of Data Collected

The procedures outlined in the preceding chapter were followed. The following two tables summarize the the data collected.

TABLE 4-1. Relationship between the rating of relationships by the Head and Graduate Resident Advisers and the configuration of goal sympathy perceived by students.

<u>Configuration of Goal Sympathy</u>	<u>Relationship Rating</u>	
	<u>Satisfactory f (%)</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory f (%)</u>
Ability	12 (50)	8 (40)
No Ability	9 (47)	10 (53)
Desire	8 (73)	3 (27)
No Desire	13 (46)	15 (54)
Desire and Ability	6 (75)	2 (25)
Either Desire or Ability or Neither Desire nor Ability	15 (43)	16 (52)

(Continued on next page.)

(TABLE 4-1 continued.)

Desire and/or Ability	14 (64)	3 (36)
Neither Desire Nor Ability	7 (41)	10 (59)

(Total N in each case = 39; %'s computed laterally.)

TABLE 4-2. Relationship between the rating of relationships by Resident Assistants and the configuration of goal sympathy perceived by students.

Configuration of Goal Sympathy	Relationship Rating	
	Satisfactory f (%)	Unsatisfactory f (%)
Ability	23 (68)	11 (32)
No Ability	14 (42)	19 (58)
Desire	18 (62)	11 (38)
No Desire	19 (50)	19 (50)
Desire and Ability	16 (73)	5 (27)
Either Desire or Ability or Neither Desire nor Ability	21 (47)	24 (53)
Desire and/or Ability	25 (61)	16 (39)
Neither Desire Nor Ability	12 (45)	14 (54)

(Total N in each case = 67; %'s computed laterally.)

Each of the above breakdowns of the total N's is an attempt to view the relationship implied by a specific configuration of goal sympathy. These configurations, of course, are not mutually exclusive. The residual left from set intersection, for example, is inclusive of part of the union of the same sets. The two two-by-two matrices involving set intersection and set union (for each table) can be combined into a single two-by-three matrix. These alternative breakdowns are included in the appendix.

Analysis and Hypotheses

Inspection of the above tables reveals evidence supporting the existence of the hypothesized relationship. That is, in every instance except one the percents in the upper left and lower right corners of each subdivision in both tables exceed fifty percent.

With respect to the particular relationships between the ratings of relationships by Head and Graduate Resident Advisers and the students' perceptions of goal sympathy as exemplified by each possible configuration, we find the following:

1. For "ability," $C = .024$ and $X^2 = .22$ ($p < .70$).
2. For "desire," $C = .178$ and $X^2 = 1.27$ ($p < .30$).
3. For "desire and ability," $C = .150$ and $X^2 = .90$ ($p < .50$).
4. For "desire and/or ability," $C = .169$ and $X^2 = 1.15$ ($p < .30$).

With respect to the same particular hypothesized relationships between the ratings of Resident Assistants and the students' perceptions of goal sympathy as exemplified by its various configurations, we find the following:

5. For "ability," $C = .246$ and $X^2 = 4.31$ ($p < .05$).
6. For "desire," $C = .113$ and $X^2 = .87$ ($p < .30$).
7. For "desire and ability," $C = .239$ and $X^2 = 4.06$ ($p < .05$).
8. For "desire and/or ability," $C = .143$ and $X^2 = 1.41$ ($p < .30$).

Because of the relatively small N from which the Contingency Coefficients were computed for the first set of hypotheses, Yates' correction for continuity was used in the computations of the X^2 's. It was not used in the computations of the X^2 's for the second set of hypotheses since the N was larger and each cell of the data matrices had at least five cases. The maximal value of C for a two-by-two table is .707.³¹

Interpretation of Data

Although the data clearly reveal evidence to support the general hypothesis in that the relationship is present in seven out of eight possible instances, it would be less than a completely sound undertaking to arrive at anything but the most tentative conclusions concerning the underlying relationship between the two variables. To begin with, the probabilities that any of

these seven relationships could have occurred by chance range from the conventionally acceptable one chance in twenty to seven chances in ten. In addition to this, there are some methodological difficulties which dictate a certain amount of caution in drawing conclusions.

Primary among these difficulties is the nonresponse error, i.e., the fact that only slightly over sixty percent of those to whom questionnaires were sent responded to them. Subsequent responses probably would have confirmed the trends, but one cannot be certain of this. There is also no way of knowing what biases are represented in this differential rate of response. And finally, larger N's would have made the drawing of any kinds of conclusions a scientifically more respectable venture.

Another difficulty may arise from the lumping of the Head and Graduate Resident Advisers together on the questionnaire administered to the students. At the time of the construction of the questionnaire, however, it was decided that any more possible responses referring to the staff in the students' residence hall would tend to make them unduly reluctant in making candid responses. And, as it turned out, the N for these three individuals together was barely sufficient to make a meaningful analysis.

An unfortunate inherent difficulty centers around the fact that only nominal or categorical data were

gathered. Had more sensitive measures been available, perhaps more clearly definite signs of a relationship (or its absence) would have revealed themselves. Depending, of course, on the tenable assumptions inhering to more sophisticated measures, it would seem likely that more alternatives with respect to modes of analysis would also have been available and legitimate.

Despite these difficulties, however, if one were pressed to make a decision on the basis of the evidence obtained, he would probably be less wrong if he concluded that the hypothesized relationship does exist than if he did not so conclude. If pressed one could also probably say that perceived goal sympathy as exemplified by "desire" is relatively most important in the relationships between students and the Head and Graduate Resident Advisers; and that perceived goal sympathy as exemplified by "ability" is relatively most important in the relationships between students and Resident Assistants. In other words there are some apparent differences that may be real.

Thus, with a most tentative positive conclusion concerning the existence of the hypothesized relationship, the time has come to note some of the possible implications of this somewhat less than completely satisfactory exploration into the empirical domain for the original task of bridging the gap between the empirical and theoretical domains.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Summary

For all practical purposes, the explication is now at least tentatively completed. Before finally concluding, however, it might be useful to briefly recapitulate in order to achieve a more or less balanced perspective.

So far it has been noted that colleges and universities are in the business of socialization. To help accomplish this task in many colleges and universities, a more or less specialized area of study and practice has come into being; it is called student personnel services. By various means, practitioners in this field attempt to compliment or supplement the efforts of others in the college or university community who are engaged in this "third stage" of socialization.

It was suggested that there is a certain necessary precondition for this kind of socialization. A certain kind of associative relationship was suggested as this necessary condition. It was termed meaningful interaction, and it was conceptually defined as the kind of interaction occurring between a member of the student personnel services staff and a student who perceives him as having the desire and/or ability to help him attain

certain of his ends or goals. The over-all purpose of this project was to be an explication of this concept. In other words, the attempt would be made to discover an empirical counterpart to this conceptual formulation.

The strategy employed was to--after discussing the theoretical antecedents of the conceptual formulation--go to a setting where this kind of socialization was being attempted and try to observe the phenomenon. The phenomenon, meaningful interaction, was to be operationally defined as the correlation of two variables which, in turn, were operationalized components of the conceptual definition. It was hypothesized simply that the correlation would exist, and if it did the concept would have been shown to have an empirical referent.

The relevant terms were operationalized and a modest empirical study was designed. Data were gathered which seem to support the above hypothesis. That is, meaningful interaction was observed. But the results of the study were somewhat less than completely satisfactory. A number of more or less "mechanical" difficulties were discussed. Despite these difficulties, however, it was concluded that the explication was in some measure successful.

Concluding Remarks

At the very least the bulk of the foregoing makes a number of things quite clear with respect to any future related endeavors. Following are a number of things

that future interested students may wish to consider.

Of these concerns, a primary one should be with valid and reliable instrumentation. This, of course, presupposes that a number of other conditions have been met, e.g., that the dependent and independent variables have been adequately operationalized. Gottlieb, Reeves, and TenHouten, in developing the facet design application of the Gottlieb-Guttman model, chose "perceptual states" and "level of involvement" (as determined by a questionnaire administered to college students) as corresponding, respectively, to the variables operationalized in this study: "perceived goal sympathy" (as determined by a questionnaire administered to students) and "relationship rating" (as determined by interviewing the referents).³²

For the above purposes the Gottlieb, Reeves, and TenHouten approach was not feasible since the object was to examine some of the presumed implications of students' perceptions for the relationships between them and referents. It is possible that a similar approach could be used in a much more comprehensive design. It should be remembered, however, that some indication of the nature of the relationship--independent of any antecedent perceptions--would be most useful to have.

A related concern here is the level of measurement. This has already been discussed as a possible shortcoming, but it ought to be made clear that it probably is legit-

imate to measure the two variables as continuous. Carefully constructed and pretested instruments, in addition to being a more accurate reflection of "reality," should make measurement and analysis possible at least at the ordinal level, thus allowing one to draw (or fail to draw) conclusions based on more precise observations.

Another concern centers around the ultimate usefulness of such observations. Future interested students would do well to use a more sophisticated sampling procedure--even if one is again only interested in exploring possible relationships rather than attempting to generalize to a population. The recommendation here is that one attempt to select a larger and more representative sample. In the present study only one residence hall staff and only males were included in the sample. This made it impossible to say anything about any possible sex differences or possible variations among student personnel services staffs.

If such an interested future investigator were interested in the possible practical implications of his work, he would also do well to retain residence halls as sampling units and familiarize himself with sampling problems peculiar to these sub-units. Trow, in a discussion of the administrative implications of research in higher education, writes that "...residence halls are usually things the administrator can do something about; they are manipulable. And when the social scientists can

say something concrete about the bearing of the residence halls on student life and the educational enterprize, then the administrator is more likely to pay real attention--and, conceivably, even to make use of those findings in his policy planning."³³

A final recommendation concerns the desirability of useful control. Control would, of course, again entail a more comprehensive design, but there are possible variables on which it may be useful to stratify samples or of which independent measures may be taken. Examples of the former could be sex, class standing, or cumulative grade point average. A possible example of the latter is suggested in some research reported by Stern concerning the implications of the relationships among situation, personality, and learning. Stern reports that in a number of situations the psychological variables authoritarianism, rationalism, and antiauthoritarianism were related to academic achievement as measured by common³⁴ objective examinations. To the extent that similar mechanisms are involved, similar relationships may hold.

Stern and his associates had something available to them, however, that was not available for this study and well may not be available for subsequent studies. Stern was able to use scores on common objective examinations as indications of learning. No similar device is available to indicate socialization. That the analytically distinct phenomena socialization and, say,

social control may be inextricably interwoven empirically suggests that one may only obtain less than concrete, quantifiable indications of socialization. Indeed, the ultimate usefulness of this entire explication depends on the tenability of the assumption that socialization was occurring (or was not blocked) in the setting from which the data were gathered. Perhaps a solution here is to simply define socialization in this "third stage" as that process during which college students become oriented to or involved with referents who are attempting to be of help to them.

FOOTNOTES

1. Gerald P. Burns (ed.), Administrators in Higher Education, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), see especially Chapter IX.

2. Ibid., passim.

3. Wilbert E. Moore, Social Change, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), pp.12-13 and 72-74.

4. David Gottlieb, Jon Reeves, and Warren TenHouten, The Emergence of Youth Societies: A Cross Cultural Approach, (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1963), p. 1b.

5. Letter from David Gottlieb, Washington, D.C., January 11, 1965.

6. Pitirim A. Sorokin, Society, Culture, and Personality, (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1962), p. 44.

7. Talcott Parsons, The Social System, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), pp. 8-9.

8. Sorokin, op. cit., pp. 44-47.

9. Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action, (2d ed.; New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), p. 51.

10. George C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1961), p. 13.

11. Ibid., p. 35.

12. Theodore M. Newcomb, "Varieties of Interpersonal Attraction," Group Dynamics, ed. Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, (New York: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960), p. 105.

13. Ibid.

14. Talcott Parsons, "General Theory in Sociology," Sociology Today, ed. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959), p. 30.

15. Ibid.
16. Parsons, Social System, pp. 206-207.
17. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), especially Chapters I and XI.
18. Terry F. Lunsford, (ed.), The Study of Campus Cultures, The Papers Presented at the Fourth Annual Institute on College Self Study, University of California, Berkley, July 24-27, 1962.
19. Howard S. Becker, "Student Culture," The Study of Campus Cultures, Ibid., p. 12.
20. Ibid., p. 13.
21. Martin A. Trow, "Administrative Implications of Analyses of Campus Cultures," Ibid., p. 105.
22. Ibid.
23. C. Robert Pace, "Interactions Among Academic, Administrative, and Student Subcultures," Ibid., pp. 55-80.
24. Parsons, Social Systems, p. 206.
25. Trow, op. cit., p. 105.
26. Parsons, Social Systems, pp. 204-205.
27. Howard S. Becker, "Changing Societies as Family Contexts," Marriage and the Family, ed. Howard Becker and Reuben Hill, (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1942), p. 4.
28. Howard Becker, Man in Reciprocity: Introductory Lectures on Culture, Society, and Personlaity, (Fredrick A. Praeger, 1956), p 398.
29. Leslie Kish, "Selection of the Sample," Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, ed. Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953), pp. 198-202.
30. Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman, Union Democracy, (New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 480-485.
31. Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), pp. 196-202.

32. Gottlieb, Reeves, and TenHouten, op. cit., p. 1c.

33. Trow, op. cit., p. 96.

34. George G. Stern, "Environments for Learning,"
The American College, ed. Nevitt Sanford, (New York:
John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 699.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Becker, Howard S. "Changing Societies as Family Contexts," Marriage and the Family. ed. Howard S. Becker and Reuben Hill. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1942.
- Becker, Howard S. Man in Reciprocity: Introductory Lectures on Culture, Society, and Personality. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, 1956.
- Burns, Gerald P. (ed.) Administrators in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Gottlieb, David, Reeves, Jon, and TenHouten, Warren. The Emergence of Youth Societies: A Cross Cultural Approach. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1963.
- Homans, George C. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1961.
- Kish, Leslie. "Selection of the Sample," Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences. ed. Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1953.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, Trow, Martin, and Coleman, James. Union Democracy. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962.
- Lunsford, Terry F. (ed.) The Study of Campus Cultures. The Papers Presented at the Fourth Annual Institute on College Self Study, University of California, Berkley, July 24-27, 1962. Includes: Becker, Howard S. "Student Culture;" Pace, C. Robert, "Interactions Among Academic, Administrative, and Student Subcultures;" and Trow, Martin, "Administrative Implications of Analyses of Campus Cultures."
- Moore, Wilbert E. Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Newcomb, Theodore M. "Varieties of Interpersonal Attraction," Group Dynamics. ed. Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. New York: Row, Peterson, and Company, 1960.

Parsons, Talcott. "General Theory in Sociology," Sociology Today. ed. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard Cottrell, Jr. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.

Parsons, Talcott. The Structure of Social Action. 2d ed.; New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. Society, Culture, and Personality. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1962.

APPENDIX A
INSTRUMENTATION

The following is a copy of the note attached to the questionnaire sent to the students in the sample:

Dear Student:

If you will glance at the attached questionnaire you will notice that there are a number of questions referring to a list of people who are presumed to be relevant to you and your life here at the university and possibly in your future. You are being asked to fill out the attached questionnaire so that answers to several carefully formulated research questions may be discovered. The answers to these questions are expected to be of practical importance to both educators and college students.

It is hoped that you will feel free to respond as candidly as possible. All your answers will be confidential; they will be used for the research being done and for no other purposes. Read each question carefully and make your responses as accurately and carefully as the structure of the questionnaire permits.

When you have finished, seal the completed questionnaire in the attached envelope and return it to Don Bybee (East Wilson Scholastic Graduate Adviser). This may be done in person or via the East Wilson reception desk. If you have any questions you may see or call Don Bybee at 3-0298. To be of use, the questionnaire must be returned no later than Friday, April 23.

The following is a copy of the questionnaire sent to the sample of students:

- I. Under your present circumstances here at the university, which one(s) of those listed below do you see as having an interest in you and your future? Place an X on the short line preceding each applicable response and/or write in an applicable response in the provided space.

____ An instructor or professor other than your

- _____ academic adviser.
- _____ Your academic adviser.
- _____ Your R.A.
- _____ A close friend other than your roommate.
- _____ Your roommate.
- _____ The head adviser or either graduate adviser in your residence hall.
- _____ Someone not listed. Please specify:_____.

II. In question number I above, if you indicated more than one response, circle the X preceding the one referring to the individual whom you see as having the most interest in you and your future.

III. Which of those listed below do you see as having a sincere desire or inclination to give you some kind of help or advice? Place an X on the short line preceding each applicable response and/or write in an applicable response in the provided space.

- _____ An instructor or professor other than your academic adviser.
- _____ Your academic adviser.
- _____ Your R.A.
- _____ A close friend other than your roommate.
- _____ Your roommate.
- _____ The head adviser or either graduate adviser in your residence hall.
- _____ Someone not listed. Please specify:_____.

IV. In question number III above, if you indicated more than one response, circle the X preceding the one referring to the individual having the strongest desire or inclination to give you some kind of advice or help.

V. Which of those listed below do you see as having the ability to give you useful or valuable advice or help? Place an X on the short line preceding each applicable response and/or write in an applicable response in the provided space.

- _____ An instructor or professor other than your academic adviser.
- _____ Your academic adviser.

- ___ Your R.A.
- ___ A close friend other than your roommate.
- ___ Your roommate.
- ___ The head adviser or either graduate adviser in your residence hall.
- ___ Someone not listed. Please specify:_____.

VI. In question number V above, if you indicated more than one response, circle the X preceding the one referring to the individual having the most ability to give you advice or help.

Following is a copy of the questions asked of the members of the student personnel services staff. The precoded responses were recorded on separate index cards.

Instructions:

At the end of this interview you will be asked to rate the relationship between you as an R.A. (or Head Resident Adviser or Graduate Resident Adviser) and the student on a six point scale ranging from very satisfactory to very unsatisfactory. The immediately following questions are asked to assist you in making this judgement by recalling specific features of the relationship to your mind.

1. In terms of the following continuum, how well do you know _____?
Very well (5), Well (4), Average (3), Slightly (2), Hardly at all (1).
2. How often do you interact with _____ compared with the rest of the men in the house (hall)?
Less than average (3), Average (2), More than average (1).
3. Has _____ ever come to you with any sort of problem?
Yes (2), No (1).
4. If "no," do you think it is likely that he ever will?
Yes (2), No (1).
5. If "yes," what kinds of problems usually?
Academic (3), Personal-Social (2), Other (1).
6. Do you think that the outcome was (is usually) satis-

factory for _____?

Yes (2), No (1).

7. Have you ever approached _____ about a problem?

Yes (2), No (1).

8. If "no," is there any specific reason? _____.

9. If "yes," what kind(s) of problems (usually)?

Academic (4), Personal-Social (3), Discipline (2),
Other (1).

10. If "yes," how did he (how does he usually) react at the time(s)?

Favorably (2), Unfavorably (1).

11. Do you think that _____ is currently benefiting from his stay in Wilson Hall?

Yes (2), No (1).

12. How would you as (an R.A., a Head, or Graduate Resident Adviser), and in terms of what you're trying to accomplish, rate the relationship between you and _____?

Very satisfactory (6), Quite satisfactory (5),
Just satisfactory (4), Just unsatisfactory (3),
Quite unsatisfactory (2), Very unsatisfactory (1).

APPENDIX B

ALTERNATIVE BREAKDOWN OF DATA

TABLE B-1. Relationship between the rating of relationships by Head and Graduate Resident Advisers and perceptions of goal sympathy by students.

<u>Perception of Goal Sympathy</u>	Relationship Rating	
	<u>Satisfactory f (%)</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory f (%)</u>
Desire and Ability	6 (75)	2 (25)
Desire or Ability	8 (57)	6 (43)
Neither Desire nor Ability	7 (41)	10 (59)

The data for this table are the same as for TABLE 4.1. The total N, therefore, is the same (i.e., 39). The X^2 for table B-1 is 2.67 ($p < .30$) with two degrees of freedom. TABLE B-2 (reproduced on the next page) is constructed from the same data used in TABLE 4-2. The total N is 67; the X^2 is 3.90 ($p < .20$) with two degrees of freedom. The percents in both tables were computed laterally.

TABLE B-2. Relationship between the rating of relationships by Resident Assistants and perceptions of goal sympathy by students.

<u>Perceptions of Goal Sympathy</u>	<u>Relationship Rating</u>	
	<u>Satisfactory f (%)</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory f (%)</u>
Desire and Ability	16 (73)	6 (27)
Desire or Ability	9 (47)	10 (53)
Neither Desire nor Ability	12 (46)	14 (54)

ROOM USE ONLY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293201454612