THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT ASSISTANT IN THE MEN'S RESIDENCE HALLS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Harold Roy Marquardt

1961

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT ASSISTANT
IN THE MEN'S RESIDENCE HALLS
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

presented by

Harold Roy Marquardt

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

William W. Jacquka
Major professor

Date June 5, 1961

O-169

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT ASSISTANT
IN THE MEN'S RESIDENCE HALLS
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

by Harold Roy Marquardt

The Problem

This study was designed to determine and examine the nature of and the differences in expectations that resident assistants, resident advisors, and students hold for the role of the resident assistant in the men's residence halls at Michigan State University.

Two major null hypotheses and one sub-hypothesis were tested with alternate directional hypotheses.

Major Null Hypothesis A: There is no difference in the expectations that resident advisors, resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students hold for the role of the resident assistant as measured by the instrument developed for the study.

Major Null Hypothesis B: There is no difference in the amount of consensus of expectations that resident advisors, resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students hold for the role of the resident assistant.

Sub Null Hypothesis C: There is no difference in the amount of consensus among the resident assistants on aspects of the resident assistant's role as measured by the sub-scales of the instrument used in the study.

Methods and Procedures

An instrument was designed to measure role expectations for the resident assistant and was distributed to a sample of 30 resident advisors, 39 resident assistants, 78 upperclassmen, and 78 freshmen students. The percentage of sample returns for each group ranged from 90 to 100 with a 92.4 per cent return for the total sample.

The total instrument was composed of 60 items divided into 4 sub-scales of 15 items each. The sub-scales were designed to measure the following areas:

Sub-scale I	Advisory
Sub-scale II	Administrative-Supervisory
Sub-scale III	Leadership
Sub-scale IV	Personal Characteristics

Five possible responses were established for each item; giving a range from a high to low expectation. Reliability was estimated to be .84 for the total instrument using Hoyt's method. Only content validity was established for the instrument based on a theory of role expectancy.

The hypotheses were tested by:

1. Analysis of variance, which locates the items on which there are significant differences in expectations among the groups.
2. Scheffe's test, which determines actual differences between means.
3. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of the variance, which indicates differences in consensus among the groups.
4. F_{max}, which measures differences in agreement of the resident assistants on the four sub-scales.

Results and Conclusions

Significant differences were found among the group expectations for the role of the resident assistant as measured by the total instrument and all four sub-scales. However, the differences did not rank as predicted in the alternate hypotheses. The expectations followed by resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students, in that order. The difference in expectations between resident advisors and resident assistants was not found to be significantly smaller than the differences between resident advisors and both student groups and between resident assistants and both student groups.

No significant differences were found in the amount of agreement within each group for the role of the resident assistant as measured by the four sub-scales and the total instrument.

The resident assistant group had approximately the same amount of agreement in what they expected of the resident assistant in the four areas measured by the sub-scales.

The conclusions based on the results of the study are:

1. Resident advisors, resident assistants, and students all differ significantly in their expectations for the resident assistant's role. However, upperclassmen and freshmen hold similar expectations.
2. Resident advisors have the most professional expectations, followed by resident assistants, with the least professional expectations being held by the students.
3. Consensus on expectations was nearly the same for all four groups. Training does not appear to increase homogeneity of expectations.
4. If role conflict for a group is measured by a lack of consensus on expectations, resident assistants are not in a role conflict situation. It might be concluded that adequate training can overcome conflict.

THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT ASSISTANT IN THE MEN'S RESIDENCE HALLS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Harold Roy Marquardt

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1961

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is indebted to a number of persons:

Dr. William W. Farquhar, his major advisor, for encouragement and careful examination of the rough draft of the study.

The members of his doctoral guidance committee, Dr. Walter F. Johnson, Dr. David R. Krathwohl, and Dr. Henry C. Smith for their valuable criticisms and suggestions.

Dr. John W. Truitt and Mr. Wayne F. Tinkle for their help on developing the rating instrument.

Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker for graciously sharing his experiences and helping to outline the initial proposal of the study.

Dr. Raymond O. Collier and Mr. John A. Paterson for their advice on statistical methods.

Dr. Hugh J. McCardle for his constant and effective prodding.

Dean E. G. Williamson for generously allowing the necessary time off to complete the study.

A friend in need, Mr. Fred Leafgren, who handled last minute emergencies unselfishly.

And especially to the most understanding and helpful person of all, his wife, Ingeborg, whose patience, assistance, and love were totally essential in the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

Page

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM: ITS NATURE AND IMPORTANCE

American universities have for the past 300 years provided housing and board for their students. One of the first buildings erected on the campus of Michigan State University was a residence hall named Saints' Rest. Such housing was usually constructed to provide the students with a place to sleep, eat, and study.

Not until the latter half of the nineteenth century did the first evidences of student personnel work find their way into the American universities. And beginning with the twentieth century, educators have become increasingly aware of the service which residence halls can perform in providing both social and educational opportunities for their residents. Initially, staff members were employed to live in the residence halls for the purpose of controlling student behavior and protecting the university's property. However, the trend since 1900 has been in the direction of providing positive leadership rather than negative restraint in the supervising of residence halls.

Arbuckle[1], Lloyd-Jones[2], and Wrenn[3] all agree that an important area of student personnel services is the supervision and integration of housing and food services to contribute to education in group living and social graces. The view of residence halls as a valuable contributor to the total education of students has received strong emphasis since World War II. Borreson[4] has stated that student housing involves more than just shelter, reasonable comfort, and sanitation. He indicated in 1949 that the problem of housing was one of the most pressing concerns of college administrators. He felt that the living environment within a housing arrangement should be used by the university to supplement and complement the classroom.

Sifferd[5] stated that if educators are truly concerned with educating the whole student and not merely his mental processes, they must not neglect the valuable contributions

---

1. Dugald S. Arbuckle, Student Personnel Services in Higher Education, New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1953.

2. Esther Lloyd-Jones and Margaret R. Smith, Student Personnel Work as Deeper Teaching, New York, Harper, 1954.

3. C. Gilbert Wrenn, Student Personnel Work in College, New York, Ronald Press, 1951.

4. B. James Borreson, "Student Housing as Personnel Work," Trends in Student Personnel Work, E. G. Williamson, editor. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

5. Calvin S. Sifferd, Residence Hall Counseling, Bloomington, Illinois, McKnight & McKnight, 1950.

which the residence hall can make. An important phase of such a comprehensive educational program is preparation for living in a democracy which Sifferd believes can ideally be learned from experiences provided through planned residence hall living.

However, the education of the whole student does not result from merely establishing and maintaining adequate physical facilities. Arbuckle[1], Lind[2], and Wrenn[3] have stated that in order for the residence hall to play an important and effective part in the total educative process, provisions must be made to develop a basic philosophy for the residence halls which is compatible with the educational philosophy of the university. This approach implies extensive thought and planning, and suggests that implementation of a basic philosophy is dependent upon proper staffing of the halls.

Residence hall staffs are the direct link through which the static physical housing facilities are transformed into dynamic laboratories for promoting a more thorough and comprehensive education. This places a heavy responsibility

---

1. Dugald S. Arbuckle, op. cit.

2. Melva Lind, "An Experiment in the Art of Living," Journal of Higher Education, XVII (Nov. 1946), pp. 433-436.

3. C. Gilbert Wrenn, op. cit.

upon the members who staff these halls. Browner[1] and Rhulman[2] have stated that residence hall counselors are expected to perform both a teaching and an administrative function. In order for a staff to perform its functions with the greatest effectiveness, it is important that its role is recognized and understood. Without this understanding it is improbable that individuals will be selected and trained in the most appropriate manner for achieving the educational goals of the residence halls and the university.

A limited amount of research has been performed on the problems of residence halls, and part of the research has been centered about the student assistants. Arbuckle[3] found a trend among the Big Ten universities and many other institutions of higher education toward an increasing use of student assistants as part of the personnel staffs of residence halls.

In his doctoral thesis, Raines[4] investigated the role of the part-time student assistant in the men's residence

---

1. Paul J. Browner, Student Personnel Services in General Education, ACE, 1949.

2. Jessie L. Rhulman (Ch.), Personnel Principles in the Chapter House, ACE, 1953.

3. Dugald S. Arbuckle, op. cit.

4. Max Reid Raines, The Role of the Part-Time Student Assistant in the Men's Residence Halls of the Big Ten Universities, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State College, 1952.

hall personnel programs of the Big Ten universities. In his survey of the Big Ten universities, Raines found that the student assistant was considered to be an indispensable element for satisfactory operation of a residence hall program. College administrators who were concerned with the educational aspects of the residence hall were giving more and more attention to the role of the part-time student assistant. Raines came to some interesting conclusions which helped to precipitate the current study. He found that the student assistant performed a variety of functions, and that contradictory functions frequently caused inconsistencies in his role as a personnel agent. Raines also felt that there was a need for clarification of many of the resident assistant's functions.

Michigan State University has one of the largest and one of the best known residence hall programs to be found in American universities. In implementing this program, Michigan State University has relied heavily upon part-time student assistants. At the time this study was performed, there were sixty part-time student assistants, or resident assistants as they were called, in the men's residence halls at Michigan State University.

Each undergraduate men's residence hall at Michigan State University is supervised by a full-time personnel worker who has the title of head resident advisor. He is married and doing part-time graduate study in the field of

College Personnel Work. He is assisted by graduate students who are called graduate resident advisors, and by either eight or ten undergraduate resident assistants. The graduate resident advisors are half-time employees and half-time students in College Personnel Work or an area related to the personnel field. The resident assistants are considered part-time employees and are allowed to carry a full academic load in their area of study. The resident assistant is the member of the personnel staff who has the most intimate contact with the students. He is responsible for the general welfare of the fifty to eighty students living in a subdivision of the residence hall.

In the past years, the resident assistant has performed a variety of functions, and his role has become increasingly complicated as the residence hall program has gained sophistication. Increased separation of differences between student expectations and advisor expectations for the role of the resident assistant is likely to have resulted from employing professional personnel workers for advisors. The resident assistant finds himself in a conflict situation when the expectations of his supervisor deviate from the expectations held by students. Knowledge of role expectations is basic to a better understanding of any differences and conflicts that might exist among and between resident advisors, resident assistants, and students.

The problem of this study develops out of the belief that different expectations are held for the role of the resident assistant.

Statement of the Problem

The general problem of this study is to determine and examine the nature of and the differences in expectations that resident assistants, resident advisors, and students hold for the role of the resident assistant in the men's residence halls at Michigan State University.

It is assumed that these groups do have different expectations and varying degrees of consensus concerning the resident assistant's role. The assumption of different expectations and varying degrees of consensus has developed from the following research and theoretical frame of reference. Gross, Mason, and McEachern[1] hypothesized that "The greater the homogeneity among or between position incumbents, the more consensus they will have on the expectations for their own and others' positions." The resident advisors tend to form a more homogeneous group than either the resident assistants or the students because they are older than most undergraduate students, they are working toward a post-graduate degree, their educational emphasis is College

---

1. Neal C. Gross, et. al., Explorations in Role Analysis, New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1956.

Personnel Work or a related field, they receive special training, and they attend twice weekly meetings together. The resident assistants tend to form a more homogeneous group than the students, resulting from primarily two processes affecting their position. First, the selection process usually requires that resident assistants have a 2.6 or better all-college grade point average. They must have demonstrated a potential for leadership and the ability to work and live harmoniously with other students. Second, the training procedure includes a fall orientation program, a three credit course which studies residence hall personnel work, and weekly group meetings within their respective halls.

This analysis then separates the resident advisors, resident assistants, and students into three groups having different degrees of homogeneity; the resident advisors being the most and the students being the least homogeneous group. It is assumed that the homogeneity of the group directly determines the homogeneity of the group's expectations for the role of the resident assistant.

However, Jacobson, Charters, and Lieberman[1] found that past role experience might influence the extent to which an

---

1. E. Jacobson et al., "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," Journal of Social Issues, 1951, pp. 19-27.

individual is in a conflict situation. Due to this, and because the resident assistant maintains two sometimes opposing roles (student and staff), it is likely that resident assistants as a group will agree less upon those aspects of their role for which advisor expectations differ most markedly from students' expectations.

Training is a major part of the internal development of the residence halls' advisory staff, comprised of resident advisors and resident assistants. The behavior of a group has been interpreted by Homans[1] to be the resultant of pressures of the environment and the internal development of the group. It can be assumed that advisors and assistants hold different expectations than do the students for aspects of the resident assistant's role, which are affected to a greater extent by training.

Jones and Thibaut[2] found that the perceiver, or for the purpose of this study the perceiving group, seeks out and interprets information about others which will best meet the needs of the perceiver in the situation of interaction. This means that distinct groups will also likely differ from

---

1. G. C. Homans, The Human Group, New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1950.

2. Edward E. Jones and John W. Thibaut, "Interaction Goals as Bases of Inference in Interpersonal Perception," Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo, editors, Stanford, California, 1958, p. 151.

each other in the expectations they hold for themselves or others. Because the resident advisors, resident assistants, and students have been distinguished as three distinct groups, it may be assumed that each group possesses different expectations for the role of the resident assistant. It may further be assumed that freshmen students, who have lived less than three quarters in the residence halls, will have different expectations for the role of the resident assistant than will upperclass students who have lived in the residence halls for more than five quarters.

Broadly stated, the basic hypotheses of the total study are as follows:[1]

1. Resident advisors, resident assistants, and students hold different expectations for the role of the resident assistant.

2. Resident advisors, resident assistants, and students differ in the amount of consensus they have for the role of the resident assistant.

Sub-hypotheses developed from the research previously discussed are:

a) Resident advisors and resident assistants are more similar to each other than they are to the students in the expectations they hold for the role of the resident assistant.

b) Freshmen and upperclass students have different expectations for the role of the resident assistant.

---

1. The working null hypotheses are stated in Chapter III, DESIGN OF THE STUDY.

c) Resident advisors have the greatest amount of consensus and students have the least amount of consensus for the role of the resident assistant.

d) Resident assistants have less consensus on aspects of the role of the resident assistant for which resident advisors and students have the least amount of agreement.

Importance of the Study

Hulett and Stagner[1] have found that differences in role expectations and degrees of consensus might result in the lowering of morale within an organization. Good morale is important for creating and maintaining an atmosphere which is most suitable for promoting the educational goals of the university through the residence halls. Role conflict and ineffectiveness results from different role expectations and degrees of consensus, according to a study by Getzels and Guba.[2] The implication is made that the effectiveness of a program is reduced by differences in both consensus and expectations of the participants. In line with this, the interpretation could be made that no matter how excellent a residence hall program may appear to be,

---

1. J. E. Hulett and R. Stagner, Problems in Social Psychology, an Interdisciplinary Inquiry, University of Illinois, 1952.

2. J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Role, Role Conflict and Effectiveness: an Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, pp. 164-175.

its final effectiveness is dependent upon the expectations held for the role of the resident assistant.

If the results of the Hulett and Stagner study are accepted, conflicting expectations pose a problem to achieving the educational goals of the residence hall program. Without a better understanding of role expectations within the residence hall setting, it is naive to assume that any program can approach its maximum effectiveness.

The main purpose of this study is to provide a better understanding of differences and similarities in the expectations that residence hall personnel workers hold for the resident assistant's role.

Definition of Terms

Role: Although role is interpreted differently by different investigators, for the purposes of this study role is broadly defined as follows:

"A role is a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position."[1]

Altering the definition of Gross, Mason, and McEachern, role, as applied to resident assistants, may be defined as:

---

1. N. Gross et al., op. cit.

. . . . a set of expectations applied to resident assistants by resident advisors, resident assistants, and students.

Head resident advisor: The head resident advisor is the highest ranking personnel staff member in the residence hall. He is a trained personnel person and resides in the hall. In this position he devotes full time to the direction and supervision of his particular residence hall. Administratively he is directly responsible to the Educational Director of the men's residence halls and works cooperatively with the related personnel services and referral agencies in the university.

Graduate resident advisor: Two graduate resident advisors are employed in each of the men's residence halls at Michigan State University. The graduate resident advisors are directly responsible to the head resident advisor and are the second highest ranking personnel staff members within the residence hall. In this role they aid the head resident advisor in the direction and supervision of the residence hall program. The graduate resident advisors are part-time personnel staff members and may carry ten hours graduate credit. It is preferred that their graduate work be directed toward a major in College Personnel Work or toward a closely related field.

Resident advisor: For the purposes of this investigation, head resident advisors and graduate resident advisors

were placed into one group. No advisor who had previously been a resident assistant was included in the category.

Resident assistant: Each men's residence hall at Michigan State University employs the services of from eight to ten student resident assistants. The number varies with the structure of the building. The resident assistant is usually a full-time undergraduate student and is permitted to carry a full schedule of credits in his chosen field. The resident assistant must maintain a 2.6 all college average on the four point basis.

The resident assistant is directly responsible to the head resident advisor and to the graduate resident advisors of his particular hall. He is the member of the personnel staff who operates at the level nearest the student. The resident assistant lives with the fifty to eighty men in his precinct and is responsible for the general welfare of the men in his care. He also shares a responsibility for the general residence hall program and is directly responsible for the residence hall program at the precinct level.

For the purposes of this investigation, only those resident assistants who had attended at least one fall pre-school Workshop and the fall term residence hall personnel work course were included.

Freshmen student: Any student with less than forty-two course credits who has lived in the Michigan State

University men's residence halls for less than three complete quarters.

Upperclass student: Any student with forty-two credits or more, who has lived in the Michigan State University men's residence halls for more than five complete quarters.

Precinct: Each residence hall building is divided into two wings. Each wing has from four to five floors and these floors are designated as precincts. The number of precincts varies with the size and structure of the building. Six of the residence halls have eight precincts, and two of the residence halls have ten precincts each. Each precinct has from fifty to eighty students and one resident assistant.

Outline of the Study

Chapter II is devoted to a review of the literature. Attention is given to research in the areas of residence hall personnel programs and role expectations.

In the third chapter the methodology and procedures used in conducting the study are presented. In addition, the statistical design and basic assumptions underlying the design are discussed in the chapter.

In the fourth chapter is included a description of the instrument used in securing the data for the study. The methods used to determine the reliability and validity of the instrument are outlined and the reliability coefficients for the instrument are presented.

The analysis of the data is presented in the fifth chapter.

The literature which provides the basis of the current study is critically reviewed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The purpose of Chapter II is to review selected research pertaining to residence hall personnel programs and role expectations.

Focus will be placed upon studies which pertain directly to the part-time student personnel worker and his role in the residence hall program. No attempt will be made to present historical or developmental literature. Excellent reviews of the history and development of residence hall personnel programs can be found in two Ph.D. dissertations; one by Raines[1] and the other by Nevison.[2]

Role theory research has been comprehensively reviewed by Nonnamaker[3] in his doctoral thesis. Much of the role theory research has examined role expectations with

---

1. Max Reid Raines, The Role of the Part-Time Student Assistant in the Men's Resident Halls of the Big Ten Universities, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State College, East Lansing, 1952.

2. Myrne Burdette Nevison, Differing Perceptions of Residence Counselors, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1957.

3. Eldon Ray Nonnamaker, The Role of the Enrollment Officer at Michigan State University, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1959.

check-lists and non-parametric statistical analysis techniques. The present review will be limited to parametric research on role expectations.

Residence Hall Personnel Programs

Max Raines[1] surveyed eight of the Big Ten universities' residence hall personnel programs. The purpose of his study was to: (1) define the role of the part-time student assistant in the residence halls; (2) determine the attitudes of personnel staff toward the role of the student assistant; and (3) evaluate the role of the student assistant.

Responses were received on a questionnaire from 359 staff members at different functioning levels in residence hall personnel administration. A response was generalized to be indicative of the role of the part-time student assistant if it was received on two-thirds of the questionnaires.

The conclusions were: (1) the student assistant performed a variety of functions; (2) contradictory functions caused inconsistencies; (3) work demands were usually greater than normally assigned for part-time work; (4) insufficient training reduced effectiveness; and (5) many functions of the student assistant needed clarifying.

---

1. Raines, op. cit.

Raines suggests a plan to overcome the problems presented in his conclusions: The use of graduate counselors who are more group stimulators than counselors.

The problem in the Raines' study was broadly defined but no attempt was made to develop a theoretical base. Because the study was primarily descriptive, the lack of a theory need not be considered as a serious limitation. The instrument was well defined although its construction was not clearly described. The nature of the sample remained unclear because of inadequate definition given to stratification within the sample.

The major limitation of the study is that conclusions are made concerning the role of the student assistant without the aid of probability models. The study is valuable because of the descriptive information. Generalizations based on the findings should be restricted and interpreted with caution.

Differing perceptions of residence counseling were investigated by Nevison[1] to measure the effectiveness of the residence hall personnel program at the University of Minnesota. The study was restricted to the job functions and personality traits of residence counselors in two women's residence halls. Hypotheses were presented

---

1. Nevison, op. cit.

in the form of questions. Statistical techniques were used to test the hypotheses. A rating scale developed by the investigator was distributed to 565 students and 18 residence counselors. Returns were received from 558 students and all 18 counselors. An estimated reliability coefficient of .93 was arrived at by retesting three counselors approximately two months after the initial administration. Content validity was claimed for the instrument.

The instrument was designed to measure perceptions of residence counselors and students for comparison on:

1. The amount of agreement between the groups on the relative importance of the items.
2. The items that each group thought most important or least important for the job or persons.

Probability models were used to analyze the data. Results of the study indicated that there was significant agreement between the student groups and residence counselors both on job functions and personality traits. The investigator was careful to restrict the conclusions to the residence halls in which the examinations were performed. Implications of the findings are presented as recommendations for improvement of the residence counseling program.

The problem of the study was initially stated as a need for evaluating residence hall personnel programs. The problem lacked precise definition and only tenuously associated with the hypotheses of the study. The hypotheses

were not clearly stated. The sample was adequately described regarding the size, selection, and distinguishing characteristics. The method of collecting data was clearly stated. Statistical results were clearly presented.

A major limitation of the study is that the findings provided an unsubstantiated measure of the effectiveness of the residence hall program. This was in part caused by the lack of an adequate theoretical base. Another major weakness was the insufficient sample of three, used for measuring reliability.

Recommendations were made for improving the residence counseling program. This was beyond the scope of the study and was arrived at tenuously. The study appears to be a broadly defined task with severe limitations in interpretation.

The relationship of personality characteristics of resident assistants to job performance was studied by Simons.[1] A job performance rating form was developed for the evaluation of 68 resident assistants in the men's residence halls at Michigan State University. Several personality appraisal instruments were administered to the resident assistants: The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality

---

1. Wesley S. Simons, The Personality Characteristics of the Residence Hall Assistant as Related to Job Performance, Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1957.

Inventory; the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey; the Allport-Vernon Study of Values; the Index of Adjustment and Values.

Resident assistants were divided into two groups on the basis of their evaluated job performance. Comparisons were made between the scores of the two groups on the personality measurement instruments.

Simons also studied the relationship of resident assistants and selected college student groups on the four personality instruments.

The problem being investigated was separated into four parts: (1) to determine the personality characteristics of resident assistants at Michigan State University; (2) to develop a method of rating job performance of resident assistants; (3) to measure personality differences between high performing and low performing resident assistants; and (4) to determine the advisability of using the personality instruments for the selection of resident assistants. No attempt was made to develop a theoretical base for the study.

The job rating instrument was considered to have face validity. From the data, Simons found that the rating form had sufficient reliability to classify resident assistants into high and low performing groups. The discriminating ability of the instrument for average performing assistants

was low. A limitation stated by the investigator was that raters from different halls rated resident assistants differently. It was concluded that the job rating instrument was still valuable and could also be used for periodic job evaluation interviews with the resident assistant.

No significant differences were found among high and low performing resident assistants on the Minnesota Personality Inventory. The high group scored above the low group on the Emotional Stability scale of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The Religious value scale of the Allport-Vernon Study of Values was scored higher for the top performing group than for the low group. The Index of Adjustment and Values showed no differences between the high and the low group.

Comparing resident assistants with selected student samples, Simons found that resident assistants were better adjusted and more suited for supervisory responsibilities than the student samples. Religious values as measured by the Allport-Vernon instrument were considered to be useful in the selection of resident assistants.

It was concluded that the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey showed the best probability of being successful as tools for resident assistant selection.

The problem presented in the study was well defined but the hypotheses were hidden and given little emphasis. Selection and size of the resident assistant sample was thoroughly covered. Descriptions of the student samples used were not complete although references were made to the original descriptions. The method of collecting data on resident assistants was thoroughly presented.

Chi-square and "t" tests were appropriately used to test the hypotheses. Findings of the various tests were consistent with the problem of the study.

The investigator recognized that generalizations of findings should be restricted to resident assistants at Michigan State University. The conclusion made that the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory is useful for selection purposes was not substantiated by the data. A limitation of other generalizations is that selected student samples used were from different student populations and chosen and tested at different times and for different purposes.

The Simons study is comprehensive and informative. More care in the selection of student groups would have enhanced the meaningfulness of the results. Also, development of a theoretical base for studying the problem would have improved the interpretative value of the design.

Parametric Research of Role Expectations

The role of the enrollment officer was examined by Nonnamaker.[1] A sample of seven groups from the campus of Michigan State University was surveyed on their role expectations of the enrollment officer. The groups included counselors and enrollment officers and students from several academic disciplines. An instrument containing 60 items and six sub-scales was developed by Nonnamaker. The reliability of the total instrument was determined by an analysis of variance technique and was calculated at .897. Both content and face validity were assumed for the instrument.

Expectations were measured by a choice of responses weighted from one to five. The intervals between the response weights were assumed to be equal. Differences in expectations among the seven groups were tested by the analysis of variance. Goulden's technique was used to identify which means of the seven were significantly different from each other.

The results were sufficient to reject the null hypothesis that no differences existed between the seven groups. No differences were found in the expectations held by student groups. Differences were found between the groups of enrollment officers.

---

1. Nonnamaker, op. cit.

Hypotheses were developed to be tested which is important to a non-descriptive study. However, the rationale for the hypotheses was not clearly defined. Although considerable research was presented in the review of the literature, lack of a theoretical framework poses a major limitation.

The sample was well defined and representative of the population. The instrument was developed with considerable care and based upon earlier research. Students were not included in the pilot study on a small sample, which might have resulted in lowering the instrument's validity when measuring expectations of students. To criticize the assumption that the intervals on the weighted scale are equal would not be appropriate, because weighted scales of this type have found considerable use and value in educational measurement. It might well be assumed that because expectations are dependent upon the subjective definition of each respondent, it is improbable that an attitude scale could be developed which would guarantee equal intervals.

The analysis of variance was appropriate for testing for differences between group means. The use of Goulden's technique[1] was not the most appropriate method for closer examination of mean difference because of the unequal sample

---

1. Cyril H. Goulden, Methods of Statistical Analysis, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1952.

sizes among the groups. The analysis of the data resulted in a statement of probability which was clearly defined.

The findings of the study were consistent with the problem and treated succinctly. The generalizations were well handled but a limitation results from a portion of the generalizations and conclusions being based only on inspection of the data in a non-statistical manner.

All in all, Nonnamaker's study was well defined and treated. Taking the strengths and the weaknesses into account, the study can be considered to have achieved the exploratory purpose for which it was designed.

A study by Videbeck and Bates[1] examines the relationship between conformity and role expectations. The general underlying assumption is made that "the behavior of a number of people in interaction is at least in part a function of their own expectations of what the behavior should be." The study is concerned with role expectations applying to a single type of behavior.

Five six-member groups were chosen from volunteers enrolled in an undergraduate sociology course. All members were in "the upper quartile of their class distribution on three standard educational criteria." All groups were given

---

1. Richard Videbeck and Alan P. Bates, "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations," Sociometry, 22:1-11, 1959.

an identical problem concerning a social service endeavor. The allotted time for completion of the project was 16 hours and was to be concluded with a written report.

Role expectations were measured in three steps: (1) identifying behavior which group members felt to be important to the group; (2) differentiating types of behavior to the degree to which it should be performed; and (3) differentiating to which degree each group member should perform a particular type of behavior.

The investigators recognized limitations of the study: (1) the size of the problem solving groups had an N of only six; (2) role expectations were limited to ten mutually exclusive acts; (3) only mean values were used in the analysis; and (4) the behavioral data represent perceptions about behavior rather than observations.

Four hypotheses were developed and tested:

1. Frequency of performance of an act will correlate with the intensity assigned to the act.
2. Correlation between frequency and intensity of acts will increase with an increase in consensus on inter-act intensity.
3. The frequency with which a person performs an act is dependent upon the intensity value it receives from the members of the group.
4. Combined role expectations will correlate with combined behavior frequencies.

To test the hypotheses, Kendall's tau was used. It was concluded that the three hypotheses linking intensity of

role expectations with differentials in member performance were strongly supported by evidence, but the hypothesis connecting consensus with variations in member performance was unacceptable.

The problem was well defined and the study is outstanding in the theoretical base from which the hypotheses were developed. The method of developing the hypotheses should serve as a valuable example to other researchers. The investigators recognized that the sample size was a limitation, but they did not indicate the weaknesses of making generalized conclusions from an atypical sampling of the population.

No attempt was made to check the reliability or validity of the set of ten acts by which role expectations were measured. Because of the many limitations of the study, the generalization of the findings should be restricted.

Summary

A critical examination was presented on research literature relating to role expectations and the residence hall student personnel worker. The problems, hypotheses, methodology, techniques of analysis, findings, and generalizations for several pertinent studies were examined and evaluated.

The review of the literature produced several important conclusions:

1. There is a recognized need for measuring the role of residence hall personnel workers.
2. An inadequate number (one) of the studies reviewed were based on a definitive theory.
3. Role expectations can be measured with specially constructed instruments.
4. Different groups which interact with the residence hall personnel program are considered to influence the success or lack of success of the program.
5. Role expectations for an individual have an effect upon the manner in which he performs.
6. Job performance of residence hall personnel workers can be measured.
7. Little attention has been given to the effects which differing role expectations have on the performance of the residence hall personnel worker.

The design of this study took into account the strengths, weaknesses, and findings of the literature

reviewed. The methodology, procedures, and statistical design are presented in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The study is designed to test differences in the expectations that resident advisors, resident assistants, and students hold for the role of the resident assistant in the men's residence halls at Michigan State University.

The Null Hypotheses

The basic research hypotheses for the study were stated in Chapter 1. Null hypotheses are formulated here to allow for statistical testing.

Null Hypothesis A

> There is no mean difference in the expectations that resident advisors, resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students hold for the role of the resident assistant as measured by the instrument developed for the study.

Symbolic representation for null hypothesis A is:

$$H_A: \mu_{r.advisors} = \mu_{r.assistants} = \mu_{upperclassmen} = \mu_{freshmen};$$

where μ = mean role expectations for the resident assistant held by the designated group.

The alternate hypotheses for null hypothesis A are:[1]

1. The highest expectations for the role of the resident assistant are held by the resident advisors, followed by the resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students, in that order.

Symbolic representation for alternate hypothesis A_1 is:

$$H_{A1}: \mu_{r.advisors} > \mu_{r.assistants} > \mu_{upperclassmen} > \mu_{freshmen}.$$

2. The difference between the resident advisors' and resident assistants' expectations for the role of the resident assistant is smaller than the differences between either the resident advisors' or the resident assistants' and either the upperclassmen or freshmen students' expectations for the role of the resident assistant.

Symbolic representation for alternate hypothesis A_2 is:

$$H_{A2}: \left| \mu_{r.advis.} - \mu_{r.ass't} \right| < \left| \begin{matrix} \mu_{r.advisors} - \mu_{upperclassmen} \\ \mu_{r.advisors} - \mu_{freshmen} \\ \mu_{r.assistants} - \mu_{upperclassmen} \\ \mu_{r.assistants} - \mu_{freshmen} \end{matrix} \right|$$

Null Hypothesis B

There is no difference in the amount of consensus (measured by the variance) of expectations that resident advisors, resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students hold for the role of the resident assistant.

Symbolic representation of null hypothesis B is:

---

1. Rationale is given on pages 8 and 9 of Chapter I.

$$H_B: \quad \sigma^2_{r.advisors} = \sigma^2_{r.assistants} = \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} = \sigma^2_{freshmen};$$

where σ^2 = consensus of expectations (measured by the variance) for the role of the residence assistant within the designated group.

The alternate hypothesis for null hypothesis B is:

> The highest amount of consensus for the role of the resident assistant is held by the resident advisors, followed by the resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students, in that order.[1]

Symbolic representation for alternate hypothesis B_1 is:

$$H_{B1}: \quad \sigma^2_{r.advisors} < \sigma^2_{r.assistants} < \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} < \sigma^2_{freshmen}.$$

Sub-hypothesis

A sub-hypothesis written in the null form is:

> There is no difference in the amount of consensus among the resident assistants on aspects of the resident assistants' role as measured by the sub-scales of the instrument used in the study.

Symbolic representation of the sub-hypothesis in the null form is:

$$H_C: \quad \sigma^2_{sub\ 1,r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{sub\ 2,r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{sub\ 3,r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{sub\ 4,r.ass't};$$

where $\sigma^2_{sub\ 1,2,3,\text{ and }4}$ refers to the consensus on each of the sub-scales of the instrument.

---

1. Rationale is found on page 8 of Chapter I.

The alternate sub-hypothesis is:

> Resident assistants have less consensus on those aspects of the resident assistant's role for which resident advisors and students disagree.[1]

Symbolic representation of the alternate sub-hypothesis is:

H_{C1}: σ_i^2 resident assistant $> \sigma_j^2$ resident assistant,

when

$$|\mu_i \text{ r.advisor} - \mu_i \text{ freshmen}| > |\mu_j \text{ r.advisors} - \mu_j \text{ freshmen}|$$

where i and j represent different subscales of the instrument.

The Sample

The null hypotheses were tested on a sample of resident advisors, resident assistants, and students in the men's residence halls at Michigan State University.

Resident Advisors

Both head resident advisors and graduate resident advisors are included in the sample. All resident advisors who were employed during the period between January, 1958 and June, 1960 were used.

To obtain a more homogeneous sample, resident advisors who previously had been resident assistants were not included. The total population of employed resident advisors

---

1. Rationale is given on page 8 of Chapter I.

not having resident assistant experience were selected for the study along with past resident advisors whose addresses were known. The size of the population before and after deletions is presented in Table 3.1. The sample totaled 30; 18 of which were resident advisors at the time of the study.

The instrument, which is described in the next chapter, was distributed to each resident advisor on campus and mailed to the past resident advisors. All 30 of the resident advisors returned the instruments for a 100 per cent response. Informal follow-up was made by phone to encourage the return of two delinquent forms. All instruments mailed were returned without follow-up which reflects the conscientiousness of the respondents.

Resident Assistants

Resident assistants from all men's halls but one were given the instrument.[1] The sample was further limited to those who had held their position for more than two class terms and had also taken part in the pre-school Advisory Workshop and the fall term residence hall personnel work

---

1. Because the investigator was the head resident advisor of one of the halls at the time of the study, neither resident assistants nor students assigned to this hall were sampled.

TABLE 3.1

Population of Resident Advisors

between January 1958 to June 1960.

Total	Former Resident Assistants	Addresses Unknown	Sample
43	8	5	30

TABLE 3.2

Population of Resident Assistants

At Time of Study

Total	Employed less than two quarters	Did not attend pre-school Workshop*	Did not attend Residence Hall Personnel Work Class*	Sample
52	10	2	1	39

*Resident Assistants who had been employed for more than two complete quarters but had not attended either the pre-school Workshop or the Residence Hall Personnel Work Class are recorded separately.

class.[1] The population size before and after deletions is presented in Table 3.2. The instrument was distributed to 39 resident assistants by their respective head resident advisors. Thirty-seven of the sampled resident assistants, or about 95 per cent, returned their questionnaires.

Students

Freshmen students and upperclassmen were selected in equal numbers. Sophomores, juniors, and seniors are included in the upperclassmen group. All selected freshmen had lived in the residence halls less than three quarters; all selected upperclassmen had lived in the residence halls for more than five quarters. Two freshmen and two upperclassmen were selected by use of a table of random numbers from each precinct where the resident assistant was given the instrument.

The instrument was delivered to the students, along with an envelope, by their respective resident assistants. The students were instructed to return the complete instrument within the sealed envelope. Seventy-one complete returns, or about 91 per cent of the 78 freshmen selected,

---

1. The pre-school Advisory Workshop is held just prior to the opening of the fall quarter and presents an initial orientation and theme for the approaching year. The residence hall personnel work class is conducted during each fall term for all new residence hall personnel staff members.

were received.[1] There were 70 complete forms returned by the upperclassmen, or about 90 per cent of those distributed.[2]

Sample Returns

The sample and the per cent of return for the instrument are presented in Table 3.3. A total of 92.4 per cent of the sample returned a completely answered instrument.

Statistical Analysis

Several measures were considered necessary to test the hypotheses of the study and to examine any differences in group expectations for the role of the resident assistant. Central tendency was used to obtain an indication of the average opinion of each group about the various aspects of the resident assistant's role. Variance was used to gain insight into the degree of agreement or consensus a group had for a particular expectation. Analysis of variance was used to compare all four groups and to determine whether their expectations differed significantly. Finally, Scheffe's technique was employed to determine exactly which groups were significantly different.

---

1. Two freshmen inventory forms had an item response omitted.

2. Three upperclassmen inventory forms had an item response omitted.

TABLE 3.3

SUMMARY OF SAMPLE RETURNS FOR THE VARIOUS GROUPS STUDIED

Group	Sample	Returns	
	n	n	%
Resident advisors	30	30	100
Resident assistants	39	37	95
Upperclass students	78	70	90
Freshmen students	78	71	91
Total sample	225	208	92.4

Description and Difference Statistics

Central tendency was determined by the mean or arithmetical average. Results derived from the "DEVCOR" program on the electronic digital computer at the University of Minnesota allowed for the variance to be computed from the deviations of the raw scores from the means.[1] The Bartlett[2] test for homogeneity of variance was used to test the null hypothesis of equal variances between groups. It was intended to apply the variance ratio[3] to consecutive pairs of variances to test the alternate hypothesis that the groups can be ranked on the amount of consensus with the resident advisors having the most consensus, followed by the resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen. However, no significant differences were found by Bartlett's test among the variances between the groups, thus eliminating the possibility of rank differences and the need for further testing.

F_{max}[4] measured differences in variances of resident assistants on the four sub-scales of the instrument.

---

1. $s^2 = \frac{(\bar{X} - X)^2}{N - 1}$

2. Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference, New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1953, p. 193.

3. Ibid., p. 185

4. Ibid., p. 192

Analysis of variance as described in Guilford[1] was used to test differences between the groups.

Assumptions of analysis of variance. Four basic assumptions are made when using the analysis of variance model:[2]

1. Observations within groups must be mutually independent. All four groups are from hypothetically different treatment population. Students were randomly selected, and resident advisors and resident assistants included the total available population.

2. Variance must be approximately equal within experimentally homogeneous sets. Norton[3] found that it is not necessary to be restricted by this assumption. (No tests were made for homogeneity of variance because the "J" distribution was not found by visual inspection.)

3. Variations within experimentally homogeneous groups must be from normally distributed populations.[4] However, Lindquist feels that the validity is affected little by violating this assumption.

4. The mean of the criterion measures must be the same for each treatment population. (This assumption was made when the null hypotheses were stated.)

---

1. J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, Third Edition, New York: McGraw Hill, 1956, pp. 256-257.

2. E. F. Lindquist, Design and Analysis of Experiments, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953, p. 75.

3. Dee W. Norton, An Empirical Investigation of Some Effects of Non-normality and Heterogeneity on the F-distribution, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, State University of Iowa, 1952.

4. Lindquist, op. cit., p. 81

Inherent in the above assumptions is the need for a metric or interval scale. The instrument used in the study, therefore, was designed with values assigned to the available responses for each item. The method of scaling is more thoroughly discussed in Chapter IV.

Scheffe's Technique. The analysis of variance technique can indicate only that differences do exist among the means of the groups being studied. To identify which means are significantly different, it is necessary to employ an additional method. A technique developed by Scheffe[1] satisfies this need. By using "within mean squares" obtained in the analysis of variance and the n's of the respective means being tested, he establishes an interval for each pair of means which indicates their difference from each other.

Scheffe's test declares that $\bar{X}_i$ and $\bar{X}_j$ are significantly different at level α if the interval produced by

$$(\bar{X}_i - \bar{X}_j) \pm \sqrt{(k-1)F_\alpha}\sqrt{WMS\left(\frac{1}{n_i} + \frac{1}{n_j}\right)}$$

does not include zero. $\bar{X}_i$ and $\bar{X}_j$ are the means being compared; k is the number of groups; F_α is the value of the "F" distribution at the desired confidence level; WMS is

---

1. Henry Scheffe, "A Method for Judging all Contrasts in the Analysis of Variance," Biometrica, Vol. 40, June 1953, pp. 87 - 104.

the "within mean squares" which is an estimate of the variance; and n_i and n_j are the respective sizes of the groups being compared.

Assumptions of Scheffe's Test. The same four assumptions made for the analysis of variance also apply to Scheffe's test. Because Scheffe's test is more strict than the F-test, Scheffe suggests using a confidence level of 10 per cent rather than the five per cent used in computing the analysis of variance.[1]

Analysis of Sample Returns

The data from the instruments were tabulated. The results were placed on IBM cards and processed using the "DEVCOR" program in the electronic digital computer. The means, sum of the scores, sum of the squared scores, and sum of the squared deviation scores were derived from the "DEVCOR" output. Variance was calculated using the sum of the squared deviation scores. Items, sub-scales, and the total instrument were tested by the analysis of variance. Scheffe's technique was applied where significant differences were found by the F-test. Bartlett's technique tested for differences in the variances of the sub-scales and the total instrument. F_{max} was computed to measure difference in variances of resident assistants on the four sub-scales.

---

1. Ibid., p. 71

Analysis of the results was done first for each sub-scale and its corresponding items followed by the analysis of the total instrument.

Summary

The null hypothesis, the sample, and the statistical analysis have been discussed. Measures used in testing the hypotheses are:

1. Arithmetic mean, which indicates the general opinion of a group to an item or set of items.
2. Analysis of variance, which locates the items on which there are significant differences in expectations among the groups.
3. Scheffe's test, which determines actual differences between means.
4. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of the variance, which indicates differences in consensus among the groups.
5. F_{max}, which measures differences in agreement of the resident assistants on the four subscales.

Because the study is not designed for predictive purposes but is primarily pilot in nature, it was decided to establish the 5 per cent level, except for Scheffe's technique, as the point at which the null hypotheses would be rejected. Because of the stringency of Scheffe's test, his suggestion of 10 per cent level was used.

The development of the instrument used to collect the data is presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

INSTRUMENTATION

This study is patterned after Nonnamaker's[1] investigation of the role of enrollment officers. Careful analysis of Nonnamaker's study and his methods for gathering information revealed that his approach was applicable to this study.

Development of the Instrument

For purposes of quantification and adaptability to statistical analysis, it was decided that the instrument should take the form of a questionnaire. Head resident advisors, graduate resident advisors, resident assistants, and students were interviewed and asked to describe what a resident assistant should do or be. A series of items was developed from these interviews. Simons'[2] "Resident Assistant Rating Form" was examined and used as a guide for formulating additional items.

---

1. Nonnamaker, op. cit.
2. Simons, op. cit.

A total of 114 items were developed for the initial pool. From the interviews with resident advisors, resident assistants, and students it appeared that the role of the resident assistant could be divided into several areas. After discussion with the Assistant Director of the Men's Division of Student Affairs and two doctoral guidance committee members, the following five categories were determined:

1. Advisory
2. Administrative-Supervisory
3. Leadership
4. Personal characteristics
5. Social interaction

The role of the resident assistant was considered to be mainly composed of elements found in these five categories. All areas except "Personal characteristics" and "Social interaction" are largely influenced by the personnel and living structure within the residence hall and relate directly to the job of the resident assistant. "Personal characteristics" relate more to the resident assistant as an individual and are less influenced by the job he is to perform. Raines[1] omitted the "Personal characteristics" category but he stated that it is "probably one of the most crucial qualities considered in the process of selection (of resident assistants)."

---

1. Raines, op. cit., p. 55; parenthesis mine.

The initial 114 items were submitted to three administrators in the Dean of Students' Office: The Director of the Men's Division of Student Affairs; the Educational Director of Men's Residence Halls; and the Assistant Director of the Men's Division of Student Affairs. All three administrators were thoroughly aware of the operations of the residence hall personnel program. The three men were asked to rate each item on the basis of its importance and significance in relation to the functioning of a resident assistant. The administrators were secondly asked to categorize each of the 114 items into one of the five groups listed above.[1] They were asked to perform each task separately. The following description was given for each aspect of the resident assistant's role to aid the administrative panel in making categorizations:

1. Advisory - performance of a function related to giving aid or guidance; helping students with problems or suggesting where they may receive help.

2. Administrative-Supervisory - performance of perfunctory type duties pertaining to the management of the residence hall; supervision of the students in the precinct or hall with regard to rules and regulations, safety, protection of private and university property; assistance to the business management of the residence halls.

---

1. The Resident Assistant Inventory form with instructions may be found in Appendix A.

3. Leadership - performance relating to the programs and activities of the precinct or residence hall; the ability to direct students toward positive goals.

4. Personal characteristics - traits of the individual which would be recognizable in non-residence as well as residence hall situations.

5. Social interaction - social mixing with students from the residence hall on an individual or group basis.

Examination of the rankings and categorizations of the items by the panel of administrators indicated that there were only four clearly distinguishable categories. The social interaction category was found to be vague and insufficiently important to the overall role of the resident assistant.

The administrative panel's agreement on the rankings of the items reduced the size of the pool to 78 items. Dividing the 78 items into the four remaining categories produced an unequal number of items in the different categories. The smallest number of items in any one division was 15. Therefore, all sub-scales of the instrument were limited to the 15 highest-ranking items to allow for easier statistical treatment. The total instrument containing the four sub-scales was thereby reduced from 78 to 60 items.

Preliminary Test of Instrument

The instrument was initially tested on twelve students and five resident assistants to determine the clarity of the

items and the instructions.[1] All 17 subjects were interviewed after completing the instrument. Suggestions were made by the subjects which indicated that certain items needed rewording. The instructions appeared to function properly, but because several item-responses were omitted by the subjects, it was decided to caution the respondents to be certain all responses were completed.

Final Instrument of the Study

The instrument was changed according to the suggestions of the preliminary subjects. Furthermore, the wordings of 16 items were reversed to reduce the likelihood of the subjects developing a set toward answering the items strongly positive. Thereafter, the entire instrument was presented to the panel of administrators for their comments and criticisms.

The final form of the instrument was developed with a total of 60 items, divided into four sub-scales of 15 items each.[2] The sub-scales measure:

1. Expectations for the resident assistant to perform advisory functions.
2. Expectations for the resident assistant to perform administrative-supervisory functions.

---

1. Subjects were drawn from the residence hall which was omitted from the study.
2. The final instrument may be found in Appendix B.

3. Expectations for the resident assistant to provide leadership.

4. Expectations for the resident assistant to display selected personal characteristics.

Scaling

In order to measure the expectations for the role of the resident assistant it was necessary to devise a method by which the strength of responses to the items could be measured.

A scale with five possible responses was selected. The responses were arranged in descending order from high positive to low negative. The subjects were asked to precede each item with "The resident assistant" and then select for each item the appropriate response from among the following: absolutely must; preferably should; may or may not; preferably should not; and absolutely must not.

All items were scaled so that the "absolutely must" response indicated the subjects' belief that it was important for the resident assistant to perform a function or possess a trait in order to properly conduct his job. The direction of weighting on the 16 reversed items was correspondingly changed so that scores on all items would be comparable.

Arbitrary values were assigned to each of the five possible responses. For ease of calculation, a weight of four was assigned to the "absolutely must" response, three

to "preferably should," two to "may or may not," one to "preferably should not," and zero to the "absolutely must not" response. All items were carefully worded with the purpose of making possible the selection of any of the five responses.

Administration of the Instrument

The instruments were delivered to the head resident advisors during the ninth week of spring quarter 1960. All head resident advisors who were directing halls on the Michigan State University campus were given sufficient forms and envelopes to include the resident assistants and students as specified in Chapter III. At the same time, the instrument was also distributed to past resident advisors.

Returns from resident assistants and students were received prior to the conclusion of spring quarter final exams. All returns from resident advisors were received within three weeks of the distribution.

Names of the respondents were not requested. The only method of identification used was for the purpose of distinguishing the four groups of subjects. The initials of the appropriate group were placed in the upper right hand corner of the instrument.

Scoring

The weights assigned to each of the responses were recorded on work sheets and punched into IBM cards for

processing as described in Chapter III. The means were given in the output of the electronic computer. Additional hand calculation was required for the variance, analysis of variance, and Scheffe's test.

The assumption is made that the zero to four values given to the five possible responses have equal intervals. This same problem was encountered by Gross[1] and Nonnamaker.[2]

The weighted response instrument has been considered appropriate and used satisfactorily for many problems of educational measurement. There is no reason to assume that the weighting of responses used in the study at hand should not also be appropriate and satisfactory.

Validity

A panel of administrators in college personnel work and professors in college personnel work helped to develop the items and the structure of the instrument. Resident advisors, resident assistants, and students were consulted and contributed items to the scale. The method of development of the items and the total instrument is sufficient to claim content validity for the instrument.

---

1. N. Gross, W. S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superindendency Role, New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1958.

2. Nonnamaker, op. cit., p. 46

Reliability

Because there was no single response which was considered to be right or wrong, it was necessary to find a test of reliability which could apply to items which have somewhat unrestricted scores. Hoyt and Stunkard[1] designed a test which met the need of the instrument. For this test the variance is computed both among items and among individuals. Theoretically, there is still variance which cannot be accounted for. The assumption is made by Hoyt and Stunkard that the unaccounted variance has resulted from inconsistency in the respondent's answers.

The Hoyt and Stunkard method was used to compute the reliability for the total instrument and for each of the sub-scales. The results of the reliability estimates are presented in Table 4.1.

A reliability coefficient of .80 is usually considered to be acceptable. The estimated reliability coefficient of .84 for the total instrument meets this requirement. Of the sub-scales, number two only is able to meet the acceptable level. Scales one, three, and four cannot be considered reliable and therefore should be interpreted with caution.

---

1. Cyril J. Hoyt and Clayton L. Stunkard, "Estimation of Test Reliability for Unrestricted Item Scoring Methods," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 12:756-758, 1952.

TABLE 4.1

RELIABILITY FOR THE TOTAL INSTRUMENT AND THE SUB-SCALES

Scale	Name	Reliability Coefficient
Sub-scale 1	Advisory	.49
Sub-scale 2	Administrative-supervisory	.82
Sub-scale 3	Leadership	.50
Sub-scale 4	Personal characteristics	.57
Total instrument		.84

Summary

The instrument in the study was developed from suggestions and information received from residence hall personnel, staff, and students. A panel of college personnel work administrators selected appropriate items and categorized them into four aspects of the role of the resident assistant: (1) Advisory; (2) Administrative-Supervisory; (3) Leadership; and (4) Personal Characteristics. The instrument of 60 items was preliminarily tested on a small sample. Changes were made in the instrument following the preliminary test. The instrument was examined by the panel prior to the final distribution. Scoring weights for items were arbitrarily set at 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Validity for the instrument was measured by the content. Hoyt's technique was used to measure reliability. Satisfactory reliability was achieved for the total instrument (.84) and the Administrative-Supervisory scale (.82). The other three sub-scales had estimated reliabilities of .49, .50, and .57.

CHAPTER V

THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the data from each sub-scale is analyzed along with the individual items to test the hypotheses presented in Chapter III. The total instrument will be discussed after the four sub-scales have been examined.

Analysis of Expectations Held for the Resident Assistant to Perform Advisory Functions (Sub-scale I)

The means, variance, and analysis of variance for all items in Sub-scale I are presented in Table 5.1. Comparisons of mean scores calculated by Scheffe's test are reported in Table 5.2. Results of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance are presented at the end of Table 5.1 and also in Table 5.13. Presentation of the major null hypotheses and alternate hypotheses together with the findings of the tests of the hypotheses may be found in Table 5.3.

Major Null Hypothesis H_A: $\mu_{r.advisors} = \mu_{r.assistants} = \mu_{upperclassmen} = \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. A significant difference was found at the one per cent level of confidence

TABLE 5.1

ANALYSIS OF THE FIFTEEN ITEMS IN SUB-SCALE I
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO PERFORM ADVISORY FUNCTIONS

Legend: In column 1, m equals mean and s^2 equals variance. Column 6 is the small f obtained through analysis of variance for the mean scores. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance was computed for the sum of the items in Sub-scale I. The result is given in column 7. One percent significance is indicated by two asterisks, and 5 per cent significance by one asterisk.

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:		1 Resident Advisors	2 Resident Assistants	3 Upper-Classmen	4 Freshmen	5 f	6 B
1.	Be available to help his men with their problems	m s^2	3.70 .22	3.70 .21	3.10 .29	3.27 .28	16.46**	
5.	Not interfere with or help his precinct chairmen #	m s^2	2.43 .94	2.14 .84	2.03 .66	1.94 .74	2.35	
9.	Have an awareness of basic counseling techniques	m s^2	3.20 .30	3.19 .60	3.36 .52	3.27 .46	.63	
13.	Discuss his men's personal problems with other precinct members #	m s^2	3.57 .46	3.73 .37	3.61 .47	3.41 .93	1.59	
17.	Advise his committee chairmen on their jobs	m s^2	3.20 .37	3.03 .42	2.84 .24	2.87 .60	7.94**	

TABLE 5.1 (continued)

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:		1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
21.	Help his men to improve their study habits	m_2		3.23	3.16	2.81	2.97	3.96**	
		s^2		.25	.25	.69	.32		
25.	Discuss with other students matters which his men told him in confidence #	m_2		3.93	3.89	3.83	3.75	1.14	
		s^2		.13	.27	.20	.42		
29.	Be as much concerned with causes of behavior as with the behavior itself	m_2		3.43	3.40	3.16	3.00	3.94**	
		s^2		.60	.36	.51	.57		
33.	Refer all problems of which he is uncertain to the Head Adviser	m_2		3.20	3.03	3.04	2.66	3.52*	
		s^2		.65	.58	.94	.86		
37.	Form opinions of his men quickly so that he will know how to work with them #	m_2		3.23	2.70	2.81	2.45	4.71**	
		s^2		.80	.82	.99	1.08		
41.	Help students with minor problems and refer serious problems to proper place	m_2		3.47	3.03	2.73	2.65	8.86**	
		s^2		.60	.42	.64	.72		
45.	Be discreet in questioning others about their personal lives	m_2		3.40	3.16	3.37	3.31	.99	
		s^2		.25	.42	.58	.39		

TABLE 5.1 (continued)

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
49.	Regularly discuss the problems of his men with the Head Advisor	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.53 .26	2.89 .43	2.31 .77	2.28 .55	25.03**	
53	Initially accept the student's point of view, even if he doesn't agree	$\bar{x}$ s^2	1.80 1.20	2.00 .44	2.04 .77	2.06 .74	.68	
57.	Be able to make criticisms in a manner which will not offend his men	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.30 .29	3.05 .44	3.17 .43	3.20 .36	.89	
	<u>Sub-scale I</u> - All items Advisory functions	$\bar{x}$ s^2	48.67 10.44	46.14 13.01	44.31 15.73	43.11 11.93	18.51**	2.27

#Scoring reversed

TABLE 5.2

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE'S TEST OF MEAN SCORES FOR ITEMS FOUND TO HAVE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS IN SUB-SCALE I: ADVISORY FUNCTIONS

Legend: All possible comparisons between group mean scores of items which had significant differences according to the analysis of variance are presented in this table. By use of Scheffe's technique an interval has been established for each comparison. The difference is significant if the interval does not include zero. Significance at the .10 confidence level is indicated by an asterisk in the column labeled significant difference.

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
1. Be available to help his men with their problems	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.70 - 3.70)	+.32 to - .32	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.70 - 3.10)	+.88 to + .32	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.70 - 3.27)	+.71 to + .15	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.70 - 3.10)	+.86 to + .34	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.70 - 3.27)	+.69 to + .17	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.27 - 3.10)	+.05 to - .39	
17. Advise his committee chairmen on their jobs	r.advisors - r.assistant	(2.43 - 2.14)	+.57 to - .23	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(2.43 - 2.03)	+.71 to + .01	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(2.43 - 1.94)	+.68 to - .02	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.14 - 2.03)	+.52 to - .14	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.14 - 1.94)	+.49 to - .17	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.03 - 1.94)	+.24 to - .30	

TABLE 5.2 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
21. Help his men to improve their study habits	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.23 - 3.16)	+.48 to - .34	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.23 - 2.81)	+.78 to + .06	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.23 - 2.97)	+.62 to - .10	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.16 - 2.81)	+.68 to + .02	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.16 - 2.97)	+.52 to - .14	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.81 - 2.97)	+.12 to - .44	
29. Be as much concerned with cause of behavior as with behavior itself	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.43 - 3.40)	+.48 to - .42	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.43 - 3.16)	+.67 to - .13	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.43 - 3.00)	+.83 to + .03	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.40 - 3.16)	+.61 to - .13	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.40 - 3.00)	+.77 to + .03	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.16 - 3.00)	+.47 to - .15	
33. Refer all problems of which he is uncertain to the Head Adviser	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.20 - 3.03)	+.73 to - .39	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.20 - 3.04)	+.66 to - .34	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.20 - 2.66)	+1.04 to + .06	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.03 - 3.04)	+.45 to - .47	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.03 - 2.66)	+.83 to - .09	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.04 - 2.66)	+.76 to .00	

TABLE 5.2 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
37. Form opinions of his men quickly so that he will know how to work with them #	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.23 - 2.70)	+1.14 to - .08	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.23 - 2.81)	+ .96 to - .12	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.23 - 2.45)	+1.32 to + .24	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.70 - 2.81)	+ .40 to - .62	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.70 - 2.45)	+ .75 to - .25	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.81 - 2.45)	+ .78 to - .06	
41. Help students with minor problems and refer serious problems to proper place	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.47 - 3.03)	+ .93 to - .50	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.47 - 2.73)	+1.17 to + .31	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.47 - 2.65)	+1.25 to + .39	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.03 - 2.73)	+ .70 to - .10	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.03 - 2.65)	+ .78 to - .02	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.73 - 2.65)	+ .42 to - .26	
49. Regularly discuss the problems of his men with the Head Advisor	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.53 - 2.89)	+1.05 to + .18	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.53 - 2.31)	+1.64 to + .80	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.53 - 2.28)	+1.66 to + .84	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.89 - 2.31)	+ .97 to + .20	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.89 - 2.28)	+ .99 to + .23	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.31 - 2.28)	+ .35 to - .29	

TABLE 5.2 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
Sub-scale I - All items Advisory functions	r.advisors - r.assistants	(48.67 - 46.14)	+4.79 to + .27	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(48.67 - 44.31)	+6.36 to +2.36	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(48.67 - 43.11)	+7.56 to +3.56	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(46.14 - 43.31)	+3.70 to - .04	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(46.14 - 43.11)	+4.89 to +1.17	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(44.31 - 43.11)	+2.75 to - .35	

#Scoring reversed

TABLE 5.3

RESULTS OF THE TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES FOR SUB-SCALE I
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO PERFORM ADVISORY FUNCTIONS

Legend: R indicates rejection of the hypothesis. A indicates that the hypothesis is accepted. Significance of .01 is indicated by two asterisks. One asterisk is used for the .05 confidence level.

Hypotheses	Items 1	5	9	13	17	21	25	29	33	37	41	45	49	53	57	All Items Sub-Scale I	Test
Null H_A: $\mu_{r.adv.} = \mu_{r.ass't} = \mu_{u.c.} = \mu_{fr.}$	R**	A	A	A	R**	R**	A	R**	R*	R**	R**	A	R**	A	A	R**	Analysis of Variance
Alt. H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.adv.} > \mu_{r.ass't} > \mu_{u.c.} > \mu_{fr.}$	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Scheffe
Alt. H_{A2}: $\left\lvert \begin{matrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{r.ass't} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{matrix} \right\rvert < \left\lvert \begin{matrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{matrix} \right\rvert$	A	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Scheffe
Null H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} = \sigma^2_{r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{u.c.} = \sigma^2_{fr.}$																A	Bartlett
Alt. H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} < \sigma^2_{r.ass't} < \sigma^2_{u.c.} < \sigma^2_{fr.}$																R	

between the mean scores of the four groups for Sub-scale I. Null hypothesis H_A is rejected.

Item analysis. There was a significant difference between the mean scores on eight of the fifteen items (#1, 17, 21, 29, 33, 37, 41, and 49) of Sub-scale I. Mean scores of seven items were significantly different at the one per cent level and one item (#33) was significantly different at the five per cent level of confidence. The null hypothesis H_A must be rejected for the eight items listed.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.advisors} > \mu_{r.assistants} > \mu_{upperclassmen} > \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. The alternate hypothesis H_{A1} is rejected with the following inferred relationships observed from the data:[1]

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
48.67	46.14	44.31	43.11

Item analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A1} must be rejected for each item in Sub-scale I. The observed relationships are presented in Table 5.2.

---

1. Means connected by a continuous underline have not been found to be significantly different by Scheffe's test.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A2}:

$$\left|\mu_{r.advisor} - \mu_{r.assistant}\right| < \left|\begin{matrix}\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.}\end{matrix}\right|$$

Sub-scale analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} is rejected with the following inferred relationships observed from the data:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
48.67	46.14	44.31	43.11

Item analysis. The mean scores for Item #1 are as follows:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
3.70	3.70	3.10	3.27

Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} may therefore be accepted for this item. All other items in Sub-scale I do not meet the requirements of the alternate hypothesis. The observed relationships are given in Table 5.2.

Major Null Hypothesis H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} = \sigma^2_{r.assistants} = \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} = \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. No significant differences were found between the variances of the four groups when tested by Bartlett's technique. Null hypothesis H_B must be accepted.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} < \sigma^2_{r.assistants} < \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} < \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Alternate hypothesis H_{B1} must be rejected because of the similarity among the variances of the four groups.

Interpretation of Results

The mean scores indicate the degree of importance that a group expects each item or sub-scale to play in the overall role of the resident assistant. Mean scores have a possible range of from zero to 60 for each sub-scale and from zero to four for each item. The group which has the highest mean score for an item or a sub-scale is considered to place greater importance, compared with the other three groups, upon that item or sub-scale.

The differences in the mean scores among the four groups indicate lack of agreement in what is expected of a resident assistant's advisory function. Review of Table 5.2 shows that resident advisors place greater importance upon aspects of the resident assistant's role relating to advisory responsibilities than do either resident assistants or students. Also, resident assistants place significantly greater importance on the advisory aspects than do freshmen students. Expectations of resident advisors and resident assistants cannot be considered to be more alike than the expectations of students and resident

advisors or resident assistants. The results of Bartlett's test give no reason to believe that any one group is more in agreement in their expectations than any other group.

The eight items on Sub-scale I for which the four groups hold significantly different expectations lead to the following interpretation: Resident advisors thought it more important for resident assistants to carry out the functions described in these eight items than did at least one student group. On only two items (#1 and #49) did both resident advisors and resident assistants differ from both student groups in the expectations. On Item #1 resident advisors and resident assistants were more similar to each other than they were to either student groups in the expectations they held. Resident advisors placed significantly more importance on Item #49 than did the resident assistants. On no other item relating to advisory functions was there a significant difference between resident advisors and resident assistants on the expectations held.

Analysis of Expectations Held for the Resident Assistant to Perform Administrative-Supervisory Functions: (Sub-scale II)

The means, variance, and analysis of variance figures for all items in Sub-scale II are presented in Table 5.4. Comparisons of mean scores calculated by Scheffe's test are reported in Table 5.5. Results of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance are presented at the end of Table 5.4

and also in Table 5.13. The major null hypotheses and alternate hypotheses together with the findings of the tests of the hypotheses may be found in Table 5.6.

Major Null Hypothesis H_A: $\mu_{r.advisors} = \mu_{r.assistants} = \mu_{upperclassmen} = \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. The mean scores of the four groups were found to be unequal at the .01 level of significance. Null hypothesis H_A must be rejected.

Item analysis. Significant differences were found at the .01 level among the mean scores for eleven of the items (#6, 10, 14, 22, 26, 30, 34, 38, 42, 46, and 54). Mean scores on Items #2 and 50 differed significantly at the .05 level of confidence. Null hypothesis H_A must be rejected for all thirteen of the above items.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.advisors} > \mu_{r.assistants} > \mu_{upperclassmen} > \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A1} is rejected with the following inferred relationships observed from the data:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
47.83	44.62	36.49	36.21

TABLE 5.4

ANALYSIS OF ITEMS IN SUB-SCALE II
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO PERFORM ADMINISTRATIVE-SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Legend: In column 1, m equals mean and s^2 equals variance. Column 6 is the small f obtained through analysis of variance. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance was computed for the sum of the items in Sub-scale II. The result is given in column 7. One per cent significance is indicated by two asterisks, and 5 per cent significance by one asterisk.

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
2.	Discipline his men in the presence of other students #	m_2	3.10	2.94	2.74	2.58	3.27*	
		s^2	.37	.44	.89	.85		
6.	Let his men know when he disagrees with higher decisions he must enforce #	m_2	3.13	3.43	2.11	1.96	22.73**	
		s^2	1.02	.42	1.26	1.31		
10.	Be able to explain the philosophy of the University and the residence halls	m_2	3.63	3.68	3.27	3.31	4.27**	
		s^2	.66	.28	.43	.56		
14.	Keep record of his men's behavior to more accurately evaluate them at the end of the year	m_2	3.23	2.86	2.37	2.35	10.35**	
		s^2	.66	.34	.73	.95		
18.	Place loyalty to the Head Advisor ahead of being loyal to his men	m_2	2.70	2.49	1.71	1.62	1.08	
		s^2	1.11	.98	1.16	1.41		

TABLE 5.4 (continued)

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
22.	Have authority in any precinct of the residence hall	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.50 .26	3.35 .57	2.00 1.91	2.01 1.50	23.31**	
26.	Evaluate each man's performance in the precinct's and hall's program	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.10 .58	2.89 .54	2.13 .95	2.14 .87	14.04**	
30.	Through discipline make examples of students who break rules #	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.17 .42	2.30 .71	2.38 .94	2.39 .81	7.05**	
34.	Keep Resident Advisors informed on his precinct's activities and programs	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.70 .22	3.08 .41	2.74 .61	2.70 .38	18.75**	
38.	Have a positive attitude toward the residence hall program and the University	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.77 .18	3.46 .25	3.07 .77	3.03 1.12	7.09**	
42.	Carry out administrative policy even though he disagrees with the policy	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.67 .30	3.46 .70	3.00 .70	3.08 .59	7.03**	
46.	Use discretion in reporting students for having alcohol in the residence hall #	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.03 2.24	3.19 1.88	2.38 2.04	2.18 2.34	5.24**	

TABLE 5.4 (continued)

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
50.	Be consistent so that all students are disciplined in the same way #	m s^2	1.37 1.55	1.27 1.04	.83 .84	.87 .74	3.53*	
54.	Not talk against the residence hall or University before his men	m s^2	3.47 .67	3.24 .47	2.44 .71	2.62 .76	15.58**	
58	Post notices on the precinct bulletin board in an interesting manner to keep his men well informed	m s^2	3.27 .20	2.97 .53	3.28 .26	3.25 .42	2.53	
	<u>Sub-scale II</u> - All items Administrative-Supervisory	m s^2	47.83 17.94	44.62 15.24	36.49 20.37	36.21 25.00	71.76**	3.00

#Scoring reversed

TABLE 5.5

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE'S TEST OF MEAN SCORES FOR ITEMS FOUND TO HAVE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS IN SUB-SCALE II: ADMINISTRATIVE-SUPERVISORY

Legend: All possible comparisons between group mean scores of items which had significant differences according to the analysis of variance are presented in this table. By use of Scheffe's technique an interval has been established for each comparison. The difference is significant if the interval does not include zero. Significance at the .10 confidence level is indicated by an asterisk in the column labeled significant difference.

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
2. Discipline his men in the presence of other students #	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.10 - 2.94)	+ .69 to - .37	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.10 - 2.74)	+ .83 to - .11	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.10 - 2.58)	+ .99 to + .05	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.94 - 2.74)	+ .64 to - .24	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.94 - 2.58)	+ .80 to - .08	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.74 - 2.58)	+ .52 to - .20	
6. Let his men know when he disagrees with higher decisions he must enforce #	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.13 - 3.43)	+ .35 to - .95	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.13 - 2.11)	+ 1.60 to + .44	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.13 - 1.96)	+ 1.75 to + .59	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.43 - 2.11)	+ 1.86 to + .78	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.43 - 1.96)	+ 2.01 to + .93	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.11 - 1.96)	+ .60 to - .30	

TABLE 5.5 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
10. Be able to explain the philosophy of the University and the residence halls	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.63 - 3.69)	+ .38 to - .48	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.63 - 3.27)	+ .74 to - .02	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.63 - 3.31)	+ .70 to - .06	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.68 - 3.27)	- .77 to + .05	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.68 - 3.31)	+ .72 to + .01	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.27 - 3.31)	+ .26 to - .34	
14. Keep record of his men's behavior to more accurately evaluate them at the end of the year	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.23 - 2.86)	+ .90 to - .16	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.23 - 2.37)	+ 1.33 to + .39	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.23 - 2.35)	+ 1.35 to + .44	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.86 - 2.37)	+ .93 to + .05	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.86 - 2.35)	+ .95 to + .07	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.37 - 2.35)	+ .38 to + .34	
22. Have authority in any precinct of the residence hall	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.50 - 3.35)	+ .55 to - .25	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.50 - 2.00)	+ 1.86 to +1.14	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.50 - 2.01)	+ 1.85 to +1.13	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.35 - 2.00)	+ 1.68 to +1.02	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.35 - 2.01)	+ 1.67 to +1.01	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.00 - 2.01)	+ .27 to - .29	

TABLE 5.5 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
26. Evaluate each man's performance in the precinct's and hall's program	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.10 - 2.89)	+ .76 to - .34	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.10 - 2.13)	+ 1.46 to + .48	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.10 - 2.14)	+ 1.45 to + .47	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.89 - 2.13)	+ 1.22 to + .30	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.89 - 2.14)	+ 1.20 to + .29	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.13 - 2.14)	+ .37 to - .39	
30. Through discipline make examples of students who break rules #	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.17 - 2.30)	+ 1.42 to + .32	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.17 - 2.38)	+ 1.28 to + .30	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.17 - 2.39)	+ 1.27 to + .29	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.30 - 2.38)	+ .37 to - .53	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.30 - 2.39)	+ .36 to - .54	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.38 - 2.39)	+ .37 to - .39	
34. Keep Resident Advisors informed on his precinct's activities and programs	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.70 - 3.08)	+ 1.03 to + .21	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.70 - 2.74)	+ 1.33 to + .60	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.70 - 2.70)	+ 1.37 to + .64	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.08 - 2.74)	+ .68 to 0	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.08 - 2.70)	+ .72 to + .04	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.74 - 2.70)	+ .32 to - .24	

TABLE 5.5 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
38. Have a positive attitude toward the residence hall program and the University	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.77 - 3.46)	+ .84 to - .22	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.77 - 3.07)	+ 1.17 to + .23	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.77 - 3.03)	+ 1.20 to + .28	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.46 - 3.07)	+ .82 to - .04	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.46 - 3.03)	+ .86 to 0	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.07 - 3.03)	+ .40 to - .32	
42. Carry out administrative policy even though he disagrees with the policy	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.67 - 3.46)	+ .69 to - .27	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.67 - 3.00)	+ 1.10 to + .24	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.67 - 3.08)	+ 1.02 to + .16	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.46 - 3.00)	+ .86 to + .06	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.46 - 3.08)	+ .25 to - .41	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.00 - 3.08)	+ .25 to - .41	
46. Use discretion in reporting students for having alcohol in the hall #	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.03 - 3.19)	+ .75 to -1.07	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.03 - 2.38)	+ 1.46 to - .16	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.03 - 2.18)	+ 1.65 to + .05	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.19 - 2.38)	+ 1.56 to + .06	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.19 - 2.18)	+ 1.76 to + .26	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.38 - 2.18)	+ .82 to - .42	

TABLE 5.5 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
50. Be consistent so that all students are disciplined in the same way	r.advisors - r.assistants	(1.37 - 1.27)	+ .70 to - .50	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(1.37 - .83)	+ 1.07 to + .01	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(1.37 - .87)	+ 1.03 to - .03	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(1.27 - .83)	+ .94 to - .06	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(1.27 - .87)	+ .90 to - .10	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(.83 - .87)	+ .37 to - .45	
54. Not talk against the residence hall or University before his men	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.47 - 3.24)	+ .74 to - .22	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.47 - 2.44)	+ 1.49 to + .75	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.47 - 2.62)	+ 1.30 to + .40	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.24 - 2.44)	+ 1.22 to + .38	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.24 - 2.62)	+ 1.04 to + .20	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.44 - 2.62)	+ .172 to - .53	
Sub-scale II - All items Administrative-Supervisory	r.advisors - r.assistants	(47.83 - 44.62)	+ 6.04 to + .38	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(47.83 - 36.49)	+13.85 to +8.83	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(47.83 - 36.21)	+14.12 to +9.12	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(44.62 - 36.49)	+10.47 to +5.79	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(44.62 - 36.21)	+10.74 to +6.08	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(36.49 - 36.21)	+ 2.22 to -1.66	

#Scoring reversed

TABLE 5.6

RESULTS OF THE TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES FOR SUB-SCALE II
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO PERFORM ADMINISTRATIVE-SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS

Legend: R indicates rejection of the hypothesis. A indicates that the hypothesis is accepted. Significance of .01 is indicated by two asterisks. One asterisk is used for the .05 confidence level.

Hypotheses	Items 2	6	10	14	18	22	26	30	34	38	42	46	50	54	58	All Items Sub-Scale II	Test
Null H_A: $\mu_{r.adv.} = \mu_{r.ass't} = \mu_{u.c.} = \mu_{fr.}$	R **	R **	R **	R **	A	R **	R **	R **	R **	R **	R **	R **	R *	R **	A	R **	Analysis of Variance
Alt. H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.adv.} > \mu_{r.ass't} > \mu_{u.c.} > \mu_{fr.}$	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Scheffe
Alt. H_{A2}: $\lvert\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{r.ass't}\rvert < \lvert\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.}\rvert$, $\lvert\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.}\rvert$, $\lvert\mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.}\rvert$, $\lvert\mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.}\rvert$	R	A	R	A	R	A	A	R	R	R	R	R	R	A	R	R	Scheffe
Null H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} = \sigma^2_{r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{u.c.} = \sigma^2_{fr.}$																A	Bartlett
Alt. H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} < \sigma^2_{r.ass't} < \sigma^2_{u.c.} < \sigma^2_{fr.}$																R	

Item analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A1} must be rejected for each item in Sub-scale II. The observed relationships may be found in Table 5.5.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A2}:

$$|\mu_{r.advisor} - \mu_{r.assistant}| < \begin{vmatrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{vmatrix}$$

Sub-scale analysis. The relationships of the mean scores for the four groups are as follows:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
47.83	44.62	36.49	36.21

Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} must therefore be rejected.

Item analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} may be accepted for items #6, 14, 22, 26, and 54:

Item	$\bar{X}$ r.adv.	$\bar{X}$ r.ass't	$\bar{X}$ u.c.	$\bar{X}$ fr.
6.	3.13	3.43	2.11	1.96
14.	3.23	2.86	2.37	2.35
22.	3.50	3.35	2.00	2.01
26.	3.10	2.89	2.13	2.14
54.	3.47	3.24	2.44	2.62

The observed relationships are presented in Table 5.5.

Major Null Hypothesis H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} = \sigma^2_{r.assistants} = \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} = \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. No significant differences were found between the variances of the four groups when tested by Bartlett's technique. Null hypothesis H_B must be accepted.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} < \sigma^2_{r.assistants} < \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} < \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Acceptance of the null hypothesis H_B necessitates rejection of alternate hypothesis H_{B1}.

Interpretation of Results

Mean score differences for each of the four groups (resident advisors, resident assistants, upperclass students, and freshmen students) indicate that the groups do not have the same expectations for the resident assistant to perform administrative-supervisory functions.

From Table 5.5 it can be seen that resident advisors place greater importance on administrative-supervisory functions than do resident assistants or students. Resident assistants also consider administrative-supervisory functions to be more important than do students. No differences were noted in the expectations of upperclass and freshmen students.

Expectations of resident advisors and resident assistants cannot be considered to be more alike than expectations of students and resident advisors or resident assistants.

No differences were found in the amount of consensus each group had on their expectations for the resident assistant. (Table 5.4, Bartlett's test.)

On only two items (#18 and 58; described in Table 5.4, pages 74 and 76) did the four groups agree on what they expected of a resident assistant in the performance of administrative-supervisory duties. Upperclass and freshmen students were the only two groups which held the same expectations for all fifteen items in Sub-scale II.

Analysis of Expectations Held for the Resident Assistant to Provide Leadership (Sub-scale III)

The means, variance, and analysis of variance computations for all items in Sub-scale III are presented in Table 5.7. Comparisons of mean scores calculated by Scheffe's test are reported in Table 5.8. Results of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance are presented at the end of Table 5.7 and also in Table 5.13. The major null hypotheses and alternate hypotheses together with the findings of the tests of the hypotheses may be found in Table 5.9.

TABLE 5.7

ANALYSIS OF ITEMS IN SUB-SCALE III
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO PROVIDE LEADERSHIP

Legend: In column 1, m equals mean and s^2 equals variance. Column 6 is the small f obtained through analysis of variance. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance was computed for the sum of the items in Sub-scale III. The result is given in column 7. One per cent significance is indicated by two asterisks, and 5 per cent significance by one asterisk.

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
3.	Attempt to organize and direct his men toward common goals	m s^2	3.13 .60	2.94 .50	2.78 .66	2.69 .85	2.32	
7.	Decide at the beginning of fall term about the best programs for his precinct #	M_2 s^2	2.37 1.00	1.78 1.12	2.04 1.49	1.77 1.15	2.43	
11.	Encourage participation in the residence program through his participation	m_2 s^2	2.93 .54	2.76 .36	2.73 .58	2.77 .38	.65	
15.	Train the committee chairmen of his precinct for their jobs	m s^2	3.20 .51	2.73 .54	2.34 .58	2.35 .57	11.70**	

TABLE 5.7 (continued)

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
19.	Allow precinct spirit and unity to develop by itself#	$\bar{x}$ s^2	2.43 .80	2.19 .77	2.20 1.03	2.28 1.06	.47	
23.	Remain slightly aloof from the men in his precinct#	$\bar{x}$ s^2	2.27 1.30	1.94 1.05	2.66 1.13	2.76 1.01	5.92**	
27.	Reward "good" men by allowing them more privileges#	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.37 .66	3.11 .66	3.00 .93	3.06 .83	1.22	
31.	Help coordinate the activities of his precinct	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.47 .39	3.16 .42	3.08 .31	3.15 .45	2.70*	
35.	Attempt to find his own close friends among his precinct members #	$\bar{x}$ s^2	2.40 .25	2.51 .59	1.90 .64	2.10 .75	6.16**	
39.	Delegate responsibilities for precinct affairs to his committee chairmen	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.20 .72	3.24 .19	3.06 .37	2.72 .49	7.17**	
43.	Be consistent in directing and maintaining his precinct	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.77 .25	3.57 .31	3.46 .31	3.35 .43	3.83*	
47.	Encourage activities which produce greater unity among his men	$\bar{x}$ s^2	3.30 .36	3.11 .27	3.06 .58	3.15 .36	1.04	

TABLE 5.7 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
51. Encourage other leadership in his precinct	m s^2	3.53 .26	3.43 .31	3.06 .51	3.01 .53	6.78**	
55. Lead group discussions within his precinct	m s^2	2.53 .52	2.05 .23	2.16 .46	2.28 .36	3.75*	
59. Encourage good men to try for offices in the precinct or hall	m s^2	3.17 .21	3.11 .38	3.04 .48	3.01 .30	.55	
Sub-scale III - All items Leadership	m s^2	44.67 13.40	41.73 15.37	40.66 18.92	40.63 16.18	8.14**	1.34

#Scoring reversed

TABLE 5.8

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE'S TEST OF MEAN SCORES FOR ITEMS FOUND TO HAVE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS IN SUB-SCALE III: LEADERSHIP

Legend: All possible comparisons between group mean scores of items which had significant differences according to the analysis of variance are presented in this table. By use of Scheffe's technique an interval has been established for each comparison. The difference is significant if the interval does not include zero. Significance at the .10 confidence level is indicated by an asterisk in the column labeled significant difference.

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
15. Train the committee chairmen of his precinct for their jobs	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.20 - 2.73)	+ .93 to + .01	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.20 - 2.34)	+1.27 to + .45	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.20 - 2.35)	+1.27 to + .44	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.73 - 2.34)	+ .77 to + .01	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.73 - 2.35)	+ .76 to .00	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.34 - 2.35)	+ .31 to - .33	
23. Remain slightly aloof from the men in his precinct #	r.advisors - r.assistants	(2.27 - 1.94)	+ .98 to - .32	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(2.27 - 2.66)	+ .19 to - .97	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(2.27 - 2.76)	+ .09 to -1.07	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(1.94 - 2.66)	- .18 to -1.26	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(1.94 - 2.76)	- .28 to -1.36	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.66 - 2.76)	+ .35 to - .55	

TABLE 5.8 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
31. Help coordinate the activities of his precinct.	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.47 - 3.16)	+ .70 to - .08	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.47 - 3.08)	+ .73 to + .05	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.47 - 3.15)	+ .66 to - .02	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.16 - 3.08)	+ .40 to - .24	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.16 - 3.15)	+ .33 to - .31	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.08 - 3.15)	+ .20 to - .34	
35. Attempt to find his own close friends among his precinct members #	r.advisors - r.assistants	(2.40 - 2.51)	+ .38 to - .60	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(2.40 - 1.90)	+ .93 to + .07	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(2.40 - 2.10)	+ .73 to - .13	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.51 - 1.90)	+1.01 to + .21	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.51 - 2.10)	+ .81 to + .01	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(1.90 - 2.10)	+ .13 to - .53	
39. Delegate responsibilities for precinct affairs to his committee chairmen	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.20 - 3.24)	+ .37 to - .45	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.20 - 3.06)	+ .22 to - .50	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.20 - 2.72)	+ .84 to + .12	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.24 - 3.06)	+ .52 to - .16	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.24 - 2.72)	+ .86 to + .18	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.06 - 2.72)	+ .62 to + .06	*

TABLE 5.8 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
43. Be consistent in directing and maintaining his precinct.	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.77 - 3.57)	+ .56 to - .16	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.77 - 3.46)	+ .63 to - .01	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.77 - 3.35)	+ .74 to + .10	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.57 - 3.46)	+ .41 to - .19	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.57 - 3.35)	+ .52 to - .08	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.46 - 3.35)	+ .36 to - .14	
51. Encourage other leadership in his precinct	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.53 - 3.43)	+ .51 to - .31	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.53 - 3.06)	+ .84 to + .10	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.53 - 3.01)	+ .89 to + .15	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.43 - 3.06)	+ .71 to + .03	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.43 - 3.01)	+ .76 to + .08	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.06 - 3.01)	+ .33 to - .23	
55. Lead group discussions within his precinct	r.advisors - r.assistants	(2.53 - 2.05)	+ .87 to + .09	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(2.53 - 2.16)	+ .72 to + .02	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(2.53 - 2.28)	+ .60 to - .10	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.05 - 2.16)	+ .21 to - .43	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.05 - 2.28)	+ .10 to - .56	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.16 - 2.28)	+ .15 to - .39	

TABLE 5.8 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant To:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
Sub-scale III - All Items Leadership	r.advisors - r.assistants	(44.67 - 41.73)	+5.47 to + .41	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(44.67 - 40.66)	+6.26 to +1.76	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(44.67 - 40.63)	+6.28 to +1.80	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(41.73 - 40.66)	+3.16 to -1.02	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(41.73 - 40.63)	+3.19 to - .99	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(40.66 - 40.63)	+1.76 to -1.70	

#Scoring reversed

TABLE 5.9

RESULTS OF THE TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES FOR SUB-SCALE III
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO PERFORM LEADERSHIP FUNCTIONS

Legend: R indicates rejection of the hypothesis. A indicates that the hypothesis is accepted. Significance of .01 is indicated by two asterisks. One asterisk is used for the .05 confidence level.

Hypotheses	Items 3	7	11	15	19	23	27	31	35	39	43	47	51	55	59	All Items Sub-Scale III	Test
Null H_A: $\mu_{r.adv.} = \mu_{r.ass't} = \mu_{u.c.} = \mu_{fr.}$	A	A	A	R**	A	R**	A	R*	R**	R**	R*	A	R**	R*	A	R**	Analysis of Variance
Alt. H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.adv.} > \mu_{r.ass't} > \mu_{u.c.} > \mu_{fr.}$	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Scheffe
Alt. H_{A2}: $\lvert\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{r.ass't}\rvert < \lvert\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.}\rvert$, $\lvert\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.}\rvert$, $\lvert\mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.}\rvert$, $\lvert\mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.}\rvert$	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	A	R	R	R	Scheffe
Null H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} = \sigma^2_{r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{u.c.} = \sigma^2_{fr.}$																A	Bartlett
Alt. H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} < \sigma^2_{r.ass't} < \sigma^2_{u.c.} < \sigma^2_{fr.}$																R	

Major Null Hypothesis H_A: $\mu_{r.advisors} = \mu_{r.assistants} = \mu_{upperclassmen} = \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. Application of the analysis of variance to the mean scores of the four groups revealed a difference significant at the one per cent level of confidence.

Item analysis. Items #15, 23, 35, 39, and 51 had mean scores which differed significantly at the one per cent level. Three items (#31, 43, and 55) had mean scores which were significantly different at the five per cent level of confidence. The null hypothesis H_A must be rejected for all eight of the above items.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.advisors} > \mu_{r.assistants} > \mu_{upperclassmen} > \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. The following inferred relationships observed from the data lead to the rejection of alternate hypothesis H_{A1}:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
44.67	41.73	40.66	40.63

Item analysis. The mean scores of the four groups could not be ranked according to the alternate hypothesis for any of the items. Thus,

alternate hypothesis H_{A1} must be rejected for each item in Sub-scale III. The observed relationships are shown in Table 5.8.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A2}:

$$|\mu_{r.advisor} - \mu_{r.assistant}| < \begin{vmatrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{vmatrix}$$

Sub-scale analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} is rejected with the following inferred relationships observed from the data:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
44.67	41.73	40.66	40.63

Item analysis. The mean scores for Item #51 are as follows:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
3.53	3.43	3.06	3.01

Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} may therefore be accepted for this item. All other items in Sub-scale III do not meet the requirements of the alternate hypothesis. The observed relationships may be found in Table 5.8.

Major Null Nypothesis H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} = \sigma^2_{r.assistants} = \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} = \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. Application of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance indicated no significant differences between the variances of the four groups. Null hypothesis H_B may be accepted.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} < \sigma^2_{r.assistants} < \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} < \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Rejection of alternate hypothesis H_{B1} becomes necessary when null hypothesis H_B is accepted.

Interpretation of Results

Expectations for the resident assistant to provide leadership are not the same for all four groups studied.

Resident advisors consider it more important for the resident assistant to provide leadership than do either resident assistants or students. Resident assistants and both student groups tend to agree on leadership expectations.

No greater similarity was found between the expectations of resident advisors and resident assistants than was found between either of these two groups and the two student groups.

Bartlett's test of the variances indicates that all four groups have nearly the same amount of consensus in the leadership expectations they hold. (Table 5.7)

At least one group was found to have different expectations from the other groups on eight of the items (#15, 23, 31, 35, 39, 43, 51, and 55; described in Table 5.7, page 84) in Sub-scale III. Upperclass and freshmen students disagreed only on their expectations for the resident assistant to delegate responsibilities for precinct affairs to his committee chairmen. (Item #39)

Analysis of Expectations Held for the Resident Assistant to Display Selected Personal Characteristics (Sub-scale IV)

The means, variance, and analysis of variance computations for all items in Sub-scale IV are presented in Table 5.10. Comparisons of mean scores calculated by Scheffe's test are reported in Table 5.11. Results of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance are presented at the end of Table 5.10 and also in Table 5.13. The major null hypotheses and alternate hypotheses together with the findings of the tests of the hypotheses are reported in Table 5.11.

Major Null Hypothesis H_A: $\mu_{r.advisors} = \mu_{r.assistants} = \mu_{upperclassmen} = \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. Application of the analysis of variance technique to the mean scores

TABLE 5.10

ANALYSIS OF ITEMS IN SUB-SCALE IV
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO DISPLAY SELECTED PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Legend: In column 1, m equals mean and s^2 equals variance. Column 6 is the small f obtained through analysis of variance. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance was computed for the sum of the items in Sub-scale IV. The result is given in column 7. One per cent significance is indicated by two asterisks, and 5 per cent significance by one asterisk.

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisers	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
4.	Use sarcasm when making suggestions or criticisms of others #	m	3.30	3.11	3.24	3.15	.48	
		s^2	.49	.54	.44	.84		
8.	Be a person who would rather listen than talk	m	2.70	2.46	2.04	1.68	11.70**	
		s^2	.42	.64	.88	.99		
12.	Be able to recognize his own limitations and inadequacies	m	3.60	3.68	3.63	3.54	.70	
		s^2	.25	.22	.26	.31		
16.	Expect a high performance level from his men, even if he is unable to perform as well #	m	2.40	2.02	1.93	1.92	1.66	
		s^2	.80	.86	1.29	1.28		
20.	Refrain from gossiping	m	3.23	3.14	3.20	3.11	.10	
		s^2	2.12	1.40	1.47	1.24		

TABLE 5.10 (Continued)

	Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
24.	Be able to adjust easily to new situations	m_2	3.53	3.57	3.37	3.25	3.42*	
		s^2	.26	.25	.44	.22		
28.	Always behave in a manner which is above reproach	m_2	3.20	3.08	2.78	2.42	5.78**	
		s^2	.72	.80	1.13	1.16		
32.	Be able to remain calm under pressure	m_2	3.70	3.65	3.53	3.44	2.05	
		s^2	.22	.23	.37	.36		
36.	Have at least a 2.6 all-university grade point average	m_2	3.13	2.89	2.73	2.94	2.38	
		s^2	.39	.60	.55	.54		
40.	Be tactful	m_2	3.80	3.57	3.41	3.32	4.30**	
		s^2	.16	.25	.56	.45		
44.	Be a person who will try not to hurt anyone's feelings	m_2	2.43	2.73	2.94	2.83	2.08	
		s^2	1.36	.70	.89	.86		
48.	Be decisive and definite in his actions	m_2	3.07	3.30	3.28	3.07	2.37	
		s^2	.41	.27	.38	.35		
52.	Be even tempered and not easily excitable	m_2	3.53	3.46	3.38	3.27	2.10	
		s^2	.26	.31	.30	.31		

TABLE 5.10 (Continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
56. Always be patient when working with others	m_2 s^2	3.40 .46	3.40 .36	3.28 .26	3.28 .49	.56	
60. Be at least of junior class standing	m s^2	2.20 .37	2.11 .32	2.50 .80	2.45 .51	3.03*	
Sub-scale IV - All items Personal Characteristics	m s^2	46.87 12.19	46.16 16.25	45.33 19.85	43.68 23.82	4.84**	4.80

#Scoring reversed

TABLE 5.11

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE'S TEST OF MEAN SCORES FOR ITEMS FOUND TO HAVE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS IN SUB-SCALE IV: PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Legend: All possible comparisons between group mean scores of items which had significant differences according to the analysis of variance are presented in this table. By use of Scheffe's technique an interval has been established for each comparison. The difference is significant if the interval does not include zero. Significance at the .10 confidence level is indicated by an asterisk in the column labeled significant difference.

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
8. Be a person who would rather listen than talk	r.advisors - r.assistants	(2.70 - 2.46)	+ .80 to - .32	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(2.70 - 2.04)	+1.16 to + .16	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(2.70 - 1.68)	+1.52 to + .52	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.46 - 2.04)	+ .88 to - .04	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.46 - 1.68)	+1.24 to - .02	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.04 - 1.68)	+ .74 to - .02	
24. Be able to adjust easily to new situations	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.53 - 3.57)	+ .30 to - .38	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.53 - 3.37)	+ .46 to - .14	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.53 - 3.25)	+ .58 to - .02	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.57 - 3.37)	+ .48 to - .08	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.57 - 3.25)	+ .60 to + .04	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.37 - 3.25)	+ .36 to - .12	

TABLE 5.11 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
28. Always behave in a manner which is above reproach	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.20 - 3.08)	+ .75 to - .51	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.20 - 2.78)	+ .98 to - .14	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.20 - 2.42)	+1.34 to + .22	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.08 - 2.78)	+ .82 to - .22	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.08 - 2.42)	+1.18 to + .14	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.78 - 2.42)	+ .79 to - .07	
40. Be tactful	r.advisors - r.assistants	(3.80 - 3.57)	+ .63 to - .17	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(3.80 - 3.41)	+ .74 to + .04	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(3.80 - 3.32)	+ .83 to + .13	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(3.57 - 3.41)	+ .49 to - .17	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(3.57 - 3.32)	+ .58 to - .08	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(3.41 - 3.32)	+ .36 to - .18	
60. Be at least of junior class standing	r.advisors - r.assistants	(2.20 - 2.11)	+ .55 to - .37	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(2.20 - 2.50)	+ .11 to - .71	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(2.20 - 2.45)	+ .16 to - .66	
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(2.11 - 2.50)	- .01 to - .77	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(2.11 - 2.45)	+ .04 to - .72	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(2.50 - 2.45	+ .37 to - .27	

TABLE 5.11 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant to:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
Sub-scale IV - All items Personal Characteristics	r.advisors - r.assistants	(46.87 - 46.16)	+3.45 to -2.03	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(46.87 - 45.33)	+4.08 to - .89	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(46.87 - 43.68)	+5.62 to + .76	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(46.16 - 45.33)	+3.10 to -1.44	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(46.16 - 43.68)	+4.74 to + .22	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(45.33 - 43.68)	+3.53 to - .23	

TABLE 5.12

RESULTS OF THE TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES FOR SUB-SCALE IV
EXPECTATIONS FOR RESIDENT ASSISTANTS TO DISPLAY SELECTED PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Legend: R indicates rejection of the hypothesis. A indicates that the hypothesis is accepted. Significance of .01 is indicated by two asterisks. One asterisk is used for the .05 confidence level.

Hypotheses	Items 4	8	12	16	20	24	28	32	36	40	44	48	52	56	60	All Items Sub-Scale IV	Test
Null H_A: $\mu_{r.adv.} = \mu_{r.ass't} = \mu_{u.c.} = \mu_{fr.}$	A	R **	A	A	A	R *	R **	A	A	R **	A	A	A	A	R *	R **	Analysis of Variance
Alt. H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.adv.} > \mu_{r.ass't} > \mu_{u.c.} > \mu_{fr.}$	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Scheffe
Alt. H_{A2}: $\lvert \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{r.ass't} \rvert < \begin{cases} \lvert \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \rvert \\ \lvert \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \rvert \\ \lvert \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \rvert \\ \lvert \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \rvert \end{cases}$	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Scheffe
Null H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} = \sigma^2_{r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{u.c.} = \sigma^2_{fr.}$																A	Bartlett
Alt. H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} < \sigma^2_{r.ass't} < \sigma^2_{u.c.} < \sigma^2_{fr.}$																R	

of the four groups revealed a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence.

Item analysis. Items #8, 28, and 40 were found to have mean scores which differed at the one per cent level of confidence. Items #24 and 60 were significantly different at the five per cent level. The null hypothesis H_A must be rejected for the above five items.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.advisors} > \mu_{r.assistants} > \mu_{upperclassmen} > \mu_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A1} is rejected with the following inferred relationships observed from the data:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
46.87	46.16	45.33	43.68

Item analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A1} must be rejected for each item in Sub-scale IV. The observed relationships may be found in Table 5.11.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A2}:

$$|\mu_{r.advisor} - \mu_{r.assistant}| < \begin{vmatrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{vmatrix}$$

Sub-scale analysis. The mean scores of the four groups have the following relationships on Sub-scale IV:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ Freshmen
46.87	46.16	45.33	43.68

Alternate hypothesis H_{A1} must be rejected.

Item analysis. Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} must be rejected for each item in Sub-scale IV. The observed relationships are shown in Table 5.11.

Major Null Hypothesis H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} = \sigma^2_{r.assistants} = \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} = \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Sub-scale analysis. Application of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance indicated no significant differences between the variances of the four groups. Null hypothesis H_B may be accepted.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} < \sigma^2_{r.assistants} < \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} < \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Because significant differences were found between the variances, alternate hypothesis H_{B1} must be rejected.

Interpretation of Results

Agreement was not found between all four groups on the personal characteristics they expected a resident assistant to display.

Freshmen students considered it less important, than did either resident assistants or resident advisors, for the selected personal characteristics to be exhibited by the resident assistant.

Resident advisors, resident assistants, and upperclass students all had similar expectations on Sub-scale IV.

No differences were found in the amount of consensus of each group in their expectations for the resident assistant. (Bartlett's test, Table 5.10)

There was a difference in group expectations on five of the 15 items (#8, 24, 28, 40, and 60; described in Table 5.10, page 96.) Resident advisors and resident assistants tended to agree on all items in Sub-scale IV. Agreement was also found on all of the items between upperclass and freshmen students.

Analysis of Expectations Held for the Role of the Resident Assistant (Total Instrument)

The means, variance, and analysis of variance figures for the total instrument are presented in Table 5.13. Comparisons of mean scores calculated by Scheffe's test are reported in Table 5.14. Results of Bartlett's test for

homogeneity of variance are shown in Table 5.13. The findings of the F_{max} test applied to the variances of scores for resident assistants on the four sub-scales are exhibited in Table 5.15. The major null hypotheses and alternate hypotheses together with the findings of the tests of the hypotheses are reported in Table 5.16.

Major Null Hypothesis H_A: $\mu_{r.advisors} = \mu_{r.assistants} = \mu_{upperclassmen} = \mu_{freshmen}$

Application of the analysis of variance technique to the mean scores of the four groups revealed a significant difference at the one per cent level of confidence.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.advisors} > \mu_{r.assistants} > \mu_{upperclassmen} > \mu_{freshmen}$

Alternate hypothesis H_{A1} is rejected with the following inferred relationships observed from the data:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
188.03	178.65	166.79	163.63

TABLE 5.13

ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL INSTRUMENT
EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT ASSISTANT IN THE MEN'S RESIDENCE HALLS
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Legend: In column 1, m equals mean and s^2 equals variance. Column 6 is the small f obtained through analysis of variance. The results of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance is given in column 7. One per cent significance is indicated by two asterisks, and 5 per cent significance by one asterisk.

Expectations for the Resident Assistant	1	2 Resident Advisors	3 Resident Assistants	4 Upper-Classmen	5 Freshmen	6 f	7 B
Sub-scale I Advisory functions	m	48.67	46.14	44.32	43.11	18.51**	2.27
	s^2	10.44	13.01	15.73	11.93		
Sub-scale II Administrative-Supervisory	m	47.83	44.62	36.49	36.21	71.76**	3.00
	s^2	17.94	15.24	20.37	25.00		
Sub-scale III Leadership	m	44.67	41.73	40.66	40.63	8.14**	1.34
	s^2	13.40	15.37	18.92	16.18		
Sub-scale IV Personal Characteristics	m	46.87	46.16	45.33	43.68	4.84**	4.80
	s^2	12.19	16.25	19.85	23.82		
TOTAL	m	188.03	178.65	166.79	163.63	37.94**	2.07
	s^2	107.69	121.68	162.37	140.48		

TABLE 5.14

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE'S TEST OF MEAN SCORES FOR SUB-SCALES
AND THE TOTAL INSTRUMENT USED IN MEASURING ROLE EXPECTATIONS FOR THE RESIDENT ASSISTANT

Legend: All possible comparisons between group means of sub-scales which had significant differences according to the analysis of variance are presented in this table. By use of Scheffe's technique an interval has been established for each comparison. The difference is significant if the interval does not include zero. Significance at the .10 confidence level is indicated by an asterisk in the column labeled significant difference.

Expectations for the Resident Assistant:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
Sub-scale I - Advisory functions	r.advisors - r.assistants	(48.67 - 46.14)	+ 4.79 to + .27	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(48.67 - 44.32)	+ 6.36 to + .36	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(48.67 - 43.11)	+ 7.56 to +3.56	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(46.14 - 44.32)	+ 3.70 to - .04	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(46.14 - 43.11)	+ 4.89 to +1.17	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(44.32 - 43.11)	+ 2.75 to - .35	
Sub-scale II - Administrative - Supervisory	r.advisors - r.assistants	(47.83 - 44.62)	+ 6.04 to + .38	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(47.83 - 36.49)	+13.85 to +8.83	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(47.83 - 36.21)	+14.12 to +9.12	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(44.62 - 36.49)	+10.47 to +5.79	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(44.62 - 36.21)	+10.74 to +6.08	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(36.49 - 36.21)	+ 2.22 to -1.66	

TABLE 5.14 (continued)

Expectations for the Resident Assistant:	Comparison Groups	Means	Scheffe's Interval	Significant Difference
Sub-scale III - Leadership	r.advisors - r.assistants	(44.67 - 41.73)	+ 5.47 to + .41	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(44.67 - 40.66)	+ 6.26 to + 1.76	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(44.67 - 40.63)	+ 6.28 to + 1.80	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(41.73 - 40.66)	+ 3.16 to - 1.02	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(41.73 - 40.63)	+ 3.19 to - .99	
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(40.66 - 40.63)	+ 1.76 to - 1.70	
Sub-scale IV - Personal Characteristics	r.advisors - r.assistants	(46.87 - 46.16)	+ 3.45 to - 2.03	
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(46.87 - 45.33)	+ 4.08 to - .89	
	r.advisors - freshmen	(46.87 - 43.68)	+ 5.62 to + .76	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(46.16 - 45.33)	+ 3.10 to - 1.44	
	r.assistants - freshmen	(46.16 - 43.68)	+ 4.74 to + 1.22	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(45.33 - 43.68)	+ 3.53 to - .23	
Total Instrument	r.advisors - r.assistants	(188.03 - 178.65)	+16.73 to + 2.03	*
	r.advisors - upperclassmen	(188.03 - 166.79)	+27.76 to +14.72	*
	r.advisors - freshmen	(188.03 - 163.63)	+30.91 to +17.89	*
	r.assistants - upperclassmen	(178.65 - 166.79)	+17.93 to + 5.79	*
	r.assistants - freshmen	(178.65 - 163.63)	+21.08 to + 8.96	*
	upperclassmen - freshmen	(166.79 - 163.63)	+ 8.20 to - 1.88	

TABLE 5.15

COMPARISON OF VARIANCES OF RESIDENT ASSISTANTS ON THE FOUR SUB-SCALES BY THE F_{MAX} METHOD TO TEST THE

SUB NULL HYPOTHESIS H_C: $\sigma^2_{\text{sub 1,r.advisors}} = \sigma^2_{\text{sub 2,r.assistants}} = \sigma^2_{\text{sub 3,r.advisors}} = \sigma^2_{\text{sub 4,r.assistants}}$

	Sub-scale I Advisory	Sub-scale II Administrative-Supervisory	Sub-scale III Leadership	Sub-scale IV Personal Characteristics	F_{max}	$F_{max\ .95}$
Variance of responses by resident assistants	13.01	15.24	15.37	16.25	1.25	< 2.40

TABLE 5.16

RESULTS OF THE TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES FOR THE TOTAL INSTRUMENT EXPECTATIONS FOR THE ROLE OF THE RESIDENT ASSISTANT

Legend: R indicates rejection of the hypothesis. A indicates that the hypothesis is accepted. Significance of .01 is indicated by two asterisks. One asterisk is used for the .05 confidence level.

Hypotheses	Sub-Scales I	II	III	IV	Total Instrument
Null H_A: $\mu_{r.adv.} = \mu_{r.ass't} = \mu_{u.c.} = \mu_{fr.}$	R**	R**	R**	R**	R**
Alt. H_{A1}: $\mu_{r.adv.} > \mu_{r.ass't} > \mu_{u.c.} > \mu_{fr.}$	R	R	R	R	R
Alt. H_{A2}: $\lvert\mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{r.ass't}\rvert < \begin{vmatrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{vmatrix}$	R	R	R	R	R
Null H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} = \sigma^2_{r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{u.c.} = \sigma^2_{fr.}$	A	A	A	A	A
Alt. H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.adv.} < \sigma^2_{r.ass't} < \sigma^2_{u.c.} < \sigma^2_{fr.}$	R	R	R	R	R
Sub Null H_C: $\sigma^2_{sub\ 1,r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{sub\ 2,r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{sub\ 3,r.ass't} = \sigma^2_{sub\ 4,r.ass't}$					A
Alt. Sub H_C: $\sigma^2_{i\ r.ass't} > \sigma^2_{j\ r.ass't}$ when $\lvert\mu_{i\ r.adv.} - \mu_{i\ fr.}\rvert > \lvert\mu_{j\ r.adv.} \mu_{j\ fr.}\rvert$					R

Alternate Hypothesis H_{A2}:

$$|\mu_{r.advisor} - \mu_{r.assistant}| < \begin{vmatrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{vmatrix}$$

For the Total Instrument the mean scores of the four groups have the following relationships:

$\bar{X}$ r.advisor	$\bar{X}$ r.assistant	$\bar{X}$ upperclassmen	$\bar{X}$ freshmen
188.03	178.65	166.79	163.63

Alternate hypothesis H_{A2} must be rejected.

Major Null Hypothesis H_B: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} = \sigma^2_{r.assistants} = \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} = \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Application of Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance revealed no significant differences between the variances of the four groups. Null hypothesis H_B may be accepted.

Alternate Hypothesis H_{B1}: $\sigma^2_{r.advisors} < \sigma^2_{r.assistants} < \sigma^2_{upperclassmen} < \sigma^2_{freshmen}$

Acceptance of the null hypothesis H_B necessitates rejection of alternate hypothesis H_{B1}.

Sub Null Hypothesis H_C:

$$\sigma^2_{\text{Sub-scale I, r.ass't}} = \sigma^2_{\text{Sub-scale II, r.ass't}} = \sigma^2_{\text{Sub-scale III, r.ass't}} = \sigma^2_{\text{Sub-scale IV, r.ass't}}$$

An F_{max} value of 1.25 was not large enough to reject the hypothesis. Null hypothesis H_C may be accepted.

Alternate Sub Hypothesis H_{C1}:

$$\sigma^2_{i\ \text{r.ass't}} > \sigma^2_{j\ \text{r.ass't}}$$

when

$$|\mu_{i\text{,r.adv.}} - \mu_{i\text{.fr.}}| > |\mu_{j\ \text{r.adv.}} - \mu_{j\ \text{fr.}}|$$

Acceptance of sub null hypothesis H_C requires the rejection of alternate sub hypothesis H_{C1}.

Interpretation of Results

Only upperclass and freshmen students agreed on their expectations for the role of the resident assistant. Resident advisors and resident assistants rated the role of the resident assistant, as defined by the instrument, to be more important than did the students. (Table 5.13)

All four groups had an equal amount of within-group agreement on the expectations they held.

The resident assistants had nearly an equal amount of consensus on all four sub-scales of the total instrument.

Summary

The major null hypothesis H_A which states that there are no differences between the groups in the expectations they hold for the resident assistant as measured by the instrument must be rejected at the one per cent level of significance. The two alternate hypotheses concerning mean score rankings and mean score differences must also be rejected.

The major null hypothesis H_B which states that there are no differences between the four groups in the amount of consensus that each group has for the role of the resident assistant must be accepted.

The sub null hypothesis H_C stating that there are no differences in the amount of consensus that resident assistants have on each of the sub-scales of the total instrument must be accepted.

Tests of the major null hypotheses on the four sub-scales produced the same results found for the total instrument. The major and alternate hypotheses concerning the level of expectations were rejected. The major hypothesis relating to the amount of consensus each group has for the role of the resident assistant was accepted for each sub-scale.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The Problem

The major problem of the study was to determine the nature of and the differences in expectations that resident advisors, resident assistants, upperclass students, and freshmen hold for the role of the resident assistant.

Theoretical assumptions were developed from research in role theory and applied to the area of residence hall personnel work. Two basic assumptions were made: 1) resident advisors, resident assistants, and students hold different expectations for the role of the resident assistant, and 2) resident advisors, resident assistants, and students differ in the amount of consensus they have for the role of the resident assistant.

The investigation was conducted near the end of the 1960 academic spring quarter. The instrument used to measure role expectations was distributed to all head resident advisors employed at that time. The head resident advisors distributed the instrument to the appropriate graduate resident advisors and resident assistants defined by the study and also a random stratified sample of upperclass and freshmen students. Resident advisors no longer

employed by Michigan State University were mailed the instrument if their present addresses were known. A 92.4 per cent return was received on all instruments distributed.

Review of the Instrument

The instrument contains sixty items and was designed to measure the expectations which four sampled groups have for the role of the resident assistant. Four sub-scales of fifteen items each have been separated within the total instrument to measure separate aspects of the resident assistant's role:

1. Sub-scale I - Expectations for resident assistants to perform advisory functions.
2. Sub-scale II - Expectations for resident assistants to perform administrative-supervisory functions.
3. Sub-scale III - Expectations for resident assistants to provide leadership.
4. Sub-scale IV - Expectations for resident assistants to display selected personal characteristics.

The items were arranged to distribute each sub-scale throughout the length of the instrument. Every fourth item was taken from the same sub-scale.

Reliability of the instrument was estimated by Hoyt's analysis of variance method which measures internal consistency. The total instrument was found to have an estimated reliability of .84. Only Sub-scale II (Administrative-Supervisory functions) with a coefficient of .82 and the

total instrument were considered to be reliable. Sub-scales I, III, and IV had reliability coefficients of .49, .50, and .57 respectively.

Review of Scoring

There are five possible responses for each item. They are arbitrarily weighted and assumed to have equal intervals. The responses and the corresponding weights are:

absolutely must - weight = 4
preferably should - weight = 3
may or may not - weight = 2
preferably should not - weight = 1
absolutely must not - weight = 0

By selecting one of the above weighted responses the subject indicated the degree of importance that he expected each item to play in the resident assistant's role. A response weighted four would describe the item as most important with a response weighted zero as least important.

The expectations for the role of the resident assistant for each group were indicated by the mean scores the group obtained on the items, the sub-scales, and the total instrument. The analysis of variance model was used to test for significant mean score differences among the four groups. Scheffe's test was used to determine which pairs of mean scores were significantly different. Agreement within a

group was indicated by the variance produced by the responses on expectations. Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance was used to measure variance differences among the four groups in order to determine if the variations were significant. F_{max} was used to test for difference in variances for the resident assistant group on the four sub-scales of the instrument.

Sample

Four groups were sampled with a total N=208:

1. Resident advisors (N=30)
2. Resident assistants (N=36)
3. Upper class students (N=70)
4. Freshmen students (N=71)

Hypotheses and Results

The two major null hypotheses are: 1) there is no significant difference in expectations for the role of the resident assistant among the four groups (resident advisors, resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students) and 2) there is no significant difference in the amount of agreement within each of the four groups for the resident assistant's role. A sub null hypothesis is that there is no significant difference in the amount of agreement that the resident assistant group has on each of the sub-scales

of the total instrument. (All hypotheses tested are presented symbolically along with the results in Table 5.16 on page 111.)

Significant differences were found among the group expectations for the role of the resident assistant as measured by the total instrument and all four sub-scales. The expectations were not found to be ranked with the resident advisors having the highest expectations followed by resident assistants, upperclassmen, and freshmen students, in that order. ($\mu_{r.advisors} > \mu_{r.assistants} > \mu_{upperclassmen} > \mu_{freshmen}$) The difference in expectations between resident advisors and resident assistants was not found to be significantly smaller than the differences between resident advisors and both student groups and between resident assistants and both student groups.

$$\left(\left| \mu_{r.advisor} - \mu_{r.assistant} \right| < \begin{vmatrix} \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.adv.} - \mu_{fr.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{u.c.} \\ \mu_{r.ass't} - \mu_{fr.} \end{vmatrix} \right)$$

No significant differences were found in the amount of agreement within each group for the role of the resident assistant as measured by the four sub-scales and the total instrument.

The resident assistant group had approximately the same amount of agreement in what they expected of the resident

assistant in the four areas measured by the sub-scales.

($\sigma^2_{\text{sub 1, r.adv.}} = \sigma^2_{\text{sub 2, r.ass't}}$

$\sigma^2_{\text{sub 3, r.adv.}} = \sigma^2_{\text{sub 4, r.ass't}}$)

Conclusions

The total instrument and sub-scales will be treated separately.

Total Instrument

Several conclusions are based on the results of the study:

1. Resident advisors, resident assistants, and students all differ significantly in their expectations for the resident assistant's role. However, upperclassmen and freshmen hold similar expectations. This finding partially supports the theory on which the study is based. Although four distinct groups were chosen for the study, it may easily be assumed that upperclassmen and freshmen actually compose but one student group. The fact that expectations for both student groups are similar might indicate that the major perceptions of resident assistants by students are formed in the first year of residence. It should be noted that the smallness of the observed differences between the expectations of residence advisors and resident assistants would indicate that training does tend to make distinct

groups perceive the resident assistant's role more similarly.

2. Because the instrument was developed from items selected as being acceptable for resident assistant behavior, it is implied that higher mean scores indicate higher professional expectations. It may be assumed that resident advisors have the most professional expectations, followed by resident assistants, with the least professional expectations held by students. Training may be assumed to increase the level of professional expectations held for the resident assistant's role. Because of the significantly different expectations held by students and the two residence personnel staff groups, it is highly probable that the present methods of communicating the professional role of the resident assistant to students lack the effectiveness of training methods employed for the resident assistants.
3. The members of each group have a nearly equal amount of consensus for the role of the resident assistant. It was predicted that the most homogeneous groups would have the most consensus. Although no significant differences

appeared, the observed variances for resident advisors are the smallest among the four groups, followed by resident assistants and freshmen, with upperclassmen having the least consensus. Freshmen were theorized to be less homogeneous in role expectations than upperclassmen; the data of the study partly indicate this is not the case. Examination of the sub-scales reveals that no consistent pattern exists. Resident advisors were observed to be less agreed on administrative-supervisory functions than were resident assistants. Although the difference was not significant, it casts further doubt upon the assumption that group homogeneity increases group consensus. One reason might be that training in professional areas tends only to raise the level of professional expectations and not to produce persons who think more alike.

4. If role conflict for a group is measured by a lack of consensus in expectations, it must be assumed that resident assistants are not in a role conflict situation. Resident advisors and freshmen were found to have the

greatest difference in expectations for administrative-supervisory functions (Sub-scale II) which should hypothetically place resident assistants in a role conflict situation. Observed variances, however, indicate that resident assistants had the highest amount of agreement on the administrative-supervisory functions. The high amount of consensus on Sub-scale II might result from the nature of the items on the scale. The items refer to responsibilities which have been thoroughly prescribed for the resident assistant and allow little room for interpretation if he is to properly perform his job. This leads to two possible conclusions: 1) lack of consensus within a group is not an adequate measure of role conflict or 2) role conflict may be reduced by adequate training and communication. If role conflict is to be interpreted as the difficulty in choosing between different act responses, it is likely that adequate training can overcome conflict.

Sub-scales

Conclusions based on the results of the sub-scales are:

1. Resident advisors place greater importance on the advisory functions (Sub-scale I) of the resident assistant's role than do the other three groups. This relationship was assumed from the theory. The observed difference in expectations between resident assistants and upperclassmen was not significant but closely approached significance.

Examination of the individual items reveals that significant differences in expectations are found mainly on items which relate to giving help to students who have problems or are in need of guidance. On all such items at least one student group differs from the resident advisors in what they expect of the resident assistant. The conclusion might be drawn that students have more tendency than resident advisors to regard the resident assistant as being unqualified to give guidance. However, the lack of consistency for the same student group to have significantly lower expectations and the weakness of the significance requires that the above interpretation be regarded cautiously.

Items for which the groups had similar expectations related largely to ethical standards of counseling relationships with students. It might be assumed that students are aware of counseling ethics such as confidentiality, however, it is more likely that students are responding in a personal way regarding the treatment they would like to receive.

Consensus on advisory functions is similar for all four groups. It is interesting to note that freshmen are observed to have the second highest amount of consensus. No reason is apparent for this relationship. Resident advisors have the greatest observed consensus which might be explained by their education and training in the counseling field. The similarity in the amount of consensus among all four groups, however, tends to indicate that neither training, education, nor age have the effect of producing individuals who think more alike in their expectations for the resident assistant to perform advisory functions.

The interpretations of results on Subscale I (Advisory functions) have been made to serve as a basis for further investigations

and should not be considered conclusive. The lack of reliability for Sub-scale I requires that any interpretations made should be viewed with caution.

2. Significant differences exist between the expectations held by resident advisors, resident assistants, and students for the resident assistant to perform advisory-supervisory functions. (Sub-scale II). Resident advisors are followed by resident assistants and students respectively in the importance they give to the advisory-supervisory area. Both student groups had similar expectations which is contrary to the theoretically formed hypothesis.

Although students expected the resident assistant to carry out the administrative-supervisory functions described, it should be noted that the observed rating of this aspect of the resident assistant's role by the students was lower than for the aspects measured by the three other sub-scales. This relationship is not surprising because the items in Sub-scale II pertain largely to the authority which the resident assistant has. Two conclusions can be made: 1) students believe it is necessary

for the resident assistant to possess authority over student behavior and 2) students consider administrative-supervisory functions to be the least important part of the resident assistant's role. The differences between staff perceptions and student perceptions are greater than for all other aspects of the resident assistant's role. This relationship precipitates the assumption that the resident assistant will face the greatest student opposition when attempting to carry out his administrative-supervisory responsibilities.

Items which referred to administrative rather than supervisory procedures were considered to be more important by the students. It might be assumed that students feel administrative actions place fewer restrictions upon the students and are more desirable and therefore more important than supervisory actions.

Although all four groups had a similar amount of consensus in their expectations concerning administrative-supervisory functions, resident assistants were observed to have a slightly greater consensus.

A reason has already been postulated for the observed higher agreement among resident assistants for administrative-supervisory functions. (See page 124.)

3. Leadership functions (Sub-scale III) are considered more important by resident advisors than by either resident assistants, upperclassmen, or freshmen students. It is interesting to find that resident assistants and students have similar expectations for leadership functions. Only on this aspect of the total resident assistant's role were the students and resident assistants in agreement.

The assumption might be made that leadership expectations, as measured by the fifteen items in Sub-scale III, are less affected by training than they are by age and education. However, examination of the individual items reveals that there is no single item for which resident assistants and students hold similar expectations while disagreeing with the resident advisors.

Freshmen students consider "delegation of responsibilities for precinct affairs to committee chairmen by the resident assistant"

to be less important than do either resident advisors, resident assistants, or upperclassmen. This is the only item of the total instrument on which the two student groups disagree. It is difficult to generalize from this item because of the lack of consistency with responses to other items. (e.g. freshmen rate "coordination of precinct activities by resident assistant" similary to the resident advisors and assistants.)

All four groups are more similar to each other in the amount of consensus they have on leadership functions than on any other function of the resident assistant's role. The assumption might be made that the resident assistant's leadership responsibilities are no less clearly defined in the minds of students than in the minds of the residence hall personnel staff.

Because of the lack of reliability of Sub-scale III, any generalizations should be used restrictively and not for the purpose of prediction.

4. Freshmen do not have as high expectations as the other three groups studied for the resident assistant to display the personality

characteristics described in Sub-scale IV. Why the freshmen should hold different expectations is not readily apparent because the sub-scale is composed mainly of general types of characteristics. The overall differences of the freshmen responses appear to be caused by extreme differences on a few items. The result that the groups have the most similar expectations for this area can reasonably be expected.

A closer look at the individual items reveals that advisors and assistants tend to agree on expectations for all items relating to personal characteristics. On no other area did the resident advisors and assistants so completely agree.

No significant differences exist between the amount of consensus which each group has on its expectations regarding the selected personal characteristics. However, the observed within group agreement was greater for the resident advisorsthan for the freshmen. No answer is evident as to why resident advisors should tend to have greater within group agreement than is found among the freshmen.

As with Sub-scales I and III, generalizations should not be used to making predictions but rather to suggest further hypotheses for testing.

Research Implications

The study was based upon two main theoretical positions: (1) Different groups hold different levels of expectations for the role of the resident assistant and (2) factors inherent in a group and in a group's environment affect the amount of agreement among individuals in the group for expectations they hold for the resident assistant.

The position that different groups hold different expectations is tenable. However, agreement within a group does not seem to be influenced by either internal or external factors.

Several recommendations for further research seem appropriate:

1. Greater effort should be focused on defining the differences (age, education, training, etc.) between resident assistants, resident advisors, and students.

2. A longitudinal study of the developmental process of student expectations for the resident assistant's role should increase understanding of differing expectations.

3. Closer investigation of training methods for residence hall personnel staff members could provide valuable information on the effects of training on level and consensus of role expectations.

4. Further research could be conducted on the manner in which training has an effect on role conflict.

5. Examination of role conflict with the purpose of developing other definitions or factors should enhance the usefulness of the role conflict concept.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arbuckle, Dugald S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1953.

Borreson, B. James. "Student Housing as Personnel Work," Trends in Student Personnel Work, E. G. Williamson, editor, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

Browner, Paul J. Student Personnel Services in General Education, ACE, 1949.

Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "Role, Role Conflict and Effectiveness: an Empirical Study," American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, pp. 164-175.

Goulden, Cyril H. Methods of Statistical Analysis, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1952.

Gross, N., W. S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, Third Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1956.

Homans, G. C. The Human Group, New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Company, 1950.

Hoyt, Cyril J. and Clayton L. Stunkard. "Estimation of Test Reliability for Unrestricted Item Scoring Methods," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 12, pp. 756-758, 1952.

Hulett, J. E. and R. Stagner. Problems in Social Psychology, an Interdisciplinary Inquiry, University of Illinois, 1952.

Jacobson, E. et al. "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," Journal of Social Issues, 1951, pp. 19-27.

Jones, Edward E. and John W. Thibaut. "Interaction Goals as Bases of Inference in Interpersonal Perception," Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo, editors, Stanford, California, 1958, p. 151.

Lind, Melva. "An Experiment in the Art of Living," Journal of Higher Education, XVII, 1946, pp. 433-436.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and Analysis of Experiments, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1953.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther and Margaret R. Smith. Student Personnel Work as Deeper Teaching, New York: Harper, 1954.

Nevison, Myrne Burdette. Differing Perceptions of Residence Counselors, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1957.

Nonnamaker, Eldon Ray. The Role of the Enrollment Officer at Michigan State University, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1959.

Norton, Dee W. An Empirical Investigation of Some Effects of Non-normality and Heterogeneity on the F-distribution, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, State University of Iowa, 1952.

Raines, Max Reid. The Role of the Part-Time Student Assistant in the Men's Residence Halls of the Big Ten Universities, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State College, 1952.

Rhulman, Jessie L., (Ch.). Personnel Principles in the Chapter House, ACE, 1953.

Scheffe, Henry. "A Method for Judging All Contrasts in the Analysis of Variance," Biometrica, Vol. 40, June 1953, pp. 87-104.

Sifferd, Calvin S. Residence Hall Counseling, Bloomington, Illinois: McKnight & McKnight, 1950.

Simons, Wesley S. The Personality Characteristics of the Residence Hall Assistant as Related to Job Performance, Unpublished Ed. D. thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1957.

Videbeck, Richard and Alan P. Bates. "An Experimental Study of Conformity to Role Expectations," Sociometry, 22, pp. 1-11, 1959.

Walker, Helen M. and Joseph Lev. Statistical Inference, New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1953.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert. Student Personnel Work in College, New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

APPENDIX A

Initial Pool of Items with Instructions for Categorizing and Ranking

RESIDENT ASSISTANT INVENTORY

The following list of items has been compiled with the help of resident assistants and advisors. The Resident Assistant Rating Form devised by Dr. Wesley S. Simons and used in his Ed. D. thesis and the Enrollment Officer Inventory developed by Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker for his Ph.D. thesis were also utilized in formulating both the approach and the items.

All of the items relate to what a resident assistant should do or be. This does not mean that each item necessarily describes the resident assistant's role in terms of good personnel principles. Certain items (indicated by the number(s) in parentheses immediately following the item) have been inserted to check on the validity of the answers received.

In the final inventory the respondents will be asked to preface each item with "The resident assistant." They will then be asked to circle one of the following responses:

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferable should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

The response chosen should indicate to what extent the resident assistant is expected to perform the function described.

The following is an example:

The resident assistant:

2.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	report any violation of the alcohol regulation in the residence hall which comes to his attention.

STEP 1

You are asked to help determine the final inventory by rating each of the following items on the basis of how important you think the item is in regard to the role of a resident assistant. Rate the items 1, 2, or 3 in the space provided before each question. A rating of "1" means that it is most important for a resident assistant to do or be what is described by the item. A "2" rating is next most important, and a "3" indicates that this item is of little importance.

Cross out items you consider to be invalid and rewrite any items which you feel are unclear.

Thank you.

STEP 2

With this set of identical items you are asked to place each item in one of five categories:

A-S	Administrative-Supervisory
A	Advisement
L	Leadership
P	Personal characteristics
S	Social interaction

The overall role of the resident assistant has been broken down into these five areas. Assign each item to one of the five categories by placing the initial(s) represented before the categories above in the space just prior to each item.

Thank you.

1. ___ mediate disputes between students in his precinct.

2. ___ post notices on the precinct bulletin boards to keep the residents well informed.

3. ___ arrange for mixers between his precinct and a precinct from one of the women's halls.

4. ___ be sincere.

5. ___ be discreet in questioning others and refrain from prying needlessly into their personal affairs.

6. ___ be familiar with the idiosyncracies or "moral taboos" of his men so that he does not offend them in these areas.

7. ___ report any violation of the alcohol regulation in the residence hall which comes to his attention.

8. ___ refrain from making decisions for the men in his precinct.

9. ___ encourage his men to dress properly and to maintain or improve their manners.

10. ___ evaluate the performance of each of his precinct members in the program of the precinct and the residence hall.

11. ___ take groups of students from his precinct out for informal coffee breaks during the week.

12. ___ spend at least five nights a week in his precinct, so that he can have more contact with his men.

13. ___ lead group discussions within his precinct.

14. ___ act in a mature manner.

15. ___ recognize the symptoms of those needing counseling (i.e., vocational, educational, social, personal, etc.)

16. ___ refrain from discussing the personal problems of any of his men with other precinct members.

17. ___ be patient when working with others.

18. ___ learn easily and be willing to learn new approaches.

19. ___ personally and without the help of the students enforce quiet hours.

20. ___ delegate responsibilities to his precinct committee chairmen for handling precinct affairs.

21. ___ refrain from disciplining any student in his precinct in the presence of other students.

22. ___ be consistent in directing and maintaining his precinct.

23. ___ be a good listener.

24. ___ work with students whose problems are less serious in implication and refer problems which appear more serious to the proper persons.

25. ___ go drinking with those men in his precinct who are of age.

26. ___ be able to recognize his own limitations and inadequacies.

27. ___ encourage other leadership in his precinct.

28. ___ encourage a feeling of mutual consideration of others by the men in his precinct.

29. ___ reserve judgment concerning individuals until valid information is available.

30. ___ be available to the men in his precinct to help them with their problems.

31. ___ remain slightly aloof from the men in his precinct.

32. ___ be able to work with all social and economic groups in the precinct.

33. ___ be loyal to the head resident advisor.

34. ___ carry out administrative policy even though he disagrees with the policy.

35. ___ keep in contact with parents of his men by letters.

36. ___ be able to remain calm under pressure.

37. ___ be able to budget and utilize his time effectively.

38. ___ stay away from discussions by his men which might be unfavorable for someone not present.

39. ___ advise the committee chairmen in his precinct on their jobs.

40. ___ have a thorough knowledge of the rules of the residence halls and the university.

41. ___ be able to organize and direct his precinct toward common goals.

42. ___ be able to lead a group meeting efficiently and in a democratic manner.

43. ___ refrain from making close personal friendships with his men.

44. ___ help the members of his precinct to improve their study habits.

45. ___ keep a record of each student's behavior so that he can recognize approaching problems and is better prepared to help the student.

46. ___ attempt to involve every man in his precinct in the social affairs of the precinct.

47. ___ be able to explain the philosophy of the university and the residence halls.

48. ___ be able to explain the rules and regulations of the residence halls and the university.

49. ___ know women resident assistants and women social chairmen so that they can make social arrangements for the men in his precinct.

50. ___ invite students into his room as they pass by so that they may become better acquainted.

51. ___ participate in or attend precinct athletic events.

52. ___ be able to adjust easily to new situations.

53. ___ refer students who desire advice or information to the proper source.

54. ___ know at least two counselors at the Counseling Center.

55. ___ keep his door open when he is in and not studying.

56. ___ help to channel the energies of his men toward useful functions.

57. ___ encourage good men to try for a chairman's position or other office in the precinct or hall.

58. ___ be able to develop an "esprit de corps" within his precinct.

59. ___ encourage members of his precinct to help in planning the precinct program.

60. ___ be able to subordinate personal feelings when a higher decision is made.

61. ___ always fulfill his obligations and responsibilities.

62. ___ have a positive attitude toward the residence hall program and the University.

63. ___ always be honest in his relationship with others.

64. ___ have a good sense of humor.

65. ___ tutor students in his precinct in subjects for which he is qualified.

66. ___ refrain from discussing with other students matters which any of his men have told him in confidence.

67. ___ always say "hello" whenever he sees his men and call them by their first name.

68. ___ be acquainted with the operations of the Counseling Center.

69. ___ seek advice from his men about how to handle discipline situations in the precinct.

70. ___ basically like people and enjoy working with them.

71. ___ help the students to understand his responsibilities.

72. ___ be genuinely concerned with the needs of the men in his precinct.

73. ___ be able to understand and be aware of the feelings of others.

74. ___ be able to easily gain the respect of others through his appearance and performance.

75. ___ help coordinate the activities of his precinct.

76. ___ train the committee chairmen of his precinct for their jobs.

77. ___ perform at least to the level he expects of others.

78. ___ invite members of his precinct to go to church with him.

79. ___ refrain from being sarcastic and using disparaging remarks in making suggestions or criticisms of others.

80. ___ refrain from discussing information given to him in confidence except when it is being referred to a proper source for necessary disposition.

81. ___ be able to make suggestions or criticisms in a manner which is not offensive.

82. ___ serve as a consultant to his precinct chairmen.

83. ___ encourage activities which will produce greater unity among the members of his precinct.

84. ___ refrain from talking against the residence halls or University in front of his precinct members.

85. ___ be a person who will not hesitate to praise people when they have done a good job.

86. ___ be considerate of others and respect their feelings.

87. ___ be conscientious in performing his duties.

88. ___ refrain from gossiping.

89. ___ get to personally know each student in his precinct.

90. ___ attend and support the activities of his precinct.

91. ___ eat with different members of his precinct so that he can get to know all of them better.

92. ___ be consistent and not continuously changing his mind.

93. ___ behave in a manner which will <u>not</u> lead anyone to question his morals.

94. ___ double date with different members of his precinct.

95. ___ be familiar with the family life of his men.

96. ___ be able to recognize and recommend qualified students for future resident assistant positions.

97. ___ have an awareness of a few basic techniques of counseling.

98. ___ be familiar with religious preferences of his men so that he can make proper referral should the need present itself.

99. ___ be tactful.

100. ___ be flexible.

101. ___ be dependable and reliable.

102. ___ be a good personal example in work and behavior.

103. ___ attempt to operate his precinct in such a manner that the members feel an identity with the entire hall.

104. ___ solicit advice from others in an effort to improve himself.

105. ___ be decisive and definite in his actions.

106. ___ have individual contact with each member of his precinct at least twice a week.

107. ___ be familiar with social rules of etiquette.

108. ___ be even-tempered and not easily excitable.

109. ___ keep the Head and Graduate Resident Advisors well informed on the activities and programs of his precinct.

110. ___ look for causes of behavior and be as much concerned with the causes as with the behavior itself.

111. ___ refrain from showing favoritism in his relationships with the men in his precinct.

112. ___ encourage participation in the whole residence program through his participation.

113. ___ drop in on various groups in his precinct when they are having "bull" sessions to take an active part in the discussions.

114. ___ consider the other fellow's point of view and try to put himself in the other fellow's place.

APPENDIX B

Instrument Used in the Study

This questionnaire is being used to examine the expectations that students, resident assistants, and resident advisors have for the role of the resident assistant. This information will be used as the basis for my Ph.D. thesis. It should only take a few minutes of your time to complete the 60 items.

Thank you for your cooperation,

Harold R. Marquardt

Harold R. Marquardt
Head Advisor, Butterfield Hall
Michigan State University

RESIDENT ASSISTANT INVENTORY

You are asked to express your expectations regarding what <u>you</u> think a resident assistant in the men's residence halls at Michigan State University should do or be.

In responding to these items please choose one of the following:

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferably should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

Begin each item with "The resident assistant." Then choose one of the above responses which best expresses to what extent <u>you</u> expect the resident assistant to perform the function mentioned in the item. Respond according to how <u>you</u> think a resident assistant should <u>actually</u> perform, not how he should ideally perform. Circle the response you select. Be certain to answer all items.

The resident assistant:

1. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be available to the men in his precinct to help them with their problems.

2. AM PS MMN PSN AMN discipline students in his precinct in the presence of other students.

3. AM PS MMN PSN AMN attempt to organize and direct his precinct toward common goals.

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferably should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

The resident assistant:

4.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	use sarcasm to emphasize a point when making suggestions or criticisms of others.
5.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	allow his precinct chairmen to do their job without any interference or help from him.
6.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	allow his men to know when he doesn't agree with a higher decision which he must enforce.
7.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	decide at the beginning of fall term what will be the best program for his precinct.
8.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	be a person who would rather listen than talk.
9.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	have an awareness of a few basic techniques of counseling.
10.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	be able to explain the philosophy of the University and the residence halls.
11.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	encourage participation in the whole residence program through his participation.
12.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	be able to recognize his own limitations and inadequacies.
13.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	discuss the personal problems of any of his men with other precinct members.
14.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	keep a record of each student's behavior so that he can prepare a more accurage evaluation of his men at the end of the year.

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferably should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

The resident assistant:

15. AM PS MMN PSN AMN train the committee chairmen of his precinct for their jobs.

16. AM PS MMN PSN AMN expect a high performance level form his men, even if he is unable to perform as well.

17. AM PS MMN PSN AMN advise the committee chairmen in his precinct on their jobs.

18. AM PS MMN PSN AMN place loyalty to the Head Resident Advisor ahead of being loyal to his men.

19. AM PS MMN PSN AMN allow precinct spirit and unity to develop by itself.

20. AM PS MMN PSN AMN refrain from gossiping.

21. AM PS MMN PSN AMN help the members of his precinct to improve their study habits.

22. AM PS MMN PSN AMN have authority in any precinct of the residence hall.

23. AM PS MMN PSN AMN remain slightly aloof from the men in his precinct.

24. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be able to adjust easily to new situations.

25. AM PS MMN PSN AMN discuss with other students matters which any of his men have told him in confidence.

26. AM PS MMN PSN AMN evaluate the performance of each of his precinct members in the program of the precinct and the residence hall.

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferably should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

The resident assistant:

27. AM PS MMN PSN AMN reward the "good" men in his precinct by allowing them more privileges.

28. AM PS MMN PSN AMN always behave in a manner which is above reproach.

29. AM PS MMN PSN AMN look for causes of behavior and be as much concerned with the causes as with the behavior itself.

30. AM PS MMN PSN AMN through discipline make examples of students who break rules.

31. AM PS MMN PSN AMN help coordinate the activities of his precinct.

32. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be able to remain calm under pressure.

33. AM PS MMN PSN AMN refer all problems of which he is uncertain to the Head Advisor.

34. AM PS MMN PSN AMN keep the Head and Graduate Resident Advisors well informed on the activities and programs of his precinct.

35. AM PS MMN PSN AMN attempt to find his own close personal friendships among his precinct members.

36. AM PS MMN PSN AMN have at least a 2.6 all-university grade point average.

37. AM PS MMN PSN AMN form opinions of his men as quickly as possible so that he will better know how to work with them during the year.

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferably should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

The resident assistant:

38. AM PS MMN PSN AMN have a positive attitude toward the residence hall program and the University.

39. AM PS MMN PSN AMN delegate responsibilities to his precinct committee chairmen for handling precinct affairs.

40. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be tactful.

41. AM PS MMN PSN AMN work with students whose problems are less serious in implication and refer problems which appear more serious to the proper persons.

42. AM PS MMN PSN AMN carry out administrative policy even though he disagrees with the policy.

43. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be consistent in directing and maintaining his precinct.

44. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be a person who will try not to hurt anyone's feelings.

45. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be discreet in questioning others and refrain from prying needlessly into their personal lives.

46. AM PS MMN PSN AMN use discretion in reporting any students for having alcohol in the residence hall.

47. AM PS MMN PSN AMN encourage activities which will produce greater unity among the members of his precinct.

48. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be decisive and definite in his actions.

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferably should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

The resident assistant:

49.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	regularly discuss the problems of his men with the Head Advisor.
50.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	be consistent in handling discipline so that all students are disciplined in the same way.
51.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	encourage other leadership in his precinct.
52.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	be even-tempered and not easily excitable.
53.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	always initially accept the student's point of view, even if he doesn't agree.
54.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	refrain from talking against the residence halls or University in front of his precinct members.
55.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	lead group discussions within his precinct.
56.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	always be patient when working with others.
57.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	be able to make suggestions or criticisms in a manner which will not offend any of his men.
58.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	post notices on the precinct bulletin boards in an interesting manner to keep the residents well informed.
59.	AM PS MMN PSN AMN	encourage good men to try for a chairman's position or other office in the precinct or hall.

AM	absolutely must
PS	preferably should
MMN	may or may not
PSN	preferably should not
AMN	absolutely must not

The resident assistant:

60. AM PS MMN PSN AMN be at least of junior class standing.

PLEASE RECHECK THE INVENTORY TO MAKE CERTAIN YOU HAVE NOT OMITTED ANY ITEMS.

93

160

349

332